"RESPECTING THE SEPARATENESS OF OTHERS:" SEGREGATIONIST OPPOSITION TO AMERICAN FOREIGN AID AND THE FORMATION OF A SOUTHERN INTERNATIONALISM, 1946-1973

By

AMANDA ELAINE SCHLUMPBERGER

B.A., WALDORF COLLEGE, 2008

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, 2011

Submitted to the graduate degree program in History and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Dr. Sheyda Jahanbani, Chair

_____

Dr. Ruben Flores

_____

Dr. Elizabeth L. MacGonagle

_____

Dr. David R. Roediger

_____

Dr. Erik R. Scott

Date Defended: 5 MAY 2015

The Dissertation Committee for Amanda Elaine Schlumpberger

certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

"RESPECTING THE SEPARATENESS OF OTHERS:" SEGREGATIONIST OPPOSITION
TO AMERICAN FOREIGN AID AND THE FORMATION OF A SOUTHERN
INTERNATIONALISM, 1946-1973

_____

Dr. Sheyda Jahanbani, Chair

_____

Dr. Ruben Flores

_____

Dr. Elizabeth L. MacGonagle

_____

Dr. David R. Roediger

_____

Dr. Erik R. Scott

Date approved: 5 MAY 2015

Abstract

The end of World War II, decolonization, and the emerging Cold War made forming an antiracist foreign and domestic policy an imperative for the United States. This context meant that segregation at home tarnished the American image to potential allies in the Third World because the nation claimed to be the defender of freedom and equality against Soviet totalitarianism. This dissertation explores the development of a southern internationalism in response to the antiracist liberal international policies following World War II. I define southern internationalism as a belief in racial citizenship that defined efforts to maintain white supremacist global racial hierarchies, which manifested itself in support for segregation at home and neocolonial relationships abroad. The result of this global vision led to southern internationalist support of nationalistic, unilateral, and militaristic foreign policy and attached racial significance and motives to those foreign policy methods.

This dissertation uses foreign aid as an entry point into understanding how the liberal internationalist programs of the Cold War faced opposition from representatives in the American South. It argues that southern politicians, such as Otto E. Passman, Allen J. Ellender, and George C. Wallace, opposed foreign aid not only for fiscal reasons, but also because they had an alternative vision for national security and controlling the decolonizing world. Their vision, southern internationalism, attempted to combat the connection between the American civil rights movement and nationalist movements throughout the Third World and gradually gained strength during the 1950s and 1960s. Segregationists refined their message against foreign aid and eliminated direct mention of race during the 1960s so that their objectives were more palatable to a national audience. Therefore, they crafted foreign aid into a symbol for both domestic and international racial disorder. The result was a political rhetoric that attached racial meaning and

symbolism to foreign aid. Imbuing foreign aid with racial meaning allowed segregationists to take their regionalist international vision to a national audience while maintaining appeal to their southern base. Southern internationalism became one of many political traditions that formed a conservative internationalism in the 1960s and 1970s around shared interests and objectives.

Acknowledgements

As a first-year graduate student, I used to imagine sitting down to write the acknowledgements on my dissertation. I always looked forward to the moment when I could properly take a moment to show my gratitude to all the people, both inside and outside of academia, who shaped my graduate career and helped me intellectually, financially, and emotionally through this journey. I saw it as a way to express my heartfelt appreciation to everyone that has influenced my professional and personal life during these crucial years. Now, as I sit here, I realize the enormity of the task of summarizing all the people who have been instrumental in ensuring my success. A simple "thank you" seems far too inadequate. Looking back on my graduate career, I can see now just how many people have played such large roles in helping me get this far. Perhaps it is clique to say, but my dissertation and education really were far from an individual task, and the people—named and unnamed—who guided me through it have my deepest gratitude.

I never intended to go to graduate school and become a historian. I admit now to being entirely confused by what graduate school even entailed when my undergraduate professors first suggested it to me. Still, I was encouraged and curious and began researching programs. I'm forever indebt to those undergraduate professors, who saw some sort of potential in me and provided me guidance as I set out on this path. I especially want to thank Nicole Anslover, Matthew Plowman, and Doug Biggs.

Once at the University of Kansas, the welcoming environment of the history department and its graduate program immediately struck me. I have made some wonderful colleagues and friends during my time in the program that contributed to my growth as a scholar and provided

camaraderie. Claire Wolnisty and Irene Olivares have been a source of constant support. Not only have they thoughtfully read and provided feedback on large sections of the dissertation, but also they are some of the most kindhearted people and wonderful friends. Likewise, Mary McMurray has provided important feedback on the project, and has been one of my biggest cheerleaders and best friends. In addition, Stephanie Stillo, Shelby Callaway, Nick Cunigan, Alex Boynton, Jacki Miller, Rob Miller, Scharla Paryzek, and Sarah Bell have become dear friends, and without them there would have been a lot less laughter (and a lot more solitude) in my life during the last seven years.

I would also like to thank my dissertation writing group—Josh Nygren, Adam Sundberg, Harely Davidson, and Jared Taber—who spent significant time reading drafts of each of these chapters. Their thoughtful criticism and advice were crucial as I worked on revisions. John Clune read many parts of this dissertation at various stages, and deserves mention for his careful feedback, as well. I'm sure I have forgotten to name important people, but it is certainly not because I do not recognize their contribution and friendship. The friendships I have made while at KU have enriched my life on a professional and personal level, and I am grateful for it all.

A large amount of gratitude goes to my advisor, Sheyda Jahanbani, who has guided me through the dissertation with patience and enthusiasm. She carefully read each revision and provided thoughtful critiques and suggestions. She helped me (and continues to do so) in working through the difficult conceptual challenges in writing this dissertation. She encouraged and challenged me to be ambitious in my research and project. Her guidance was instrumental in my growth as a scholar. My thanks also go to other KU faculty members who contributed their valuable insight and feedback to this project, particularly my committee members, Liz

Table of Contents:

Introduction:

Nationalizing Southern Internationalism

In 1967, Bill Jones, a George Wallace for President campaign staffer, drafted an article with the intent that it would be published under George Wallace's name in the *Saturday Evening Post.* He sent his finished draft in a memo to Cecil C. Jackson, Wallace's executive secretary. In the wake of the major civil rights bills of the mid-1960s and the growing tide of black militancy that coincided with the civil rights movement's renewed focus on socio-economic justice and equality and the dawn of Black Power, Jones' article sought to rallying the growing white, middle-class resentment and backlash over the Democratic Party's domestic and international policies that had dominated American politics since the New Deal. As he sat down to pen the article, Jones channeled Wallace's fiery and dramatic political rhetoric. Throughout the draft, he emphasized themes of anti-intellectualism, American exceptionalism, local control of schools, overreach of the federal government, patriotism, and American sovereignty, all of which Wallace had built his political identity around. Jones therefore sought to tie all of these themes together, and he found his common denominator in the anti-liberal rhetoric aimed at the policymakers in the Lyndon B. Johnson administration.[1]

Jones' draft revolved mostly around deriding the direction domestic policies had taken under the liberal presidencies of the post-World War II era. Significantly though, in the completed draft that reached the desk of Jackson, Jones choose to draw readers in by opening with a discussion on the connection between international aid programs and the size and "overreach" of the American federal government. In doing so, Jones' words for Wallace both

---

[1] Bill Jones to Cecil C. Jackson, Memorandum on proposed article by Governor Wallace for *The Saturday Evening Post,* 1 August 1967, Box 10, Folder 3, George Wallace Collection, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

echoed and contributed to a longer tradition in American political thought regarding the role of

the United States in the world. Specifically, the draft articulated a particular vision of what the

parameters of the United States' interactions with the rest of the world should be. Jones argued

that the United States had extended itself too far in the world. Yet, he still saw the United States

deeply imbedded in the world, and made no calls to disentangle itself from it. He instead took

issue with the way the United States engaged with the rest of the world, and hinted at what an

alternative vision to that engagement would look like under a Wallace administration.

Underlying this alternative vision and helping it resonate with the general public was Jones' use

of international fears as well as domestic ones concerning changing racial hierarchies.

Alluding to an alternative foreign policy, Jones focused much of his attention on

dismissing the current administration. To do so he established Wallace as a political outsider, in

spite of Wallace's reputation as being politically conniving and a master manipulator. Jones

dismissed then-current political leaders as "genteel, polished and educated cowards," which

served to paint Wallace's political opponents as out-of-touch, snobbish elites. He then proceeded

to suggest that the over-intellectual "cowards" running the nation were to blame for the loss of

the very thing that, in Wallace's opinion, defined America to the rest of the world, namely, its

"rugged individualism and sheer intestinal fortitude."[2] Key among Jones' statement for Wallace

was that the current policies had not only surrendered the American character, but that they had

sold the United States out to the whims of lesser nations and peoples. In terms of foreign policy,

Jones made it very clear that Wallace believed that the United States should not allow any other

nation or peoples to dictate how the nation conducted itself abroad. The question of who

---

[2] Bill Jones to Cecil C. Jackson, Memorandum on proposed article by Governor Wallace for *The Saturday Evening Post,* 1 August 1967, Box 10, Folder 3, George Wallace Collection, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

benefitted from American policies abroad therefore was a key concern for Wallace because he feared giving aid represented the United States being at the whim and demands of other nations.

Foreign aid played an important role in Jones' ability to convey to readers the damage done by what he labeled as oversized and over-intellectual government programs, especially to American prestige abroad. With regards to foreign aid, Jones was able to use it as a symbol for the entirety of American foreign policy under the presidencies following the Cold War. Jones declared, "Today we allow every pipsqueak hottentot in the world to kick us in the teeth and then hold out his hand for some more foreign aid. Furthermore, in the name of freedom and the protection of the human welfare we have strait-jacketed ourselves with guidelines, guideposts, regulations, laws, opinions, ukases and executive orders. We have put on kid gloves when we should be talking softly and carrying a big stick."[3] In this statement Jones was able to connect the size of the government and its bureaucracy to his dismissal of aid recipients while evoking racial images in an effort to discredit aid recipients as ungrateful and twofaced "pipsqueak hottentots."[4]

Jones believed that the nation had gone too far and given up its prestige and very identity by allowing aid to be given to nations that did not prescribe to and support American goals. As seen in Jones' concern over the size of the government and its conduct towards peoples abroad, Jones also demonstrated that his vision for Wallace's engagement abroad was deeply shaped by domestic perceptions and politics. In connecting the erosion of American character and individualism to the size of the government, the imagery of foreign aid recipients as treacherous to American international interests while simultaneously primitive with outstretched hands,

---

[3] Bill Jones to Cecil C. Jackson, Memorandum on proposed article by Governor Wallace for *The Saturday Evening Post,* 1 August 1967, Box 10, Folder 3, George Wallace Collection, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.
[4] Bill Jones to Cecil C. Jackson, Memorandum on proposed article by Governor Wallace for *The Saturday Evening Post,* 1 August 1967, Box 10, Folder 3, George Wallace Collection, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

Jones created a critique of policy and aid recipients that would have reminded American readers of domestic policies and racial tensions. The result of this rhetoric was that Jones' was participating in an important step in the development of an alternative vision of American foreign policy. This was a vision that had regional roots in the history of segregation in the American South, but with the likes of Wallace and his contemporaries that vision had taken on national resonance. For opponents of liberal internationalism, dismissing foreign aid became steeped in symbolism and racial meaning in both international and domestic contexts. For example, Jones had moved beyond simply reiterating southern opinions regarding federal interference in segregation, to referencing a distrust and resentment of government size and its "human welfare" programs.[5] These "human welfare" programs not only cited foreign aid abroad, but also alluded to foreign aid being in the same vein as Johnson's Great Society social welfare programs. Therefore, Jones used the size of the federal government and its "human welfare" programs as key topics to attack Johnson while moving beyond outright racist declarations, which carried appeal among the American people beyond the American South. The national appeal of Wallace revolved around shared langue of resentment, nationalism, anti-liberalism, and unilateralism.

Importantly, Jones' drafted article for Wallace was never published. However, the reasons that the Wallace campaign shelved the article did not have to do with any sort of disagreement in the message the article conveyed. Wallace had used the same type of language and ideas Jones presented in his drafted article many times before in his local and national campaigns. Furthermore, the line regarding sending money to "Hottentots" actually draws from a longer history of critiques against liberal internationalism, specifically the New Deal liberalism

---

[5] Bill Jones to Cecil C. Jackson, Memorandum on proposed article by Governor Wallace for *The Saturday Evening Post,* 1 August 1967, Box 10, Folder 3, George Wallace Collection, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

of the Franklin D. Roosevelt era. For example, in response to Henry A. Wallace's 1942

"Common Man Speech," the National Association of Manufacturers declared that its members

make guns and tanks to "help our boys save America," not "for a quart of milk for every

Hottentot, or for a TVA on the Danube." The image of the United States providing "a quarter of

milk for every Hottentot" became pervasive in the isolationist opposition to FDR's policies and

internationalism. Robert A. Taft argued against any sort of international control of sovereign

states' resources, dismissing such programs as the foolhardy attempts of "do gooders" to "confer

the benefits of the New Deal on every Hottentot."[6] Jones and Wallace recognized the ability of

this imagery to speak to both international and domestic issues and carry resonance with a large

portion of the American public.

Wallace, although using the rhetoric of the isolationists of the pre-World War II era, did

not endorse their isolationist stance and adopted the language for his own purposes. These

purposes were in line with his efforts to export his southern appeal that revolved around his fiery

stage persona and bombastic speeches against integration to shore up national appeal. During his

wife's 1966 gubernatorial campaign, Wallace reminded the crowd that supporting his wife's

election also meant supporting his national political ambitions. He affirmed, "Why should we

change our image to suit some communist Hottentot ten thousand miles away from here?"

Wallace continued by reminding the crowd that those ideals were not unique to Alabama, and

that they had national support.[7] The fact that Wallace was able to adapt a familiar political troupe

for his own purposes begins to demonstrate the way that he was able to take his regional,

southern-based ideals to a national audience. Not only were his chosen words familiar in

---

[6] Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 159, 338.
[7] Stephan Lesher, *George Wallace: American Populist* (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1994), 363-364.

American political history, but also when Wallace posed them the implied racist meaning were brought to the forefront of his message.

Jones had lifted those crucial racially charged lines in his article almost verbatim from Wallace's own words earlier on the campaign trail. If anything, Jones' article toned down the racial meanings in Wallace's message about foreign aid. In a February 1967 campaign stop Wallace highlighted the connection he saw between domestic policies and foreign aid, suggesting that the same underlining liberal policies were threatening American identity and prestige. He insinuated that the United States was funding communists and their allies with aid. He continued by alluding to the international influence on the passage of key civil rights legislation. Reaching his crescendo, Wallace declared "Every hottentot in the world kicks us in the teeth and we smile and send them a few more billion. They stone and burn our embassies and tear down our flag and burn it and we send them more aid. But let a law-abiding school board fail to sign an illegal and vague 'loyalty oath' and immediately funds are deferred or terminated."[8] In connecting aid to foreign countries with an image of a government that disregards its own people (significantly, with regards to local control over schools), Wallace foreshawdowed the same rhetoric and imagery as Jones to suggest that both at home and abroad the American government was yielding to very "un-American" pressure.

Importantly, Wallace, and later Jones, never explicitly stated that maintaining America prestige abroad entailed a very specific vision of the United States and how citizenship was defined. Still, by connecting racial imagery of aid recipients to the same policies that had domestically yielded civil rights legislation and social-economic programs aimed at benefiting the impoverished, Wallace and Jones presented a vision of America and its prestige that was

---

[8] George C. Wallace, "Citizens Councils of America Leadership Conference," New Orleans, LA, 17 February 1967, Box SG034328, Folder Citizens Councils of America Leadership Conference, Administrative Files, 1958-1968 1967, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

firmly rooted in a "racial nationalism" in which American citizenship was defined by Anglo-Saxon lineage. The Anglo-Saxon lineage held an "inherited fitness for self-government" that could not be transplanted.[9] Foreign aid therefore was a target for Wallace during his national campaigns and was in direct response to the modernization efforts of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, because he believed that it allowed inferior peoples to assert their influence on American domestic and international policies. Furthermore, not only did such influence threaten white control in the United States, but foreign aid, with its inherent ideal of economic uplift via development, also threatened white control around the world.

The result of Wallace's calculated word choice allowed for critiques of domestic policies to be grafted onto discussions of international matters. This was part of a longer process in the development of a conservative international alternative foreign vision during the Cold War. This alternative vision was in part rooted in the American South and segregationists' efforts to maintain white control of social, political, and economic systems within the United States and later around the world. The southern vision was one that saw American engagement with the rest of the world as defined by American control, unilateral actions, force, and nationalism and sovereignty. The southern internationalism that was one of the varied ideological foundations of a conservative international coalition and it emphasized a white supremacist facet to those interactions with the rest of the world. Segregationists therefore often exalted the importance of unilateral actions and nationalism in their effort to control the changing dynamics of racial hierarchies around the world due to the threat that they saw decolonization and the civil rights movement posing to their own positions of power. Jones' draft is an example of how segregationists frequently connected their attacks on liberal domestic and foreign policies

---

[9] Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4.

because they saw them as eroding national, and more to the point, white sovereignty. This allowed southern internationalists to share common ground and language with other conservative political traditions, such as Barry Goldwater and his sunbelt conservatives.

Foreign aid proved to be an especially useful topic in segregationists' efforts to discredit liberal policies at home and abroad due to its imagery and parallels to domestic programs of socio-economic uplift in the 1960s. For Wallace and others, foreign aid therefore became a political symbol for what they defined as government overreach and interference at home and abroad. In the context of his late 1960's national presidential campaigns, Wallace was able to us foreign aid as a way to discredit civil rights and federal efforts at socio-economic justice. He did so by eliminating direct use of the racially charged rhetoric that had defined his earlier regional political career. Instead, as Jones' article demonstrates, he discredited aid recipients and suggested that the "intellectuals" in the federal government were undermining American sovereignty and prestige. In eliminating direct racial references, and using foreign aid as a symbolic whipping boy for the policies that allowed for the deterioration of white supremacist domestic and international control, Wallace was participating in a process of nationalizing southern internationalism.

Wallace's national presidential campaigns were a key moment in the creation of a conservative internationalism that was an alternative to the prevailing liberal international political traditions. Despite Wallace's legacy as a demagogue and political outlier, his efforts to rely on foreign aid and other racially coded political symbols to convey his domestic and international vision represented an effort to take his southern vision to a national level. Following the landmark civil rights bills of the mid-1960s, in the general public and political circles outright racist declarations were increasingly harmful to political clout and legitimacy.

Therefore, for segregationists, finding ways to talk about race without mentioning race became a key strategy. Furthermore, this strategy had broad appeal due to growing resentment among white, middle class families during the 1960s and 1970s.

The strategy that Wallace exemplified with his use of foreign aid as a symbol for other policies as presented to a national audience represents the basis for common foreign policy objectives of conservative internationalism. Much like the conservative coalition that emerged in the United States during the 1960s and 1970s, conservative internationalism found diverging political interests working towards shared goals and interests. Wallace's campaigns represent the segregationist internationalist base for that larger political coalition. Significantly, his national presidential campaigns and the coded racial language he used, especially surrounding foreign aid represents how that conservative international coalition was able to form and find common ground around the underlining issue of controlling shifting global racial hierarchies. With outright racist declarations like the ones that marked Wallace's early career, it would have been difficult for the alternative international vision that segregationists proposed to gain much traction outside of their southern base. Thus, the racial symbolism that Wallace and others were able to attach to foreign aid (and domestically, busing, welfare, and other socio-economic policies aimed to help those in poverty and ease inequities) allowed for shared interests over the size of the government, anti-intellectualism, fiscal conservatism and nationalism to come together.

This dissertation therefore explores the process by which segregationists like Wallace presented an alternative vision to managing the postcolonial world, and how they gradually, used those methods to move beyond the confines of the American South. Foreign aid provides a window into this process and serves as an example for the larger political process that was

occurring amongst southern segregationists. This longer process cumulated with Wallace's presidential campaigns and the shift in foreign aid policy to human rights based initiatives in 1973 with the New Direction policies and Basic Human Needs (BHN) mandate during the Carter administration. In large part because of the Vietnam War the reorientation of foreign aid under the New Direction policies represented a larger shift in foreign policy and the role of Congress in shaping foreign policy. This shift meant that there was increasing opposition to foreign aid from both the political left and the political right.[10] The result was that the rhetoric and discourse surrounding the debate over foreign aid changed as well, but the language and meanings of the earlier debates remained embedded in the way politicians discussed foreign aid.

This dissertation investigates the origins of a conservative internationalism in the post-World War II era. It uses foreign aid as an entry point into understanding how the liberal internationalist programs of the Cold War, such as development aid faced opposition from representatives in the American South. It argues that southern representatives, such as Otto E. Passman and Allen J. Ellender both of Louisiana, opposed foreign aid not just for fiscal reasons, but also because they had an alternative vision for national security and controlling the decolonizing world. That vision, southern internationalism, was connected to their efforts to maintain southern socio-economic racial hierarchies at home. I define southern internationalism as a belief in racial citizenship that defined efforts to maintain white supremacist global racial hierarchies, which manifested itself in support for segregation at home and neocolonial relationships abroad. The result of this global vision led to southern internationalist support of nationalistic, unilateral, and militaristic foreign policy and attached racial significance and motives to those foreign policy methods.

---

[10] Vernon W. Ruttan, *United States Development Assistance Policy: The Domestic Politics of Foreign Economic Aid* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 94; 104-105.

Southern internationalism attempted to combat the connection between the American civil rights movement and nationalist movements throughout the Third World and gradually coalesced through the 1950s and 1960s. Segregationists refined their message against foreign aid and eliminated direct mention of race during the 1960s. Segregationists, therefore, crafted foreign aid into a symbol for both domestic and international racial disorder. Imbuing foreign aid with racial meaning allowed segregationists to take their regionalist international agenda to a national audience. It was one of the many ways that they could talk about race without directly mentioning it. The result was a political rhetoric that attached racial meaning and symbolism to foreign aid. George C. Wallace's presidential campaigns especially highlighted the role of southern internationalism in using common motives and objectives surrounding foreign affairs to help build a New Right coalition.

Significantly, this project sheds new light on the rise of American conservatism in the postwar period. By linking the histories of foreign aid with civil rights opposition, it counters the assumption that southerners were parochial and isolationists who were only focused on their "own backyard." Instead, it reveals that they had their own agenda and methods to control what they saw to be the disorder of decolonization, and that vision was firmly rooted in their domestic view of how the world should be ordered, in this case, racially. People like George Wallace, Senator Ellender, and Representative Passman therefore fought foreign aid and ideas of global uplift by presenting a unilateral and nationalistic alternative to world engagement. They achieved this end by constructing a political fiction surrounding American foreign aid and turning it into a symbol of the excesses of liberal internationalism at home and abroad. I define political fiction to mean the manner in which opponents of foreign aid and civil rights frequently spoke of the non-

white recipients of aid in the Global South as corrupt beggars. The political fiction about the

Third World was a symbol that political ideologues employed to connect foreign aid with the

civil rights movement. This southern internationalism--in which segregationists presented

foreign aid as an international version of welfare--aligned with the later conservative

internationalism with regards to methods and the rhetoric used to discuss foreign affairs. The

inherent racial meanings in southern critiques of liberal spending at home and abroad contributed

an important political tradition in the political paradigm shift towards new conservatism in the

early 1970s.

     Aid represented contested political ground to politicians during the Cold War. For

segregationists, the connection between domestic and international policies meant that the Cold

War potentially threatened domestic racial hierarchies as it gave Third World nationalists and

domestic civil rights leaders a platform to argue for the Cold War imperative of civil rights

legislation. The international pressure for the United States to live up to its own ideals and win

allies against the Soviet Union during the Cold War provided civil rights leaders and anti-

colonialists leverage in their struggle for social justice and equality.[11] At the same time,

segregationists were adamantly anti-communist and dedicated to winning the Cold War. They

therefore had to counter international calls from the former colonial world to end segregationist

practices in the United States. The result was that segregationists wove their critiques of civil

---

[11] Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 14; Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Kevin K. Gaines, *American African in Ghana: Black Expatriates and the Civil Rights Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Gerald Horne, *Black and Red: W.E.B. DuBois and the Afro-American Response to the Cold War, 1944-1963* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986); Michael L. Krenn, *Black Diplomacy: African Americans and the State Department, 1945-1967* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1999); Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination* (Boulder: Westview, 1988); James H. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935-1961* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Penny von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004).

rights activists and global pressure as nothing more than communist agitators.[12] In terms of an international vision, their dismissal of international influence fit seamlessly with their nationalistic, unilateral approach to foreign policy.

For liberals, the paternalistic nature of the language surrounding development aid was rooted in a liberal development model that was not intentionally designed to be racist. Instead, it functioned on the idea of collaboration and self-help, which in itself implied that people in the Global South were capable of reaching "modernity" as modeled by the United States.[13] In President Harry S. Truman's technical assistance plan he saw not only an opportunity for the United States to benefit in geopolitics, but also an opportunity to replicate the "progress" of the West around the world.[14] For liberal internationalists, Western progress did not result from the efforts of its citizens, but from political ideology, capitalism, and technology, which could be replicated through development aid around the world.[15] This liberal internationalist belief in the potential for modernity regardless of race stood directly against the segregationist belief in racial citizenship and white supremacy.

At the center of the debate between conservatives and liberals stood the question of meaning and symbolism of development. It was important to Truman that advances made around the world via development symbolically reflected the same ideals that the United States claimed to represent in the context of an ideological battle against communism during the Cold War. Included among these were "democratic values, property rights, and alignment with the United

---

[12] Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004).

[13] Sheyda Jahanbani, "One Global War on Poverty: The Johnson Administration Fights Poverty at Home and Abroad, 1964-1968," in Francis J. Gavin and Mark Atwood Lawrence, eds., *Beyond the Cold War: Lyndon Johnson and the New Global Challenges of the 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 97.

[14] Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 85.

[15] Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 89; Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 4.

States and its allies."[16] In the context of decolonization, liberal internationalists used foreign aid

in line with the democratic impulses of the changing global racial hierarchies. Segregationists

countered by trying to entrench the old racial hierarchies, often dismissing foreign aid as

supporting communism in the Third World as opposed to democratic ideals.

Liberal development was a way to try to reshape the world in a democratic, anti-

imperialist, and capitalist image. The introduction of development into the Cold War expanded

the parameters of the Cold War beyond capitalism and communism. Instead, the Cold War

became a battle for the Third World between two anti-imperialist and distinctive development

models.[17] For liberals, development entailed progress that could effectively bring "civilization"

to other parts of the world.[18] Liberals thought that they could create appropriate economic and

political conditions to lead to the "culmination of modernity," an industrial society, with the

United States being the epitome of modernity.[19] Development projects were designed to not only

produce growth, but also to guide growth to a desired outcome imbued with specific meaning.[20]

Indeed, officials and theorists defined political development as "democracy, stability, anti-

Communism, peace, world community, and pro-Americanism."[21] With western aid and an

infusion of technology, liberal development promised that material gains could be made in the

---

[16] Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: American's Cold War Battle against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 5.

[17] For more on the Cold War as competing development models see Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Intervention and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[18] Michael E. Latham, "Modernization, International History, and the Cold War World," in *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War,* eds. David C. Engerman, Nils Gilman, Mark H. Haefele, and Michael E. Latham (Amherst and Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 5.

[19] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 4; David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 5; David C. Engerman, *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 2.

[20] Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 4; This method of controlling development of new nations fits with Michael H. Hunt's argument that controlling political and social change overseas is one of three fundamental ideologies in American foreign policy, see: Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 18.

[21] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 4.

Third World, but at the same time the material gains would also lead to new habits of modernity.[22] The proposed programs ultimately sought to bring modernity to all corners of the earth.

One of the key features of liberal development was its antiracist ideology. The connection liberals made to antiracism in foreign policy was strongly connected to domestic antiracism as well. Segregationists and white supremacists saw their own position at home slipping away under the influence of liberals and their development scheme. Historian Michael Krenn argues that race was never far from development, and later "modernization theory," despite the progressive rhetoric associated with it. He notes, "When the idea of race began to lose its biological foothold in the post-World War II year, it simply rebounded by attaching itself quite easily and seamless to cultural explanations of the unique progress of the Anglo-Saxon world and the continuing backwardness and lack of civilization in the nonwhite world. The amazing resiliency of racism, however, allowed it to stave off challenges during the Cold War."[23] Indeed, liberals also tried to remake racial hierarchies in an image that they wanted, and of course theory and practice did not always intersect into workable solutions. However, liberal development did ideally practice antiracism in which the West's superiority was based on a historical process that could be replicated rather than race or cultural explanations.[24] Historian David Engerman points out liberal intellectuals, in the 1920s, overcame the prevailing belief in distinctive national characters by taking up the cause of universal progress in which national character did not shape

---

[22] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 4.

[23] Michael L. Krenn, "Token Diplomacy: The United States, Race and the Cold War," in Philip E. Muehlenbeck, ed. *Race, Ethnicity, and the Cold War* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press), 14.

[24] Akira Iriye, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 7.

destiny, but was merely an obstacle to modernity.[25] What Krenn describes--the continued

prevalence of race in shaping United State foreign policy and enforcing Western superiority--was

the result of opposition to liberal development from segregationists.

Southern internationalism, at first glance, might appear to be nothing more than the old

isolationism of the pre-World War II era, but the South presented an alternative vision of

internationalism that rested on maintaining white supremacist racial hierarchies, not withdrawing

from the world. The isolationist/internationalist binary, therefore, is a bit misleading since few

political figures in the mid-20th century would have actually seriously considered completely

withdrawing from international affairs, as the prototypical definition of isolationism would

suggest.[26] Still given the popularity of the terminology the dichotomy is useful for classification

of politics during the Cold War. Charles Lerche argues that the distinction between the two terms

is not quantitative, "but rather a matter of the terms and conditions under which these contacts

were to be initiated and carried on." Lerche continues, "The isolation of the Untied States,

therefore, is conceived of as being conceptual and intellectual rather than crudely physical.

Americans are admitted to be unquestionably *in* the world but emphatically not *of* it."[27]

Isolationism therefore was inherently unilateralist in foreign affairs. Comparatively, the

internationalist philosophy of American foreign affairs thought American destiny was "tied up

with the whole of mankind."[28] Lerche suggests a unilateralism/multilateralism dichotomy as a

---

[25] David C. Engerman, *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 4.

[26] Charles O. Lerche, Jr. *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 19.

[27] Charles O. Lerche, Jr. *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 20.

[28] Charles O. Lerche, Jr. *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 20-21. Lerche elaborates on the difference between the two, writing, "Thus the first position [isolationism] denies the centrality of the world political system to the choices facing the United States, while the second [internationalism] makes such areas of common concern the very foundations of long-term American planning and action" (21).

more effective alternative. For variation and to use familiar vocabulary, I will use the terms

interchangeably (e.g. unilateralism/isolationism and multilateralism/internationalism).

Contextually speaking, sociologist and racial theorist Howard Winant argues that during

the post-World War II years there was a global shift, or "break," in "the worldwide racial system

that had endured for centuries." According to Winant, this break occurred because challenges

such as anticolonialism, antiapartheid, the U.S. civil rights movement, and the Cold War,

converged against the old racial hierarchy.[29] Thus, in the post-war years, the United States stood

at a moment when government leaders and social activists disputed domestic and international

racial hierarchies. The result was "a worldwide, antiracist, democratizing tendency."[30] State and

non-state actors, who participated in the post-war development network, therefore operated

within the context of global challenges to old racial hierarchies.[31] However, the outcome of the

global confrontations did not eliminate the entrenched system of racial inequality. Instead the old

racial hierarchies adapted to changing conditions, revealing the fluid and contradictory nature of

racial hegemony development.[32]

The process in which opponents of foreign aid adapted old racial hierarchies to the

increasingly antiracial political movements of the post-war era speaks to a larger trend in post-

civil rights American politics in which politicians use coded racial language. The use of coded

language became even more pronounced in the late 1960s once blatant displays of racism

became socially unacceptable. This was one way segregationists adapted to changing race

relations. Adapting here means a repackaging where racial hierarchies, in theory, no longer

---

[29] Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), xiii.

[30] Winant, xiii.

[31] Development networks refer to the government and nongovernmental organizations that carried out development aid's efforts.

[32] Winant, xiii, xiv. Winant elaborates that, "with the unprecedented set of democratic and egalitarian demands, racism had to be *adapted*."

existed but white supremacists and segregationists did. In their fight against the global and

domestic shifts in white racial hegemony, segregationists utilized methods that reinforced

"traditional" racial orders. In doing so, they worked within the liberal system and ultimately

adjusted to it, creating a new way of discussing race in the United States and how the nation

approached race on a global scale. Nikhil Pal Singh describes this historical process as the

"discourse of civil rights liberalism" that has been co-opted by conservatism where politicians

equate "ending racism with eliminating racial reference within juridical discourse and public

policy."[33] In this sense, the political discussions surrounding issues such as welfare and busing,

and in this case foreign aid, became coded with the racial implication masked under so-called

color-blind policies.

Unlike segregationists, who thought development threatened white supremacy, for

liberals, race and development were linked during the early Cold War years as part of the same

agenda that sought to reorient the world away from racist hierarchies. Specifically, the

convergence of several historical moments made civil rights and development important to

forming an antiracist platform for liberals. These moments were the end of World War II,

decolonization, and the emerging Cold War. After World War II, the world had seen the horrors

of racism in Hitler's concentration camps, which placed civil rights reform in the United States

in the context of the new concept of human rights.[34] The emergence of the Soviet Union as an

expansionist power at the same time new nations were forming in Africa and Asia due to

decolonization further entrenched the importance of antiracist policies for American liberals.

Indeed these events meant that segregation at home was a black mark for the United States as it

---

[33] Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 10.

[34] Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).

simultaneously claimed to be the defender of freedom and equality against totalitarianism while failing at achieving its own ideals. Liberals like Harry Truman, therefore, saw civil rights reform at home as integral to containing the advance of the Soviet Union into the former colonies, who watched closely the racial situation in the United States.[35]

Regionalism in foreign policy necessarily plays a key role in understanding opposition to foreign aid. Historian Joseph Fry argues, "*Place* matters in how Americans have responded to and influenced the formation and implementation of U.S. foreign policy; therefore, systematic, but necessarily selective, assessment of the scholarship addressing the intersection of domestic regionalism and U.S. foreign policy significantly enhances our understanding of both regional and national American history."[36] Although Fry presents a convincing case for the inclusion of regionalism in the history of American foreign relations, the task of integrating it into historical interpretations is not without its pitfalls. First and foremost is the job of defining geographic borders versus the idea of a region, as historians of the American West are already well aware of. For my purposes, I define the South as both a geographical location outlined by the former Confederate states and also a more ambiguous area defined by prevailing ideas held in the region. It is also significant to note when collectively referring to the South as a region I am characterizing those that held political, economic, and social power, namely the "white South." This is not to discount that African Americans and other minorities did live or influence the Southern perspective, but rather to follow where the prevailing political perspective came from.

---

[35] Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Harvard University Press, 2001); Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Philip E. Muehlenbeck, ed., *Race, Ethnicity, and the Cold War: A Global Perspective* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2012); Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935-1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Penny von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).

[36] Joseph A. Fry et al., "Special Forum: Domestic Regionalism and U.S. Foreign Relations," *Diplomatic History* 36, no. 3 (2012): 452.

Recognizing that the ideas that characterized the South, such as segregation, existed beyond the borders of the former Confederacy, I use the South as an example and window into the larger themes of race in U.S. foreign policy, while at the same not denying its distinctive history.

Before the late 1950s southern congresspersons largely voted in consensus on foreign aid and most other foreign policy decisions.[37] However, this began to change after the immediate Cold War years (1945-1953). Foreign aid and Southern ambivalence toward it provides an early indicator of changing southern attitudes towards international relations.[38] Indeed, an early study by Charles Lerche reaches the same conclusion Fry did through detailed analysis of southern voting patterns. Lerche argues, "The change in the international outlook of the South is nowhere more clearly documented than in the record its congressmen have made on the question of that hardy perennial of recent American foreign policy, foreign aid."[39] Although Fry and Lerche both suggest the importance of domestic events in changing the Southern outlook, they spend significantly more time on fiscal conservative attitudes and outlooks and international events than they do on the way such attitudes had domestic connections. Given the importance of foreign aid in assessing southern international attitudes it provides an equally significant bridge between international and domestic issues due to the centrality of race in both topics.

Due to the significance of the southern region in understanding American foreign policy and the illuminating role that foreign aid serves in gauging the region's vision of international engagement, this dissertation focuses on key southern political figures. These political figures not only serve as examples of a larger group of officials, but they also themselves were

---

[37] Charles O. Lerche, Jr. *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 59.

[38] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South in U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press), 226.

[39] Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 58.

influential in their opposition to foreign aid. The first of these historical figures is Allen J.

Ellender, a senator from Louisiana. Allen Joseph Ellender was born in 1890 in the Terrebonne

Parish. He was proud of his Acadian heritage and worked on his father's farm, but at the same

time aspired to rise above it. Even at a young age his family members began to call him "Sous-

Sous," which roughly translates to "Little Pennies." One explanation for this nickname was that

Ellender hustled family members and passersby for pennies when he was young. Another was

that as a child Ellender had a dream of finding pennies under his bed, but upon awaking and

realizing it was just a dream he cried mournfully.[40] Either way, from a young age Ellender

showed a propensity towards money and how it was spent. Applying his work and economic

values to his ambitions, Ellender was admitted to the bar in 1913 after attending Tulane

University Law School. In 1937, having served in various local and state political positions he

achieved his national political ambitions and was elected as a Democrat to the Senate, where

served until his death in 1972.

Like his early proclivity towards fiscal conservatism was a common southern principle,

Ellender also accepted the racial order of things in the South. He readily adopted the paternalistic

impression of blacks as lazy and inferior to whites despite having only occasionally come in

contact with African Americans during his childhood.[41] During his time as a Senator he would

often reflect on his association with African Americans when writing to constituents concerned

over civil rights, "The Lord only knows I am not against the Negro. I was raised among them and

I understand them very well."[42] According to Ellender's biographer, Thomas Becnel, "Young

---

[40] Thomas A. Becnel, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 11, 17.

[41] Thomas A. Becnel, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 13-14.

[42] Allen J. Ellender to Dr. Walker Percy, 1 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA. He later reiterates this point and his paternalistic

Allen learned of race relations during his formative years, when segregation and discrimination were ever present and violence was not unusual."[43] Later, when serving on the Senate Committee on Appropriations, his fiscal conservative and segregationist worldview shaped Ellender's opinions and decisions regarding domestic and international affairs and made him a key figure in understanding how race intertwined domestic and international politics.

Ellender's colleague in the House of Representatives also serves as a key figure and example in the development of a southern internationalism. Otto E. Passman from Louisiana also had a reputation as a fiscal conservative, and his favorite whipping boy was foreign aid. In 1958 he famously told a representative of the State Department, "Son, I don't smoke and I don't drink. My only pleasure in life is kicking the shit out of the foreign aid program of the United States of America."[44] Like Ellender, Passman was also a segregationist, who tied his domestic racial views together with his vision for what American foreign policy should look like. Passman placed a premium on preserving American sovereignty over all else and he saw all attempts by "something called 'liberalism'" to promote integration as sacrificing American liberty at home and sovereignty abroad on the altar of "compassion for racial minorities."[45]

Alabama Governor and perennial presidential candidate, George C. Wallace is perhaps the most recognizable figure in this dissertation. He is also the outlier among the congressmen. However, both because of his national political profile and because of his extremism, Wallace's opposition to foreign aid is a useful and necessary study to include when analyzing how

---

approach to race in an oral history interview, see: Allen J. Ellender, interviewed by Larry Hackman, 29 August 1967, transcript, John F. Kennedy Library, 44-45.
[43] Thomas A. Becnel, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 16.
[44] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 252.
[45] "From the Office of Otto E. Passman," 1 March 1957, General Files, Folder 07 Newspapers and Publicity, January-May, undated material, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

segregationists connected foreign aid to domestic civil rights to help form a racial basis for their

alternative internationalist vision. Known for his racist diatribes, his biographers frequently

describe Wallace as a true politician, one who would say whatever he had to win votes.

Furthermore, he was well aware of the political act that he was putting on.[46] Despite being

skilled at telling people what they wanted to hear, Wallace believed in segregation and state over

federal control. His success in the South and beyond rested on his ability to weave his attacks

against integration into a larger assault against liberals and the federal government. This helped

him in taking his message to a national audience.

Although a historian's periodization always runs the risk of appearing arbitrary and

obscuring just as much as it reveals, framing this project from 1949-1973 effectively

encapsulates the development of an alternative foreign vision surrounding foreign aid in the

context of the civil rights movement and Cold War. In development and foreign aid history,

traditionally, the Cold War led to the establishment of the modern foreign aid system due to its

purpose as a diplomatic tool.[47] David Ekbladh however, argues that the roots of development

ideology that informed the creation of a liberal consensus surrounding foreign aid during the

Cold War were in the Depression era, an outgrowth of New Deal policies on a global scale.[48]

Thus, in 1949 when President Truman announced his Point Four program, Ekbladh argues

against the notion that the origin of American development ideology was rooted in the

requirements of Cold War diplomacy. Instead, Ekbladh maintains Point Four, "was not a

[46] Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), 15. "Wallace: Welcome Home You Living Doll," *Newsweek,* 1 June 1964, 18. Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 8.
[47] Carol Lancaster, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 25.
[48] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

beginning but an acknowledgment that development had a prominent and permanent position in the global strategy of the American state."[49]

I acknowledge that the ideology underlying American foreign assistance had other origins outside the Cold War, but at the same time, the Cold War did change--or at least complicate and expedite--the practice and importance of foreign assistance. Concerning Point Four, Nick Cullather argues,

> It was at this moment of modernist optimism that Truman's Point IV speech proposed a complicated merger between development and the Cold War. Foreign aid was never simply a weapon against Soviet influence; even without a superpower confrontation the United States would have needed some means to manage the transition to a postcolonial world. The Cold War skewed aid priorities, certainly, but development shifted the Cold War onto entirely new ground. In just a few paragraphs the principles axes of global opposition--communist/noncommunist, colonial/anti-colonial--were enfolded within the overspreading categories of development and underdevelopment.[50]

Modernization theories and the Cold War affected each other due to the larger context of decolonization, and American development policies adjusted in a manner that made the Cold War about development. Beginning with the Marshall Plan and Point Four, therefore, serves as a useful starting point to examine the connection between civil rights at home and foreign aid practices abroad due to their significance as a turning point in the Cold War and development.

To show the progression of the southern internationalism heralded by the likes of Ellender, Wallace, and Passman and its connection to a more nationally based conservative internationalism, in chapter one I begin by demonstrating how race began to enter the discussion of development aid. Using the Marshall Plan and Truman's Point Four program to compare how

---

[49] Ekbladh, 79; for more on the history of development aid and its origins before Point Four see Eric Helleiner, "The Development Mandate of International Institutions: Where Did it Come From?" *Studies in Comparative International Development* 44, no. 3 (2009), 189-211; Nick Cullather, "Development? It's History," *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 4 (2000), 641-653.

[50] Nick Cullather, "Development? It's History," *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 4 (2000), 651. Also see Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) in which Westad argues that the Cold War was between to competing modes of development.

southern politicians changed their rhetoric and support surrounding the key early foreign aid policies, I argue that the response to liberal domestic and international policies by southern members of congress moved away from their initial support of Wilsonian internationalism. Instead, they increasingly argued for a more unilateral approach to foreign aid. Importantly, their move away from the Democratic consensus around Wilsonian internationalism was spurred on by their efforts to discredit the convergence of antiracist domestic and international politics that liberals championed through their internationalist approach to foreign affairs, specifically in the early development aid programs to the Third World. The United Nations introduced a multilateral approach to development aid, and when paired with the gradual civil rights reforms indicated an effort by the federal government in the post-World War II era to rectify America's image with its claims of equality for all, segregationists began to see the international impulse and efforts to guide decolonization as harmful to a white dominated socio-economic hierarchy around the world. Their efforts to move towards a unilateral and nationalistic national security policy therefore represented the foundation for their southern internationalism.

Following the beginnings of the southern international impulse, chapter two poses the question of what happens to southern support for foreign aid during the Eisenhower administration. The Eisenhower administration is a key moment in both the history of foreign aid and civil rights. In foreign aid policy, Eisenhower attempted to reduce development aid and also orientate it towards a more militaristic stance. This direction in foreign aid policy, based on the opposition expressed by Ellender and his congressional colleagues over the Point Four technical assistance program, should have appealed to the segregationists' nationalistic and anticommunist calls to foreign aid. Instead, the 1950s witnessed the continued decline of southern support for Democratic liberal internationalism. This continued decline of southern support for liberal

internationalism was due to the beginnings of a more organized civil rights movement, and the increased international pressure due to Cold War foreign policy imperatives that came with it. To show how a southern internationalism began to coalesce in response to the growing American civil rights movement, this chapter examines the southern reaction to the 1954 Supreme Court *Brown* decision. It also looks at the way segregationists combatted the platform that foreign aid and propaganda campaigns provided to foreigners. In response to the growing influence on domestic racial hierarchies that liberal internationalism allowed, this chapter addresses how segregationists began to build their own white supremacist international network with white-rule colonies and nations.

Chapter three then explores the beginnings of a nationalizing trend in southern internationalism. It argues that southern Democrats, in fear of the entrenchment of foreign aid under President Kennedy and his modernization theory of liberal development, began to insert domestic racial ideologies into their demands for fiscal conservatism. Southern politicians such as Ellender, Wallace, and Passman began to directly attack liberal internationalism via their use of foreign aid as a symbol of the same political philosophy that promoted civil rights at home: unchecked liberalism. Segregationists felt their desire to maintain a white dominated racial global hierarchy increasingly threatened by liberal international political philosophies. To segregationists, the civil rights movement and Third World nationalism came from the same dangerous political philosophy, and that philosophy threatened white American hegemony at home and abroad. Segregationists responded by entrenching their internationalist vision under the disguise of nationalistic, unilateral rhetoric regarding foreign policy, imbuing foreign aid with a proxy racial symbolism.

The efforts of people like Ellender, Passman, and Wallace solidified the southern internationalism alternative to liberal internationalism, which became the foundation for a conservative internationalism that rested on segregationist efforts. Chapter four explores this key moment in the creation of a conservative internationalism around southern internationalism. It shows how domestic civil rights debates influenced the opposition to American foreign aid policy by tracing the ways in which segregationists contributed to a national conservative coalition around the issue of foreign aid. It tells the story of how segregationists were able to take their southern internationalism and to fit with a conservative alternative to liberal internationalism that presented an approach to foreign affairs that sought to maintain traditional racial hierarchies at home and abroad. This chapter shows that increasingly in the 1960s the rhetoric surrounding race in the United States changed to one where out-right racist declarations and support of segregation became less acceptable in political discourse.[51] Therefore, when on the national campaign trail, due to the racial symbolism foreign aid carried, segregationists, like Wallace, were able to use foreign aid as a way to attack liberal policies without directly mentioning segregation and racial hierarchies. The result was that foreign aid was a key element in segregationist's efforts to create a conservative coalition. Taken together, these four chapters trace the story of how segregationists used foreign aid in their efforts to adapt old racial hierarchies to the changing ones of the decolonization age, illuminating a key element in the conservative ascendency that had roots beyond domestic concerns.

The significance of this project is threefold. First, on a disciplinary level it contributes to several historiographical topics both expanding and challenging their assertions. It subsidizes to

---

[51] For example in a 1965 letter that Wallace kept for reference, Henry E. Garratt suggested that segregation had become a hated word. See: Henry E. Garrett (Professor Emeritus of Psychology, Columbia University) to Cecil Jackson (assistant to George C. Wallace), 1 April 1965, Box SGO22384, Folder Civil Right (1 October 1964-13 April 1965), Administrative Files 1963-1979, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

the idea of "cold war civil rights" as coined by Mary Dudziak and Thomas Borstelmann by

exploring how and why domestic civil rights and foreign policy influenced each other in often

contradicting ways.[52] Furthermore, following a similar vein of inquiry as David Ekbladh it

expands the discussion of modernization and development policies, by looking domestically to

understand foreign aid policies.[53] In its broadest sense though, my project offers a narrative that

puts segregationists into a global context by highlighting connections they made between race at

home and abroad.

Historians have explored the development of liberalism within a global context, but little

work has been done on the origins of a counter or alternative "conservative internationalism."[54]

The dissertation argues that one of the political traditions in conservative internationalist

coalition can be traced back to the American South and its vision for post-World War II foreign

---

[52] Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 14; Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Kevin K. Gaines, *American African in Ghana: Black Expatriates and the Civil Rights Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Gerald Horne, *Black and Red: W.E.B. DuBois and the Afro-American Response to the Cold War, 1944-1963* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986); Michael L. Krenn, *Black Diplomacy: African Americans and the State Department, 1945-1967* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1999); Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination* (Boulder: Westview, 1988); James H. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935-1961* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Penny von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004).

[53] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010); David C. Engerman, *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003); Michael E. Latham, "Modernization, International History, and the Cold War World," in *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War,* eds. David C. Engerman, Nils Gilman, Mark H. Haefele, and Michael E. Latham (Amherst and Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003); Nick Cullather, "Development? It's History," *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 4 (2000): 641-653; Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).

[54] An exception is the recent work by Henry Nau, which attempts to identify the role of the conservative international tradition in the grand narrative of American foreign policy history. Henry R. Nau, *Conservative Internationalism: Armed Diplomacy under Jefferson, Polk, Truman, and Reagan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013).

policy. It follows southern anxieties over domestic race relations into attacks on foreign aid policy in the 1960s and 1970s, analyzing a connection between domestic and international politics, which shows that segregationists were not solely concerned with "their own backyard." Rather they saw the maintenance of a segregated society as integral to how they defined American politics, culture, and society. Moreover, they linked their own struggle to resist the growing tide of civil rights to controlling international decolonization efforts. Whereas their liberal counterparts sought to manage the rapidly changing international dynamics of the post-war years through modernization and uplift, segregationists sought to maintain their position of socio-political superiority at home and abroad by maintaining a system of racial hierarchies through Jim Crow and neocolonial world engagement.

Second, and most broadly, my project speaks to the question of characterizing conservative political rhetoric in the post-civil rights era. Matthew Lassiter argued in *The Silent Majority* that the rise of conservatism did not happen because of outright white reactionary racism in the South, instead it grew out of "color-blind" suburban politics.[55] In this sense, the political discussion of issues such as busing became coded and the racial implication masked under so-called color-blind policies. My project internationalizes this argument, by looking at how a similar process occurred in debates over foreign aid. The implied racialized meanings and symbolism in that prevalent rhetoric describing foreign aid is imbedded in how Americans discuss and understand foreign aid, despite it being detached from the reality of its practice.

Third, this project has important implications for understanding foreign aid and racism in America today. Public opinion polls as recent as 2010 have pointed out, the American public has a tradition of ignorance on aid giving practices, often grossly overestimating the amount sent

---

[55] Matthew D. Lassister, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

abroad. Recognizing misunderstandings on aid policy as a persistent theme in American foreign aid, I aim to historicize this phenomenon and illustrate the power that the segregationist political fiction surrounding aid and underlying racial attitudes coded in that fiction has on public support for policy decisions. Presently, the United States Congress is debating the amounts, merits, and methods of foreign aid projects under concerns over the federal budget. In doing so, politicians continue to publicly perpetuate stories on ineffective, bloated aid programs. Understanding how and why similar processes occurred in the past explains today's interplay between domestic and international politics inherent in the discourse on foreign aid and the way political debates over it have and continue to maintain certain perceptions about foreign aid.

Thus, my project looks at the development of this covert racism in American conservative politics and how it relates to international politics of the Cold War, specifically the institutionalization of foreign aid in American foreign policy. It traces it back to segregationist alternative vision for managing the post-World War II antiracial and anticolonial impulses on a global scale. This vision rested on racialized nationalism, anticommunism, and unilateral actions to guide the United States in its global interactions. The segregationists' efforts to maintain global white supremacy via Jim Crow in the United States and neocolonial global structures were a key contributing factor in the New Right coalition that formed in the 1970s and has dominated American politics since. As Howard Winant rightfully has observed, this "'New Right' discourse" is "hegemonic today, and in these terms racism is rendered invisible and marginalized. It is treated as largely an artifact of the past."[56] According to Winant, the result is that, "the neoconservative project now extends beyond strictly racial issue to a quasi-imperial defense of the political and cultural canons of Western culture tout court." The result is that this

---

[56] Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race, Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 44.

neoconservative project argues for a "color-blind" racial politics while at the same time co-opting former antiracist perspectives, including those of modernization ideology, to deny the validity of perceptions of racial difference, and thus, racism.[57] In its broadest sense then, the story of the introduction of southern internationalism into a conservative internationalist coalition seeks to the explain how the prevailing "color-blind" and "quasi-imperial" American domestic and international politics came to dominance, which in turn illuminates how the United States exercises power and how its citizens continue to understand those global interactions through the lens of racialized symbolism.

---

[57] Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 59.

Chapter I:

"Our White Man's Partiality for Our European Cousins":
The Intersection of International and Domestic Racial Tensions in the Marshall Plan and
Point Four

In 1963 Frank M. Coffin, the deputy director of the Agency for International

Development (AID) from 1961 to 1964, compiled an AID pamphlet in an effort to dispel some

of the fallacies circulating around foreign aid. Serving under President Kennedy, Coffin reasoned

that to allow oppositional foreign aid myths to go unchecked threatened the efforts the

administration was making to restructure and bolster the American foreign aid program. A key

part of Coffin's argument was that the opposition to foreign aid remained the same and had been

proven wrong time and time again. To demonstrate this point he cited two examples from the

pages of the *Congressional Record.* Having presented an excerpt from the Senate and the House

of Representatives, Coffin revealed that the two examples were not from 1963. Instead the

example from the Senate came from a 1948 debate over the Marshall Plan, while the House

quotes came from the 1950 debate on Point Four.[58] This information was intended to shock the

reader.

Despite his argument to the contrary, the examples that Coffin used demonstrated just

how much foreign aid opposition had actually changed over time. Additionally the change

became apparent over a relatively short duration. The sample Coffin cited from the 1948 debate

on the Marshall Plan was from a speech by Senator George W. Malone, a Republican from

Nevada. Malone's argument focused on economic concerns surrounding the Marshall Plan. He

also introduced military and national security issues into his speech, articulating his larger

critique that the Truman administration lacked a coherent foreign policy in the midst of the

---

[58] Frank M. Coffin, "Foreign Aid…Controversy and Reality," Folder Agency For International Development, 1961-
1963 (4 of 4), Box 2, Edwin R. Bayley Personal Papers, Subject Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

threating Soviet Union. When discussing the people who would receive Marshall Plan aid,

Malone did not present them as beggars, corrupt, or somehow incompetent. When he did

mention the recipients of the Marshall Plan he blamed American fiscal irresponsibility for

problems in the program rather than the recipients. He was also occupied with American

acquisition of minerals for repayment. Finally, European political matters entered Malone's

speech, because he feared propping up what he viewed as socialistic governments in Great

Britain and elsewhere.[59] Overall, Malone's speech echoed his contemporary allies in the debates

over foreign aid by focusing on fiscal and foreign policy matters.

Coffin's second example, from the House of Representatives, took on a much sharper

tone and demonstrated that among some members of congress the move from the Marshall Plan

to Point Four in foreign aid policy was not just a matter of fiscal or national security

responsibilities. Instead, Coffin's citation of Representative William's Lemke's (Republican-

North Dakota) attack against Point Four's technical assistance to the Third World demonstrated a

subtle shift in the language of foreign aid opposition. Lemke's speech employed the Uncle Sam

and Lady Columbia metaphor to present the United States government as a lecherous uncle being

lured abroad by immoral temptations. Lemke warned, "There is danger ahead. Our Uncle in his

flirtations has become the easy prey of foreign and domestic grafters, vampires, and gold

diggers. He is no longer competent to take care of the wealth that Miss Columbia and her sons

and daughters have created and accumulated."[60] Lemke blamed both the internationalist

Democratic administration in the White House and those requesting and receiving aid. He

---

[59] George W. Malone, 94 *Cong. Rec.* S 2188-2190 (5 March 1948); Frank M. Coffin, "Foreign Aid…Controversy and Reality," Folder Agency For International Development, 1961-1963 (4 of 4), Box 2, Edwin R. Bayley Personal Papers, Subject Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[60] William Lemke, 96 *Cong. Rec.* HR 4142 (27 March 1950); Frank M. Coffin, "Foreign Aid…Controversy and Reality," Folder Agency For International Development, 1961-1963 (4 of 4), Box 2, Edwin R. Bayley Personal Papers, Subject Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

degraded both groups using infidelity as a metaphor. Equally important, he not only suggested

aid recipients in the Third World were gold diggers, but he also included "domestic grafters"

amongst those who tempted the integrity of the United States. Lemke connected recipients of aid

to those benefiting at home from government international involvement. Coffin's suggestion

that Malone and Lemke's arguments against foreign aid were the same as any heard in 1963 thus

oversimplified the history of foreign aid opposition. Rather, the examples allude to the domestic

significance that foreign aid took on, as well as the importance of how politicians viewed the

recipients of aid, as foreign aid shifted from Europe to the Third World.

Another key change that Coffin ignored was the regional shift in opposition. Coffin, as a

Democrat, reasonably used Republican opposition to demonstrate the continued follies of the

foreign aid opposition. However, a comparison of voting in the Senate on the Marshall Plan and

Point Four demonstrates a growing opposition that divided as much along regional lines as it did

on party lines. Very few Senators voted against the Marshall Plan, but the majority of those who

did were Republicans.[61] In comparison, there was a much larger number of Senators who voted

against the Point Four technical assistance program. Of course the majority were Republicans,

but there was also a much larger number of Democrats who voted against the Truman

administration's key foreign policy initiative. Although a couple of those Democratic nays came

from the historically isolationist Midwest, the majority of Democrats that broke ranks from

Truman by voting against Point Four hailed from southern states like Virginia, Arkansas, and

Georgia. The question then becomes what accounts for the shift in both language and partisan

support for foreign aid between the Marshall Plan and Point Four programs. The answer, in part,

lays in the way that the lines between foreign and domestic politics became intertwined during

the early Cold War.

---

[61] "Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (Marshall Plan)," 96 *Cong. Rec.* S 2202 (1948).

This chapter studies how the language of race entered the political debates over early Cold War foreign aid programs, specifically the Marshall Plan and Point Four.[62] Comparing the political discussions surrounding Point Four and the Marshall Plan, it begins to historicize the process of the adaptation of old racial hierarchies to the changing global context.[63] Particularly it focuses on liberal development models found in parts of the Marshall Plan and Point Four that called into question old racial hierarchies and how defenders of those hierarchies responded. The comparison of Malone and Lemke's opposition to the two different foreign aid programs demonstrates the manner in which where and to whom aid was going mattered not only for foreign policy, but also domestic politics.

Exploring how individuals in the American development enterprise discussed foreign aid policy establishes the foundation of an emerging political fiction surrounding foreign aid during the Cold War. In the decades following the end of World War II, as both American development programs and the civil rights movement gained momentum, this political fiction coalesced. I define political fiction to mean the manner in which opponents of foreign aid and civil rights spoke of the non-white recipients of aid in the Third World as corrupt beggars. The political fiction about the Third World was a symbol that political ideologues employed to obscure foreign aid policies to the public. Opponents of foreign aid drew connections between race relations at home and US foreign policy. They saw advances for civil rights as a threat to the political power of their white supporters, equating black demands at home and abroad. They

---

[62] I define "race" here as a social construct, meaning people and their social orders--as opposed to essential, biological categories--create racial difference. For more, see Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: from the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York: Routledge, 1994). In addition Howard Winant has expanded the social construct race theory to include the more precise term "sociohistorical construct." Meaning that the meaning of race is not just social constructed, but that humans constantly remake it over time. See Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), xviii.

[63] Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), xviii.

therefore sought to discredit liberalism's foreign development projects and their civil rights plank. The political fiction began during these early years of foreign aid programs as Malone and Lemke's speeches in Congress suggest.

This chapter argues that in response to liberal domestic and international policies, Southern members of congress moved progressively towards unilateralist and nationalistic policies. Their response was an effort to avoid the convergence of antiracist domestic and international politics that liberals championed through their internationalist approach to foreign affairs, specifically emerging foreign aid policies. Whereas, the introduction of technical assistance with Truman's Point Four program, alongside gradual civil rights reforms indicated an effort by the federal government in the post-World War II era to control decolonization via development and modernization, segregationists began to see the international impulse and efforts to guide decolonization as harmful to American prestige abroad and white socio-economic superiority at home. Their efforts to move towards a unilateral and nationalistic national security policy therefore represented the beginnings of their own attempts to control the postcolonial world in their vision.

Key to the segregationists' strategy to assert their own alternative foreign policy vision was their effort to discredit international influence in domestic affairs, which undermined the federal government's Cold War-influenced impulse to address domestic racial concerns in an effort to shore up America's position abroad. Historians have detailed the ways American officials viewed the practices of racial segregation and discrimination as a problem for America's image overseas, often spurring on modest legal reforms in domestic civil rights.[64] In

---

[64] Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 14; Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press,

addition, to driving change at home, the Cold War could also limit the level of acceptable

discussion, as segregationists often suggested that civil rights reform was perpetrated by

communist instigators. Carol Anderson argues that the result was that African American activists

modified their objectives from demanding human rights to settling for civil rights and legal

reforms.[65] The Cold War context therefore had a paradoxical affect on the beginning of the civil

rights movement, both enabling reform while at the same time limiting the parameters of that

reform.

Segregationists adamantly rejected any linkage between civil rights and foreign policy

that threatened global white supremacy. Interference in domestic race relations from both

international and domestic sources alarmed segregationists.[66] In rejecting the liberal

internationalists' antiracist universalism, southern segregationists clung to what historian Gary

Gerstle characterized as "racial nationalism" in which American citizenship, defined by Anglo-

Saxon lineage held an "inherited fitness for self-government" that could not be transplanted.[67]

The idea that America's greatness was intrinsically linked to race and could not be replicated

stood ideologically at odds with the justifications that liberals used for development and later

2003); Kevin K. Gaines, *American African in Ghana: Black Expatriates and the Civil Rights Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Gerald Horne, *Black and Red: W.E.B. DuBois and the Afro-American Response to the Cold War, 1944-1963* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986); Michael L. Krenn, *Black Diplomacy: African Americans and the State Department, 1945-1967* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1999); Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination* (Boulder: Westview, 1988); James H. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935-1961* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Penny von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004).

[65] Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004).

[66] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South in U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press), 243-244.

[67] Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4.

modernization policies.[68] Furthermore, in adhering to the idea of white American superiority and fitness, segregationists also rejected the idea that the United States should cater to the whims and perceptions of the former colonial world, especially in terms of Third World nationalists and their calls for racial equality in the United States. Foreign aid not only represented what segregationists saw to be the United States attempting to court former colonies, but also a symbolic diplomatic tool that despite any practical concerns over winning allies in the Cold War, provided a platform for outside influence on American domestic policy. Starting in the late 1940s, segregationists therefore began to slowly break from the ranks of the Democratic Party, rejecting foreign aid and civil rights as part of their effort to maintain an Anglo-Saxon dominated world.

Segregationist attempts to maintain an Anglo-Saxon dominated world were complicated by not only the rapidly growing tide of civil rights in the United States, but also internationally by the wave of decolonization that overtook much of Africa and Asia following World War II. As noted, in the context of the Cold War, this meant that the United States was fighting to win the hearts and minds of the newly independent nations and peoples throughout the Global South. The domestic racial situation in the United States therefore reflected poorly on the United States, who faced competition from the Soviet Union, which claimed to be egalitarian and anti-imperial. In contrast, in light of the United States' internal issues harming their international standing, newly independent nations throughout the Third World also associated the United States and capitalism with western imperialism.[69] Therefore, in both domestic and international policy, the United States government risked losing ground to the Soviet Union over racial issues. Under

---

[68] Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 6.

[69] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 43; Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 92.

President Truman, as the Cold War began, the United States framed the struggle against

communism as a struggle between freedom and slavery. The result was that in an effort to bolster

its anti-imperial standing, the Truman administration and its political allies emphasized

American goals of "self-determination, democracy, and human rights."[70]

    Anti-imperialist rhetoric did not always align with practice though, and Truman

administration had to balance its obligations to its European allies with its attempts to control

decolonization with universal declarations of self-determination and human rights. One of the

key points that historian Thomas Borstelmann makes is that for the majority of the people in the

world colonialism, and not the Cold War, was their main foreign policy concern in the 1950s and

1960s. Therefore, the Truman administration had to navigate the growing calls for independence

in colonial areas while at the same time trying to balance their diplomatic ties with the European

colonizers, building a coalition of the "free world" to contain the Soviet Union.[71] In addition,

American foreign policy experts feared that rapid decolonization in Africa and Asia would harm

European economic recovery and therefore their ability to resist communist expansion.[72]

    The Truman administration therefore attempted to support a policy of gradual

decolonization in their attempt to build a multiracial alliance.[73] However, the growing racial

polarization in southern Africa created a dilemma for the Truman administration, especially

amidst the continued segregation and discrimination African Americans suffered. Borstelmann

---

[70] Thomas J. Noer, *Cold War and Black Liberation: The United States and White Rule in Africa, 1948-1968* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1985), 17.

[71] Thomas Borstelmann, *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern Africa in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 195-198.

[72] Thomas J. Noer, *Cold War and Black Liberation: The United States and White Rule in Africa, 1948-1968* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1985), 17.

[73] For an example of the European colonial legacies see Sven Lindqvist, *"Exterminate All the Brutes": One Man's Odyssey into the Heart of Darkness and the Origins of European Genocide,* trans. Joan Tate (New York: The New Press, 1992). Although more of a memoir than historical account Lindqvist details the history of European imperialism in Africa and argues that there was a genocidal impulse that accompanied it, making the atrocities of the Holocaust not new but rather part of a longer history of European policies.

points out that the administration had hoped to distance themselves from the South African racial policies, but their Cold War commitments to Europe as well as access to resources needed to wage the Cold War present in South Africa (uranium), led the Truman administration to continue to develop a relationship with South Africa even though it could also have hurt their position in the global struggle by calling into question its proclaimed ideologies due to its actions at home and abroad. Foreign aid through technical assistant programs like Point Four therefore became a way for the United States to control the pace and shape of decolonization and by extension the shifting global racial hierarchies that accompanied the end of Western imperialism, while still holding to ideals of human rights and self-determination.[74] Despite its gradualism, during these early years of the Cold War, segregationists began to associate technical assistance to the Third World represented a liberal attempt to control decolonization that ultimately was antiracist in ideology and threatened global white political, social, and economic power.

Indeed, in these early years, segregationists began to associate foreign aid with the excesses of liberal internationalism. While liberal internationalists promoted antiracist development policies, conservatives retreated to isolationist, nationalistic, and separatist defenses against development aid in an effort to maintain racial hierarchies at home and abroad.[75] Examining the way in which racial language entered the political discussion over the Marshall Plan and Point Four, this chapter reveals that politicians and prominent officials involved in the early development enterprises made direct connections between domestic and international racial perceptions, attaching symbolic significance to foreign aid, and undermining political support among segregationists. The result was an increasing support among segregationists for a unilateralist and nationalistic foreign policy. Support for the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan

---

[74] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 97.
[75] See dissertation's introduction for discussion on my usage of the isolationist/internationalist dichotomy.

built a largely bipartisan consensus around foreign aid, but with the introduction of Point Four

racial perceptions began to enter the debate more frequently.

To illustrate the shift in foreign aid opposition this chapter begins with a brief overview

of the internationalist political-orientation of southern segregationists at the end of the Cold War

and the way the intersection between race and development lead to early cracks in the

Democratic Party cohesion. Next, it looks at the creation of a consensus around foreign aid

during in the Cold War with regards to the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. Finally, Point

Four is examined, exploring how it was presented to the American public, concluding with

discussion on the connection between early civil rights and development, which demonstrates the

struggle liberal internationalists had in rectifying their claims of anti-racist ideology to the

realities of domestic and global racism and the segregationist response.

"Permanent World Peace": Segregationists, Internationalism, and the Democratic Party

The gradual southern defection from the Democratic Party is an important part of

understanding the influence of race on the foreign aid opposition, because it demonstrates how

domestic racial issues intersected with the internationalist foreign policy push within the party.

Traditionally, the historical narrative identifies the 1968 election and Nixon's southern strategy

as the moment when the South defected en masse from the Democratic Party in large part due to

the civil rights plank of the party.[76] However, this was just the manifestation of a long process

---

[76] Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975); Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002); Rick Perlstein, *Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America* (New York: Scribner, 2008); Matthew D. Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964); Glenn Feldman argues that overall the South began to leave the Democratic Party at the beginning of World War II and continued to do so because of the way southern conservatives were able to combine white supremacy and economic conservatism together using dislike of the

that had roots not only in domestic politics but also in international politics. It was the manner in which domestic racial politics quickly became intertwined with Cold War foreign policy that nudged the South away from the Democratic Party. The South had steadily moved away from the internationalism that they initially supported following World War II due, in part, to the liberal development impulse in the party and its domestic and global racial implications. The shift in southern politics away from supporting the Democratic Party's foreign policy after World War II resulted in segregationists' laying their the foundation for their own plan to control decolonization.

At the end of World War II white southern segregationists supported increased American involvement in the world. The ratification of the United Nations represented the height of southern support of Wilsonian internationalism.[77] When delegates descended upon San Francisco in April 1945 to draft the United Nations Charter and establish the parameters of the new international institution for cooperation, members of congress from the American South saw the creation of an international institution as the rallying cry for a southern lost cause, Wilsonian internationalism. The drafting and ratification of the United Nations Charter represented the realization of what many politicians in the South held to be a southern idea from a southern president. They believed that they finally were witnessing the realization of one of the "lost causes" of the post-civil war American South with the installation of a southern political ideal.[78] However, the limits of the South's support of internationalism began to show quickly during the early years of the Cold War.

---

federal government as the common denominator. See: Glenn Feldman, *The Irony of the Solid South: Democrats, Republicans, and Race, 1865-1944* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2013).

[77] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2002), 223.

[78] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U. S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2002), 6, 220.

The transformation of the South into the region of the United States that overwhelmingly supported militaristic, unilateral, and nationalistic foreign policy was a somewhat sudden shift during the years immediately following World War II. Historian Joseph Fry identifies several key themes that tempered the American southern foreign policy outlook prior to World War II. Among these was the ideology of republicanism, a colonial-scheme economy based on agriculture, fear for liberties, states' rights, the threat of "foreigners," and partisan politics. Assertive national defense spending and militarism added to the southern foreign policy perspective in 1898 with the introduction of a formal American empire into foreign affairs. Racial assumptions and southern history connected all these themes.[79] Specifically, the idea of the "lost cause" stemming from the Civil War linked economic concerns, racial assumptions, and ideas of states' rights and liberties to foreign policy into "the region's heightened sensitivity to matters of personal, sectional, and national honor."[80]

Senator Allen Ellender's (Louisiana-Democrat) 1946 Senate speech against loans to Great Britain demonstrates the manner in which these white Southern political themes entered foreign policy discussions. Ellender was a Democrat from Terrebonne Parish in Louisiana, first elected to the Senate in 1937. He was a fiscal conservative, and like many of his southern contemporaries accepted the racial social order of the South. He readily adopted the paternalistic impression of blacks as lazy and inferior to whites, and despite having only occasionally come in contact with African Americans during his childhood claimed to "know" them well due to "growing up" with them.[81] Throughout his career—especially during the early Cold War years—

---

[79] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 4.

[80] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 6.

[81] Thomas A. Becnel, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 13-14. Allen J. Ellender to Dr. Walker Percy, 1 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA. He later reiterates this point and his

Ellender was obsessed with the distribution of natural resources. Namely, he evoked the memory of the Civil War and the economic system it created in the South, comparing it to that of the British colonies. Ellender's fiscal conservatism paired with his belief in the southern historical memory of Reconstruction, dictated his understanding of the 1946 proposal for loans to Great Britain. Ellender argued that British reconstruction was the equivalent of trying to "revive a dead horse." He said the British were selfish, and on the topic of providing long-term financial aid to the British he argued, "It will be necessary to keep on pouring money into London, just like pouring water into a rat hole, and expecting it to reach the rats."[82] His proposal for a solution to Great Britain's post-war economic and industrial situation highlighted his domestic perspective, resulting in a paradoxical view regarding colonialism and the restructuring of global politics in the looming postcolonial world.

Ellender's indignation over the British colonial economics was more rooted in his own regional perspective than in concern over the colonies. He continued his speech against the proposed loans by offering his alternative to loaning money to Great Britain, which reinforced exploitive colonial relationships of the British Empire while simultaneously claiming to reject imperialism. He told the Senate that the only way to avoid propping up Great Britain in the long

---

paternalistic approach to race in an oral history interview, see: Allen J. Ellender, interviewed by Larry Hackman, 29 August 1967, transcript, John F. Kennedy Library, 44-45.

[82] Senator Allen Ellender (Louisiana). "Proposed Loan to Great Britain," *Congres. Rec.* 92, Part 4 (29 April 1946): S 4183, 4187. Also See: Box 1433, Folder Foreign Aid Speech, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA. Interestingly this language of foreign aid being money thrown down a rat hole would be the same language that people like George Wallace would later apply to development aid to the Third World. The image of aid recipients as greedy and lazy was easily adapted and racialized by segregationists when foreign aid shifted to the Third World. Used here, it reflected Ellender's fervent fiscal conservatism and his desire to return to the "isolationism" of the pre-war days. He saw little use in propping up Western Europe since they did not have access to essential natural resources for an industrialized, modern economy without colonial possessions. Many Southerner politicians had a paradoxical relationship with imperialism. They equated colonialism to the "occupied South" after the Civil War, and claimed to support self-rule and cultural autonomy. At the same time, in practice, they often opposed majority rule and nationalistic movements in the Third World due to racism, militaristic heritage, and anticommunism. For more on the relationship between the American South and anti-imperialism see: Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 6, 207.

term would be to finically support Great Britain as an empire. He reasoned that since Great

Britain had few natural resources and relied on an economic system where manufacturers in

Great Britain got their raw materials from the colonies and then turned around and "forced"

colonial subjects to buy the finished goods, maintaining that system was the only way to

continue. He then equated the economic plight of the colonies to the American South, stating, "I

do not wish to bring into the picture any reference to the War Between the States, but what I

have stated happened also in our own country. It was the same practice that kept the South so

poor. After the Civil War the South furnished, to a large extent, raw materials to the northeastern

section of the United States, and in the meantime that section grew rich."[83]

Comparing the British economy with the American South after the Civil War implies that

initially Ellender sympathized with the British colonies. His solution demonstrated the opposite.

Not only did he imply that the only way to support Great Britain was through continued support

of its colonial possessions, he essentially suggested that the British export its population to more

resource rich parts of their Empire.[84] Otherwise, Ellender reasoned, that with the British colonies

becoming independent nations and Great Britain thus losing its access to vital resources, it would

be necessary for the United States to keep giving money to London. Ellender's solution therefore

was simultaneously anti-colonial, while also suggesting an increase in settler-colonial activities

was the solution to rebuilding the British economy after World War II concluded. Still, despite

---

[83] Senator Allen Ellender (Louisiana). "Proposed Loan to Great Britain," *Congressional Record* 92, Part 4 (29 April 1946): S 4188, 4194, 4190, 4286, 4193. Also see: Box 1433, Folder Foreign Aid Speech, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA. The image of the American South as a colony of the industrialized North was an image that southern congresspersons frequently used during the New Deal era and World War II to argue against liberal Democratic domestic and foreign policy proposals, indicating the significance that southern domestic views had on their devotion to the Democratic Party under FDR's liberal guidance. For more on the significance of the colonialized South troupe and the growing schism in the Democratic Party see: Ira Katznelson, *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2013), 390.

[84] Allen J. Ellender to Martha G. Robinson, 10 March 1948, Box 597, Folder European Recovery Program, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA. Ellender also had this letter entered into the Congressional Record of 13 March 1948 to serve as a detailed list as to why he was going to vote for aid to Europe.

his hesitation to approve support to Great Britain due to his southern anti-imperial prospective

and fiscal conservatism, Ellender voted yay for the British loans. Much like many in the

Democratic Party, regardless of their region, Ellender yielded his concerns for to adhere to Party

cohesion and unity. For the South, its overarching political devotion to the Democratic Party,

much like its paradoxical anticolonial stance, was rooted in their regional perspective and

history.

"The Lost Cause" and its associated themes helped to orientate the South towards

internationalism before World War II due to the Democratic Party's power in the region. Fry

points to deep partisan devotion to the southerner Woodrow Wilson to explain the South's

internationalist political leanings from 1913 through the mid-1950s.[85] The Southern bloc played

a central role in the formation and ratification of the United Nations, and its backing of the

international organization represented the high point of its support of Wilsonian internationalism.

Southern members of congress believed they were fulfilling the goals of Wilson when they

rallied behind the United Nations. Still, southern support of the UN was not an abstract devotion

to internationalism, rather it "embodied another 'lost cause'—this time to enact the 'southern

idea' of the first southern president since the 1860s."[86] Devotion to one historical figure though

does not fully address why the South embraced internationalism between the World Wars.

Historian Edward Chester suggests that the Jeffersonian wing of the Democratic Party had long

been concerned with fiscal conservatism. Therefore, members of congress from the Democrat-

dominated South that adhered to Jeffersonian politics opposed large expenditures, especially

---

[85] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 6. Edward W. Chester and Charles Lerche reached a similar conclusion regarding the significance of Woodrow Wilson in to southern support of internationalism. See: Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 231; Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 43-46.
[86] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 6, 220.

those sent overseas.[87] Chester's interpretation means that Wilsonian internationalism, under the direction set forth by Wilson, was not necessarily the norm for southern foreign policy, but rather the exception.

The question, then, is what changed to steer southerners away from Wilson's international vision—whether it was an exception or prevailing outlook—during the early Cold War when they had just wholeheartedly endorsed with their support of United Nations. Regarding foreign aid specifically, Chester argues that the shift in ideas about aid, from support under the Marshall Plan to subsequent growing opposition, was economically driven. In the shift in aid from Europe to the Third World the South saw potential competitors in the former colonies. For example, American development projects promoting irrigation had the potential to create competition for the American South in cotton production.[88] Chester's identification of the Jeffersonian economic conservatism is part of the story, but it does not explain the South's continued support of military and defense expenditures throughout the Cold War.[89]

In the midst of the end of World War II and the beginning of the Cold War, with the ratification of the United Nations, the United States' foreign policy agenda continued to shift to internationalism and the inherent self-determination attached to the Wilsonian international legacy. At a moment when the United States' government was facing a changing global order due to decolonization, the realization of Wilsonian internationalism suggested a course of action that would allow for managing decolonization on the principal of self-determination. As mentioned, perspectives on race were key to the themes that directed southern foreign policy

---

[87] Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 233.

[88] Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 232. For more on early 20th century efforts to produce cotton in the Global South see Andrew Zimmerman, *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

[89] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 222; Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 242.

with regards to controlling decolonization. Ellender's obsession in 1946 with the lack of resources in Great Britain and his solution demonstrates how for segregationist politicians, their global racial perspective often found common ground with their fiscal conservatism, steering them away from the self-determinism and anti-imperialist impulses of the "lost cause" of Wilsonian internationalism.[90] Ellender's desire to avoid large overseas expenditures by maintaining a postcolonial economic system by suggesting the maintenance of the British imperial holdings and increased British settler activity reinforced patterns of racial exploitation inherent in Western imperialism. At the same time, his proposal rested on fiscal conservatism by ensuring that potential economic competitors in the resource rich colonies would remain under the control of an American ally. At a moment when decolonization seemed an inevitable outcome of the war, segregationists started to break from their Wilsonian international tradition and create their own international vision for controlling the shifting global dynamics.

Southern support for internationalism had stood on shaky ground as soon as race entered the conversation. For example, President Franklin Roosevelt appointed African American consultants to the United Nations San Francisco charter convention, including Walter White, W. E. B. DuBois, and Mary McLeod Bethune. However, when the African American consultants unsuccessfully tried to convince the formal delegation to address the issues of racial justice, labor rights, full employment and colonialism, Roosevelt's Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius Jr., a Virginian, stated that the job of the UN conference in 1945 was to create a charter, not take up topics like the "negro's question." In addition, Senator Tom Connally from Texas in the American delegation at the conference made it clear that the South would reject any attempts to interfere with race and labor relations in the South, or U.S. sovereignty. The result

---

[90] Senator Allen Ellender (Louisiana). "Proposed Loan to Great Britain," *Congressional Record* 92, Part 4 (29 April 1946): S 4188, 4194, 4190, 4286, 4193. Also see: Box 1433, Folder Foreign Aid Speech, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

was that the discussion of human rights was absent from the conference and the Charter that

Congress would approve. Many African American in the public sphere saw human rights as an

international platform and extension for their calls for justice in the United States.[91] The absence

of human rights therefore represented a rejection of social equality at home and abroad. The role

of race in the United Nations and its development policies would increasingly erode the faith the

South had in its internationalism due to the region's efforts to maintain its domestic racial

politics.

One of the first orders of business when the United Nations convened was to create a

body within the organization to take up the task of defining human rights and the specific role

these rights would play in the world organization in an attempt to remedy what the Charter

sidestepped. At their first meeting on December 10, 1946 the United Nations Economic and

Social Council (ECOSOC), under Article 68 of the Charter, created the Commission on Human

Rights and began its task of drafting an international bill of rights. As with so many other issues

that came before the United Nations in its early years, American and Soviet leaders integrated

human rights into the context of their growing animosity towards each other.[92]

Although President Truman and others publicly expressed the view that the United

Nations needed to help attain freedom and security for all people regardless of "race, language or

religion," in private they realized the dilemma such ideals created for their own imperfect

practice of freedom and equality. For example, in 1946, Eleanor Roosevelt (the chairperson of

the Commission on Human Rights) supported an attempt to prevent a complaint to the United

---

[91] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 219.

[92] For a study of the way Cold War policies were voted on in the early United Nations see Edward T. Rowe, "The United States, the United Nations, and the Cold War," *International Organization* 25, no. 1 (1971): 59-78. Rowe has studied the roll-call votes in the General Assembly and found that in the early Cold War the average support on Cold War issues overwhelming favored the position of the United States. Although this study indicates deeper issues and factors at play, on the surface level it indicates that the United States was waging the ideological battle of the Cold War in the UN and winning it.

Nations charging South Africa with human rights violations from being addressed. Roosevelt

was worried about the precedence such a complaint could set in the United Nations toward

American race problems.[93] Historian Carol Anderson went so far as to conclude that, "Although

the United States was willing to use the rhetoric of human rights to bludgeon the Soviet Union

and play the politics of moral outrage that the Holocaust engendered, the federal government,

even the liberals, steadfastly refused to make human rights a viable force in the United States or

in international practice."[94]

In spite of the Cold War-fueled debate and restrictions over the issue of human rights, the

Commission on Human Rights passed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on December

10, 1948. Although the Declaration incorporated strong language in support of basic rights, it

also contained points of contention that detracted from its meaning. The Declaration was

unanimously accepted. However, there were four abstentions from communist countries. Within

the United States minorities and the general public greeted the Declaration with praise.

Americans were quick to connect the international human rights to domestic civil rights, which

in turn was seen as a black mark on America's image abroad. Just days after the Declaration

adopted, a letter to Truman expressed the connection between the domestic and international

human rights and the manner in which the government had to rectify the two. Its author, Bishop

John Stamm, said, "The adoption of the Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations last

Friday affords hope that the world community is developing a conscience about the unalienable

rights and freedoms of every man. But we cannot expect any significant advance in the actual

practice of the world unless our own country which has borne an historic witness to human rights

---

[93] Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 3-4; also see David Forsythe, "Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Policy: Retrospect and Prospect," *Political Science Quarterly* 105, no. 3 (1990): 435-454.

[94] Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 4.

and freedoms, demonstrates our sincere determination to square our practice with our

profession."[95] This letter captured all the implications of the Cold War, human rights, and civil

rights that met on the international stage in the United Nations. America's perverse arrangement

regarding race relations hindered its ability to fight the Cold War and protect human rights, and

therefore world peace. These associations were not lost on African American leaders, and they

saw the international stage of the United Nations as an opportunity to further their own quest for

human rights.

As African Americans sought to use the international stage of the United Nations to force

equality within the United States, the question of who internationalist policies benefited also

began to change southern foreign policy based on their domestic racial perspective.[96]

Southerners often equated independence movements in the former colonies to the civil rights

movement in the United States.[97] Therefore, it was not surprising that segregationists in the

southern states were not enthusiastic regarding foreign aid due to the intertwining of domestic

and international policies in relation to race.[98] The result was a shift in southern foreign policy

away from internationalism driven by domestic racial tensions, which accelerated with the civil

rights movement. The simultaneous desertion of southern members of congress from support of

internationalism and foreign aid and the growth of civil rights at home was not a sole matter of

racism, although it was a motivator. It is true that some southern congressmen found themselves

retracting support for the United Nations, the symbol of internationalism, due to the very fact

---

[95] Bishop John S. Stamm to Harry S Truman, 13 December 1948, Box 196, folder United Nations, PSF, HSTL.
[96] For an example of how African Americans sought to use international pressure via the United Nations to force racial reforms in the United States see the 1951 petition the Civil Rights Congress submitted to the United Nations: William Patterson, ed., *We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government against the Negro People* (New York: Civil Rights Congress, 1951).
[97] Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 232.
[98] Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 232.

that a "black" nation had the same voting power as the United States in the organization.[99] But, racism is only the most obvious part of the story. In addition, they connected domestic events to international events, crafting an international response to changing racial dynamics around the world defined by nationalism and anticommunism. Southern segregationists who defected from the ranks of internationalism therefore packaged their critiques against both foreign aid and civil rights in the language of states' rights, sovereignty, and national power to create their own vision of what international engagement should look like for the United States. In the immediate years following World War II these critiques were muted, but growing.

An early example of domestic racial tensions eroding southern support for internationalism was the breakdown of the internal cohesion of the Democratic Party. Partisan devotion to the Democratic Party was a key characteristic that had orientated the South towards internationalism, therefore, the gradual loss of the Solid South played a significant role in not only domestic politics, but had inherent international implications as well.[100] The New Deal coalition that held the Democratic Party together consisted of urban labor, progressives, farmers, and southerners. Increasingly, it became difficult to hold the individual interests of the voting blocs together. For the South, the breakdown of the region's support for the New Deal and the liberal democracy it heralded began especially began its erosion during World War II as their racial order became increasingly threatened. The result was that southern representatives were

---

[99] Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 232.
[100] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 6. For more on the 1948 Dixiecrat revolt and its larger impact on the breakdown of the Solid South see Kari Frederickson, *The Dixiecrat Revolt and the End of the Solid South, 1932-1968* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001). Regarding 1948, Frederickson argues that it marked the exist of the South from the New Deal coalition and the Democratic Party steadily turned towards its more liberal wing (6).

increasingly willing to work with Republicans, laying the foundation for what would become the "conservatives coalition."[101]

The 1948 Dixiecrat revolt at the Democratic Convention highlights an early key moment in the redefinition of the Democratic Party and direction of southern foreign policy. The majority of southerners were able to easily endorse the foreign policy of Harry Truman due to their support of Wilsonian internationalism and the fact that Truman came from a border state.[102] Still, as the 1948 Democratic Convention approached, Truman faced waning political support as he tried to win the presidency for the first time. In particular he found himself embattled over his stance on civil rights.[103] In 1946, using an executive order, Truman established the President's Committee on Civil Rights (PCCR). The PCCR's report, "To Secure These Rights," recommended a number of measures to improve legal equality for all in the United States, including a permanent Civil Right Commission, abolishing poll taxes, and creating a Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC), among others. Along with his actions taken in recommending the suggestions of the PCCR, Truman became the first president to address the NAACP in late June 1947. In this speech he not only endorsed civil rights, but explicitly connected the necessity of legal equality to fighting the Cold War, presenting the case that

---

[101] Ira Katznelson, *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2013), 16.

[102] Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 231.

[103] Labor also played a key role in the 1948 Democratic convention. Southern members of congress had fought to limit the power of unions following World War II. In particular they had successfully voted with Republicans to override Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley Act, which limited the safeguards for labor and unions. Southerner politicians wanted to rollback the gains of labor from the Wagner Act due to their concern over labor strikes harming the post-war American economy.

undermined the "superiority of democracy" to provide freedom in comparison to "totalitarian regions."[104]

Truman's support of civil rights and the 1947 speech challenged the segregationists within the Democratic Party and their conception of racial order and citizenship heading into the 1948 election year. In the fourth draft of Truman's speech to the NAACP, revised the day before he delivered it, Truman emphasized the significance of the need to expand equal citizenship in the United States in light of world events. Truman's draft read, "Recent events in the United States and abroad have made us realize that it is more important today than ever before to insure that all American enjoy these [civil] rights." After which he added by hand, "When I say all Americans, I mean all Americans."[105] Just a few paragraphs later, Truman once again scrawled a note emphasizing that he again, meant "all Americans."[106] Both of Truman's edits made the final speech and undermined the idea that democracy and full citizenship in the United States was an Anglo-Saxon feature based on an inherited fitness for self-government, creating a "racial nationalism."[107] The fact that Truman had tied the need of recognizing the rights of "all Americans" to the Cold War imperative of appealing to Third World nations made segregationists question the intended outcome of the Democratic Party's internationalism due to the increasing domestic implications it held for their racial order. A small number of southerner

---

[104] Harry S. Truman, "Address Before the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People," 29 June 1947, Public Papers of the Presidents, http://www.trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/index.php?pid=2115&st=&st1 (accessed 15 May 2013).

[105] Harry S. Truman, "Fourth Draft, Speech to NAACP, with correction by Harry S. Truman," 28 June 1947, Papers of Harry S. Truman: President's Secretary's File, HSTL, http://www.trumanlibrary.org/flip_books/index.php?pagenumber=1&titleid=252&tldate=1947-06-28&collectionid=ihow&PageID=-1&groupid=3723 (accessed 12 May 2013), 1.

[106] Harry S. Truman, "Fourth Draft, Speech to NAACP, with correction by Harry S. Truman," 28 June 1947, Papers of Harry S. Truman: President's Secretary's File, HSTL, http://www.trumanlibrary.org/flip_books/index.php?pagenumber=1&titleid=252&tldate=1947-06-28&collectionid=ihow&PageID=-1&groupid=3723 (accessed 12 May 2013), 2. Emphasis in the original.

[107] Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4.

politicians therefore began to respond in 1948, by breaking their partisanship devotion at the Democratic Party Convention.

Just over a year after Truman's speech in front of the NAACP, the Democratic Party convened in Philadelphia for their nominating convention and competing goals pulled at the party's unity. Prior to the convention Strom Thurmond of South Carolina had already threatened to form his own political party. Meanwhile, liberals and progressives in the party gravitated towards figures such as Hubert H. Humphrey and Henry Wallace, respectively.[108] On the last day of the convention, as the Party debated the inclusion of a civil rights plank in the platform, Hubert Humphrey, a rising star in the Party from Minnesota, gave a rousing speech supporting such a plank. Humphrey began his address by assuring the conference delegates that he was not attacking a single region, class, racial, or religious group. Humphrey then reiterated the connection that Truman had been cultivating between civil rights reform at home and waging the Cold War abroad. Humphrey rallied supporters, declaring, "Every citizen has a stake in the emergence of the United States as the leader of the free world. That world is being challenged by the world of slavery. For us to play our part effectively, we must be in a morally sound position. We cannot use a double standard for measuring our own and other people's policies."[109] He concluded that although he wanted uniformity on the platform, civil rights was a nonnegotiable point.[110]

Despite his claim that he was not singling out one region in the Party, Humphrey then directly called out southerners while at the same time making it clear that civil rights and global

---

[108] Michael R. Gardner, *Harry Truman and Civil Rights: Moral Courage and Political Risks* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2002), 91.

[109] Hubert Horatio Humphrey, "1948 Speech on Civil Rights," 14 July 1948, http://www.mnhs.org/library/tips/history_topics/42humphreyspeech/transcript.htm (accessed 25 August 2013).

[110] Hubert Horatio Humphrey, "1948 Speech on Civil Rights," 14 July 1948, http://www.mnhs.org/library/tips/history_topics/42humphreyspeech/transcript.htm (accessed 25 August 2013).

human rights should be one and the same in the platform. He attacked southerners who had stood

behind the banner of states' rights, declaring, "The time has arrived for the Democratic Party to

get out of the shadow of state's rights and walk forthrightly into the bright sunshine of human

rights."[111] By dismissing states' rights in the name of human rights, Humphrey pushed for a

liberal internationalism that southern, white politicians could not reconcile with their domestic

and international racial perspectives. Humphrey used human rights and civil rights

interchangeably in his speech, joining civil rights in the United States to the goals of

international human rights. Significantly, the United Nations was drafting the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights at the same time, adding international political symbolism to

Humphrey's words. Humphrey's speech thus reinforced the foundation that Truman had laid out

regarding the international necessity of racial reform, and endorsed the idea that civil rights and

global human rights and equality were intrinsically linked.

African Americans in key civil rights organizations similarly connected their struggle to

that of the emerging colonial independence movements. The result was that African American

activists had an international platform in the United Nations under the auspices of human rights

claims.[112] It was in this context that Humphrey gave his convention speech, which, when

combined with the passage of the civil rights plank of the Party's platform, resulted in some

southern delegates walking out. Two days after Truman's formal nomination, the Dixiecrat

defectors met in Birmingham, Alabama and nominated Strom Thurmond as the presidential

---

[111] Hubert Horatio Humphrey, "1948 Speech on Civil Rights," 14 July 1948,
http://www.mnhs.org/library/tips/history_topics/42humphreyspeech/transcript.htm (accessed 25 August 2013).
[112] For more on African American protests to the United Nations see: Hugh H. Smythe, "The N.A.A.C.P. Protest to UN," *Phylon (1940-1956)* 8, no. 4 (1947): 355; William Patterson, ed., *We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government against the Negro People* (New York: Civil Rights Congress, 1951); Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

candidate of the States Rights Party.[113] In forming a party around states' rights over the civil rights plank of the Democratic Party, the Dixiecrats were not just rejecting civil rights, but the internationalism of liberals that incorporated global racial equality into a multilateral approach to global affairs. Southern politicians opposed to federal government interference in racial questions did not support political initiatives that also allowed international pressure from the Third World and United Nations to influence domestic racial order.

Despite the Dixiecrat revolt at the 1948 convention, the defectors of the States Rights Party were not in the majority of southern delegates, the more moderate southerners still held onto the partisan devotion to the Democratic Party, although their faith in the Party was shaken. Senator Allen Ellender opposed the civil rights plank, but he did not join his Louisianan colleague from the House of Representatives, Otto E. Passman, in the States' Right Party. He thought that the civil rights plank was, more than anything, a measure to keep Henry A. Wallace from running against Truman and to keep African Americans in the party, a political maneuver by the party leadership to win the election.[114] Still, Ellender did not support the civil rights plank and also simultaneously grew increasingly skeptical of the Truman administration's foreign policies.

Like many of his political contemporaries, Ellender thought civil rights was a communist conspiracy led by a small group of "liberal and intellectual" African Americans.[115] Behind Ellender's fear of civil rights was the his conviction that the United States was the product of

---

[113] Edward Chester also observes that in the early Cold War the foreign policy issues gained more publicity. Whereas politicians had free reign regarding foreign policy, they increasingly had to answer constituency pressures, making domestic issues such as race gradually more important in an international context as well. See: Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 233.

[114] Thomas A. Becnel, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 138.

[115] Thomas A. Becnel, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 142; For more on how segregationists cast African American activists as communist agitators see Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004).

Anglo-Saxon tradition and that integration would lead to a "mongrelization" of the races. Indeed,

he used global examples of what he interpreted to be blacks' inability to govern themselves to

justify segregation at home. Ellender argued that places like Egypt, Brazil, and India had

successful white civilizations before "mongrelization" destroyed them.[116] Ellender would

continue to use what he saw as the inability of non-white peoples to self-govern as evidence for

the necessity of domestic segregation throughout his political career.[117] The increasing

importance of foreign aid to former colonies in predominantly non-white areas of the world

meant funding global racial fluidity, which Ellender feared. Although Ellender had chosen to

stay with the Democratic Party, his views on civil rights and foreign aid slowly aligned more

with the southerners who had walked out of the convention as they redefined the terms of the

internationalism they were willing to support.

Despite the Dixiecrats' walkout, Truman won the Democratic Party's nomination and

reemphasized the Party's commitment to international leadership via nonpartisan support of his

foreign policy, including foreign aid. He proclaimed in his acceptance of the nomination, "The

United States has to accept its full responsibility for leadership in international affairs. We have

been the people who organized and started the United Nations, first started under the great

Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, as the League of Nations. The League was sabotaged

by the Republicans in 1920." He continued, "We have started the foreign aid program…and I

will say to you that all these things were done in a cooperative and bipartisan

---

[116] Thomas A. Becnel, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 142.

[117] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodeaux, LA. See chapter three for more on how Ellender's comments regarding African self-governance reflected his domestic perspective regarding civil rights.

manner…Partisanship should stop at the water's edge; and I shall continue to preach that through this whole campaign."[118]

Truman's acceptance speech should have appealed to southern support of internationalism, emphasizing nonpartisanship, while at the same time attacking Republicans for both undermining the internationalism of Wilson and later in the speech critiquing their domestic political direction. Still, while he urged the Democratic Party to allow partisanship to "stop at the water's edge," Truman and his liberal Democratic allies had already begun connecting domestic reforms to foreign policy decisions and vice versa, and when race entered the conversation southern Democrats clung desperately to their segregationist racial order model. Although Truman was able to maintain a largely nonpartisan support base for foreign policy in his second term, the beginnings of a southern revolt within his own political party marked a steady decline in support of foreign aid by segregationists that coincided with the growth of the civil rights movement.

Disillusionment in the American South over internationalism did not occur in one fatal blow. It was a gradual process through the 1950s and 1960s that was directly linked to the changing racial dynamics at home. Allen Ellender in 1948, while lamenting foreign aid to Great Britain, made it very clear that he hoped and wished the United Nations would still be able to fulfill its goals of peace.[119] However, by 1962 he worried that the United Nations was essentially open to corruption and ineffectiveness due to the inability and failures of the growing number of African and Asian nations, who he believed were selling their votes to the highest bidder.[120]

---

[118] Harry S. Truman, "Address in Philadelphia Upon Accepting the Nomination of the Democratic National Convention," 15 July 1948, http://www.trumanlibrary.org/calendar/viewpapers.php?pid=1060 (accessed 12 May 2013).

[119] Allen J. Ellender to Onesia Beadle, 2 February 1948, Box 596, Folder European Recovery Program, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodeaux, LA.

[120] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA. See chapter three for more on

Ellender's changing attitude towards the United Nations—the symbol of internationalism and development—demonstrates the importance of race and the political fiction of corruption and inefficiency regarding foreign aid in shifting the foreign policy approach in the southern states and their efforts to craft an alternative international vision.

Ellender's lost faith in the UN grew directly out of his belief in American racial nationalism that asserted that African Americans and other minorities were incapable of self-government, a critique that he transferred to his critique of foreign aid in Africa. The insertion of corruption into his rhetoric represented how far he and his segregationist contemporaries had moved away from internationalism due to the racial implications of it and their efforts to create a political fiction around foreign aid. Chester asserts that regarding foreign aid, "Even before the mid-1950's the South was more favorable to the white nations of Europe than to the black countries of Africa, while it was also more favorably inclined towards military adventures such as NATO than towards foreign aid."[121] The story of foreign aid during the Truman years demonstrates this shift well and offers an explanation as to why it occurred.

"Our European Cousins": Containment and the Marshall Plan

The debates over aid associated with the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan were rooted in foreign policy and economic concerns. Rarely did opponents interrogate the character of the recipients, and when opponents of aid did question the abilities and character of the recipients it was largely connected to political systems and economic concerns rooted in Cold War fears of communist expansion. When foreign aid opponents made ridiculing remarks about

---

how Ellender's comments regarding African self-governance reflected his domestic perspective regarding civil rights.
[121] Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975), 242.

European recipients of foreign aid, they lacked a domestic reference point to attach significance to beyond international affairs. Despite many opponents of aid beginning to express concerns over internationalist approaches to foreign affairs, their calls for unilateralist and nationalistic alternatives were muted during the implementation of early foreign aid policies. It would take global racial order being thrown into limbo via the rapid decolonization impulse after World War II entering the foreign aid debate to expand the meaning of foreign aid into the domestic sphere. Once foreign aid shifted from Europe to the Third World, the meaning of it gained domestic importance, something that the South had already found itself at odds in the Democratic Party during the New Deal and World War II.[122] The Marshall Plan aid had not reordered social racial hierarchies, but development aid suggested that anyone could achieve "Western progress," which threatened white supremacist political power in the United States.[123]

During the early years of the Cold War foreign aid was linked to national security objectives and supported by the majority of Congress.[124] The Truman Doctrine speech, delivered on March 12, 1947, was the first public statement that clearly introduced containment to the Cold War foreign policy repertoire. Foreign aid and development played a key part in how containment was carried out. Initially Truman and his administration concerned themselves with Western Europe and rebuilding the post-war economies of the allies via economic support. Historian Robert Packenham explains that the simple logic behind the economic approach to the European Recovery Program was that political and economic development were connected and could safeguard against the spread of communism. Packenham clarifies, "The United States

---

[122] Ira Katznelson, *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2013), 16.

[123] Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 89.

[124] For more on development before the Cold War and its growth from domestic programs see David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

provided aid; the economies revived; Communist parties did not come to power; stability and democracy were the political results, by and large in Western European political systems."[125] Southern members of Congress could easily align themselves with Truman's containment policy as introduced in the Truman Doctrine because of its anticommunist implications.[126] Although doing so often required that they set aside their fiscal conservatism in favor of anticommunism and international economic and political development. However, given that southerners were still holding on to their devotion to Wilsonian internationalism during the early Cold War, it was not necessarily a departure for the southern Democrats to support the Democratic president's policies.

The Truman Doctrine laid the foundation for aid that went beyond simple anticommunist-driven national security, which began to amplify preexisting southern unease with internationalism and development. Following World War II, the economic and political situation in Greece had been unstable, and the Truman administration feared that if Greece fell to communism, Turkey would not be far behind. In addition, the British economy was in ruins after World War II and they could no longer support the Greek government against the Greek Communist Party. In light of these circumstances, the United States began to fear that the Soviet Union would begin moving in on the oil-rich Middle East. Heavily influenced by George Kennan's "Long Telegram," Truman and his advisors acted by formulating a plan to aid Greece

---

[125] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 8.
[126] Joseph Fry points out that most southerners were extremely anticommunist and were quick to abandon their internationalist stance when communism was the question. However, in many of the early development and aid programs, especially the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, the programs' anticommunist focus allowed the southerners to rectify their anticommunism with liberal internationalism. Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 223.

and Turkey.[127] On March 12, 1947 Truman appeared before Congress and delivered a speech requesting aid for Greece and Turkey. The speech became known as the Truman Doctrine.

The Truman Doctrine was a combination of humanitarian and national interest politics. Packenham argues that what makes the Truman Doctrine unique was not necessarily the combination of national and humanitarian interests, but rather how Truman defined those interests. Treading lightly due to the precarious nature of the early Cold War, Truman kept his language ambiguous. Packenham concludes, "He [Truman] defined the American interests in both relatively narrow security terms and in broader developmental terms."[128] Truman achieved this by avoiding any specific attacks on the Soviet Union while at the same time proclaiming support for other "free peoples" as a feature of American interest.[129] Connecting the situation in Greece and Turkey to broader development goals situated the Truman Doctrine both within the Cold War and beyond it. Packenham concludes, "The ambiguity was in some measure intentional in order to warn the Soviet Union. But another consequence was to pave the way for other aid programs to other areas for broader development purposes according to uncertain criteria."[130]

As a result of this ambiguity, Truman was able to successfully wrangle bipartisan support for the aid bill to Greece and Turkey, producing a tenuous consensus in Congress around aid. 86% of southern House members voted for the bill, demonstrating their willingness to go along

---

[127] David S. Painter, "Oil and the American Century," *Journal of American History* 99, no. 1 (2012): 29; Dennis Merrill, "The Truman Doctrine: Containing Communism and Modernity," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (2006): 27-37; Harry S. Truman, "Recommendation for Assistance to Greece and Turkey," 12 March 1947, http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/doctrine/large/documents/pdfs/5-9.pdf#zoom=100 (accessed 27 May 2013).

[128] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 27-28.

[129] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 28; Harry S. Truman, "Recommendation for Assistance to Greece and Turkey," 12 March 1947, http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/doctrine/large/documents/pdfs/5-9.pdf#zoom=100 (accessed 27 May 2013).

[130] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 28.

with the internationalist turn in American foreign policy despite their tendency for fiscal conservatism.[131] There was hesitation among southerners though. Both Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas and Senator Claude Pepper of Florida worried that the plan was too antagonistic towards the Soviet Union. Pepper even suggested that the Truman Doctrine was not internationalist enough, and he urged that the nation redirect foreign policy through the United Nations to "maintain international peace and security."[132] On the other side of the southern Democratic opposition to the Truman Doctrine was Senator Larry Byrd's nationalistic perspective that foreshadowed the long-term development aid implications of the Truman Doctrine. Specifically Byrd was opposed to the open-endedness of the policy.[133] Byrd, who unlike many southerners held little devotion to Wilsonian internationalism feared that the Truman Doctrine would lead to the entrenchment of foreign aid in American policy. The introduction of the Marshall Plan in 1947 proved Byrd correct.

From its inception, the European Recovery Program of 1947 (the Marshall Plan) was conceived as a measure to protect U.S. Security and economic interests in terms of growing animosity between the United States and the Soviet Union. Secretary of State George Marshall, the namesake of the recovery program, expressed the political conviction behind the plan stating that there could be no political stability and peace if Europe's economy continued to limp along following World War II's destruction.[134] Due to its success in helping restore economic production in Western Europe, the Marshall Plan set the idealized standard for foreign aid in both the public's and government officials' eyes during the second-half of the twentieth century.

---

[131] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 227.

[132] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 228.

[133] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 228.

[134] Greg Behrman, *The Most Noble Adventure: The Marshall Plan and the Time when America Helped Save Europe* (New York: Free Press, 2007), 69.

Comparing the Marshall Plan to later foreign aid programs, however, can obscure the ways in which they fundamentally differed from each other—while the Marshall Plan sent large amounts of capital to European countries to rebuild infrastructures, Point Four sought to share American expertise with little accompanying capital influx in regions that had few industrial structures in place. Like later aid programs though, administration officials made sure to attach symbolic meaning to the plan beyond its economic and security motivations.

Although Congress demonstrated bipartisan support of the Marshall Plan by passing the European Recovery Act with a 4 to 1 margin in 1948, the plan initially met measurable political opposition. To fight claims that the program was extravagant, bureaucratic and socialist, the Truman administration embarked on a coordinated public relations campaign. Truman appointed Paul Hoffman, the president of Studebaker and a Republican, as the director of the European Cooperation Administration, and incorporated business groups in the planning of European recovery to shore up bipartisan support for the plan. Although in private discussions the administration acknowledged that the Marshall Plan was partly designed to stop Soviet expansion, their public relations strategies made it clear that government officials should not present it to the American people in such a manner because they did not want to appear antagonistic towards the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the Cold War was not yet set in stone, and Truman and Stalin still grasped tenuously at the weak bonds that continued to hold the Grand Alliance together.[135] Instead, the Truman administration sold the European Recovery Act as a peace measure rather than an aggressive overture against the Soviets.[136] In his announcement of

---

[135] Richard Crockatt, *The Fifty Years War: The United States and the Soviet Union in World Politics, 1941-1991* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 46; Melvyn P. Leffler, *For the Soul of Mankind: The United States, the Soviet Union, and the Cold War* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007), 75.

[136] "Notes on Discussion with congressional delegation and State Department from the papers of Joseph M. Jones," (27 February 1947), Document 6 in Dennis Merrill, ed. *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency* vol. 13 Establishing the Marshall Plan, 1947-1948 (Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 1999), 25.

the Plan Marshall, Truman explained, "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos."[137] His words allowed the administration to dodge attacks from isolationists that the Marshall Plan was hostile towards the Soviet Union while maintaining the moral high ground.

Opposition surrounding the Marshall Plan largely revolved around economic and political concerns. The majority of it also came from Republicans. Senator George Malone's (Republican-Nevada) aforementioned 1948 speech demonstrated these issues, highlighting what he viewed as extravagant government spending and mismanagement in the Marshall Plan. Malone also discussed the need for a more military aid to accompany any economic aid. He cited General MacArthur and argued that money alone would not stop communism. At the root of Malone's opposition was his self-declared fear over the direction, or rather lack of direction, in American foreign policy. Here Malone placed the blame directly at the feet of President Truman and accused him of steering the United States into bankruptcy.[138] Senator Charles Wayland Brooks, a Republican from Illinois held similar views as Malone regarding the American government overspending. He also insisted that European people did not even know that the United States was sending them food, so the Marshall Plan was failing at one of its main goals. Brooks suggested the most effective aid was based on volunteerism. He recommended individual Americans sending what amounted to care packages worked better than economic aid.[139] Malone and Brooks both demonstrated that opposition to foreign aid often rested in partisanship and economic arguments.

---

[137] Greg Behrman, *The Most Noble Adventure: The Marshall Plan and the Time when America Helped Save Europe* (New York: Free Press, 2007), 69.
[138] George W. Malone, 94 *Cong. Rec.* S 2188-2190 (5 March 1948).
[139] Charles Wayland Brooks, *Cong. Rec.* S 2188 (5 March 1948).

One of the key points that opponents of aid frequently made against the Marshall Plan was that it was funding socialist governments, but that the people receiving aid were not corrupt and incapable of governing themselves. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. (Massachusetts-Republican) made this clear when he suggested that the Marshall Plan paid for "political schemes" in foreign countries that the United States would certainly not support at home. Lodge clarified that he did not necessarily mean that funds for the Marshall Plan should be withdrawn, but rather that the United States should be increasingly in control over how recipients spent the money.[140] Importantly, Lodge did not necessarily accuse the peoples of western of Europe of being politically corrupt or weak-willed and predisposed to communism. Rather, he believed opportunist individuals were taking advantage of the situation World War II had created. If a socialist came to power in a European nation, Lodge stated he thought the people would rise up against such regimes.[141] This image of aid recipients ran counter to the later political fiction that implied recipients were corrupt beggars that were not capable of self-governing.

The debates over the Marshall Plan in Congress were not limited to Republicans. From the other side of the aisle, progressive Democrats thought the Marshall Plan did not go far enough in promoting internationalism and world peace. During a debate on the extension of the Marshall Plan, Representative Adolph J. Sabath (Illinois-Democrat) asserted that he would vote for the bill and encouraged everyone else to do the same, but he voiced his reservations against the program itself. He referred to it as the "greatest propaganda" in the nation's history. He then lamented that he thought the program was weakening the United Nations because the United States was only paying it "lip-service."[142] The same level of unilateralism in the Marshall Plan that eased the minds of conservatives, created some dissent among liberal internationalists who

---

[140] Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., *Cong. Rec.* S 2192 (5 March 1948).
[141] Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., *Cong. Rec.* S 2192 (5 March 1948).
[142] Adolph J. Sabath, *Cong. Rec.* H 4188 (9 April 1949).

wanted development to support the larger vision of internationalism. At the other end of the political spectrum were the fiscal conservatives within the Democratic Party, who tended to hail from southern states. These southern Democrats expressed skepticism over the Marshall Plan, but frequently fell in line with the party's internationalist direction.

Although fiscal conservatives tried repeatedly to reduce appropriations for the Marshall Plan, they failed time and time again. The Marshall Plan allowed the United States to participate in global development on a unilateral platform, which limited the level of international influence reflected back at the United States. Democratic politics, economic calculations, and Cold War fears prompted the South to set aside their fiscal conservatism and default to Party loyalty.[143] A look into Senator Allen Ellender's thought process surrounding the Marshall Plan and his vote on it provides a window into how southern segregationists in Congress viewed the Marshall Plan. As Ellender's reactions demonstrate, many characteristics of the Marshall Plan allowed the southern members of congress to maintain support of the liberal internationalist direction that the Democratic Party was increasingly turning towards unilateral and militaristic foreign policies.

Despite his hesitation, Senator Ellender voted to approve the Marshall Plan. While making it clear that he was a reluctant supporter, he reasoned, "I fear that the countries of Western Europe will take it for granted that Congress will enact the Marshall plan, since we are following the President as to a portion of his recommendations to the Congress regarding assistance to Europe." He also worried that providing "food and clothing" to "our friends" would create scarcities at home.[144] With these concerns, Ellender began to paint foreign aid recipients as ungrateful, but his objections still revolved around fiscal conservatism. He made it abundantly

---

[143] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 230.

[144] Allen J. Ellender to Ernie Simonds, 6 December 1947, Box 593, Folder Marshall Plan, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

clear that if it were not for humanitarian purposes, he would have rejected foreign aid to Britain due to its economic and political shortcomings.[145] In addition, he elucidated that he and the Senate were largely supporting President Truman's foreign policy objectives. Ellender and his like-minded southern colleagues would soon start rejecting the policies, especially foreign aid, proposed by the liberals within their own party. Globally and domestically, racial dynamics began to shift and the fundamental antiracism rhetoric of liberal policies seemed to be chartering a course to speed up those changes.

Senator Ellender saw strength in a "traditional," white America to guard against Communist encroachment at home and Soviet expansion internationally. In 1951 a constituent wrote to Ellender observing, "I am of the opinion that the world is too much impressed by the population totals of that country [the Soviet Union] and her satellites…We should remember, however, that only a small portion of the Russians are comparable to the American individual in peace or war. Further, the American nation is a homogeneous nation with a common background of Western civilization, and speaking a common language while in Russia, there are 49 racial stocks and languages."[146] Ellender sent a simple response, stating that he agreed about not being "overly impressed by the population totals of Russia and her satellites."[147] Ellender did not directly address the letter-writer's praise of the United States as a "homogeneous nation with a common background of Western civilization." However in agreeing that the Russian population was not a concern he implied that he also agreed with the writer's assessment of the American population's homogeneous superiority. Whether this was Ellender's intent is not relevant in the

---

[145] Allen J. Ellender to Martha G. Robinson, 10 March 1948, Box 597, Folder European Recovery Program, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.
[146] C.A. Ives to Allen J. Ellender, 28 February 1951, Box 641, Folder Communism 1951, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.
[147] Allen J. Ellender to C.A. Ives, 6 March 1951, Box 641, Folder Communism 1951, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

sense that his words and actions reinforced the interpretation of American citizenship and participation in democratic government that was tied to race.

Ellender's foreign policy stance indicates that there was more to his agenda than just stopping communism due to the Cold War threat. Unlike other southern Democrats, Ellender was not a "hawk."[148] Ellender did not want communism to spread, and he was especially concerned about internal threats, but he did not think a full-scale national security foreign policy that committed a large amount of American resources was the best direction for the nation. He frequently urged open communication with the Soviet Union and helped to facilitate Khrushchev's 1959 visit to the United States despite dissent from his constituents.[149] The fact that Ellender did not overly concern himself with communism abroad highlights that he had other reasons for supporting foreign aid under the Marshall Plan, and then later opposing it. Despite his uneasiness due to fiscal concerns, he was only emboldened to reject foreign aid when domestic racial situations became entangled in the liberal development project to override his support for the Democratic Party. Whom aid went to changed the domestic significance of foreign aid.

Ellender did begin to show early signs of suspicion regarding aid recipients and the Cold War context, but it circulated around American economic and political concerns. "I am beginning to feel that many of the countries of Europe are using the bugaboo of Communism as

---

[148] Thomas A. Becnell, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 248.

[149] Philip S. Finn, Jr. to Allen J. Ellender, 14 September 1959, Box 1070, Folder Misc. Khrushchev's Visit to the U.S., Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.; Mrs. R.J. Salassi to Allen J. Ellender, undated, Box 1070, Folder Misc. Khrushchev's Visit to the U.S., Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.; Allen J. Ellender to Philip S. Finn Jr., 16 September1959, Box 1070, Folder Misc. Khrushchev's Visit to the U.S., Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.; Allen J. Ellender to Phoebe Courtney, 24 September 1959, Box 1070, Folder Misc. Khrushchev's Visit to the U.S., Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

a goad in seeking assistance from us," he reasoned.[150] A skeptic of aid to begin with, Ellender

believed that those receiving aid were taking advantage of the tensions between the United States

and Soviet Union, and that the result was that the United States could be taken advantage of by

"socialist" governments with out-stretched hands.[151] Ellender would echo these comments

regarding recipients in the Third World just a few years later. During a 1949 trip to ERP

countries to observe the ways in which Marshall Plan recipients had used the funds, Ellender also

accused various European nationalities of being unworthy of "hard earned dollars" from the

United States. For example, he alleged that the Austrians were ungrateful, the Dutch and French

were entitled, and the British lacked incentive.[152] Although Ellender was suspicious of aid

recipients in Europe, he did not connect any of his critiques to domestic events. Instead, he

constantly returned to his fear that the United States was going to get economically entrenched in

Europe at the cost of fiscal necessity at home.[153]

Although Ellender began to hint that aid recipients were ungrateful, he never seemed to

question their abilities as he later would with aid recipients in the Third World. He reasoned that

the people aid went to were inherently "freedom-loving people" who were not prone to

communism.[154] Here, Ellender projected his belief in an Anglo-Saxon America back to its

European ancestors. He implied that western Europeans were too much like the democratically

inclined white American to actually give into to totalitarian political schemes. Ellender's gradual

move away from supporting the President's foreign policy agenda, specifically regarding foreign

---

[150] Allen J. Ellender to John T. Mendes, 15 December 1947, Box 593, Folder Marshall Plan, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[151] Allen J. Ellender, "Diary of Oct.-Nov. 1949 World Trip," Box 1511, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[152] Allen J. Ellender, "Diary of Oct.-Nov. 1949 World Trip," Box 1511, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[153] Allen J. Ellender, "Diary of Oct.-Nov. 1949 World Trip," Box 1511, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[154] Allen J. Ellender to Lawrence A. Stone, 18 December 1947, Box 597, Folder European Recovery Program, Allen J. Ellen Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

aid policy after the Marshall Plan, indicates that Ellender had alternative reasons for abandoning his albeit hesitant support of Truman's liberal internationalist policies. His prevailing fiscal conservatism only partly explains his views.

In the context of rapid decolonization, the importance of the internationalist direction of American foreign policy in the containment strategy took on domestic significance as well, especially regarding race. Historian Thomas Borstelmann observes, "The major American Cold War initiatives of the late 1940s and early 1950s…emerged against a background of mounting demands for racial equality and national autonomy. People of color at home and abroad were particularly sensitive to these policies' racial meanings…The Marshall Plan (1948) and NATO (1949) bolstered anti-Communist governments west of the Elbe River, but they also indirectly funded those governments' efforts to preserve white rule against indigenous independence movements in Asia and Africa."[155] The fact that the Marshall Plan did not challenge this social order, and in fact allowed colonial exploitive relationships to remain in place, made it more palatable to segregationists.

Ellender's solution to postwar British reconstruction even attempted to institute a postcolonial system where political and economic power still rested in the West. He said that the United Kingdom should decentralize and move a large portion of its population to Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand for the "purpose of developing natural resources in

---

[155] Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and The Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 47. For examples on African Americans calling into question the imperial underpinnings of the Marshall Plan see: George Padmore, "World Views," *Chicago Defender,* 3 January 1948, 13; George Padmore, "World Views: Exploitation Bloc," *Chicago Defender.* 27 March 1948, 15. W.E.B. DuBois, "The Winds of Time: Marshall Plan," *Chicago Defender,* 8 November 1947, 15; Willard Townsend, "Congress Refuses to Recognize Reasons Our Foreign Policy Lags," *Chicago Defender,* 15 April 1950, 7; Lucius Harper, "Dustin' off the News," *Chicago Defender,* 25 March 1950, 7.

those countries, and to carry on manufacturing within close range of raw materials."[156] This was

a concept he would further refine in the 1950s after visiting Africa, suggesting that the

distribution of the British population not only expand to the Commonwealth, but to colonial

areas in general.[157] In addition, after he had reluctantly cast his vote for the Marshall Plan, he

continued to peddle this idea, but revised his original suggestion by instead saying that the

British population should move strictly to South Africa because it was a "nucleus for the

development of a strong and powerful nation."[158] In Ellender's view, the colonies had rapidly

developed industrial capacity and he feared that they would become the chief competitors of

Great Britain (and the American South) and without control over them the British economy

would be doomed.[159] His solution would reassert Western dominance in the Third World,

especially when he amended it to strictly South Africa. In doing so, he made sure that Western

powers would continue to dominate global markets and political power by essentially creating

settler colonies that would maintain a quasi-imperial system. In South Africa, this would have

the added effect of propping up white minority rule.

Controlling the direction that decolonization would take became paramount for all

political parties in the United States after World War II. Even Republican opponents who

opposed the Marshall Plan on partisan grounds and isolationist foreign policy viewpoints voiced

their desire to gain control over the former wealth of the European Empires through the Marshall

---

[156] Senator Allen Ellender (Louisiana). "Proposed Loan to Great Britain," *Congressional Record* 92, Part 4 (29 April 1946): S 4188, 4194, 4190, 4286, 4193. Also see: Box 1433, Folder Foreign Aid Speech, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[157] Allen J. Ellender to Martha G. Robinson, 10 March 1948, Box 597, Folder European Recovery Program, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA. Ellender also had this letter entered into the Congressional Record of 13 March 1948 to serve as a detailed list as to why he was going to vote for aid to Europe.

[158] Allen J. Ellender to Felix J. Vaccaro, 19 April 1948, Box 597, Folder European Recovery Act, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[159] Senator Allen Ellender (Louisiana). "Proposed Loan to Great Britain," *Congressional Record* 92, Part 4 (29 April 1946): S4188, 4194, 4190, 4286, 4193. Also see: Box 1433, Folder Foreign Aid Speech, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

Plan. For example, in Senator Malone's speech against Marshall Plan funding, he expressed his hope that the United States could gain something from Europe via the Marshall Plan. Resting on militaristic and national security motives Malone argued that the United States should get some sort of strategic return for aid. Specifically he wanted "critical minerals and materials" from the Empires of Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium.[160] Malone suggested that with aid, the United States had essentially bought access to the resource rich imperial holdings of Europe. The way that some opponents of aid envisioned the Marshall Plan working was more of a strategy for the United States to gain control over the global economic market and maintain it western dominance of it. Malone's desire was somewhat realized in the way the Marshall Plan was carried out.

Not only did the Marshall Plan not challenge the colonial economic scheme, but it also gave the United States a way to control it, via the technical assistance aspect of the Marshall Plan. The technical assistance attached to the Marshall Plan was different than that attached to Point Four and other aid programs in the Global South and was not truly thought of as technical assistance like the programs that came after. First, in the Marshall Plan, technical assistance was an afterthought, attached more as a condition than the centerpiece of the program. The fact that it was a condition for aid money appealed to opponents of liberal development because it allowed for internationalism on American terms, which incorporated unilateral demands. Marshall and others saw technical assistance as a key measure to helping Europe regain its confidence, but they did not publicize it to the same degree as the cash influx to Marshall Plan countries.[161] Making technical assistance a minor part of the publicity of the Marshall Plan implied that the development aspect of the plan did not carry much domestic currency. The image Marshall and

---

[160] George W. Malone, 94 *Cong. Rec.* S 2189 (5 March 1948).
[161] Greg Behrman, *The Most Noble Adventure: The Marshall Plan and the Time when America Helped Save Europe* (New York: Free Press, 2007), 312.

Truman presented was that Western Europe just needed American capitalistic systems introduced to them to reach American levels of success. The result of this approach to technical assistance in Europe granted the Truman administration control and access to colonial resources.

The United States was participating in technical assistance programs in the Global South via the channels of the Marshall Plan and imperial networks under the banner of technical assistance. For partly strategic reasons, technical assistance under the Marshall Plan also aided in the European colonial project. Merle Gulick of the *Wall Street Journal* reported, $1,500,000 in ECA funds for Great Britain had been approved "to hire about 55 American technicians to help in mapping surveys and searches for valuable minerals in British colonies in Africa, South America, and Southeast Asia."[162] This project allowed the United States to gain access and control of minerals in colonial areas by laying the groundwork for a post-independence diplomatic and economic relationship. The consequence of such a relationship placed the American government in a position in the Third World where its development model could replace that of British imperial domination. This American imperialism through development ran the risk of further entrenching existing old, global racial hierarchies inherent to the imperialist enterprise under the banner of "civilizing missions," which helps to illustrate why segregationist opponents of foreign aid could readily accept the internationalist approach to foreign aid presented in the Marshall Plan.[163]

The possible imperialist implications of the Marshall Plan's technical assistance program proved vexing for the Truman administration as it tried to promote democracies through foreign aid and liberal development models. In addition, this was not the only aspect of the plan that left

---

[162] Merle Gulick, "Sharing Know-How," *Wall Street Journal,* 17 Mach 1949, 4.
[163] Michael L. Krenn, "Token Diplomacy: The United States, Race and the Cold War," in Philip E. Muehlenbeck, ed. *Race, Ethnicity, and the Cold War* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press), 14; Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 59.

it vulnerable to attacks of maintaining old hierarchies. The very success of rebuilding Western Europe via the Marshall Plan required continued exploitation of colonies' resources. For example, rebuilding the economies and industries of war-devastated European nations required the "continued importation of rubber, cotton, and other planation crops from Java and Malaya."[164] Maintaining imperial trade relationships undermined the anti-imperialist and anti-racist ideals of liberal internationalism. Following in Franklin D. Roosevelt's support of "trusteeship" programs, the Truman administration did not necessarily disapprove of "guiding colonies" to modern nationhood.[165] However, in the context of the Cold War, the appearance of colonial ambitions harmed the American image and contradicted the democratic agenda of liberal internationalism. And yet, it also begins to explain how segregationists supported foreign aid to Europe, but just a short period later scoffed at sending technical assistance to the former colonial regions. The Marshall Plan's technical assistance did not threaten domestic or international racial order, but provided the opportunity to reinforce it.

The anti-racist and democratizing philosophy of liberal foreign aid proved successful in limiting perceived differences across cultures. The Marshall Plan's success proved to Americans that foreign aid could work, even bringing the "aggressive" Germans back into the folds of "civilization" and democracy. But, as Dean Acheson, the chief internationalist designer of the economic aid program to Europe, stated later in his life, policymakers did not intend to make the Marshall Plan a model for global development. The United States government believed that in order to fuel social change, the situation in Asia and the Global South required technical assistance similar to the development models of the New Deal. Conversely, although WWII had

---

[164] Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 39.

[165] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 84, 121.

destroyed the industrial infrastructures of Europe, government officials believed in the technological and human infrastructure still in place.[166] To implement foreign aid as a tool of liberal internationalism, industrialization had to occur first. One means of developing the Third World was foreign aid through technical assistance.

The debates over the Marshall Plan laid the groundwork for a southern move towards nationalistic, unilateral approach to national security and foreign policy. This groundwork included not only fiscal conservatism and southern nationalistic political ideology, but also a burgeoning political fiction where aid recipients were lazy and ungrateful. Such hesitation, though, did not trigger a full-scale revolt from liberal internationalism during the Marshall Plan years. In part, this was because the Marshall Plan did not challenge the domestic and international racial order wrapped up in segregation and colonial economic systems, repectively. The Marshall Plan, at times, even reinforced such colonial relationships and allowed the United States to control those relationships on its own terms. It would take the Truman administration's shift from European aid to the Third World to bring race into the debate over foreign aid. The result was an aid policy that suggested that anyone could achieve "Western progress" regardless of race or citizenship. [167]

Racial domestic implications of aid prompted Ellender and his segregationist colleagues to move towards unilateralist and nationalist stances on foreign aid policy in an effort to combat the convergence of international and domestic political. Ellender and his colleagues found it increasingly more necessary to reject liberalism and its version of internationalism because it also supported domestic civil rights events that challenged white economic and political

---

[166] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 93.
[167] Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 89.

dominance at home. To segregationists, the same policies that promoted legal equality at home were promoting antiracist development abroad, thus it was necessary to reaffirm "traditional" global and domestic racial hierarchies with a nationalistic political approach.

"Colonial Swag:" Racial Hierarchies and Isolationist Critiques of Point Four

Although economic aid to Europe had been successful, in the Third World the same strategies did not have the result of rapid development and it occurred slower than most expected.[168] Material and political conditions in former colonies meant that a simple influx in capital would not lead to the desired end of modernization. The Truman administration's proposal of an institutionalized aid program to the Third World in 1949 came in the midst of the highly successful (in terms of accomplishing its objectives) Marshall Plan. However, as Packenham observed, Americans did not really understand the different conditions in the Third World compared to Europe, and how much more difficult foreign aid and development in African, Asia, and Latin America would be.[169] Therefore, disillusionment over what many in the general public viewed as a departure from previous American foreign policy practices quickly set in when foreign aid to the Global South did not produce as fast and as effective results as the Marshall Plan had. Based on their domestic point of view, those opposed to foreign aid could readily place their disillusionment at what they perceived to be deficiencies in those who were receiving the aid, a process that their representatives helped to cultivate as foreign aid turned to the Third World.

The elements of the debate over foreign aid found in the Marshall Plan did not disappear from the conversation, but the geographic focus and sturdier liberal internationalist foundation

---

[168] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 8.
[169] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 38.

introduced a new aspect to the debate. Specifically, American foreign policy quickly took on domestic and international symbolism.[170] Debates over Truman's foreign aid program, Point Four, did tackle technical and practical questions, but the debates were also framed in ideological questions. According to Packenham, the ideological aspects of the debates did not call into question the foundation of development, as established by liberals. Rather, the ideological debates over Point Four legislation featured dichotomies such as free enterprise versus socialism in the American government and national sovereignty versus world government.[171] These ideological debates reflected not only the geopolitics of the time, but also how foreign aid had symbolic significance. For example, southern segregationists increasingly abandoned the Wilsonian internationalism they had clung to in favor of unilateral, nationalistic approaches to foreign aid in their effort to combat federal involvement in their states regarding race as well as discredit international criticism of the racial situation in the United States. They did not withdraw from the world in a true isolationist sense, but rather increasingly pushed for American involvement on its own terms.

From the beginning the institutionalization of foreign aid as a permanent fixture of American foreign policy took on ideological importance. Aided in part by the vagueness of Truman's framing of the Marshall Plan, those ideological debates provided the scaffolding that segregationists could affix domestic meaning to. The introduction of Point Four as development aid to the Third World marked a growing effort by southerners in Congress to maintain a global and domestic racial order. Segregation in the United States and imperialism abroad marked this existing white supremacist racial hierarchy, which both were increasingly threatened by liberal

---

[170] For more on how Point Four represented the acknowledgment of development as a permanent part of American foreign policy see David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 79.

[171] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 47.

policies and the political imperatives brought on by the early Cold War years. Southerners therefore sought a solution to maintain existing racial hierarchies, and started to craft their own alternative to liberal internationalism. By looking at the role of race in liberal development, the function of the United Nations in Point Four, and the congressional and public debates surrounding Point Four we can gage the growing level of discomfort among segregationists regarding foreign aid due to its domestic implications. Importantly, from their response we also can glean key characteristics, such as nationalism, militarism, and unilateralism, which would help define southern internationalism as an alternative to liberal internationalism.

Named, "Point Four," because the technical aid program was the fourth major policy issue Truman proposed in his 1949 Inaugural Address, Truman referred to it as a "bold new program" to aid in the growth and development of so-called "under-developed" regions of the world.[172] The underlying premise was that America would share its "know-how" with the rest of the world, aiming to teach the purported Third World to help themselves. Truman's inaugural address itself focused on foreign policy, with the other three major policy initiatives including continued support of the United Nations, continued support of the European Recovery Program, and strengthening the security of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Thus, the Point Four program was an integral part of Truman's foreign policy agenda. Given the international context of the early Cold War--when diplomatic tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union were especially high--the Truman administration's declaration of development aid as an essential part of American foreign policy conferred upon the program global and domestic significance that became more important than the actual functions and projects associated with Point Four. The open-ended nature of Point Four contributed to its

---

[172] Harry S Truman, Inaugural Address (20 January 1949), Document 1 in Dennis Merrill, ed. *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency* vol. 27 The Point Four Program (Bethesda, MD: University Publicans of America, 1999), 1-5.

popularity.[173] Its announcement represented a version of development, mirroring and cooperating

with the existing United Nations programs of the time that sought to address the

"underdeveloped" areas of the world based on the idea that development was an international

obligation.[174]

During the early years of the Cold War, American foreign policy focused on

reconstructing Europe and keeping the Soviet Union from expanding westward. Leaders in Asian

nations increasingly complained that their own reconstruction needs were not being met.[175] In

order to combat the threat of totalitarianism in the region, planners in the State Department put

forth the idea of technical assistance as a means to bring social and political change to Asia and

the other "undeveloped" regions of the world.[176] Thus, with the introduction of the Point Four

technical assistance program, development aid became an important foreign aid tool in fighting

the Cold War. Still, the meaning of what liberal development that the Truman administration

sought to employ was up for debate. Historian Nick Cullather concludes, "Rather than a

contingent process unfolding in history by its own rules and on its own schedule 'development'

by 1948 had acquired a transitive meaning, as a procedure performed by one country upon

another. In the emerging context of imperial disintegration and U.S. economic and technological

predominance, it made sense…to prescribe a developmental regimen for all of Asia and for State

Department officials to weigh plans for managing the historical transition of a continent."[177]

---

[173] Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1.
[174] For more see Amy L. S. Staples, *The Birth of Development: How the World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, and World Health Organization Have Changed the World, 1945-1965* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 2006).
[175] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 95.
[176] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 96.
[177] Nick Cullather, *Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 40.

Foreign aid in the form of technical assistance during the Truman administration therefore, sought to manage decay of the old racial hierarchy that imperialism reinforced around the world with hopes of replacing it with antiracism and democratic regimes that could guide former colonies into political and economic modernity. Thus, Truman's vision for the Third World was deeply rooted in liberal development's goals established in the post-World War II years.

Point Four's focus on changing the attitudes and politics throughout the Third World via "know-how" aligned with the administration's definition of liberal development as one in which "backwards" peoples in the Third World could reach modernity. The administration's introduction of development in Point Four represented their articulation of a model to counter the Soviet development model. Antiracist development goals were a key part in countering the Soviet model, because they took steps against the prevailing image in the former colonies that capitalism was just another form of Western imperialism.[178] By adopting liberal development as part of American foreign policy, Truman had actively tried to disassociate American foreign policy from an older political and economic order that was wrapped in western imperialism and exploitation that fueled a racial political and economic world order.

The administration's effort to disassociate itself from western imperialism was ultimately one of the key features of Point Four. Truman's administrative assistant, David Lloyd wrote Joseph L. Rauh of the Americans for Democratic Action and stated, "The most far-reaching domestic influence to be hoped for from Point IV is its effect upon international tensions, which condition the whole environment in which our economy operates." Lloyd acknowledged that Point Four had domestic importance as well as international. Although he only mentioned

---

[178] For more on the relationship between capitalism and imperialism see Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 19; 135. On capitalism and its imperial image see David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 43; Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 92.

economic significance, he elaborated on how Point Four would ease international tensions. "It will show the under-developed countries that instead of disregarding or positively exploiting them, we mean to use our great ability to help them in pursuit of their economic aspirations, thereby removing the attraction of the Soviet Union's only basic appeal to them."[179] The goal was to reshape the politics and economy of the recipient nations, but also win their hearts and minds by discrediting the ideas of the United States reinstating imperialism.

Liberal development was a way to try to reshape the world in a democratic, anti-imperialist, and capitalist image. The introduction of development into the Cold War expanded the parameters of the Cold War beyond capitalism and communism. Instead, the Cold War became a battle for the Third World between two anti-imperialist and distinctive development models.[180] For liberals, development entailed progress that could effectively bring "civilization" to other parts of the world.[181] Liberals thought that they could create appropriate economic and political conditions to lead to the "culmination of modernity," an industrial society, with the United States being the epitome of modernity.[182] Development projects were designed to not only produce growth, but also to guide it to a desired outcome imbued with specific meaning.[183]

---

[179] David Lloyd to Joseph L. Rauh (28 September 1949), Document 33 in Denis Merrill, ed., *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency* 27, Point Four Program (Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 1999), 186; Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 98.

[180] For more on the Cold War as competing development models see Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Intervention and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[181] Michael E. Latham, "Modernization, International History, and the Cold War World," in *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War,* eds. David C. Engerman, Nils Gilman, Mark H. Haefele, and Michael E. Latham (Amherst and Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 5.

[182] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 4; David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 5; David C. Engerman, *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 2.

[183] Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 4; This method of controlling development of new nations fits with Michael H. Hunt's argument that controlling political and social change overseas is one of three fundamental ideologies in American foreign policy, see: Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 18.

Indeed, officials and theorists defined political development as "democracy, stability, anti-Communism, peace, world community, and pro-Americanism."[184] With western aid and an infusion of technology, liberal development promised that material gains could be made in the Third World, but at the same time the material gains would also lead to new habits of modernity.[185] The proposed programs ultimately sought to bring modernity to all corners of the earth regardless of race.[186]

In an effort to counter the American efforts of disassociating capitalism with imperialism, the Soviet Union emphasized the way in which Point Four and other aid programs continued Western domination. For example, in one media report from Moscow, as the Foreign Broadcast Information Service to American government officials summarized a Soviet commentary on Point Four. This report cited an article from Moscow titled, "Point Four Plans Will Enslave Africa." This article detailed the way in which the so-called "generosity of the U.S. colonizers" was actually an attempt to "squeeze their European partners out of Asia and Africa to gain control of these countries as markets and sources of raw materials, to create strategic military bases there, and turn the people of these countries into humble slaves." It continued, detailing how "the Truman program of aid" would lead to economic and military "enslavement."[187] In the Cold War context the Soviet Union tried to portray American aid as imperialistic, while the American liberals actively worked to disentangle aid from its imperial past.

Efforts to disassociate the United States with Western imperialism were connected to the American domestic landscape as well. At the time of Point Four's inception 80% of Asians lived

---

[184] Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 4.
[185] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 4.
[186] Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 98.
[187] "Point Four Plans Will Enslave Africa," Daily Report, Foreign Radio Broadcast, 2 November 1949, CC1.

agrarian lifestyles. Cullather notes "Americans, self-consciously affluent and urban, doubted their ability to identify with this alien caste."[188] This uneasiness with managing development of the impoverished presented a challenge to the United States during the early Cold War, who offered a more urban approach in comparison to the Soviet Union's agricultural planning.[189] However, there were classes of Americans that did and could identify with the Third World and their economic and political struggles. First among these were African Americans who connected their own struggle for full citizenship in the United States to that of the independence movements throughout the Third World.[190] This connection proved significant in that segregationists and civil rights leaders alike saw domestic implications and meanings in liberal development efforts in Africa and Asia.

In general terms, Truman and his advisors anchored development policy via Point Four to a domestic context. Truman framed the Cold War as a choice between "two alternative ways of life," that easily aligned with his development goals. Whereas, the Soviet Union had a clear rural modernization plan, the United States did not. The success of internationalism via the Marshall Plan could not be replicated in the unindustrialized parts of the world.[191] Foreign aid in the form of technical assistant attempted to bridge the gap. The efforts of the American planners to reach out to "rural peasants" in Asia through the means of technical assistance represented an important step in codifying the meaning of the liberal internationalist agenda. To help sell Point Four and the development agenda it entailed to a skeptical public and members of congress

---

[188] Nick Cullather, *Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 40.

[189] Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[190] Penny Von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999); James H. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935-1961* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935-1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

[191] Nick Cullather, *Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 73.

Truman and his advisers drew on domestic projects as both an ideological and technical touchstone.[192] New Deal programs, especially the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) proved to offer a model for international development. As historian David Ekbladh has demonstrated, the TVA's importance in shaping what international development would look like reveals the domestic (and liberal) origins of development aid. It was therefore not without precedence when opponents of foreign aid started to see development and its economic, political, and social implications as one and the same with domestic liberal causes, including civil rights.

One of the key features of liberal development was its ostensibly antiracist ideology. The connection liberals made to antiracism in foreign policy was strongly linked to domestic antiracism as well. Segregationists and white supremacists saw their own position at home slipping away under the influence of liberals and their development scheme. Historian Michael Krenn argues that race was never far from development, and later "modernization theory," despite the progressive rhetoric associated with it. He notes, "When the idea of race began to lose its biological foothold in the post-World War II year, it simply rebounded by attaching itself quite easily and seamless to cultural explanations of the unique progress of the Anglo-Saxon world and the continuing backwardness and lack of civilization in the nonwhite world. The amazing resiliency of racism, however, allowed it to stave off challenges during the Cold War."[193] Indeed, liberals also tried to remake racial hierarchies in an image that they wanted, and of course theory and practice did not always intersect into workable solutions.

However, liberal development did ideally practice antiracism in which the West's superiority was based on a historical process that could be replicated rather than race or cultural

---

[192] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 97.

[193] Michael L. Krenn, "Token Diplomacy: The United States, Race and the Cold War," in Philip E. Muehlenbeck, ed. *Race, Ethnicity, and the Cold War* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press), 14.

explanations.[194] Historian David Engerman points out liberal intellectuals, in the 1920s,

overcame the prevailing belief in distinctive national characters by taking up the cause of

universal progress in which national character did not shape destiny, but was merely an obstacle

to modernity.[195] McVety concludes that the idea behind Point Four also rejected older ideas of

American progress originating from the identity of its citizens. Instead, the creators of Point Four

operated under the belief that American advancement had come from "freedom, education,

creativity, and, above all, progress.[196] What Krenn describes--the continued prevalence of race in

shaping United State foreign policy and enforcing Western superiority--was the result of

opposition to liberal development from segregationists. Development to liberals meant economic

capitalism and democratic political development. The implication was that it was not necessarily

race that marked "undevelopment" and inequality, but rather economic deficiencies and political

practices.[197] Liberal internationalism could use development as a way to create a new global

order that was antiracist. Both at home and abroad, liberals with their words and support for

development and civil rights sought to move beyond a racial nationalism that implied a cultural

and biological presupposition for political and economic success. To achieve these goals, liberals

supported technical aid for development via multilateral efforts, specifically the United Nations.

---

[194] Akira Iriye, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 7.

[195] David C. Engerman, *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 4.

[196] Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 85, 89. See also Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4.

[197] Michael Adas, "Modernization Theory and the American Revival of the Scientific and Technological Standards of Social Achievement and Human Worth," in *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War,* ed. David C. Engerman, Nils Gilman, Mark H. Haefele, and Michael E. Latham (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 35-36; Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 59-60; Michael L. Krenn, "Token Diplomacy: The United States, Race and the Cold War," in Philip E. Muehlenbeck, ed. *Race, Ethnicity, and the Cold War* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press), 14. In addition, by trying to change the social, political, and economic conditions of the former colonies, liberals were essentially challenging the "content and importance" of racial categories, as Omi and Winant have suggested in their influential "racial formation" theory. See Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States From the 1960s to the 1980s* (New York: Routledge, 1986), 61.

The United Nations became a symbol of internationalism and liberal development to segregationists who were increasingly uncomfortable with multilateralism and where aid was going. When Truman announced Point Four in his inaugural address he built off of the connection between national security and development that he had previously articulated in the Truman Doctrine and his support of the Marshall Plan. In doing so, his speech also made it clear that Point Four would be advancing an internationalism that focused on multilateral approaches and antiracist goals. A key feature of this was the United Nations as a vehicle of global cooperation. Truman stated, "This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies whenever practicable. It must be a worldwide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom."[198]

In this sense Truman rhetorically aligned himself with the tenets of international development as set forth in the United Nations. Historian Amy Staples argues that international efforts by the World Bank, the Food Agriculture Organization (FAO), and the World Health Organization (WHO) led to the establishment of modern development. The development the people of these international groups advocated for was economic development in the Third World without political, imperial, or religious ambitions. They instead crafted an "international identity" based around their progressive ideals, which sought to use economic development to improve life in the Third World.[199] Although these groups failed to carry out these ambitions, Truman had publically tied Point Four to the same internationalist ideals as these UN specialized agencies while at the same time tempering it with politics of national sovereignty. The result was an internationalism that denied that citizenship was tied to race and dismissed imperial systems,

---

[198] Harry S Truman, Inaugural Address (20 January 1949), Document 1 in Dennis Merrill, ed. *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency* vol. 27 The Point Four Program (Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 1999), 1-5.

[199] Amy L.S. Staples, *The Birth of Development: How the World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, and World Health Organization Have Changed the World, 1945-1965* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 2006), 1-3.

undermining the prevailing idea of "racial nationalism" in the United States and around the world.[200]

The multilateral approach and antiracist direction of development under Point Four began to erode southern support for foreign aid, especially through the means of the UN. Although the internationalism supported by the UN grew directly from Wilsonian internationalism, a southern political mainstay, it also ran against their tendency to support unilateral, anticommunist foreign policy. Staples observes, "Postwar internationalism sprang from a loss of faith in the ability of the system of nation-states and traditional diplomacy to cope with modern problems, coupled with a search for solutions."[201] The internationalism that Truman connected Point Four to, therefore, surrendered a degree of sovereignty to an international organization in the name of global uplift. However, Point Four was still a national program and although connected to the ideals of internationalism in its purest iteration, it did not reject the nation-state and traditional diplomacy completely. It did, however, make nationalists leery of what the implications of tying American foreign policy to the United Nations meant for the sovereignty and direction of the nation. The level of United Nations involvement therefore played a key role in the debates over how Point Four would be carried out and what that meant for international influence in American policy.

The question of national sovereignty increasingly concerned southern members of congress, who laid claim to states' rights as protection against any government interference, be it from federal or international sources. Joseph Fry argues that prior to the post-War period the South was the United States' most interventionist region, but he attributes this to devotion to

---

[200] For more of racial nationalism see Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

[201] Amy L.S. Staples, *The Birth of Development: How the World Bank, Food and Agricultural Organization, and World Health Organization Have Changed the World, 1945-1965* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 2006), 5.

partisan politics expressed in Wilsonian internationalism. However, even from the beginning the

internationalism that Southerners sought to institutionalize in the United Nations did not

necessarily approve of surrendering any amount of sovereignty, especially regarding labor and

race issues as seen in debates at the San Francisco United Nations Convention in 1945.[202] Even

before Point Four became a formal American policy it carried diplomatic weight, as Washington

did not hesitate to use international enthusiasm for "economic and social advancement" to

further own diplomatic ends.[203] Increasingly, segregationists began to resent the amount of

influence that foreign aid allowed foreigners to have in American domestic and international

policies, especially regarding civil rights.[204]

  The role of race in the United Nations and its development policies increasingly eroded

the faith the South had in its internationalism due to their own changing domestic racial politics.

The administration's linking of Point Four to the same institution that allowed African American

activists a platform to critique the United States while at the same time giving international

critics a voice on American domestic politics caused segregationists to articulate their

nationalistic turn away from liberal internationalism.[205] On foreign aid specifically, some

segregationist critics suggested that Africans and Asians would do anything to get more money.

They went so far as to reason that hatred for whites led the recipients of aid to demand that the

---

[202] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 220.

[203] Amy L.S. Staples, *The Birth of Development: How the World Bank, Food and Agricultural Organization, and World Health Organization Have Changed the World, 1945-1965* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 2006), 151-152.

[204] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 142, 146-147.

[205] For examples on how African Americans attempted to use the United Nations to increase international pressure regarding the United States' treatment of African Americas see: William Patterson, ed., *We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government against the Negro People* (New York: Civil Rights Congress, 1951); NAACP, *A statement on the Denial of Human Rights to Minorities in the case of Citizens of Negro Descent in the United States of America and an Appeal to the United Nations for Redress* (*An Appeal to the World*), 23 October 1947.

United States end segregation, and that the administration agreed to promote civil rights in an effort to buy support against the Soviet Union. They concluded that "antiwhite" nations were exerting indirect over American domestic policies.[206] Point Four could help win hearts and minds overseas, but it also opened the door to critiques of the United States own racial politics, segregationists recognized this and started to reject their support of liberal internationalism.

Segregationists' fears were not completely misplaced, as Truman saw the significance of Point Four in the context of a growing civil rights movement. In 1952 he outlined a six-point civil rights program in a speech at Howard University, a black university. In the speech he also included discussion of Point Four in the context of civil rights. He highlighted that the program was inclusive of all Americans and internationalist in practice. He observed, "The technical skills and knowledge that have been brought to such perfection in our country depend upon scientific discoveries that have come to us from all over the world." Acknowledging that scientific and technological advancement came from outside the Anglo-Saxon purview undercut the "racial nationalism" that had dominated American politics.[207]

Truman then presented Point Four as an example of what an integrated America could accomplish around the global, rhetorically undermining segregated racial orders. Discussing the responsibility that the United States had to the rest of the world, he continued, stating that the United States could help former colonies improve their conditions and preserve their independence through Point Four. Truman noted that graduates of Howard were helping to "cure sickness in Burma and Lebanon, to increase output in Liberia, to improve education in Ethiopia and Iran." Not only did Point Four take on significance in the black public sphere, but it also

---

[206] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 146-147.

[207] Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4.

served as a site where the greater promises of America could be realized. Truman said, "In these and other countries Americans are working together, regardless of race, creed, or ancestry to help the progress of mankind…We are working with the new nations of Asia and Africa as equals…Better than any other country, the United States can reach out through our diversity of race and origins, and deal as man to man with the different peoples of the globe." [208] Point Four served the administration as a public relations tool at home and abroad, demonstrating support of civil rights. The debates over Point Four in Congress demonstrate how this connection between domestic and international race politics helped widen the growing rift between segregationist and liberal internationalists.

Like the Marshall Plan, much of the debate revolved around how to implement the plan the best and partisanship differences. Truman's introduction of Point Four was little more than an idea and the State Department was tasked with working out the specifics.[209] In between the time Truman announced Point Four, the White House submitted a sponsored bill to congress, and finally the passage of it under the Foreign Economic Assistance Act in June 1950, many of the same Marshall Plan debates regarding foreign aid were reiterated. Political and economic concerns did not disappear with the shift of aid to the Third World.[210]

Not surprisingly, the debate over Point Four divided along party lines. Framing Point Four as a part of the Cold War foreign policy of the administration allowed Truman to combat Republican claims that he was weak on communism and utilize the historical context to try to put action to his words. For example, in August 1950, Truman wrote to the Speaker of the House,

---

[208] "Truman Outlines 6-Point Civil Rights Program: U.S. Must Guarantee Rights by Law, He Says," *Chicago Defender,* 12 June 1952, 12.
[209] Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 94.
[210] Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia* (New York: Oxford Press, 2012), 99.

Sam Rayburn, advocating for Point Four appropriations in terms of fighting "communist imperialism." He urged the Speaker to reconsider a proposed cut to Point Four funding, stating: "The advance agents of the communist conspiracy loudly promise the peoples of these countries a better way of life…We know that the way of freedom actually can and will provide a better life for people everywhere…This attempt to save some ten million dollars will do more for the communists in their attack on the free world than hundreds of millions of dollars of their own propaganda."[211]

Critics in Congress used the internationalist thrust of Point Four to draw attention inward, pointing to isolationist separateness abroad. In doing so they transferred their earlier opposition to liberal domestic policies to the global setting. Whereas Senator Taft criticized Point Four for taking the New Deal to a global scale, some commentators suggested that programs to combat ignorance, disease, and poverty at home were needed, a domestic Point Four.[212] These critics often expressed their displeasure of the internationalist preoccupation of the administration, citing economic and social problems at home.[213] From the beginning the public discourse on Point Four connected the domestic to the international by suggesting that Point Four was a Fair Deal for the world.[214] However, here the international shined a light on the domestic front. The idea that "development" and "technical" assistance should also be used within America was tied to the New Deal era roots of development aid.[215] This rhetoric taps into a competing vision of America's global position, wherein domestic problems were given priority over international

[211] Harry S Truman to Sam Rayburn, 25 August 1950, Folder 192a: Technology (June-Dec. 1950), Box 820, Truman Papers, WHCF: OF, HSTL.

[212] Marshall Andrews, "Point 4 Program Urged in U.S. Areas," *Washington Post,* 15 December 1949.

[213] Don Wicklund to Harry S Truman, 20 January 1949, Folder PPF 200: Inaugural Address (1-20-49 CON), Box 326, Truman Papers, WHCF: PPF, HSTL.

[214] Robert C. Albright, "First Full Term Accepted With Bold Program to Win Peace; Truman Proposes World 'Fair Deal'", *The Washington Post,* 21 January 1949. The Fair Deal refers to Truman's domestic reform legislation agenda.

[215] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 13.

concerns. The message this line of argument articulated was clear; the United States needed to

get its own house in order. These critics framed their argument in terms of a global perspective.

In this sense, rather than remaking the world in America's image, as the Fair Deal for the world

rhetoric implied, American society should be uplifted at home to secure its position in the world.

Related to the question of how the debate over foreign aid shifted between the Marshall

Plan and Point Four was the change in how aid opponents discussed the recipients of aid. In the

Marshall Plan debates members of congress rarely accused the European recipients of incapable

of digging themselves out of using the given aid to rebuild. In the debates over Point Four

though, the character and capabilities of the recipients became a subject of debate. The

introduction of recipients into congressional debates to discredit foreign aid represented the

beginning of a political fiction where Third World aid recipients were considered corrupt

beggars who manipulated the generosity of the United States. Representative Lemke's

denouncement of aid recipients as "gold diggers" is one example of the way the rhetoric

surrounding aid recipients was beginning to shift.[216]

Senator Ellender, too, discussed Third World recipients differently than he had described

European ones. Although generally Ellender supported technical assistance more so than outright

loans and monetary assistance, his evaluation of technical programs while on one of his frequent

"fact finding" world trips for the Senate Appropriations Committee demonstrates that he

questioned the aims of liberal development in the program. In 1953 having observed a technical

training school funded by Point Four, Ellender wrote that he was not impressed with the three-

year course in trigonometry that the school offered. He said he doubted that the students had the

---

[216] William Lemke, 96 *Cong. Rec.* HR 4142 (27 March 1950); Frank M. Coffin, "Foreign Aid…Controversy and Reality," Folder Agency For International Development, 1961-1963 (4 of 4), Box 2, Edwin R. Bayley Personal Papers, Subject Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

capacity to learn it or the necessity to.[217] In addition, he highlighted in his diary that Ethiopia had great natural resources and every opportunity to gain wealth from them, but it was still a "backward" country. Ellender clearly thought that Ethiopians had neglected or were incapable of using their resources. Considering Ellender's career-long obsession with natural resources, here he seemed to be suggesting that not only had Ethiopians squandered their natural wealth and had reason to be impoverished. The implication was that progress was tied to national citizenship and character, and for Ellender Ethiopians did not have the same inherent abilities that allowed Americans to successfully use the resources of their environment to reach modernity. Even though Ellender voted for Point Four and supported technical assistance he did so on the basis of a more nationalistic viewpoint as he shifted away from the racially progressive rhetoric of liberal internationalism.

Point Four represented the beginning of institutionalized aid to the Third World. Increasingly segregationists withdrew their support for the liberal internationalism that Point Four was rooted in due to the racial implications, both domestic and international, that the program carried with it. Segregationists did not wish to withdraw from the world though, especially considering the anticommunist vein that ran deep in their political ideology. Instead many turned towards supporting unilateralist and nationalistic foreign policy, often favoring military aid over any monetary efforts to contain the spread of communism abroad. They began to reject the United Nations as an acceptable means to maintain global peace due to the spotlight it often cast on American race relations. The way southern Democrats discussed aid recipients also changed in comparison to those in Western Europe, indicating that domestic social orders based on race influenced the internationalist perspective of southern opponents of foreign aid.

---

[217] Allen J. Ellender, Box 1511, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA

Conclusion

Following World War II, liberal internationalist and subsequent liberal development political agendas sought to be a democratizing and anti-racist force in the world, one that could eliminate the old racial hierarchies that had dominated international politics during the age of imperialism. However, early foreign aid programs (the Marshall Plan and Point Four) met opposition from conservative unilateralists who endeavored to be anti-imperialist, but also anti-multilateral. In doing so they clung to a vision of Americanism and citizenship that was firmly rooted in Anglo-Saxonism both at home and abroad. In addition, Liberal internationalism could not escape the realities of its programs, which often times replicated old imperial patterns of exploitation, leaving it open to attack from a wide variety of people from different ends of the political spectrum.

Southern segregationists initially supported foreign aid programs due to regional political trends towards internationalism and loyalty to the Democratic Party. However, as liberal internationalism via development aid in the Point Four program increasingly blurred the line between international and domestic policies, especially concerning racial social orders, segregationists found it increasingly difficult to stand behind liberalism. Instead, they began to slowly break from the Democratic Party and the liberal direction it was heading. Segregationists wanted to maintain both the racial hierarchy at home and abroad, and as aid shifted to the Third World, the antiracism of development served as a mirror on the United States. Segregationists thus responded by voicing their discontent over foreign aid policy. They rejected an international pressure regarding segregation and racial inequality. Instead, segregationists increasingly turned towards a unilateral and nationalistic foreign policy.

Despite opposition from various factions, the early foreign aid projects were largely bipartisan efforts because of not only their importance to strategic and economic exigencies of the Cold War against the Soviet Union, but also because they preached a philosophy of self-help and improvement that did not immediately call into question racial hierarchies. Furthermore, from the beginning foreign aid projects spoke to the southern proclivity for internationalism in American foreign policy. These bipartisan efforts surrounding foreign aid began to fray at the edges as foreign aid became institutionalized and the civil rights movement coalesced around the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954. The result was a fringe, but growing movement of segregationists from southern congressional districts who began to actively resist racial reform at home and abroad by voting against foreign aid appropriations.[218] Increasingly these southern members of congress resisted internationalist, multilateral policies and turned to nationalistic, unilateral approaches. Foreign aid was one of the earliest locations that this political shift in the American South's foreign policy occurred.[219] In foreign aid policy, the symbolic meaning of who aid was sent to became important for the opposition. Largely absent from these early debates was the degrading labeling of aid as "giveaways" or "handouts." As civil rights accelerated, though, such rhetoric became more prevalent, indicating a connection between conservative domestic and international policies. The next chapter, focusing on the restricting of development aid under Eisenhower's Mutual Security Administration, tells this story.

---

[218] Although a substantial body of work on the "long civil rights movement" argues that the American civil rights movement was part of a longer process that transcends the traditional 1955-1975 scope, taking a long view can obscure important distinctions across time and space about what made the civil rights movement (as well as Black Power) a distinct period in a longer history of the black freedom struggle. See Sundiata Keita Cha-Jua and Clarence Lang, "The 'Long Movement' as Vampire: Temporal and Spatial Fallacies in Recent Black Freedom Studies," *The Journal of African American History* 92, no. 2 (2007), 269.

[219] Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975); Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002); Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964).

Chapter II:

"International Gift Shop":
Segregationists and Mutual Security in the Early Civil Rights Years

The 1957 school integration crisis in Little Rock, Arkansas was both a domestic and international crisis for the United States federal government. Domestically, integration of Little Rock Central High stalled with the nine African American students being barred from entering the high school by National Guard troops, all while President Eisenhower struggled to determine a course of action. The domestic standoff took on new urgency as the international press widely published news about the event, which added ammunition to the arsenal of Soviet propaganda against the United States. Civil rights episodes like Little Rock undermined the progressive American race story that the United States government tried to actively tell to combat international acts of hypocrisy during the Cold War. The goal of the federal government was acknowledge that the United States was not living up to its own standards of self-proclaimed defender of freedom and equality for all. However, if any form of government could overcome such deficiencies it was American democracy.[220] Events like Little Rock therefore were problematic because they harmed the American image, which in turn discredited the liberal antiracist ideology driving American foreign policy.

Segregationists, on the other hand, used the Cold War to their advantage as well and easily adopted the nationalistic patriotism of the era to combat civil rights efforts. They claimed

---

[220] Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 13, 117-188; For more on the connection between the Cold War and its impact on the American civil rights movement see: Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Harvard University Press, 2001); Philip E. Muehlenbeck, ed., *Race, Ethnicity, and the Cold War: A Global Perspective* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2012); Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle, Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004).

that activists were subversive, communist, or outside agitators that harmed America's image and sewed racial conflict, creating chaos in a once orderly social system.[221] Moreover, the idea of state sovereignty became increasingly important in the rhetoric that segregationists used to combat civil rights reform. When Eisenhower did send federal troops in to enforce the integration of Little Rock Central High, southern senators compared it to the Soviet Union's actions in Hungary, decrying that the state of Arkansas's sovereignty was being forcefully taken from it.[222] Senator Allen J. Ellender also made it clear that he believed that states' rights had been violated, and he encouraged his constituents to actively circumvent the implementation of desegregation as called for by the *Brown* decision.[223] By 1957, southerners thought their control over their social order was slipping away at the hands of communists and a complacent (and even abetting) federal government. Segregationists' nationalism and calls for state sovereignty only increased when they believed that international influence was eroding their cherished racial order.

As the previous chapter demonstrates, southern segregationists were increasingly adverse to international influence on American domestic policy, especially concerning Jim Crow. The international press' coverage of the Little Rock situation only boosted southern resistance, and the federal government's efforts to ameliorate America's image abroad was met with outrage from southern members of congress. For example, a display at 1958 Brussels World Fair depicting U.S. race relations eventually had to be withdrawn due to southern threats to cause a

---

[221] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Louisiana State University Press, 2002); Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle, Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004); Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 141.
[222] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 249.
[223] Allen J. Ellender to Kenneth Collins, 21 November 1957, Box 706, Folder Little Rock Situation-Civil Rights," Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.

stir on the House floor.[224] The South's aversion to international influence on American domestic affairs was directly connected to liberal foreign policy, which sought to win allies throughout the Global South. Key among policies that permitted international influence within the United States, southerners believed, was foreign aid. As a result, segregationists continued to distant themselves from the internationalism they had once reluctantly endorsed in preference for unilateral, nationalistic, and anti-communist foreign policy.[225]

Foreign aid under President Eisenhower seemed to align more closely with segregationists' vision of foreign aid due to its focus on military aid as opposed to development aid. Eisenhower reorganized foreign aid under the Mutual Security Act. The result was a more militarized foreign aid policy. In addition Eisenhower tried unsuccessfully to reduce the amount of aid sent abroad.[226] Indeed, in 1951 when Point Four was reorganized under the Mutual Security Act, supporters in the American public responded with despondence. They worried that Point Four now fell under the more general umbrella of "foreign aid," which—in the circumstances of the Korean War and the Cold War more generally--emphasized military aid over economic aid.[227] Point Four was formally merged with economic and military aid in the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA). This merger did not necessarily kill Point Four, but as one official reported it "cut Point Four to Point Two and a Half."[228] In 1954, a Senate Appropriations Committee further reported that the Technical Assistance Program (the name

[224] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 249-250.

[225] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 147-149.

[226] Carol Lancaster, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 69.

[227] State Department, "Special Report on American Opinion, 15 June 1951, Folder Foreign Relations: Point IV (Pamphlets and Miscellaneous), Box 62, Papers of George M. Elsey, HSTL.

[228] Paul F. Kennedy, "Point 4 Shift Seen Weakening Effort," *The New York Times,* 25 September 1953. See also Paul F. Kennedy, "Morale Plunges in Point 4's Shift," *The New York Times,* 26 September 1953.

Point Four was dropped when Eisenhower came into office) was in danger of losing even more funding.[229] In the meantime, from the perspective of the American people, foreign aid became military and monetary handouts to people they considered "backwards." Unlike Marshall Plan recipients, segregationists increasingly cultivated an image of these "backwards" people receiving "handouts," as lacking the means to properly use American economic assistance, despite the fact that aid under Eisenhower aligned more closely with the South's vision of militaristic aid as opposed to development aid.[230]

If Eisenhower's policies represent a shift in both the direction of foreign aid and amount, why did southerners continue to retract their support for it at increasing rates? Southerners who were opposed to aid due to fiscal concerns should have supported Eisenhower's efforts to cut aid. In addition, Southern calls for more military aid during the Marshall Plan and Point Four debates should have easily aligned with the militarization of aid under the Mutual Security Act. The answer to the question of the American South's eroding support for foreign aid in the 1950s lies partly in the rapidly changing domestic racial context. It is not mere coincidence that the increasing opposition to aid overlapped with the growing civil rights movement at home. Specifically, building on the critiques that entered the foreign aid debate during the passage of Point Four, segregationists feared the antiracist ideology of liberal internationalism wherein foreign aid was seen as a tool for promoting international equality. Segregationists saw domestic civil rights demands and antiracist development aid to emerging independent nations in the Third World as stemming from the same political impulse that threatened their vision of a white supremacist global racial order. For example, during his world tours Senator Ellender frequently used the terms "native" and "negro" interchangeably, which implied that he conflated his

---

[229] "Aim of Point Four Found Distorted," *The New York Times,* 7 February 1954.
[230] State Department, "Special on American Opinion," 27 May 1949, Folder Foreign Relations: Point IV (Public Opinion), Box 62, Papers of George M. Elsey, HSTL.

domestic and international perspectives and saw Africans as primitive and African Americans as the same.[231]

Still, continued opposition and calls for fiscally conservative foreign policies among segregationist politicians did not represent the beginning of a retreat from world affairs for segregationists. Rather, they began to develop a more concrete foundation for a counter-ideology, one of southern internationalism. In response to domestic civil rights events, segregationists began to clarify their internationalist vision. This southern internationalism would become the foundation a conservative international ideology in the late 1960s. The pillars of this southern or Jim Crow internationalism were racial separatism, anticommunism, sovereignty, and nationalism that rejected international influence. In the opinion of segregationists, foreign aid went against these pillars, and therefore they often used it as a symbol of liberal internationalism that they could readily attack.

Historians of foreign aid and the American southern diplomatic tradition have identified the key turning point in the Southern break from consensus Cold War foreign policy in foreign aid as being in the 1950s.[232] This is largely because beginning in the 1950s southern support for foreign aid bills steadily declined, turning the South into the most "extreme opponent" of foreign aid measures in the short-span of eight years.[233] Most of these historians identify economic and fiscal concerns as being the overriding reason for the turning point. Domestic racial politics is not completely dismissed though. Thomas Noer has perhaps most thoroughly examined what race meant for southern support of internationalist programs, arguing, "The indictments of

---

[231] Allen J. Ellender, "Republic of South Africa," Folder South Africa Misc, Box 1570, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.

[232] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002); Edward W. Chester, *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975); Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964).

[233] Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 59.

independent Africa, foreign aid, and the UN were the first attempts of white supremacists to try to connect the domestic campaign against segregation with international affairs."[234] Still, Noer argues that this did not happen until the 1960s. By looking at the opposition to foreign aid not only can the impact of race be more fully and systematically explored, but we can also see that the connection between domestic and international socio-racial orders was occurring earlier than previously argued.

To demonstrate the way in which a southern internationalism began to coalesce in response to the growing American civil rights movement, this chapter will first examine the southern reaction to the 1954 Supreme Court *Brown* decision. Specifically, it will explore how ideas of anticommunism, sovereignty, and racial nationalism entered the segregationists' case against integration. Secondly, it will look at the federal government's use of foreign aid as a propaganda tool during the Cold War and the way segregationists responded to that strategy. Finally, it will explore how segregationists began to build their own white supremacist international network with white-rule colonies and nations in Africa in response to domestic civil rights events. Ideas of anticommunism, sovereignty, and racial citizenship built this international network.

"Racial privacy and racial integrity are the spiritual aspiration of a great race of people":
***Brown v. Board of Education,* George Wallace, and Segregationist Critiques of Foreign Policy in Their Domestic Civil Rights Stance**

1954 marked an important turning point in both civil rights and foreign aid policy. Despite the historiographical debate over the "long movement" versus the "short movement," in the history of American civil rights, 1954 is still a key moment in the black freedom struggle.

---

[234] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 148.

The hallmark of the civil rights movement was sustained direct action that developed after the watershed event of *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954, as it laid the groundwork for a more massive and militant movement.[235] Historians who adhere to the "short movement" periodization of the movement herald it as the beginning of the civil rights movement.[236] The Supreme Court's 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision set the course for legal desegregation by nullifying the "separate but equal" legal doctrine the 1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision established. The resulting movement's goals frequently revolved around achieving desegregation and equal access via legal action. The result was a more organized civil rights movement that focused on sustained legal action by civil rights groups and individuals to end legal segregation.[237]

On the foreign aid front, the militarization of foreign aid under the auspices of Mutual Security in 1951 and 1953 should have brought the wayward southern segregationists back into the internationalist consensus. Militarization meant more business for southern factories and also represented the more nationalistic, unilateral approach to aid that segregationist opponents had been encouraging since the beginning.[238] However, as contemporary historian Charles Lerche observed in his 1964 book, the hesitant southern support of internationalism in Truman's foreign

---

[235] Harvard Sitkoff, *The Struggle for Black Equality,* 25th Anniversary ed. (New York: Hill and Wang, 2008), 36.
[236] See Harvard Sitkoff, *The Struggle for Black Equality,* 25th Anniversary ed. (New York: Hill and Wang, 2008) for an example of a narrative of the civil rights movement. Sitkoff sees the development of sustained action after 1954 as marking the beginnings of the civil rights movement that adopted nonviolence as their mode of operation; Thomas F. Jackson, *From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Struggle for Economic Justice* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Sundiata Keita Cha-Jua and Clarence Lang, "The 'Long Movement' as Vampire: Temporal and Spatial Fallacies in Recent Black Freedom Studies," *The Journal of African American History* 92, no. 2 (2007), 269; Jacquelyn Hall, "The Long Civil Rights Movement and the Political Uses of the Past," *Journal of American History* 91, no. 4 (2005): 1233-1263. For more on the debate between the "long movement" and "short movement" see Sundiata Keita Cha-Jua and Clarence Lang, who argue that the "long movement" is ahistorical and conflates trends that did not shape the period of sustained agendas and mobilization of large numbers of people during the period between 1954-1965 (279-280).
[237] For more on the periodization of the American civil rights movement see: Sundiata Keita Cha-Jua and Clarence Lang, "The 'Long Movement' as Vampire: Temporal and Spatial Fallacies in Recent Black Freedom Studies," *The Journal of African American History* 92, no. 2 (2007), 269.
[238] Vernon W. Ruttan, *United States Development Assistance Policy: The Domestic Politics of Foreign Economic Aid* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 70-76; Carol Lancaster, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 98.

aid ventures continued to crumble during the Eisenhower years. He notes, "Beginning in 1954, the number of Southerners in the opposition column began to increase each year as the annual request for a renewal of the program reached the floor of the House."[239] The explanation for this continued decline in southern support of internationalism, lies in the convergence of the civil rights moment and at the same time spending in development aid increased.

It would be easy to dismiss the fact that a key civil rights legal decision and the coalescing of southern opposition to international aid occurred at the same time as a mere historical coincidence that does not necessarily demonstrate a relationship between the two. However, as the previous chapter has revealed, opponents and proponents linked foreign policy to racial conflicts within the United States--especially on the question of foreign aid. The internationalist antiracist ideology that buttressed foreign aid was therefore a key factor in driving segregationists and their support for foreign aid away. The fact that Eisenhower's administration marked the inclusion of foreign aid into the Mutual Security program and attempted to reduce the amount of aid the US gave, should have appealed to the segregationists who had cloaked their opposition to foreign aid in calls for fiscal conservatism, nationalistic, and militaristic approaches to foreign policy. Instead, 1954 marked the tipping point in the story of southern support for international development policy, indicating that the southern opposition to aid was not just rooted in foreign policy and economic concerns.

As chapter one has shown, Louisiana's Senator Allen Ellender and like-minded members of Congress started to question foreign aid when its beneficiaries shifted from countries in Europe to those in the Global South. Ellender's domestic racial perspective tempered his views. In 1954, the federal government called into question southern socio-racial hierarchies more than

---

[239] Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 59.

it had since the heyday of Radical Reconstruction. Segregationists responded to the federal government's attempts to end legal segregation by firmly tethering their opposition to foreign aid to domestic civil rights. At this time George C. Wallace was circuit court judge in Alabama, and he and his allies reacted to the *Brown* decision in ways that highlight how segregationists attached domestic significance to foreign aid. They wrapped their anticommunist and unilateralist declarations against liberal policies at home and abroad in a segregationist worldview that rested on maintaining racial hierarchies abroad and at home. Attacking foreign aid and civil rights in the same context suggested the foundations of a southern conservative counter to liberal internationalism.

In his capacity as a circuit court judge, Wallace weighed in on the Supreme Court's *Brown* decision, and deployed contempt for current American foreign policy in his critiques of integration. Importantly, his assessment of the *Brown* decision did not take the same form as the bombastic rhetoric he embraced in his later national political career. Instead, Wallace used official and procedural channels and comparatively speaking, muted rhetoric. Wallace attached his support to an "Application for Rehearing and for Modification of Opinion" regarding the *Brown* decision. An application for rehearing is the first step for rehearing at an appellate court level. After defeat in an appellate court, the almost automatic response for a lawyer is to submit an application for rehearing. Appellate courts are flooded with such applications, and most are frequently rejected. That Wallace endorsed this application therefore demonstrates the significance of the argument presented in it. The fact that the application used foreign to attack civil rights at home in an official application for rehearing of the Supreme Court case reveals that the connection segregationists saw between foreign policy and domestic race relations was moving from the periphery of American political discourse to the center, coinciding with a

sustained and increasingly effective civil rights movement.[240] After *Brown,* segregationist support of foreign aid steadily continued to decline. The application for rehearing that Wallace supported highlights why southern Democrats saw foreign aid as stemming from the same ideology that challenged their position at home.

One of the key features of the intersection of foreign policy and civil rights in the *Brown* application for rehearing was the way in which it discussed citizenship. The inclusion of the rights of citizenship as justification for continued segregation aligned closely with the South's embrace of nationalistic, unilateral policy. The application turned internationalism inward using the familiar southern political motif of anticolonialism. Harkening back to memories of Reconstruction, the application claimed that the United States federal government was treating the South like a conquered territory, which for southerners touched a nerve The application took it further though and suggested that the United States treated actual conquered territories with more respect. It stated, "The United States should not adopt toward thirty-five million white citizens a domestic policy different from the foreign policy by which it has uniformly abided in dealing with citizens of lands which its troops have conquered or occupied…The Southern States are the only conquered territory upon which the United States by armed might or otherwise has ever forced acceptance of mores opposed to their sincere, conscientious principles and fundamental traditions by which they lived."[241] The qualification of "white" citizenship implied a privilege of theirs that Southerners thought the federal government had trampled. This only fed

---

[240] From the perspective of the Federal government the *Brown* decision was linked to waging the Cold War. During the last weeks of Truman's presidency the Justice Department submitted an amicus curiae briefs regarding the *Brown* case. In the briefs the Truman administration emphasized the international importance of American discrimination, including its impact on foreign affairs and American prestige. For more see: Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 90-92.

[241] "In the Supreme Court of the United States of America, RE: *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, Application for Rehearing and for Modification of Opinion," Box SG19965, Folder 11 (1 of 2), Administrative Assistants' Files, A-C, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

southern resentment and invoked the "Lost Cause" of the Civil War era. The message to the

federal government was that the South held firmly to a "racial nationalism" in which citizenship

was tied to Anglo-Saxon heritage.[242] By suggesting that the liberalism of the federal government

dismissed white privileged citizenship in favor of places like Africa and China, as well as

African Americans at home, the application fueled segregationist efforts to maintain their

position of political, economic, and social power at home and abroad in the face of changing

global racial hierarchies.[243]

The idea that the federal courts had trampled southerners' rights as citizens helped lay the

foundation for an emerging alliance between religious groups and conservatives, which would

become a key alliance in the conservative political coalition. The application equated southern

rights to segregation as equal to protection like religious rights. As far as the supporters of the

application were concerned the courts had as much right to order integration, as it had to force

Catholics to practice birth control. The "integrity of race," according to the application was

constitutionally protected because the level of their devotion to segregation as a social order

matched religious conviction. The application argued, "The people of the South reverently

esteem family honor and racial integrity. The purity of their race is higher than an ethical idea

with them. With man it is an article of religious faith, with almost all it is an important as life or

death." They reasoned that the South was a loyal region of the United States and as a

"homogeneous 'land' within the nation" that had been signaled out and wronged by the court's

---

[242] Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4.

[243] "In the Supreme Court of the United States of America, RE: *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, Application for Rehearing and for Modification of Opinion," Box SG19965, Folder 11 (1 of 2), pg. 3, Administrative Assistants' Files, A-C, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

decision.[244] The religious fervor that segregationists attached to their cause suggests a possible explanation for the alliances that held together what would become the New Right. In their case against *Brown* segregationists clearly used racial definitions of American citizenship. Their decision to compare it to religious rights in the United States allowed them to articulate a legal, but fervent, argument to reject federally mandated integration based on rights endowed to American citizens. While facing Cold War international pressure to remedy the racial situation at home to win allies in the Third World, segregationists fervently clung to their racial order and definition of citizenship. In an effort to maintain the South's racial order based on segregation, the growing alliance with religious groups and evangelicals laid the foundation for a later conservative coalition. In the face of the *Brown* decision, the coalition provided fortitude against liberal and international pressure.

The application for rehearing made it very clear that the type of "southern citizenship" it believed had been trampled was "white citizenship," further emphasizing that the nationalism segregationists in the region moved steadily towards was a racially based vision of the United States in the world that ran counter to the ideals of liberal internationalism. Despite suggesting that African Americans were also citizens, the application always qualified citizenship by "white" or "negro." The application claimed that African Americans and white Americans both shared in the "national fortune," while at the same time making it clear that it was the "white America" that had *built* the nation. In fact, the rehearing application attempted to argue against integration based on the charity Southerners had shown to African Americans. It reasoned, "There is no parallel in history to the magnificent generosity shown these involuntary newcomers. Yet, not content with equal and exact justice and with an equal share in the material

---

[244] "In the Supreme Court of the United States of America, RE: *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, Application for Rehearing and for Modification of Opinion," Box SG19965, Folder 11 (1 of 2), pg. 8, 10, Administrative Assistants' Files, A-C, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

accumulation of centuries, they demand the right to adulterate the very race which matchless

generosity and energy provided the vast national fortune in which they share." Echoing Senator

Ellender's fear of "race mixing," the application even suggested that wanting to maintain "racial

privacy and racial integrity" were the characteristics of "a great race of people."[245] The

implication was that the nation was great because of white racial purity. Integration threatened

that greatness. This was the domestic socio-racial order that segregationists were attempting to

maintain at home in face of calls for equality at home and abroad.

The rehearing application reinforced the southern vision of a white supremacist racial

order by essentially claiming that white Americans were better citizens. For segregationists,

demonstrating the superiority of "white citizenship" was especially important to assert in the

context of the hyper-patriotism of the early Cold War years. The application concluded that

white Americans had "patriotic superiority."[246] This claim solidified the racial nationalism that

was the backbone of the application for rehearing's main argument regarding their region's

sovereignty being violated at the whim of the federal government. Furthermore, it served to

counter the federal government's efforts to use foreign relations as an argument in favor of

integration. Segregationists had clearly connected race to national character, and what they

deemed to be "liberal" court decisions threatened to undermine their definition of citizenship and

the privileges that came with it. The emphasis on patriotism was in direct response to the

growing radical black politics of the 1930s and 1940s.[247] More specifically the application began

---

[245] "In the Supreme Court of the United States of America, RE: *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, Application for Rehearing and for Modification of Opinion," Box SG19965, Folder 11 (1 of 2), pg. 10-11, Administrative Assistants' Files, A-C, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.
[246] "In the Supreme Court of the United States of America, RE: *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, Application for Rehearing and for Modification of Opinion," Box SG19965, Folder 11 (1 of 2), pg. 10, Administrative Assistants' Files, A-C, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.
[247] Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004); Gerald Horne,

to touch on the anticommunism of the Cold War by highlighting the fact that one of the characteristics that set white Americans apart as superior citizens was that they were more patriotic as opposed to what they branded as communist agitators in the civil rights movement, who sought to create instability and upheaval domestically. When coupled with other political literature that discussed efforts to "reclaim" America and democracy, this racialized vision of citizenship implied that to go against segregation was anti-American and a likely communist endeavor.[248] The argument that the application presented implied that segregation was an American institution and defined the Southern region. Segregationists therefore felt the need to reassert their patriotism and Americanism in the face of the federal government justifying integration via its importance to combatting the Cold War. They presented their counterargument that suggested that to work against a segregated racial order was to provoke domestic instability and allow communist agitators influence within the United States, which weakened the nation in their fight to contain global communist expansion.

If segregationists believed that their citizenship was under attack, they also looked for people to blame. It was here that they inserted foreign policy into their argument. The fact that racism extended beyond the shores of the United States is hardly any surprise, but, as the discussion surrounding Point Four previously showed, segregationists started to believe and publicize that these "underdeveloped" nations were exerting control over the United States, and dictating integration. The application for rehearing made it clear that the federal government was treating the region worse than conquered territories, and in the context of decolonization, many

Black and Red: W.E.B. DuBois and the Afro-American Response to the Cold War, 1944-1963 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986; For an example of how radical African Americans attempted to use international pressure to force racial change within the United States see: William Patterson, ed., *We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government against the Negro People* (New York: Civil Rights Congress, 1951).

[248] A. Graves Williams, "Before the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce," 14 November 1945, Box 12, Folder 94, Alabama Pamphlets, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

of those "conquered" and otherwise involved in territories were in the Global South, adding race to the mix.

Segregationists articulated their southern resentment for the changing global racial dynamics brought on by decolonization in their rebuttal to the *Brown* decision. The application argued that not only was "white America" being treated worse than a conquered foreign land, but also that black people around the world dictated that mistreatment. It claimed, "The Supreme Court as looking outwardly at the opinion of the colored races of the world when it wrote the opinion in Brown v. Topeka…It must not oppress Americans with an unthinkable denial of vital matters of conscience in order to purchase prestige from colored people abroad."[249] The application painted a picture of segregationists as a minority group under attack from the government at home and "inferior" races abroad.[250] Harkening back to earlier debates regarding the United Nations and Point Four, segregationists turned increasingly towards conspiratorial declarations of an international communist, anti-white plot to incite racial conflict within the United States.[251]

In combating liberal internationalism with nationalistic rationale and rejecting outside interference, segregationists built off of the established white resistance rhetoric introduced in the debates over Point Four. Specifically, the segregationist effort to connect the "nefarious global plot against segregation" aligned easily with using anti-communism to discredit the civil

---

[249] "In the Supreme Court of the United States of America, RE: *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, Application for Rehearing and for Modification of Opinion," Box SG19965, Folder 11 (1 of 2), pg. 5, Administrative Assistants' Files, A-C, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[250] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 141.

[251] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 141; 146-147.

rights movement.[252] Foreign aid was a key target, because segregationists worried that it allowed foreigners a platform to exert control over American domestic policy. Along with supporting the application for rehearing of *Brown,* based on the pamphlets he kept as reference for speech material, Wallace also read extensive literature that laid out how foreign aid was communist in nature. Among this literature was a 1949 editorial from the *Birmingham News* by Ronald M. Harper on the defining features of a communist. Harper listed Point Four among communist "ambition-destroying" programs. He further elaborated that in the venture of helping "backward" countries there was no assurance that they would not "bite the hand that feeds them."[253] Thus, Harper suggested that foreign aid to the Third World was not only communistic in nature, but also that the recipients of the aid were untrustworthy. In doing so, he echoed the increasingly racialized discussion about foreign aid that Ellender's and others promulgated beginning with Point Four. Harper specifically blamed liberals for domestic and international communist-inclined programs and deemed support of such programs as being inherently anti-American.

In accusing liberals of supporting communist programs, Harper categorized domestic liberal programs as stemming from the same anti-American ideology that endorsed foreign aid. According to Harper, a typical communist was a "left-winger" that wished to abolish all distinction of "race, sex, intelligence, and character." He accused educators, humanitarians, and politicians of catering to the "underprivileged" classes, claiming that to do so was essentially communist. Harper argued that leaders were turning the United States into a "welfare state" as quickly as possible, contributing to policies that destroyed individual ambition. Like the later application for rehearing, though, Harper also made it clear that not all citizens were equal.

---

[252] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 141.

[253] Ronald M. Harper, "What is a Communist?," 28 June 1949," Box 4, Folder 76, Alabama Pamphlets, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

Regarding programs aimed at the "underprivileged classes" he wrote, "They [liberals] act as if they thought all that is necessary to convert depraved, diseased, ignorant and shiftless people into good citizens is to put them through school, build hospitals for them, cure their social diseases, let hem vote, pension them when unemployed or old, etc."[254] According to Harper, liberals were disturbing the socio-racial order at home and abroad with communist schemes that undermined a racial nationalism and thus were anti-American as well. Wallace kept many of Harper's editorials on hand for reference, and they influenced his understanding of the purposes of foreign aid to the Third World.

The racialized nationalism that underscored the steadily coalescing conservative international political ideology also entered Harper's interpretation of the *Brown* decision. In a 1955 editorial, Harper referenced an argument made in an earlier pamphlet by the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital. The pamphlet credited the common foreign affairs problem that segregation in Washington D.C. created, namely, the issue of African diplomats being denied services because they were mistaken for African Americans.[255] Harper reasoned, "That is indeed unfortunate, but it is no valid reason why innocent white children should now be embarrassed and humiliated, and subjected to moral hazards, by being forced into close association with negroes, in some cases under negro teachers."[256] Harper's assessment not only called into question the abilities of African Americans, but more significantly, it put the

---

[254] Ronald M. Harper, "What is a Communist?," 28 June 1949," Box 4, Folder 76, Alabama Pamphlets, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[255] For more on African Diplomats in the United States during the civil rights movement see, Renee Romano, "No Diplomatic Immunity: African Diplomats, the State Department, and Civil Rights, 1961-1964," *The Journal of American History* 87, no. 2 (2000): 546-579; Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 160-167; Michael Krenn, "The Unwelcome Mat: African Diplomats in Washington, D.C., during the Kennedy Years," in *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988,* ed. Brenda Gayle Plummer (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 163-180.

[256] Ronald M. Harper, "Racial Contrasts in the National Capital," Box 13, Folder 11, Alabama Pamphlets, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

desire to maintain southern social order above American foreign policy interests. Like Ellender

had done in 1949 and the application for rehearing regarding the *Brown* decision did, Harper

scoffed at the idea that American domestic policy should be dictated in any way by nations in the

Third World. After *Brown,* segregationists increasingly repudiated liberal calls for domestic civil

rights reform based on international prestige in favor of a nationalistic foreign policy that

dismissed concerns about American image abroad, especially among Third World nationalists.

Wallace himself provides an important window into the history of conservative

internationalism due to his extremism and the fact that he was a congressional outsider.

Wallace's biographers all agree that he was the very definition of a politician, saying whatever

he thought would motivate his base and win votes. When scholars engage with Wallace as an

historical actor, one of the key questions they ask is to what extent he believed the racist diatribes

he publicly made.[257] An oft-cited story by Wallace's former adviser John Kohn best

demonstrates the way Wallace approached politics. Kohn said, "If George had parachuted into

the Albanian countryside in the spring of 1962, he would have been head of a collective farm by

the fall, a member of the Communist Party by mid-winter, on his way to the district party

meeting as a delegate by the following year, and a member of the Comintern in two or three

years." Kohn concluded, "Hell, George could believe whatever he needed to believe."[258] A

Newsweek reporter in 1964 described Wallace as having nervous tendencies that he compensated

for with his skills of exploiting the fears and frustrations of his constituents.[259] Still, Wallace also

clearly believed—to some degree—in the institution of segregation and was as racist as any other

---

[257] For more on Wallace see: Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995); Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana States University Press, 1996); Stephan Lesher, *George Wallace: American Populist* (Da Copo Press, 1994).

[258] Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), 15.

[259] "Wallace: Welcome Home You Living Doll," *Newsweek,* 1 June 1964, 18.

Southern white politician of the time. What made Wallace different was the fact that he was so skilled at telling people what they wanted to hear. Despite his exaggerated rhetoric and demagogue status, this makes him an example of how the segregationist political fiction surrounding foreign aid resonated beyond the debates of Congress and into the American public, laying the foundation for a conservative internationalism. On occasion, Wallace would pull himself away from gatherings to give speeches, explaining, "I got to give 'em a little nigger-talk," which demonstrates that he knew what kind of a show he was putting on.[260] It was this calculated self-awareness about his message that made Wallace such an important figure in the rise of the Right based around racial politics, both domestic and foreign.

In 1954, Wallace was not yet a national political figure and focused on rallying white, southerners in Alabama against integration, which was not a difficult task. Wallace already had a fiery, rhetorical style that rested in part on his ability to not just attack integration, but weave that attack into a larger assault against liberals and, by extension, the federal government. This method would eventually take his political message beyond the South and earn him a small, but vocal national base.[261] A key feature of this rhetoric involved evoking fears that liberal foreign policy (including foreign aid) was leaving the United States vulnerable to communism at home and abroad. The underlying message of Wallace's attack on American foreign policy was firmly rooted in domestic race relations.

Using the same critiques of foreign influence over American domestic policy as he read in the application for rehearing and Harper's editorials, Wallace reiterated a nationalistic counterpart to liberal internationalism by placing southern racial citizenship in the context of

---

[260] Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 8.
[261] See chapter 4 for more on how foreign aid played a role in Wallace taking the conservative rhetoric to a national level.

world events. In an undated speech on the 1954 *Brown* decision, he all but quoted the application

for rehearing, stating, "Let me say that the people of the South ask only that they be treated no

differently than citizens of the lands which our troops have conquered or occupied." However,

unlike in the application, Wallace purposefully pointed out that these are the very people to

whom the United States gave aid—as well as occupied.[262] The result was not only to attack the

federal government for supposedly mistreating upstanding southern citizens, but also to

delegitimize any pressure from overseas for domestic racial reform because those international

critics of race in the United States were dependent on aid money. This was a similar, but more

muted technique of attacking foreign aid via civil rights that Wallace would use during his later

presidential campaigns. It was a nationalistic declaration reflecting Wallace's and his supporters'

growing southern internationalism that rested on claims that southern and American sovereignty

should be protected from the meddling opinions of other nations.

Wallace's implication that Third World nations had no right to attack American socio-

racial order mirrored his treatment of African Americans in his speech. This helped to deepen the

connection between international decolonization and American civil rights in the eyes of

segregationists. After detailing the number of ways the South had been wronged and treated as a

conquered territory, Wallace went on to clarify the southern stance on African Americans. He

said that the South believed in the "onward and upward" direction of African Americans. He

continued, "We support that destiny with our tax money and our Christian good wishes. We

build his opportunity with a vast program of industrial development and record breaking efforts

in the field of public education. The freedom of opportunity and liberty to develop to the limits

---

[262] George C. Wallace, "1954 Brown v. School Board Decision: Fraud in the Brown Case, Speech Prepared for Delivery by George C. Wallace," Box SG19965, Folder 11 (2 of 2), pg. 18, Administrative Assistants' Files, A-C, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL. Although undated the speech says Governor Wallace delivered it, which means its earliest date would be 1963. I have chosen to use it here since it is highlighting the way segregationist built their case against the *Brown* decision.

of his capabilities should not and will not be denied…The people of the South have carried the Negro citizen on their shoulders and have endowed him with every blessing of civilization that he has been able to assimilate."[263] The qualification of "negro citizenship" and their abilities rested on the socio-racial order that Wallace and his supporters hoped to maintain. The message was that only white Americans citizens had a political voice. Critiques against segregation from abroad or at home were invalid to people like Wallace because via foreign aid, white American citizens were helping domestic and international critics of segregation reap the rewards of what segregationists deemed white "civilization."

In the halls of Congress, Representative Otto Passman from Louisiana echoed the anticommunist and nationalist calls for southern and American sovereignty against international and domestic attacks on segregation following the *Brown* decision that the rehearing application, Harper, and Wallace wove together. Entering office in 1947 Passman had quickly earned a reputation among his constituents and colleagues in the House as a fervent fiscal conservative. He frequently referred to himself as "just a country boy," but he also exulted that his hobbies were "decent clothes and good food." He even kept a detailed inventory of his wardrobe. When the well-dressed Passman took to the House floor, often to denounce foreign aid spending, he recited budget figures off the top of his head and did what colleagues called the "Passman's Dance," the result of "pent-up nervous energy." The *New York Times* described him as a "tense, fast talking businessman," who had been, "wielding a countryman's axe on foreign aid outlays since 1955 as chairman of a twelve-member House Appropriations subcommittee."[264] In 1958, he famously told a representative of the State Department, "Son, I don't smoke and I don't drink.

---

[263] George C. Wallace, "1954 Brown v. School Board Decision: Fraud in the Brown Case, Speech Prepared for Delivery by George C. Wallace," Box SG19965, Folder 11 (2 of 2), pg. 18, Administrative Assistants' Files, A-C, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL. Although undated the speech says Governor Wallace delivered it, which means its earliest date would be 1963.
[264] "Aid Bill Axe Man: Otto Ernest Passman," *New York Times,* 14 June 1960, 5.

My only pleasure in life is kicking the shit out of the foreign aid program of the United States of America."[265] Passman thus built his political reputation based on his opposition to foreign aid. He also was a fervent segregationist, and his response to the *Brown* decision reveals how he had began to form a political response to domestic civil rights that rested on an alternative vision of what American foreign policy and the means of national security should look like. This vision was an attempt to combat the threat to southern racial hierarchies coming domestic and international sources.

In his defense of segregation, Passman painted a picture of liberalism in which its political agenda ran counter to American interests, allowing him to craft an alternative understanding of international engagement with the world. He was able to therefore use the hyper-patriotic atmosphere of the Cold War to shore up a nationalist defense of segregation. He did so by using a definition of racial citizenship that rested on southern notions of sovereignty, both domestically and internationally. The result was that Passman, like Wallace and Harper, began to attack liberalism more directly based on domestic race issues. Thus, their attacks against federal government interference were based on calls for sovereignty and racial definitions of citizenship and the rights inherent to said citizenship. These attacks against liberalism and the federal government would lay the foundation for future attacks against not just domestic liberal programs, but also international ones like foreign aid.

Rather than outright attacking African Americans and their demands for equality, Passman responded by suggesting the *Brown* decision represented the country sacrificing state sovereignty and liberties in the name of "compassion for racial minorities" by "something called

---

[265] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 252.

'liberalism.'"[266] He further refined his critique of integration during in the wake of the desegregation crisis in Little Rock in 1957. Passman told congressional colleagues that civil rights were a threat to the liberties of all Americans. He continued, "It begins to look more and more as though the highly emotional and inflammatory question of 'segregation or integration' is methodically being used as a 'whipping boy' to disguise an all-out attack upon constitutionally guaranteed freedoms of the American people." Passman argued that, in the South, civil liberties had not yet been corrupted by calls for "social equality." Instead, the South saw integration for what it was, Passman declared, a misguided attempt by liberals to subvert individual American freedom.[267]

The *Brown* decision and southern reaction to it was, therefore, a key moment in building a conservative internationalism to counter the liberal internationalist antiracist agenda. Southern ideas regarding anticommunism, sovereignty, international influence, and definitions of citizenship all made up key points of their critiques on foreign policy. More importantly, these criticisms entered the public forum regarding civil rights. Therefore, the message of Wallace and his allies was that it was foreign aid that in part allowed international opinion to dictate domestic race relations. Southerners responded by trying to counter federal government claims that race reform, and by extension foreign aid, had influence in international affairs. They also sought to create their own network of allies abroad, looking towards nations that had white-rule governments in the Third World. In doing so, they not only attacked foreign aid as a platform for international criticism of United States socio-racial order, but they made it increasingly clear that

---

[266] "From the Office of Otto E. Passman," 1 March 1957, General Files, Folder 07 Newspapers and Publicity, January-May, undated material, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

[267] "From the Office of Otto E. Passman," 1 March 1957, General Files, Folder 07 Newspapers and Publicity, January-May, undated material, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

aid went to lesser people who were incapable of self-governance. Ellender and others often used their opportunity to point out what they perceived to be deficiencies in Africans for self-government to compare those Africans to African Americans in their civic capacity. The result was that they utilized the foreign affairs to discreetly comment on the domestic state of affairs.

"This stuff about starving people of other nations is unadulterated poppycock": Ellender, Passman, Propaganda, and Foreign Aid

One of the many ways the federal government promoted foreign aid was by arguing that it could serve as a propaganda tool to combat the Soviet Union in key areas of the world enflamed by revolutionary nationalism. That meant selling the United States as an antiracist, multicultural society where opportunities were expanding for everyone. The official message of the American government to the rest of the world was that the United States was not perfect with regards to race, but that it was progressing because democracy allowed for social progress.[268] The federal government did not waste the opportunity to use foreign aid and other diplomatic ventures to further the cause of the American image abroad. Segregationists responded by condemning foreign aid and government information services as one and the same. Specifically, they used anticommunism, nationalism, and claims of defending state and national sovereignty as the foundation for their attacks against the "extravagances" of the "do-gooders and world planners."[269] Segregationists' efforts to maintain their domestic racial order rested on undermining global antiracist programs and messages that allowed for international influence in American affairs, and more specifically, southern affairs. In the process of dismissing liberal

---

[268] Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 13.

[269] Allen J. Ellender to Broussais Coman Book, 26 April 1957, Box 702, Folder Appropriations--USIA, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

international antiracist aspirations to control decolonization, segregationists continued to form their own ideological counterpart.

The United States Information Agency (USIA) played an integral role in spreading the message of American democracy's progressive racial trajectory to the world. USIA was established in August, 1953. Key among its purposes was to advise President Eisenhower and other foreign affairs officials on what the world thought about the United States, and also to explain and promote American policies and interests abroad. On the topic of desegregation, USIA praised the *Brown* decision in 1954, and in 1957, during the Little Rock integration crisis, USIA faced the task of controlling the damage done to the American image abroad, especially in non-white countries.[270] As the agency tasked with not only telling a progressive American race story, but also the one responsible for gathering information on international opinion about the United States, USIA provided a target for segregationists attempting to protect their domestic racial institutions against international influence.

Segregationists in particular were threatened lsjdlfjsljf One way that the USIA and the State Department sought to correct the image of race in the United States abroad was to send African American jazz musicians around the world to represent the culture of the United States and the achievements of democracy to correct racial inequality. The idea that the United States could use jazz musicians as cultural ambassadors came from an alliance of musicians, civil rights proponents, and cultural critics. The appealed to the State Department under Eisenhower because it provided a means to combat the image of America as culturally inferior to the Soviet Union, while at the same time demonstrating American efforts to correct racial inequalities to

---

[270] Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 9, 142.

international audiences.[271] African Americans traveling abroad in the context of the Cold War

had real political significance. As W.E.B. DuBois observed in 1956, the State Department

expected African Americans traveling internationally either not to speak about race conditions in

the United States or say what the State Department wished the world to believe about them.[272]

These jazz ambassadors were far from puppets of the State Department, though. Instead, they

exercised agency in the political atmosphere created by the Cold War in which civil rights

activists were often expected to adopt the liberal cold war consensus rhetoric to aid in advancing

legal reforms.[273]

For segregationists, it was not enough that the "jazz ambassadors" were expected to fall

in line with the federally prescribed progressive American race story that the Cold War had

dictated as a foreign policy imperative. Instead, the fact that African Americans were being sent

abroad to represent the United States and its culture was quickly dismissed, in the same vein as

foreign aid, as wasteful spending that undermined American sovereignty. Senator Ellender in

1957 boasted to a constituent that he had received negative press for his criticism of USIA,

specifically its use of Dizzy Gillespie as a "jazz ambassador." Ellender wrote, "I agree with you

that it is difficult to see how such aggregation as the Dizzy Gillespie group could properly

represent cultural aspects of American music, jazz or otherwise."[274] For Ellender, "American

culture" and African American culture were not mutually compatible, and to spend money

---

[271] Penny M. Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 6.

[272] Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 175.

[273] Penny M. Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 25; For more on the way that the civil rights movement embraced legal reform and the rhetoric of Cold War liberals over more revolutionary calls for human rights see Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[274] Allen J. Ellender to Robert H. Russell, 9 May 1957, Box 702, Folder Appropriations—USIA, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

promoting African American culture abroad was foolish and invited further critiques of the

American race situation. Furthermore, since the jazz ambassadors did not follow the State

Department's message at all times, such a program did not advance American interests abroad.

Ever the fiscal conservative, Ellender also did not understand what benefit both USIA

and foreign aid could have to the American economy. He lamented to a constituent that he did

not see the purpose of spending millions of dollars to combat propaganda against the United

States, especially when foreign aid was supposed to be securing allies for the nation. He was

even irritated that Great Britain and France dared to level complaints against the United States

after the amount of Marshall Plan funds they had received. Ellender was not necessarily against

all forms of propaganda; he thought that the USIA's Voice of America radio broadcast served an

important purpose. But, Ellender's disdain for most of USIA's activities and foreign aid more

generally was rooted in concerns about maintaining sovereignty. Ellender aversion to

propaganda stemmed from his desire to avoid any sort of outside influence on American

domestic politics, especially regarding the racial order. He therefore dismissed foreign aid and

USIA as "extravagant" spending by "do-gooders" and "world planners.".[275] His charges that

foreign aid did not work to gain allies and that USIA was wasteful suggested his alternative to

Eisenhower's foreign policy was more unilateral and nationalistic, one which would fortify the

United States against "world planners" and other internationalists who allowed for outside

influence while considering domestic and international politics.

Passman agreed with Ellender and attempted to discredit foreign aid appropriations based

on the jazz tours. In 1958, he delivered a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives. In

his efforts to refute the logic for foreign aid funding, Passman included jazz tours by the likes of

---

[275] Allen J. Ellender to Broussais Coman Book, 26 April 1957, Box 702, Folder Appropriations—USIA, Allen J.
Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

Louie Armstrong and Dizzy Gillespie among items that foreign aid contributed to that he found

wasteful.[276] Passman did not go into detail about what he thought was wasteful about the jazz

tours, but he included them among other items that he deemed ridiculous. The list itself further

highlighted how little he valued foreign aid recipients. For example, along with the jazz tours, he

also included education subsidies to the Middle East.[277] Still, Passman never made any direct

racialized attacks on aid recipients, although he did accuse recipients of fraud. Yet, by suggesting

that these activities were frivolous, Passman questioned the idea that the United States needed to

endear itself to Third World nations.

Importantly, political commentators used Passman's critiques of foreign aid and

propaganda to support and further disseminate his sentiments regarding the United States

yielding to the rest of the world and the economic costs of such internationalism. One such

person was a prominent foreign aid critic, Eugene Castle.[278] In one of his pamphlets, Castle

quoted from Passman's February 1958 speech. Building on Passman's critique he observed, "In

the name of foreign aid we are spending \$5 million annually to send warblers of arias to Western

Europe, weigh-lifters to the Near East and high-priced jazz bands to the Far East!"[279] In addition,

Dan Smoot, an influential conservative media commentator, also quoted from Passman's 1958

congressional address.[280] Thus, the segregationist critique of foreign aid and the propaganda

campaigns that went along with it were supported and repeated to the public via conservative

---

[276] Otto E. Passman, "Speech delivered by Congressman Passman before the House of Representatives" 13 February 1958, General Files, Folder 30—Speeches—unmarked year, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

[277] Otto E. Passman, "Speech delivered by Congressman Passman before the House of Representatives" 13 February 1958, General Files, Folder 30—Speeches—unmarked year, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

[278] For more on Eugene Castle see Chapter 3.

[279] Eugene W. Castle, "Foreign Spree for our Superspenders," *American Mercury,* May 1958, Foreign Aid Files, Folder 19 Aid-National Constituent Opposition, 1958, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

[280] Dan Smoot, *Dan Smoot Report,* vol. 4, no. 9 (3 March 1958), Foreign Aid Files, Folder 19 Aid-National Constituent Opposition, 1958, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

commentators, helping reinforce the foundation for an emerging conservative internationalism that rested on nationalistic engagement with the world.

Passman also attacked foreign aid and propaganda by suggesting that foreign aid in the 1950s was itself a product of an internal propaganda campaign of sorts. He referred to efforts by the executive branch to push foreign aid as "Eisenhower Operation Brainwash." He told the House of Representatives, "There has probably never been devised in our nation a more actively functioning propaganda machine than the one which is operated by the advocates of free-spending with pressure groups pushing the program, seeking spending far in excess of the needs justifiable by the facts."[281] Passman did not name the "pressure groups" he spoke of, but in the context of his speech, it seems he likely that African Americas, Third World nationalists, and American liberals were among those that he had in mind. Passman was convinced that foreign aid policy was being influenced by foreign nations trying to get more funds sent to them. In Passman's view, the result was that the United States was hoodwinked into "paying glorified blackmail to unfriendly regimes in many countries."[282] Passman therefore suggested that groups within the United States were misleading the American public, and that foreign nations took advantage of it. His attempts to present this argument represented an effort to cast a shadow on aid as little more than a vehicle for foreign meddling in American affairs.

Here, like Ellender's dismissal of "do-gooders" and "world planners" and their policies, Passman suggested that it was propaganda spread by overly emotional policymakers that was leading Congress and the American people astray. In 1960, he directly called out the

---

[281] Otto E. Passman, "Speech delivered by Congressman Passman before the House of Representatives" 13 February 1958, General Files, Folder 30—Speeches—unmarked year, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

[282] Otto E. Passman, "Speech delivered by Congressman Passman before the House of Representatives" 13 February 1958, General Files, Folder 30—Speeches—unmarked year, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

humanitarian images and arguments that supporters of foreign aid often used when justifying their budgets. He wrote, "This stuff about starving people of other nations is unadulterated poppycock. A great majority of them are about as well fed as we are." Passman believed that Third World recipients were opportunists that used the convergence of the Cold War and decolonization to squander the United States out of money. Passman feared the result was that the United States was losing ground in the world market to the very people that the nation was providing aid to, something southerners had feared happening at the onset of development aid.[283] He also attacked one of foreign aid's other key selling points: its ability to win allies in the fight against the Soviet Union. He lamented, "That through this Frankenstein-like monstrosity we may have eventually been? brought to our knees economically, and with fewer friends than we ever had?"[284] Yet, Passman did not directly attack liberal members of his party, because he held on to his southern Democratic Party devotion.

He still did not completely reject the internationalism the Democrats established under Truman. He pointed out emotionalism and partisanship as the problem and should be avoided. However, he was becoming increasingly vocal about the role that pressure groups that were pushing for foreign aid.[285] His attack on foreign aid and propaganda represented his resentment towards liberal policies, but not an abandonment of his political party. Although the Democrat Party had started to farcture in the post-World War II years, it was an ongoing process that did not reach its crescendo until the loss of the so-called "Solid South" in 1964. The political attack

[283] Otto E. Passman to Palmer Van Gundy, 6 May 1960, Foreign Aid Files, Folder 2 Foreign Aid—National Support, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.
[284] Otto E. Passman, "Statement before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations on Mutual Security Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1958," 15 August 1957, General Files, Folder 08 Foreign Aid 1957, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.
[285] Otto E. Passman, "Statement before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations on Mutual Security Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1958," 15 August 1957, General Files, Folder 08 Foreign Aid 1957, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

signified how his opposition against foreign aid was not just about fiscal concerns, but also his worry over influence in American policies from abroad and at home. They rested on his desire to maintain national control over international and domestic affairs.

By questioning the need for USIA's propaganda, segregationists like Ellender and Passman sought to discredit an international influence on domestic affairs, especially regarding the southern segregated racial order. They responded to the federal government's efforts to present a progressive American race story to potential allies in the Third World. Ellender and Passman argued that foreign aid and the propaganda associated with it were wasteful. They hinted that internationalists were to blame for misleading the American public and garnering support for foreign aid. They believed that internationalism had allowed outside influence that had eroded American power abroad and caused upheaval domestically. Their actions represented a segregationist desire to eliminate foreign influence and maintain sovereignty for their individual states as well as the nation. Realistically, though, they recognized that withdrawing from the world completely was impossible, especially in the context of the Cold War. Therefore, the foundation of a conservative internationalism that segregationists were building on ideas of sovereignty and nationalism was not akin to isolationism. Instead, they wanted world involvement on their terms. Specifically, segregationists sought international engagement that did not threaten their socio-racial standing at home and abroad. Therefore, in the 1950s, to counter liberal internationalist ideas, segregationists began to cultivate their own international network of likeminded allies. Here, not only did nationalism dictate their cause, but also strict anticommunism came into play.

**"Wilson had never contemplated self-determination except for homogenous peoples":
South Africa, Rhodesia, and the American South**

The support of segregationists for white rule in Africa illustrates the way in which a conservative internationalism was coalescing around race following the *Brown* decision and subsequent Little Rock school integration crisis in 1957. Segregationists felt increasingly attacked from domestic and international sources. Their response was to go on the offensive. This meant not only countering domestic liberalism, but also international liberalism, often identifying the two as one and the same. Internationally, this meant creating a global white supremacist alliance that rested on theories of racial superiority. Looking at how southern politicians discussed events in Africa highlights the key idea of racial nationalism and anticommunism, unilateralist foreign policy that buttressed the attempts of southerners to maintain the white superiority at home and abroad. The result was their intentional alignment with like-mind minority-rule governments in Africa, specifically South Africa and Rhodesia (modern-day Zimbabwe).

Questions of race in Cold War politics (both directly and indirectly) has played a significant part in understanding the nature of American Cold War foreign relations with Africa, especially the civil rights movement at home and decolonization abroad converged. Thomas Borstelmann's *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern African in the Early Cold War* is one of the first studies of how the United States approached diplomatic relationships with Africa during the Cold War and its connection to these larger themes. Borstelmann's scope is limited to the Truman era and politics as he sees this as a crucial time when American officials cemented the relationship between the United States and South Africa due to Cold War concerns in the region. Yet, this relationship posed many problems for the United States due to issues of race relations at home and abroad, bridging the gap between domestic and international policy concerns.

The hypocrisy of the United States regarding racial equality and the nation's inability to live up to its self-proclaimed ideals invited the possibility of accusatory global outrage towards the United States. Segregationists resented internationalism for allowing outside influence to dictate American policies, so they began to cultivate their own white internationalism. The Jim Crow system in the southern United States and the apartheid regime of the Nationalist Party made natural, if uneasy allies.[286] Although Cold War concerns often dominated the way that the United States interacted with the rest of the world, in the case of South Africa there was also a level of self-identification with South Africa. Southerners built on their previous attempts to use African nations as examples for black inferiority, as Ellender's world trip diaries and reports have demonstrated, and renewed their support for the "the civilizing whites" in Africa, Rhodesia and South Africa in the late 1950s and early 1960s.[287] In doing so they were not just connecting domestic race perspectives with international ones in their effort to maintain racial hierarchies at home, but they actively were trying to cultivate a global network of white supremacists. This directly undermined the liberal internationalism in foreign aid programs, and fostered a southern internationalism on the basis on global white supremacy.

After *Brown* in 1954 and Little Rock in 1957, segregationists continued their domestic attack on civil rights by claiming they were engineered by communists (both domestic and international) while at the same time denouncing the international pressure on the United States that they argued the United Nations and foreign aid allowed. The year 1960, or "the Year of Africa," provided segregationists with an opportunity to utilize events in decolonization to

---

[286] Thomas Borstelmann, *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern Africa in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 201.

[287] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 142, 145; Thomas J. Noer, *Cold War and Black Liberation: The United States and White Rule in Africa, 1948-1968* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1985), 140.

rollback segregation at home. This was compounded by increasing numbers of demonstrations such as the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee's (SNCC) sit-in movement throughout the South.[288] Thomas Noer argues, "To segregationists, African independence was a clear premonition of the calamity that would follow racial equality at home. Black rule in Africa was a model to be avoided, not duplicated."[289] People like Ellender, Wallace, and Passman all kept up to date on the news out of Rhodesia and South Africa, and often wrote and discussed it, siding with the white-rule governments for maintaining order in the region.[290]Again, the segregationists adhered to racial nationalism used international events as a way to critique racial reform within the borders of the nation.

Noer, however, focuses his attention on conservative groups with political influence. But, when politicians are taken into account it because increasingly clear that the growth of conservative internationalism came in part from earlier attempts to connect foreign aid to civil rights. Ellender and others' opposition to Point Four demonstrates how conservatives began to use the Third World as an example of racial inferiority that applied abroad and at home. Still, Ellender's earlier critiques of Third World abilities were muted and indirect. After the events of decolonization abroad and the early civil rights episodes, Ellender and his allies more openly attacked Third World abilities and began to more aggressively support white supremacist regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa.

---

[288] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed. *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 142.

[289] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed. *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 142.

[290] George C. Wallace, Allen Ellender, and Otto E. Passman all have substantial folders and holdings regarding South Africa and Rhodesia in their archival materials. Furthermore, they frequently wrote letters to both colleagues and constituents regarding the situation in those countries and their support for the white-rule regimes.

By the late 1950s, Ellender framed his critiques against foreign aid in racial terms by describing the inefficiencies and inabilities of Africans. Upheaval in the Congo and Angola in 1960 and 1961 only reinforced segregationist fears that not only were blacks going to displace southern white power at home, but that it would lead to chaos. Although Ellender had been critiquing the ability of Africans to self-govern since Point Four in 1949, after the domestic racial upheaval in the South of the mid-to-late 1950s, his attacks became more pointed and combative. He said, "These people are entirely incapable of governing themselves and in my opinion it would be a waste of our taxpayer's dollars to initiate a program of direct assistance there."[291] In Ellender's vision, the United States should not give foreign aid to less than desirable candidates, whereas under the Marshall Plan some recipients were ungrateful, they were still considered capable. This was not the case in after the turmoil-filled independence of the Congo.

Ellender's fellow Louisianan in the House, agreed with Ellender's assessment of the civic abilities of the Congolese following independence. On the situation in the Congo, Passman frequently received letters from constituents and others that decried the situation in the Congo. One such letter went so far as to compare the Congo to the American South. He wrote, "What is going on in the Congo now, mass raping of white women, murder of white men by Africans, has been going on all over the U.S. (especially in the South), ever since the depraved and Communist-minded U.S. Supreme Court issued its Un-Constitutional integration edict."[292] The letter reflected the same themes that Ellender, Wallace, and Passman had articulated regarding foreign policy in the Third World and its connection to domestic race relations. The letter-writer highlighted the character of Africans and how it was similar to what he perceived to be

---

[291] Allen J. Ellender, Box 760, Folder Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[292] Letter forwarded to Passman from Dr. B. E. Masters of the Citizens Councils of Texas, 8 July 1960, General Files, Folder 17 Segregation 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

lawlessness and violence of African Americans, he suggested that the federal government was responsible for a communist policy, and he implied that integration had put white-citizenship in a dangerous situation. Essentially, he used an international episode as a platform to critique domestic policies. He highlighted the key ideas that segregationists had been using to create a southern internationalism. Passman readily agreed with this interpretation of the events in the Congo and the American South.[293]

By the late 1950s, Ellender concluded that Africans were unable to rule themselves and that African Americans were essentially in the same position in the United States. These attacks only served to further his efforts and those of other segregationists to stem the tide of antiracist liberalism at home and abroad. On the topic of the Congo, Ellender observed on one of his world tours that "I find that the negro here is not different in many respects than our own negroes. They are shiftless and most cunning in their efforts to get out of work."[294] In this statement, Ellender simply internationalized the contemporary prevailing stereotype that African Americans were lazy and needed white guidance to urge them to work and domesticated his views on Africans. He used his domestic perspective and projected it internationally, creating an international racial perspective that merely imposed his American southern understanding on the world stage.

Southern white paternalism towards African Americans and Africans was always present as justifications for segregation in discussions on civil rights and foreign aid, but compared to his earlier statements on the subject, Ellender's rhetoric had shifted to a more clearly articulated connection between African Americans and Africans. He articulated his southern racialized worldview time and time again on his "fact finding" trips for the Senate Appropriations

---

[293] Letter forwarded to Passman from Dr. B. E. Masters of the Citizens Councils of Texas, 8 July 1960, General Files, Folder 17 Segregation 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

[294] Allen J. Ellender, "Diary of 1952 World Trip," Box 1512, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

Committee. Despite taking these trips for official purposes, Ellender's reports were always a strange mix of official matters, travel diary, personal observations, partisan interpretations, and guidebook. Speaking to the commonness of Ellender's opinions at the time, his racist and personal observations that littered the reports he submitted to the Appropriations Committee never need to be official rebuked. It was only in 1962 when Ellender publically insulted African leaders that the federal government had to intervene and distant itself from Ellender's remarks. Instead, during the 1950s his domestication of global racial hierarchies created little stir among his colleagues.

In his 1953 world trip to evaluate foreign aid in Africa, Ellender was more tempered in his critiques, but he still clearly supported white-rule governments in Africa. In the Belgian Congo, Ellender described Leopoldville as a modern city in many ways, because of the large presence of the Belgium.[295] He also wrote, "I find the natives here more polite than other colonies. They seem satisfied and most grateful for their advancement. I believe there are fewer agitators here than in any fewer agitators here than in any other territory I have visited."[296] Ellender's assessment of black South Africans was similar. He wrote, "Judging from what I have seen in this area, they get rough treatment, but they seem humble and not troublesome. All very polite and as in most of Africa they refer to the white man as 'master.'"[297] Ellender's observations implied that black Africans under white rule were more complacent and less likely

<hr>

[295] "Senator Ellender's Diary, South African Tour," 9 August-2 October 1953, pg. 54, Box 1513, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.
[296] "Senator Ellender's Diary, South African Tour," 9 August-2 October 1953, pg. 62, Box 1513, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.
[297] "Senator Ellender's Diary, South African Tour," 9 August-2 October 1953, pg. 78, Box 1513, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.

to cause trouble. This mirrored his view of African Americans as content with segregation in the American South.[298]

But, even in 1953, the connection between civil rights at home and foreign aid supporting antiracism and decolonization abroad was present in Ellender's assessment and wrapped in praise for the white-rule governments in Africa. Ellender reported on the situation in Southern Rhodesia that he did not think that black Rhodesians would ever be able to support themselves without the "help and guidance of white men."[299] In doing so, Ellender suggested that African self-rule was not possible due to inferiority among blacks. Although he did not explicitly state them, the domestic parallels were clear to Ellender and his audience.

Building on his conflated comparison of African Americans and Africans, Ellender continued to praise the South African system as an effective way to manage independence in South Africa and equated it to the American history of expansion and racial order. He observed that on his visits "the natives were cheerfully going about their business," and that they were earning betters wages with the benefits of education, health, and housing than any other "black man in any other country of Africa." He continued by praising the system that the South African government had set up. Stating, that the only result of a multiracial state would have been native political dominance, so apartheid was the only possible policy.[300] Given that Ellender had already established that he believed non-white populations to be incapable of running their own affairs, Ellender's dismissal of "native rule" as even a possibility was congruent with his own global racial views.

---

[298] Thomas A. Becnel, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 16.

[299] "Senator Ellender's Diary, South African Tour," 9 August-2 October 1953, pg. 92, Box 1513, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.

[300] Allen J. Ellender, "Republic of South Africa," undated, Folder South Africa Misc, Box 1570, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.

Ellender continued his positive assessment of the South African racial policy by drawing comparisons to the history of the United States and pointing out how the South African apartheid model was actually better than that of the United States'. He pointed out that the history of South Africa paralleled that of the settlement of the American West, except, because of the rapid industrialization and agricultural advancements that the white population brought to South Africa, the number of "natives" in South Africa actually increased instead of decreasing. He therefore reasoned that just like giving American land "back to the natives" was not going to happen in the United States, it was not going to happen in South Africa either. Finally, Ellender concluded, "Just as some groups in our own country have sought to break down customs through legislation and laws, the South African government has sought to make customs the law of the land."[301] Not only did Ellender praise the separate races system that South Africa had instituted, but also he suggested that it was the most effective way to control decolonization and an independent African state, thus reinforcing traditional racial hierarchies. Furthermore, in his thinly veiled attack on the American civil rights movement's efforts at legal reform in contrast to the South African legal institutionalization of apartheid, he suggested an alternative development model that rested on white superiority and neocolonial relationships in the Third World.

Ellender did not limit his racialized critique of foreign aid to the African continent; he also criticized the Korean recipients of aid in 1956, which demonstrates the way in which he extended his racist rhetoric to all non-white recipients of aid. In doing so, Ellender further entrenched his vision of a superior global white race, representing his efforts to maintain the global racial hierarchies of the pre-World War II imperial system. On the topic of foreign aid to Korea Ellender declared, "Look at Korea! Korea has done more construction than at any other

---

[301] Allen J. Ellender, "Republic of South Africa," undated, Folder South Africa Misc, Box 1570, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.

time in its history. When they get money, Koreans always want more. They are sucking your blood."[302] By calling Koreans "bloodsuckers," Ellender had attacked the character of aid recipients. The *New York Times* was quick to pick up on the nuanced shift in Ellender's declaration against aid. An editorial in the paper declared that Ellender was free to offer critiques on foreign aid policy. However he did not have the "freedom to slander in such a manner a nation which is a true friend of ours and a valiant ally of ours." The *Times* concluded, "Mr. Ellender has only betrayed his own ignorance and bigotry by making a statement slandering Korea."[303] The *Times* recognized the way that Ellender's domestic racial beliefs were influencing foreign aid discussions.

Furthermore, Ellender's comments about Korea and Africa demonstrate the way in which a foundation of a white international resistance had been developing among segregationists; white-rule in Africa had to be maintained if development was ever to occur. The domestic events of the late 1950s only renewed Southern efforts to build a global network of white supremacist. The Cold War only aided in these efforts, as South African and Rhodesia were anticommunist and pro-American. However, that the white-ruled African nations and the American South had shared socio-racial systems made it all the more easy for segregationists to identify with these colonies and nations.

Rhodesia and South Africa also courted segregationists, which helped segregationists build their southern internationalism defined by white supremacy and global efforts to combat the changing racial hierarchies that decolonization sparked. South Africans monitored the racial situation in the United States not only because they were concerned with the gains of the civil

---

[302] Allen J. Ellender, "Release issued by the Republic of Korea Office of Public Information," 10 September 1956, Folder Korea 1956, Box 1529, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.
[303] Allen J. Ellender, "Release issued by the Republic of Korea Office of Public Information," 10 September 1956, Folder Korea 1956, Box 1529, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.

rights movement, but also because they used the events in the United States to demonstrate that white control was the most effective governance.[304] Southern politicians and South African minority rule therefore had a self-reciprocating relationship. South Africans more quickly dismissed American internationalism than did segregationist congressmen. South African ambassador William Naude defiantly told President John F. Kennedy's Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, "Wilson had never contemplated self-determination except for homogenous peoples."[305] Naude's comments against a key feature of internationalism, self-determination, echoed the same rationale that Wallace and liked minded officials articulated after the *Brown* decision in 1954 that "racial integrity" was paramount to southern citizenship.[306] The rejection of liberal internationalism by both American segregationists and white South Africans demonstrates that, by the early 1960s, the global white resistance to antiracist internationalism was firmly established.

By 1963, segregationists had all but abandoned liberal internationalism and this was evident in foreign aid policy. Building on his previous remarks that dismissed the abilities of black Africans to govern themselves, Ellender, while on one of his many world trips in 1962, announced to the African press that he did not believe that any African nation was capable of self-government, and that he therefore opposed grants to them.[307] He observed that Africans had not made "the least bit of progress on their own."[308] The fact that Ellender made these remarks in Rhodesia, a British colony whose white minority was fighting the tide of decolonization,

---

[304] Thomas J. Noer, *Cold War and Black Liberation: The United States and White Rule in Africa, 1948-1968* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1985), 140.

[305] Thomas J. Noer, *Cold War and Black Liberation: The United States and White Rule in Africa, 1948-1968* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1985), 140.

[306] "In the Supreme Court of the United States of America, RE: *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, Application for Rehearing and for Modification of Opinion," Box SG19965, Folder 11 (1 of 2), pg. 8, 10, Administrative Assistants' Files, A-C, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[307] "Ellender Opposes Grants to Africa," *New York Times,* 2 December 1962, 50.

[308] "Not Yet Ready for Self Rule, Africans Told," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* 2 December 1962, B10.

amplified the significance of his comments, which suggested that Africans could not advance without European intervention and that the United States supported the minority rule's regime and ideology because they aligned with their own.[309] Following those early battles of the civil rights movement, Ellender's comment essentially solidified a conservative internationalism based on racial nationalism at home and white supremacist networks abroad. In terms of foreign aid policy, this meant that foreign aid was a "giveaway" or "handout" to people who could not effectively employ it. The message Ellender and others gave was that foreign aid was a failed internationalist "do-gooder" scheme that was bankrupting the United States and threatening white power on all fronts. Foreign aid was an example of how liberal antiracist policies were failing.

Conclusion

Segregationist opposition to foreign aid continued to grow under the Eisenhower administration. This was despite the fact that Eisenhower had attempted to moderate the foreign aid budget and militarize it under the Mutual Security Act. However, when in combination with aid's focus on the Third World and the beginning of the American civil rights movement, segregationists clung to a nationalistic, unilateral approach to foreign policy. The result was the foundation of a southern internationalism that rested on anticommunism, sovereignty, and racial nationalism. Especially when segregationists used foreign events as symbols and cautionary examples for domestic racial conflict. Furthermore, in an effort to discredit liberal foreign policy goals and to combat international influence in domestic race issues, segregationist discredited propaganda and its role in foreign aid. Ultimately the convergence of the nationalistic and anticommunist view of segregationists meant that liberalism and the federal government became

---

[309] For more on this episode see chapter three.

key targets in the opposition to foreign aid. The result of was that segregationists did not seek to withdraw from world affairs, rather they sought create international alliances with likeminded white supremacists in South Africa and Rhodesia in an effort to control the rapidly changing global racial hierarchies that World War II and the Cold War initiated.

In response to the growth of foreign aid and the civil rights movement, segregationists not only took a defensive approach, but they also went on the offensive. In an effort to cultivate an alternative to liberal internationalism, they actively engaged in creating an international network of white supremacists with Rhodesia and South Africa. This was part of their effort to maintain white social, political, and economic power at home and global. "Racial integrity" was what segregationists held to define citizenship, and they carried this over to foreign affairs with their support of white-rule in Africa. With the election of John F. Kennedy, foreign aid would once again take on a more liberal and internationalist direction. Meanwhile, the civil rights movement entered its high-point of militant non-resistance. Segregationists and their allies responded by entrenching their power under the disguise of nationalistic, unilateral rhetoric regarding foreign policy, which resulted in imbuing foreign aid with racial symbolism, as the next chapter addresses.

Chapter III:

"Then I'll be Concerned about Their Attitude Towards Us":
Segregationist Opposition to Foreign Aid and Internationalism, 1960-1964

In 1959, Eugene W. Castle, dismayed over the amount of foreign aid the United States

government continued to approve, amended his 1957 book, *The Great Giveaway: The Realities*

of Foreign Aid, by penning a postscript.[310] Castle was a former San Francisco newspaper

reporter, newsreel cameraman, founder of Castle Films, and investment banker. But, in addition

to his accomplishments in the news media and the financial sector, Castle had also made his

name as a "budget hawk," who relentlessly critiqued American foreign aid policy, or as he

labeled it, "Alice-in-Wonderland extravaganza."[311] Since the 1940s, he had derided government

excess. He shifted his focus to foreign aid as the epitome of that excess in the 1950s, even

appearing several times in front of congressional groups to present testimonies against aid

programs.[312] Throughout *The Great Giveaway* he frequently cited foreign aid as a symptom of

ineffective government overreach that propagandists sold to the American people in place of an

actual foreign policy. No matter how fantastical and hyperbolic his claims were in the 1957

edition of his book, Castle largely based his arguments against aid in terms of practical matters

such as economic and policy concerns. When ideology did enter his reasoning, it was in terms of

an internationalist, communist-influenced conspiracy that he believed would bankrupt the United

States. In 1959, however, a new urgency marked Castle's pleas for the American people to take a

---

[310] Life Line Books published the 1959 edition of *The Great Giveaway: The Realities of Foreign Aid.* Life Line Books were intended for "Patriotic Americans, on the lookout for a second Karl Marx or a fanatic concealing a time bomb, [who] often fail to see where the greatest danger to our liberties lies." Life Line Books believed these "mistaken" citizens were hiding the conspiracy against the country with their influence in all mediums of media. Therefore, Life Line wanted their books to be passed on to other "Patriots" after it had been read. Their mission statement reasoned, "One book passed around according to this plan may help as much as seven books not in active circulation to combat the false propaganda designed to keep the public deceived for the final kill." Castle's alarmist critique of foreign aid policy matched Life Lines Books' vague, apocalyptic conspiracy vision well.
[311] Eugene W. Castle, *The Great Giveaway: The Realities of Foreign Aid* (Washington D.C.: Life Line Books, 1959), 6.
[312] "E. W. Castle, Film Pioneer, Author, Dies," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* 10 February 1960, B9.

stand against foreign aid, and he found a receptive audience in southern politicians who had slowly been defecting from the ranks of foreign aid supporters since Truman introduced Point Four technical assistance.

As Castle contemplated his 1959 postscript, the growth of aid in the previous two years weighed heavily on his mind and he feared his crusade would go unheard by the American public. The growing congressional opposition to foreign aid that occurred in 1957, especially in the southern states, emboldened Castle. Still, he did not see the results he hoped for as foreign aid authorizations continued to gain congressional approval. Although Eisenhower had expressed his desire to curb the growth of aid at the beginning of his administration, during his presidential terms appropriations for it began to rise steadily.[313] Facing the election of a new president in 1960 and observing the full results of Eisenhower's attempts to cut foreign assistance, Castle lamented, "There have been no basic changes in the foreign aid story, only more and more of the same things—more waste, more extravagance, more corruption, more employees added to our free-spending bureaucracy."[314] In his zealous commitment to his cause, Castle had done everything he could to solidify an opposition bloc on foreign aid in the coming election. He continued to maintain communications with senators and representatives who opposed foreign aid. Commonly, these members of congress were from the South and had opposed foreign aid appropriations since the mid-1950s. They included Senator Allen J. Ellender and Representative Otto E. Passman.[315] Castle both reflected congressional opposition and was influenced by it at the same time.

---

[313] Carol Lancaster, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 68-69.

[314] Eugene W. Castle, *The Great Giveaway: The Realities of Foreign Aid* (Washington D.C.: Life Line Books, 1959), 196.

[315] J.C. Gorman to Allen J. Ellender, 19 August 1955, (1955), Box 680, Folder Legislation: Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA; Eugene W. Castle to Allen J. Ellender, 28 July 1955, Folder Legislation: Foreign Aid (1955), Box 680, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University

In an effort to rally even more support in Congress and endear the American public to his cause, Castle's postscript echoed many of his previous complaints against assistance of any type, yet he also made a more direct appeal to the domestic policy sensibilities of the public and members of congress. Castle argued that the "suicidal" assistance program would cause detrimental harm to the "middle group" of Americans, "whose energy, purchasing power, and sacrifices made our country the envy of all peoples everywhere."[316] The result would be the breakdown of constitutional processes, the center of American governance, and would dethrone the United States as the world leader. Castle argued—with more fervor even than he had two years earlier—that foreign aid would lead to the failure of the American economy and politics by crushing the middle class. Such a result would truly signal the United States' defeat in the Cold War on the basis of the collapse of republican democracy and capitalism at home.

By including discussion of the domestic economic landscape of the United States, Castle began to introduce race into his argument against foreign aid and placed blame for the threatening foreign aid program at the feet of liberals. His reference to the "middle group" of Americans as those who had the purchasing power was the white, middle class. Money spent overseas in what Castle claimed were "corrupt" governments could better benefit the middle class in the United States in Castle's vision, excluding others from active participation in American commerce and therefore civil governance.[317]

Archives, Thibodaux, LA; Allen J. Ellender to Eugene W. Castle, 11 August 1955, Folder Legislation: Foreign Aid (1955), Box 680, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA. Thomas E. Morgan to Eugene W. Castle, 15 May 1958, Folder 19: Foreign Aid—National Constituent Opposition, May 1958, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA; Eugene W. Castle to Thomas E. Morgan, 4 June 1958, Folder 19: Foreign Aid—National Constituent Opposition, May 1958, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

[316] Eugene W. Castle, *The Great Giveaway: The Realities of Foreign Aid* (Washington D.C.: Life Line Books, 1959), 202.

[317] For more on the history of American consumption and how it became linked to citizenship see: Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003).

By 1959, he knew who should shoulder the blame for the destruction of the American way of life via foreign aid. Unlike the 1957 edition of the book, rather than simply relying on a generally mislead government as the primary instigator, in the 1959 postscript, Castle outright named "modernism" and "liberalism" as the "deceptive banners" deserving blame for the foreign aid policy that would destroy the middle-class and thus American global hegemony.[318] More clearly than in his previous diatribe against foreign aid, Castle pointed to the connection between crumbling, old social structures like segregation at home at the hands of liberalism abroad. What had changed for Castle between 1957 and 1959 to lead him to more blatantly attack liberalism as a vast threat to America rather than just critique foreign aid policy?

Linking foreign aid to what he thought was an overreaching vision of liberalism and its ideology of modernization?, Castle continued his line of logic and attacked liberalism's domestic projects as one of the main reasons why the government allowed foreign aid to continue. The result, he believed, would herald the destruction of the social and economic foundation of the United States. In the presidential election, he argued that the candidates used foreign aid as a political proxy to gain votes from special interests. He wrote, "It is a shocking fact that all of the would-be candidates of both political parties for the next Presidential election are supporting foreign giveaways forever. They are using foreign aid as a device to win the support of misguided and 'brainwashed' Americans, of pressure groups and short sighted minorities whose self interest comes before our Nation's solvency and security."[319] Castle highlighted the fact that foreign aid was more than just a policy; it was a political symbol that meant very different things to different groups. More importantly, he argued that foreign aid was merely a tool to curry

---

[318] Eugene W. Castle, *The Great Giveaway: The Realities of Foreign Aid* (Washington D.C.: Life Line Books, 1959), 202.

[319] Eugene W. Castle, *The Great Giveaway: The Realities of Foreign Aid* (Washington D.C.: Life Line Books, 1959), 202.

political support among minorities in the United States. By emphasizing the symbolism of foreign aid in the domestic context, Castle suggested that to support foreign aid was to inherently undermine American interests. Blaming liberals and minority groups further suggested that only certain people had a voice in the process of determining foreign policy.

In his effort to blame liberals and their domestic interests for the expansion of foreign aid, Castle excluded all but white, middle class Americans from having any legitimate role to play in foreign and national politics.[320] In doing so he was following a long tradition in American political history. As historian and theorist Nikhil Pal Singh observes, "For most of U.S. history this problem [the accommodation of racism in the U.S. constitution] was simply resolved by defining black people apart from any representation of the national interest. At the delicate intersection of public opinion formation and public policy formulation—national sovereignty and state institution building—was a broad racial consensus based on black exclusion."[321] American citizenship and participation in civic affairs was just as much about whom it excluded as included.

Castle juxtaposed minority interests to American interests. In the context of an accelerating reorientation of global racial hierarchies due to the end of colonialism, Castle's exclusion from and simultaneous blame of African Americans in the discussion of foreign aid represented a fight against the fluid remaking of race that was underway across the globe.[322] The

---

[320] For more on the way in which Conservative ideology linked race with socio-economic interests see Matthew D. Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 4. Lassiter argues the Right was able to rally white-collar families throughout the United States "around a 'color-blind' discourse of suburban innocence that depicted residential segregation as the class-based outcome of meritocratic individualism."

[321] Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 22. In addition, this historical process is what Gary Gerstle refers to as the conflict between "racial nationalism" and "civic nationalism." See: Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

[322] Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), xviii.

growth of the civil rights movement in the late 1950s and early 1960s was a key domestic

embodiment of this global contestation of prevailing social, political, and economic racial

hierarchies.[323] Often, white southerners led legal efforts to maintain the racial status quo. The

evolution of Castle's fiscal conservatism to envelop racist attitudes represented an important step

in the development of a conservative internationalism that reached beyond outright declarations

of racism and segregation. Castle's congressional allies, including Ellender and Passman,

mirrored his arguments and began to craft a rhetoric around foreign aid that alluded to

segregationists' racial fears. This chapter explores how the marriage between fiscal conservatism

and segregation proved to be an important step in creating a conservative internationalism that

carried appeal beyond the segregationist American South.

Following the 1960 election the efforts to combat antiracial internationalist policies via

domestic reference points, as Castle encouraged, faced an increasing challenge. As part of a

larger, calculated shift in the geographic focus of the American efforts in the Cold War,

President John F. Kennedy employed a flexible response to foreign policy in the Third World.[324]

A key component of the Kennedy Doctrine was modernization theory accomplished through

development aid. Although Kennedy was certainly not the progenitor of development as a key

weapon in fighting the Cold War, development took on a renewed importance in his

administration. Kennedy recognized foreign aid's symbolic significance in the context of

decolonization and its importance in fighting the Cold War against the Soviet Union in the

---

[323] Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States From the 1960s to the 1980s* (New York: Routledge, 1986), 66.

[324] For more on the geographic shift of the Cold War from the European to global theater see: Richard Crockatt, *The Fifty Years War: The United States and the Soviet Union in World Politics, 1941-1991* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Gabriel Kolko, *Confronting the Third World: United States Foreign Policy, 1945-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988); Melvyn P. Leffler, *For the Soul of Mankind: The United States, The Soviet Union, and The Cold War* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007); Robert J. McMahon, *The Cold War : A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); David S. Painter, *The Cold War: An International History* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

periphery. Kennedy and his team were aware that, in the late 1950s, the United States appeared

as the "defenders of the status quo" in the Third World, which they feared would lead Third

World nationalists to turn to the Soviet Union for support.[325] Reforming foreign aid therefore

presented an opportunity to redefine the American image from one of a colonial power by

another name in the Third World to one of benevolent mentor. Kennedy's efforts to shift the

geographic terrain of the Cold War, and therefore its key weapons in fighting it, to the Third

World--especially Latin American and Africa—represented, for segregationists, a real danger to

the domestic and international racial order they were fighting to furiously to maintain.

By choosing to target foreign aid, a key instrument in implementing modernization

theory, racial conservatives attacked a core aspect of liberalism during the early 1960s. This

ultimately unsuccessful assault on foreign aid illustrates that the political culture of the United

States was more complicated during the 1960s than historians have previously suggested. Rather

than a golden age of American liberalism from the 1930s to the 1970s, the opposition to foreign

aid demonstrates that liberalism's continued triumph was not inevitable or stable.[326] In addition,

it is only when the intersection between domestic and international spheres is examined that the

roots of the conservative coalition that dominated post-1968 American politics is seen.

---

[325] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 191; Philip E. Muehlenbeck, *Betting on the Africans: John F. Kennedy's Courting of African Nationalist Leaders* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), xii.

[326] For more on the history of liberalism, specifically the New Deal liberal coalition see: Jefferson Cowie and Nick Salvatore, "The Long Exception: Rethinking the Place of the New Deal in American History," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 74, no. 1 (2008): 3-32; Gary Gerstle, "The Protean Character of American Liberalism," *The American Historical Review* 99, no. 4 (1994): 1043-1073; Alan Brinkley, *The End of Reform: New Deal Liberalism in Recession and War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995); Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939,* 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Steve Franser and Gary Gerstle, eds., *The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order, 1930-1980* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989); Allen J. Matusow, *The Unraveling of America: A History of Liberalism in the 1960s* (New York: Perennial, 1985). For more on the connection between liberalism and modernization see: Nick Cullather, "Development? It's History," *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 4 (2000): 641-653; Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).

Specifically, those roots were planted in segregationists' struggles to craft a message that maintained the existing racial order, yet might still resonate with a national demographic.

Castle's postscript begins to provide insight into the subtle shift in the opposition to foreign aid. His new concern in 1959 (just two years after the publication of the first edition) over the middle-class and the scourge of politicians catering to minority groups points to a deeper fear among segregationists of the shifting domestic and global racial hierarchies, a fear that could eventually be exploited by white politicians beyond the South. The fact that the region that most consistently voted against foreign aid starting in 1957 was the South (and that they were proud of it too) is significant to the history of race in foreign aid policy.[327] Although more recent scholarship on the civil rights movement has expanded geographically beyond the South, the region has been a key battleground in which segregationists fought efforts to end white supremacy. [328] Simultaneously attacking foreign aid allowed segregationists to apply their domestic racial understandings to international politics. The result was the creation of racial symbolism surrounding foreign aid, which they could later refine and take to a national audience.

Historians have attributed the growth of the New Right to the ability of conservatives to connect domestic concerns of communism, government growth, taxation, civil rights, and a perceived decay of morality to liberalism, a message that resonated in the ever-growing constellation of Sunbelt suburbs.[329] However, when we look to the international activities of

---

[327] Charles O. Lerche, Jr. *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 59.

[328] For more on the civil rights movement in the Northern United States see Thomas J. Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North* (New York: Random House, 2008); Jeanne F. Theoharis and Komozi Woodard, eds., *Freedom North: Black Freedom Struggles Outside the South, 1940-1980* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

[329] Historians initially interpreted the rise of conservatism in American political history as reactionary response to civil rights based in the South. Since these initial histories, historians have argued for a more nuanced account of the rise of the right, taking into account grassroots movements, socio-economic factors, and the importance of the Sunbelt suburbs. For more on the evolution of the historiography of American conservatism in the twentieth century see: Michael Kazin, "The Grass-Roots Right: New Histories of U.S. Conservatism in the Twentieth Century," *The*

people like Congressmen Allen J. Ellender and Otto E. Passman, and Governor George C.

Wallace, we can see a conservative coalition that cohered not just over domestic concerns, but

over the intersection between the domestic and international, in this case race and how it is

connected to socio-economic status and global political participation. The language Castle and

his congressional allies used hinted at the "color blind language" that conservatives would coopt

in the late 1960s-1980s in which calls for racial equality and economic justice were met with

claims of special interests and the "tyranny of the minority" at the cost of "the majority." The

inclusion of foreign aid in this discussion demonstrates that the attempts of conservatives to use

"color blind language" to deny racially progressive policies happened far earlier than previously

suggested.[330] Segregationist efforts to maintain white supremacy were tied to an international

vision that rested on nationalistic and unilateral strategies to exercise American hegemony

around the world by opposing liberal internationalism and multilateralism on the basis of their

antiracist ideals. Castle, Passman, Ellender, and Wallace attempted to forge this link between

---

American Historical Review 97, no. 1 (1992): 136-155; Thomas J. Sugrue, "Crabgrass-Roots Politics: Race, Rights, and the Reaction against Liberalism in the North, 1940-1964," *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (1995): 551-578; Daniel Bell, ed. *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955); Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995); Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996); Alan Crawford, *Thunder on the Right: The 'New Right' and the Politics of Resentment* (New York: Pantheon, 1980); Thomas Byrne Edsall and Mary D. Edsall, *Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights, and Taxes on American Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991); Godfrey Hodgson, *The World Turned Right Side Up: A History of the Conservative Ascendancy in America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996); Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays* (New York: Vintage Books, 2008); Kevin Kruse, *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Matthew D. Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Stephan Lesher, *George Wallace: American Populist* (Boston: Da Capo Press, 1994); Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); R. O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

[330] Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 12; Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race, Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 44; Thomas J. Sugrue, "Crabgrass-Roots Politics: Race, Rights, and the Reaction against Liberalism in the North, 1940-1964," *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (1995): 551-578; Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995); Kevin Kruse, *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

international and domestic politics during the early 1960s. Their efforts represent the first iterations of a rhetoric that merged foreign aid with prevailing racial stereotypes, a rhetoric that would eventually resonated with a national audience.

This chapter argues that southern Democrats feared the extent to which foreign aid and liberal development philosophy might become entrenched during the Kennedy administration, and that they began to graft domestic racial ideologies onto their demands for fiscal conservatism. Initially, the language that segregationists used to combat foreign aid spoke to their regional political culture. Segregationists thought the position of the United States abroad was weakening and catering to the demands of the Third World. Meanwhile, domestically, the civil rights movement farther eroded their racialized vision of American citizenship and society. Southern politicians such as Allen J. Ellender, Otto Passman, and George C. Wallace began to use foreign aid as a symbol of the same political philosophy that promoted civil rights at home: unchecked liberalism. As a key foreign policy item for liberals, development aid represented an easy target for segregationists to attach domestic racial meanings to as they faced increased attacks and militancy from African Americans and their allies on southern political and economic power. Furthermore, segregationists also recognized that many of the nationalist movements abroad, which threatened to undermine America's Cold War superiority over the Soviet Union, inspired civil rights leaders in the United States.[331] For segregationists, the civil rights movement and Third World nationalism were one and the same and both threatened American democracy at home and hegemony abroad.

---

[331] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Louisiana State University Press, 2002); Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle, Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004); Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

For Castle and his ilk, foreign aid was a symbol of liberal efforts to accommodate and control rapidly changing racial hierarchies at home and abroad; therefore, for southern Democrats, fighting it represented an opportunity to entrench their power under the disguise of nationalistic, unilateral rhetoric regarding foreign policy, imbuing foreign aid with a proxy racial symbolism. We can see their response unfold by first examining the Kennedy administration's foreign aid policy, studying the opposition of Louisiana Senator Allen Ellender's to Kennedy's foreign aid program, and moving beyond the halls of Congress to explore the amplified rhetoric of Alabama Governor George C. Wallace as he increasingly connected foreign aid to the civil rights standoffs of the early 1960s in the South. The chapter will then move on to a brief discussion of conservative media and the purchase foreign aid gained as a way to appeal to popular fears about liberalism. Finally, the chapter concluded with discussion of Representative Otto E. Passman and his crusade against foreign aid appropriations. The efforts of people like Ellender, Passman, and Wallace laid the foundation for a conservative internationalism that rested on segregationist efforts to maintain domestic and international power via unilateral, nationalistic, and white supremacist foreign policy.

"The Civil and Economic Rights Essential to the Human Dignity of All Men": The Kennedy Administration, Modernization, and the Restructuring of Foreign Aid

Dying of a "long illness" on February 9, 1960 at the age of 62, Castle did not live to see the impact of his efforts in his 1959 postscript, the outcome of the 1960 presidential election, and future debates over foreign aid. He did not achieve his objectives, as one of President John F. Kennedy's first priorities was to redesign foreign aid and orient it towards long-term commitments. Meanwhile, members of Congress who agreed with, encouraged, and listened to Castle's arguments only grew more emboldened in their attempts to maintain social, economic,

and political racial meanings as they saw segregation attacked at home and modernization

promoted abroad.[332] In the context of what appeared to be a breakdown of an effective foreign

policy in the waning days of the Eisenhower administration, Kennedy saw modernization as a

way to close what he called the "economic gap" in developing countries while at the same time

providing policymakers a method of containing the growing number of revolutionaries in former

European colonies.[333]

The 1960 presidential election was one of the closest in U.S. history. Senator John F.

Kennedy from Massachusetts narrowly beat Vice President Richard M. Nixon by winning 303

Electoral College votes to Nixon's 219. Looking at the popular vote reveals a much closer

election than the Electoral College initially suggests. Kennedy won 34,220,984 votes to Nixon's

34,108,157. Still, despite the close presidential election, Kennedy came into office with a

favorable Democratic Congress, and he sought to capitalize on this by presenting an aggressive

agenda that would establish his leadership and usher in the domestic and foreign policy vision of

his "New Frontier." Even more than domestic policy, Kennedy wanted to create a presidential

legacy that revolved around foreign policy.

Foreign aid, specifically to the Third World, was a crucial part of this agenda. During the

1960 election he claimed that the there was an "economic gap" in "world development" that was

---

[332] Michael Omi and Howard Winant argue that race is a sociohistorical concept, meaning, "Racial categories and the meanings of race are given concrete expression by the specific social relations and historical context in which they are embedded." Therefore, Castle and his congressional allies were fighting against a redefinition of race and its indicators in a changing sociohistoical period. See: Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States From the 1960s to the 1980s* (New York: Routledge, 1986), 60-61.

[333] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 191; Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 3; Michael H. Hunt argues that controlling political and social change overseas is one of three fundamental ideologies in American foreign policy, see: Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 18.

just as harmful for America's global position as the "missile gap."[334] Kennedy feared falling

behind the Soviet Union in developing the newly emerging nations. Yet, his support of

development was not just political maneuvering to counter the Republicans, he and his advisors

were truly concerned about the Soviet Union winning over the Third World due to the rapid pace

of decolonization, the official establishment of the Non-Aligned Movement, and a shift in Soviet

policy.[335] Kennedy's concern over development was not a new phenomenon. As a Senator he

was often most vocal on foreign aid issues.[336]

Kennedy's interest in developing the Third World was also connected to changing

domestic dynamics as the civil rights movement accelerated. His increased focus on

development aid represented an opportunity to win hearts at home and abroad. By most accounts,

as Kennedy was running for president and later preparing to take the oath of office he did not

have intentions of making civil rights reform a priority.[337] Still, Kennedy recognized that the

African American vote in the election was too important to ignore while at the same time he did

not want to lose the southern Democratic votes. He therefore used his record of supporting

African independence as a means to win African American votes without isolating

southerners.[338]

---

[334] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 191; Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 28.

[335] Philip E. Muehlenbeck, *Betting on the Africans: John F. Kennedy's Courting of African Nationalist Leaders* (New York: Oxford University Press, xii.

[336] Senator Allen J. Ellender, interviewed by Larry Hackman, 29 August 1967, transcript, John F. Kennedy Library, 6.

[337] Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 155.

[338] James H. Meriwether, "'Worth a Lot of Negro Votes': Black Voters, Africa, and the 1960 Presidential Campaign," *The Journal of American History* 95, no. 3 (2008): 738; Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 155; Richard D. Mahoney, *JFK: Ordeal in Africa* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 20-33; Philip E. Muehlenbeck, *Betting on the Africans: John F. Kennedy's Courting of African Nationalist Leaders* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 205.

In detailing his "New Frontier" vision, Kennedy connected domestic and international policies not only on the topic of African independence but in development aid. Although his 1960 Democratic National Convention speech in which he accepted the Democratic nomination for president is mostly remembered for his declaration of the New Frontier where he called a new generation to mobilize as "pioneers," he began his acceptance by expressing his approval of the Democratic platform. He stated, "'The Rights of Man'—the civil and economic rights essential to the dignity of all men—are indeed our goal and our first principles. This is a Platform on which I can run with enthusiasm and conviction."[339] His connection of economic rights to civil rights highlighted a liberal agenda that moved beyond equality of all before the law and brought questions of economic justice into the equation, a strategy that liberal Democrats had used since Franklin D. Roosevelt. The fact that this message, as Kennedy presented it to the American public in 1960, spoke to universal rights highlighted that development abroad could be associated with the same agenda that promoted civil rights reform at home, providing fuel of segregationists to oppose foreign aid based on its connection to the expanding civil rights movement at home.

As Kennedy prepared to take the oath of office, development seemed to take on new urgency as the Soviet Union launched an important aid endeavor. On January 6, 1961, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev gave a decisive speech on the Soviet role in the Third World. He declared that it was the "historical mission" of world communism to aid "war of national liberation" and end colonialism.[340] According to presidential historian Robert Dallek, Kennedy

---

[339] John F. Kennedy, *1960 Democratic National Convention,* 15 July 1960, http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/AS08q5oYz0SFUZg9uOi4iw.aspx (accessed 3 August 2013).

[340] Philip E. Muehlenbeck, *Betting on the Africans: John F. Kennedy's Courting of African Nationalist Leaders* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), xi-xii.

took this speech quite seriously, often reading it to friends over dinner and, on occasion, by himself in the Oval Office.[341]

On January 20, 1961 Kennedy had an opportunity to respond to Khrushchev's declaration of support of Third World nationalists with his inaugural address. Regarding aid, he reaffirmed to "those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins" were shared with the United States that they would continue to receive aid. At the same time he pledged support for former colonies. Referencing the Soviet Union, he promised that colonialism would not be "replaced by a more iron tyranny." He then assured the nations of the periphery that the United States would help "people in the huts and villages" around the world "help themselves." He ambitiously stated the importance of development in asserting that the United States was poised to "move more than half the people of the less-developed nations into self-sustained growth." Significantly, he promised to aid the Third World for "whatever period" was required. Lastly, he attached his domestic policy ambitions to an internationalist vision that put the United States on the same level as every other nation of the world by declaring, "Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you."[342] His address suggested a global equality of all people.

Kennedy's goal in proposing a new foreign aid program was to create better organization and combat instability within the bureaucracy of foreign aid. He proposed a "new set of basic concepts and principles to the foreign aid program." Among the new basic concepts were: a multilateral approach that would complement efforts by other industrialized nations, a new

---

[341] Robert Dallek, *An Unfinished Life: John F. Kennedy, 1917-1963* (Boston: Little Brown, 2003), 350.
[342] John F. Kennedy, *Inaugural Address,* 20 January 1961, http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/BqXIEM9F4024ntFl7SVAjA.aspx (accessed 18 July 2013).

agency, and a separation of military assistance from social and economic development.[343] The

goal of this was to design a bureaucracy that could effectively carry out modernization. Along

with reorganizing the way the government organized foreign aid, Kennedy eventually was able

to launch a number of key aid ventures with the Alliance for Progress for Latin America, aid to

independent African countries, and he put pressure on governments in Western European and

Japan to also send aid abroad.[344]

Modernization theory, which promised to universalize economic growth and political

development, was important to how Kennedy wanted to restructure foreign aid around the

concept of development. Aid under Kennedy was not just humanitarian or emergency aid.

Instead, Kennedy listened to social scientists and advisors like Walt W. Rostow, who argued that

modernization could be produced and controlled, which would lead to thriving economies and

democracies. These social scientists claimed that certain sets of conditions would lead to these

desired political and economic results, and those conditions could be replicated around the

world.[345] Such a theory was explicitly anti-racist in the sense that Kennedy and his advisors

thought that the political and economic development was rooted not in innate abilities, but

instead could be taught and even accelerated. Another influential social scientist, the Swedish

anti-racist activist Gunnar Myrdal, described foreign aid as a type of international welfare system

that would help redistribute opportunities for wealth and create equality.[346] These were among

the academic suggestions that help create the liberal development model with which Kennedy

---

[343] John F. Kennedy, "Special Message to the Congress on Foreign Aid," 22 March 1961, http://www.jfklink.com/speeches/jfk/publicpapers/1961/jfk90_61.html (accessed 7 July 2013).

[344] Carol Lancaster, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 65.

[345] Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 6; Robert A. Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), 6. W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961).

[346] Vernon W. Rutten, *United States Development Assistance Policy: The Domestic Politics of Foreign Economic Aid* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 87.

and his administration hoped to remake the world. Liberal development under Kennedy became the goal of foreign aid and it reflected an effort by the administration to promote political, social, and economic equality at overseas and at home, all of which the administration believed would help fight the Cold War. In practice, race was never far from development, and its lofty antiracist objectives were rarely achieved.[347]

For the Kennedy administration, a key part of reforming foreign aid was to rehabilitate its image. Kennedy and his officials sought to control the message of foreign aid. Edwin R. Bayley, Director of the Information Staff sent from letters to newspaper editors offering to send "factual reports on the activities" of the programs. Including announcements of new loans, grants or technical assistance program, personnel appointments, official reports, among a number of other items.[348] The information staff also monitored what types of pamphlets had been distributed by various agencies. In another report, Bayley prepared a guide to what various media outlets were saying about foreign aid.[349]

The administration was facing an uphill battle, though, as the meaning of foreign aid had become so muddled. Bayley wrote to another staff member, "By now, you can't make it clear what you're talking about if you say anything but 'foreign aid,' although we try to steer clear of those words."[350] The staffer Bayley communicated with was particularly concerned with the disappearance of the name "Mutual Security." He wrote, "Who the hell can try to defend foreign aid to the old folks waiting for medicare or the young folks who are going to foot the bill for

---

[347] Michael L. Krenn, "Token Diplomacy: The United States, Race and the Cold War," in Philip E. Muehlenbeck, ed. *Race, Ethnicity, and the Cold War* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press), 14.

[348] Edwin R. Bayley to D. E. Whelan, 8 November 1962, Box 2 Folder General Correspondence: 1962 November-December, Edwin R. Bayley Personal Papers, Subject Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[349] Edwin R. Bayley to Frank M. Coffin, Memorandum: "Information Staff activities in support of the presentation to the Congress," 5 April 1963, Box 2 Folder General Correspondence: 1962 November-December, Edwin R. Bayley Personal Papers, Subject Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[350] Edwin R. Bayley to Fred Steffan, 15 November 1962, Box 2 Folder General Correspondence: 1962 November-December, Edwin R. Bayley Personal Papers, Subject Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

both? ...Words, words, words…..such important words."[351] By expanding foreign aid beyond

simply fighting communism and turning it into a larger social project that attempted to remake

racial hierarchies around the world, the Kennedy rebranding and repurposing of foreign aid made

it easier to attach domestic political issues to it, turning it into a symbol of equality for some and

resentment for others.

Civil rights became one area that the administration saw an obvious international

connection to development abroad. One example of how domestic and international development

intersected was in the form of students coming to the United States to study. Although not a

direct or official form of foreign aid, the administration tracked them and recognized the

symbolism they had in a larger context of a rapidly changing global racial hierarchy at home and

abroad.[352] From the outset, the arrival of large numbers of African students became part of the

political discourse of race, the Cold War, and African liberation. Kennedy saw it as an

opportunity to win hearts and minds at home and abroad, tying issues of international and

domestic race together with political symbolism. Much like he did in the campaign, Kennedy

used foreign aid and decolonization as proxy topics to endear African Americans and other

minorities to him politically.

By tying civil rights, African liberation, the Cold War together under the premise of

liberal development, Kennedy also helped provide the opposition with a political symbol they

could attack. This was especially the case with southern segregationists who opposed civil rights

and saw foreign aid as a global version of the civil rights platform at home. Yet, there was still

an element of party loyalty for southern democrats, and they did not completely abandon support

---

[351] Fred Steffan to Edwin R. Bayley, 13 November 1962, Box 2 Folder General Correspondence: 1962 November-December, Edwin R. Bayley Personal Papers, Subject Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[352] Box 3, Folder Africa, General, 6/63, Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, , John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA. Jason C. Parker, "'Made-in-America Revolutions'? The 'Black University' and the American Role in the Decolonization of the Black Atlantic," *The Journal of American History* 96, no. 3 (2009): 727-750.

of the Democratic Party's policy initiatives. Charles Lerche observed, "The only year after 1957 in which the South did not show its opposition to foreign aid in unequivocal terms was 1961. In that first year of the New Frontier, President Kennedy was in the first flush of his honeymoon with Congress and the people and was determined to establish the primacy of his leadership beyond question."[353] In an effort to counter the growing opposition to foreign aid that was coming from southern Democrats in the 1950s, Kennedy highlighted the bipartisan history of recent foreign aid programs under Truman and Eisenhower. It was only because of Kennedy's effort to rally Congressional support that foreign aid appeared to regain popularity among southern segregationists in 1961 despite the liberalization of it under modernization theory and development aid. Already by 1962, the disappearing consensus around foreign aid returned with calls from the halls of Congress that the United States were not responsible for correcting the results of European colonialism and that aid had proven itself to be wasteful and unrealistic.[354]

Still, this strategy also worked against Kennedy once he was in office in a way that historians have largely ignored. The manner in which Kennedy was able to win African American votes by exploiting foreign policy regarding African independence also allowed Southern segregationists to use foreign policy as part of the same fight against civil rights reform at home. As Kennedy saw civil rights and African independence connected, so too did segregationists, who started to break from the consensus around Cold War foreign policy that had existed during the early post-World War II years. Development aid in particular represented a terrain that both liberals and segregationist could project their competing domestic and international visions on.

---

[353] Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 62.

[354] Carol Lancaster, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007), 71.

"I Have Yet to See Any Part of Africa Where Africans are Ready for Self-Government:"
Senator Ellender Goes to Africa

After the establishment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 one incident demonstrates

the way in which domestic and foreign policy became intertwined at the site of foreign aid

policy, making foreign aid a symbol of domestic civil rights. Much like his previous world tours,

Senator Allen J. Ellender embarked in late 1962 as a member of the Senate's Appropriations

Committee to evaluate AID activities abroad for three months.[355] During this particular trip,

Ellender spent his time traveling and attending meetings throughout the African continent. On

December 2, 1962, word came back to the United States via the press that Ellender had managed

to insult newly independent African leaders, stating at a stop in Salisbury, Rhodesia, that he

opposed grants to African nations because in the 23 African countries he visited he had not seen

a competent government or one where capability for one existed.[356] He observed that Africans

had not made "the least bit of progress on their own."[357] He had essentially suggested that

Africans could not advance without European intervention. The fact that he made these remarks

in Rhodesia, a British colony whose white minority was fighting the tide of decolonization

amplified the significance of his comments.

Ellender's remarks were not new or out of character for him. And, his statements were

not front-page news in the United States. They echoed his previous sentiments regarding

Africans and their ability to govern themselves, and reiterated his neocolonial scheme to have

---

[355] Ellender's biographer argues that these trips fulfilled Ellender's desires to be a world ambassador, flattered his ego, and made him appear important. An oral history interview for the Kennedy Library suggests that this was indeed the case, as he sent his reports from the trip to Kennedy, took pride in the fact that Kennedy read his report from 1958 and kept others in his library, and hoped that they would make it into the collection at the "memorial library." Thomas A. Becnel, *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography* (Baton Rogue: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 208; Allen J. Ellender, interviewed by Larry Hackman, 29 August 1967, transcript, John F. Kennedy Library, 26.
[356] "Ellender Opposes Grants to Africa," *New York Times,* 2 December 1962, 50.
[357] "Not Yet Ready for Self Rule, Africans Told," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* 2 December 1962, B10.

Europe rebuild itself after World War II using Third World colonies as a resource bank.[358] Still,

the State Department, headed by Dean Rusk, immediately started damage control by distancing

themselves from Ellender because the remarks undermined Kennedy's domestic and

international policies.[359] Meanwhile, his diplomatic blunder was evident by the fact that his trip

itself was put into flux, as the Ugandan government denounced him as a "prejudice

segregationist" and "prohibited immigrant." Tanganyika and Ethiopia also prohibited Ellender's

entry into their countries.[360]

Having gained admittance for a brief meeting with the American Consul General and

other American officials in Nairobi, Kenya, Ellender issued a non-apology regarding his

remarks. He said the African press had taken his words out of context to suggest that he did not

approve of independence for African countries. Still his clarification did not necessarily acquit

the implications of what he said. His statement explained, "I feel each independent nation should

have an economic base strong enough in both natural and human resources to allow it to be

genuinely free. Once again, I wish to emphasize that my statements are my own personal views

and should not be considered to express the position of my Government."[361] Ellender's focus on

building a strong economic base in Africa reflected his tenuous support of technical assistance.

---

[358] See chapters 1 and 2 for more on Ellender's previous world tours and views on colonialism. "Ellender's Blast At Africa Embarrassing But JFK Needs Him," *Chicago Defender,* 8 December 1962, 5.

[359] Telegram to the Secretary of State, 3 December 1963, Box 3, Folder Africa, General (11/62-12/62), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA; Edward R. Murrow, Memorandum for McGeorge Bundy, 5 December 1962, Box 3, Folder Africa, General (11/62-12/62), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA; State Department Telegram, 5 December 1962, Box 3, Folder Africa, General (11-62-12/62), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA; "Press Statement to be distributed by White House," Box 3, Folder Africa, General (11/62-12/62), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[360] "Louisiana Senator Barred From Uganda After Being Accused of Fanning Racial Hatred in Africa," *Atlanta Daily World,* 4 December 1962, 1; "Sen. Ellender Refused Entry by Tanganyika," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* 5 December 1962, 7; "Ethiopia Bars Dixie Senator," *Chicago Daily Defender,* 6 December 1962, 1.

[361] Allen J. Ellender, "Statement Made by U.S. Senator Allen Ellender Upon His Departure from Nairobi on December 8th, 1962," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

His field notes reveal that he truly thought that if the United States was going to give aid to

African nations it should not be in the form of direct funds but rather technical assistance or

loans.[362] Ellender's insistence on technical assistance as opposed to direct loans aligned with his

neocolonial vision for Africa.

Furthermore, Ellender's actual words also revealed his efforts to maintain some brand of

colonial exploitation in Africa. Regarding the incident he wrote, "I did say that the average

African leader (I mean among the blacks) is incapable of leadership except through the

assistance of Europeans…I also stated that if there are any areas of Africa where the natives have

built a community of their own by the use of mortar and brick, or where they have established a

manufacturing community to build up an economy on their own, I have yet to find that

community." Ellender went on to cite the problems facing the Congo at the time, placing blame

on the large "black" population, and named the Republic of South Africa as a place "where the

Europeans have established as fine a community that exists in any part of Africa." Ellender

argued that turning South Africa over to majority rule would result in another Congo.[363] His

comments reinforced the opposition's vision about foreign aid that those receiving the money

were incapable of utilizing it properly for development. The key signifier of their incapability to

Ellender was their non-European descent.

In his briefing notes on his trip, Ellender elaborated on the idea that African leaders were

incapable of governing, building an even stronger case for his argument that foreign aid was

going to corrupt and lesser governments. After trying to deflect attention away from his

[362] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.
[363] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA; An official United States Information Service transcript of the news conference in question farther confirmed that Ellender had been quoted correctly, see "Recording Bears Out Quotation," *New York Times,* 7 December 1962, 21.

comments without retracting them, Ellender infantilized African leaders. He accused African leaders of being overly sensitive. He suggested that they were politically inept due to their inability to accept the truth and take criticism, or as he put it, "their political skins are too tender."[364] Ellender's allegation was that if the African governments could not handle criticism, they were too politically immature to properly spend and put to good use American loans and aid. Therefore, as a fiscal conservative, Ellender painted a picture of development aid as wasteful government spending, while simultaneously interweaving racist tropes into his opposition to foreign aid. Suggesting continued European intervention in the region reinforced old colonial state models and undermined liberal development theories that were a cornerstone of Kennedy's foreign policy during these crucial years of the Cold War.

He carried his line of argument further by tying it more directly to what he viewed as political inability among African leaders and corruption. Continued foreign aid would only feed that corruption if unchecked, Ellender reasoned. He reported that the new African nations were full of weak politicians and leaders who took advantage of the United States government's foreign aid generosity. Ellender thought American generosity would result in the leaders of these new nations trying to get aid from whomever they could. The new nations would then blindly follow the donor nation no matter the principles involved. He even went so far as to suggest that certain leaders had created some of the new nations for the sole purpose of receiving "handouts," all of which threatened and eroded the purpose of the United Nations because he thought African nations were essentially selling their voting in the organization to the highest bidder.[365] Thus, in addition to being incapable of ruling themselves without European support, in accepting foreign

---

[364] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[365] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

aid African leaders were morally weak and corrupt. Their corruption undermined the internationalist ideals of the UN. In his 1962 world tour, Ellender's comments demonstrate the way he had redoubled his efforts in crafting an image of corruption and inability around foreign aid and refining his attack against internationalism.

Even though Ellender had not directly mentioned civil rights in his controversial remarks on the capabilities of African leadership, his record and previous comments on both foreign aid and civil rights made the implication clear to the larger American public, no matter his intentions. The American press, in particular, demonstrated one way in which the symbolism of foreign aid, that segregationists from the 1950s had laid the groundwork for, had taken hold domestically. Rather than simply ignoring the remarks that were not all that new from Ellender, the importance his comments had for Kennedy's foreign affairs dubbed them newsworthy and all major newspapers carried the story. One paper, the liberal *New York Post,* did not hesitate to make a clear connection between the fallout for Ellender and domestic civil rights.[366] In sarcastic commentary the *Post* reported, "We sympathize with Senator Ellender (Democrat-Louisiana) in his hours of exclusion from African territory. He is clearly the victim of discrimination. Perhaps he should demand a rider to the foreign aid bill requiring recipient African nations to accept their quota of visiting segregationist Southern Senators."[367]

Ellender's reaction to the newspaper's comments demonstrates how deeply he clung to segregation as an accepted and benign way of life that should be devoid of federal government interference. The Senator took great offense to this and accused the author of being an "ardent integrationist." He defended himself and the American South, arguing that southerners would not

---

[366] During these years the *New York Post* was a major American newspaper. Rupert Murdoch introduced he current day sensationalist tabloid-style to the paper after he purchased it in 1976.

[367] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

hesitate to help African Americans when in need. In a futile attempt to disconnect his views on foreign aid and civil rights he lamented, "It is a great tragedy that the Negro issue has become so involved in politics."[368] To Ellender, segregation was a matter decided by individual states, and the Supreme Court, Congress, and the President were politicizing the issue and overstepping their jurisdiction. The fact that international influence now also dictated domestic policies regarding segregation only further reinforced Ellender's fear of eroding racial social structures at the hands of internationalist political ambitions.

Ellender's comments aligned with a vision of American exceptionalism and citizenship wherein people with a common skin color defined the nation's character and had the right to participate in politics. Ellender and his segregationist colleagues shared in this belief that fitness for self-government was a uniquely American characteristic that was inherited from an Anglo-Saxon lineage.[369] Ellender's repeated critiques of African self-government emphasized that race and ability were linked when it came to governance. Development and modernization--as laid out by Rostow and his colleagues and put into practice by the Kennedy State Department--were ineffective and wasteful because the nations the United States attempted to help did not have the American "capacity" for self-government.

The mainstream African American press also picked up Ellender's remarks regarding Africans and their ability to self-govern, making it clear to the African American public sphere that the by insulting Africans he had essentially mounted the same critiques against African Americans and their ability to govern and overcome socioeconomic class barriers in the United States. In fact, Ellender had essentially grafted his domestic perceptions of African Americans

---

[368] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[369] Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4.

onto Africans, shoring up his southern internationalist vision of the Third World. Jackie

Robinson wrote in a column in the *Chicago Defender* that Senator Ellender was wrong for the

task of evaluating foreign operations in Africa and Asia due to his stance on civil rights.[370] The

Chicago Defender also referred to Ellender in their headlines as the "Dixie Senator," evoking

historical memories of the Civil War, or even less ambiguously, the "Racist Senator."[371] The

Defender also urged Congress to censure Ellender and Kennedy to denounce him.[372] In addition,

the *Baltimore Afro-American* published a piece that stated that Mississippi Governor Ross

Barnett's racist fears over the "mongrelization" of races in the United States were akin to

Ellender's discussion of African self-government, despite the fact that Barnett's statements did

not mention Africa.[373] Major African American presses clearly connected Ellender's

segregationists attitudes to his critique of Africans' inability to effectively self-govern. All of

which undermined delicate balance between civil rights policy and foreign affairs Kennedy had

cultivated during his campaign and first years in office.

Having successfully pushed the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 through Congress with a

significant amount of support from the south, marking a key moment when a geographic shift in

the battlegrounds of the Cold War moved to the Third World, Kennedy did not need a setback

like the publicity that Ellender's remarks received at home and abroad.[374] The State Department

reported that extremist wings would use Ellender's statements as a sign of American imperialism

---

[370] Jackie Robinson, "How President Could Erase Blast at Africa," *Chicago Defender,* 22 December 1962, 8.
[371] "Dixie Senator Attacks African Nations," *Chicago Daily Defender,* 3 December 1962, 1; "Second African Nation Bars Racist Senator," *Chicago Daily Defender,* 5 December 1962, 1.
[372] "Ask Kennedy to Bar Ellender from Congress," *Chicago Defender,* 8 December 1962, 2; "Urge Kennedy to Denounce Ellender's African Blast," *Chicago Daily Defender,* 6 December 1962, 13.
[373] "Gov. Barnett's Chicago Talk Echoes Ellender's Race Slurs," *Baltimore Afro-American,* 5 January 1963, 17.
[374] Charles O. Lerche, Jr., *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 62.

and as representative of the Kennedy's administration's views.[375] Despite an official statement

from the State Department that made clear that Ellender's views did not represent official

American policy towards African nations, the White House continued to receive pressure from

government officials, senators, and the press to make an official statement. Much of the pressure

to issue a formal statement came from the fear that Ellender's comments were harming American

prestige and trust of America in Africa.[376] In addition to reaching out and reassuring individual

African allies that Ellender's stance did not represent theirs, the White House drafted a press

statement. The statement reiterated that Ellender did not speak for the administration,

emphasizing a shared history of colonial rule between the United States and former African

colonies.[377] Still, the damage Ellender's comments did to the image of foreign aid abroad was

done, and were firmly rooted in domestic concerns over racial hierarchies as well as global ones.

In addition to causing alarm in the Kennedy administration, Ellender's comments

exacerbated the regionalism inherent in domestic and international politics. Increasingly,

Southerners like Ellender felt that the South was unfairly singled out for segregation.

Cooperating with the State Department's larger effort to disavow Ellender's statement,

Representative Barratt O'Hara, a Democrat from Illinois, held a press conference. Given his

African American constituency, political necessity dictated that O'Hara publically disavow his

Democratic colleague. O' Hara declared, "What the senator said has hurt us very much in

Africa...The senator was expressing a personal, regional feeling. He was expressing the

sentiment of his constituency…If a man comes from Louisiana, where there is a race question,

---

[375] Telegram to the Secretary of State, 3 December 1963, Box 3, Folder Africa, General (11/62-12/62), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[376] Edward R. Murrow, Memorandum for McGeorge Bundy, 5 December 1962, Box 3, Folder Africa, General (11/62-12/62), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA; State Department Telegram, 5 December 1962, Box 3, Folder Africa, General (11-62-12/62), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[377] "Press Statement to be distributed by White House," Box 3, Folder Africa, General (11/62-12/62), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

he may not be as careful of what he says as he would if he came from somewhere else."[378]

O'Hara unmistakably saw Ellender and his constituency as connecting African aid to civil rights in the United States, causing harm to American foreign policy. O'Hara interpreted that to criticize African leadership stemmed directly from Ellender's domestic and regional views. Ellender responded to this generalized critique of the South by suggesting that the South was capable of dealing with inequality on its own without interference from the federal government.[379] Ellender's defense of the South made it clear to his constituents that liberalism in the federal government was to blame for eroding race relations in the South and around the world because they interfered in Southern affairs.

Within a matter of weeks the press forgot Ellender's diplomatic misstep and Kennedy and his administration moved on. Ellender and other segregationists, however, had laid the groundwork for a perception of foreign aid among the general public that proved strangely durable. His constituents read his remarks within their domestic context, relating them to civil rights. Responding to Ellender's repeated utterances of the inability of Africans to self-govern and the events of the civil rights movement in the spring of 1963 one constituent, Clarence Yancey, wrote to Ellender to commend him for his stance concerning "negro nations." The letter continued by blaming "liberal do-gooders" and the government for "pouring money into Africa. Meanwhile, regarding events at home Yancey argued that civil rights demonstrations were doing more harm for African Americans than good. In his worldview African Americans were not a part of the "American life" and they had to collectively earn their way by developing their own businesses and industry as opposed to "trying to be like the white man and stop trying to force himself upon the whites." Yancey concluded that African Americans were better off than others

---

[378] "O'Hara Chides Ellender for Digs at Africa," *Chicago Daily Tribune,* 7 December 1962, 8.

[379] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

"of his race in the world" because they had inherited the white-American civilization.[380]
Yancey's belief in the benefits of white civilization reflected Ellender's own opinions regarding
the benefits of European rule in Africa.[381]

Recognizing the precarious position resistance to civil rights had on American image
around the world, Yancey suggested the solution was for African Americans to leave for Africa
rather than continue to raise attention regarding discrimination in the United States. He reasoned
that African Americans would not leave though because they wanted to "continue to enjoy the
fruits of the ingenuity of the white man."[382] Yancey made it quite clear that African Americans
were not part American citizens in the same sense that whites were and connected his domestic
opinion to the question of global racial hierarchies in suggesting they should return to Africa. For
Yancey, foreign aid to Africa and civil rights at home were one and the same.

Ellender only reinforced and fed the connection that there was a liberal agenda at home
and abroad that threatened traditional social structures in the South in his form letter response he
sent to Yancey and other concerned constituents. First, he sent Yancey a broadcast that detailed
his views on African self-government and echoed his 1962 world trip comments. He continued
by addressing "this thing which the liberals continue to refer to as 'civil rights' battles." He
reassured Yancey that he thought the "pendulum" would swing in the opposite direction soon
and that "the threats of violence to white people by irresponsible Negro leaders will, in my
judgment, strengthen our cause."[383] The accusation of African American violence against the
southern white population echoed his report from his 1962 trip regarding the Congo in which he

---

[380] Clarence L. Yancey to Allen J. Ellender, 9 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.
[381] See chapter 2 for more discussion on Ellender's support of white rule in Africa.
[382] Clarence L. Yancey to Allen J. Ellender, 9 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.
[383] Allen J. Ellender to Clarence L. Yancey, 10 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

accused the majority black population of being violent towards the Belgians, proving that the United States government officials were "saps" for continuing to finance development programs in the Congo due to the inability of the Congolese to self-govern.[384] His comments regarding violence at home and abroad foreshadowed his growing obsession with African American crime across the South, which other conservatives would also adopt as a surrogate for attacking civil rights during the 1970s and 1980s.

Ellender's preoccupation with crime at home and violence abroad against white populations emboldened his desire for maintaining the global racial status quo due to the chaos segregationists like him saw it bringing. Another constituent did not need Elllender to make any direct comparisons between civil rights and events in the Congo for them. A constituent, W. M. Hallack wrote to Ellender, "The Kennedy dynasty and their cohorts are prodding, agitating and financing the American negro to rape the United States as the Congo negroes raped the Province of Katanga…The majority of American people are tired of the Kennedy clan and their New Frontier of socialism and communism and exploitation of the negro race for their vote."[385] The political story Ellender had been telling regarding foreign aid had filtered down to his constituents who related violence in Africa to their shifting racial landscape at home. For many the blame belonged to Kennedy. Like Ellender's defense of his remarks in Rhodesia where he suggested race was just a political scheme, Hallack saw civil rights as nothing more than a liberal political ploy that threatened to turn the United States into another Congo by inciting racial tensions.

---

[384] Allen J. Ellender, "Unclassified Briefing Book," Box 1572, Folder Unclassified Briefing Book—Trip to Africa 1962, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA. Senator Ellender also made similar comments regarding violence and self-governance regarding Mozambique and Angola during his 1962 world tour.

[385] W. M. Hallack to Allen J. Ellender, 16 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

Even more significantly, in the form letter, Ellender accused his fellow members of Congress of being unconcerned with what he labeled "super-citizenship by certain Negro groups."[386] Ellender did not elaborate on what exactly he meant by "super-citizenship." However, given the context of the letter to Yancey and others who received similar responses from Ellender, super-citizenship indicates that Ellender thought civil rights groups were positioning themselves above the law and that his liberal colleagues were allowing it to happen. In terms of the growing civil rights movement and revolutions abroad, Ellender's concern over super-citizenship demonstrates the way in which segregationists clung to the status quo and feared a rapidly evolving racial landscape at home and abroad by continuing to deny citizenship and a voice to racial minorities in their regions. Although Ellender did not directly reference foreign aid when discussing the idea that civil rights groups were practicing "super-citizenship," the letter focused on opposition to both foreign aid and civil rights. In addition, when contextualized within the historical period of civil rights and decolonization abroad, a constituent--especially one like Yancey who excluded African Americans from the politics and history of the country-- could have interpreted Ellender's usage of "super-citizenship" as a critique of African Americans who saw their civil rights struggle as part of the same revolutionary movement against colonialism and exploitation in the Third World.[387]

---

[386] Allen J. Ellender to Clarence L. Yancey, 10 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA. Allen J. Ellender to N. R. Yarbrough, 1 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[387] For more on the relationship between African Americans and Africa during these years see: James T. Campbell, *Middle Passages: African American Journeys to Africa, 1787-2005* (New York: Penguin Books, 2006); James H. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935-1961* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Francis Njubi Nesbitt, *Race for Sanctions: African Americans against Apartheid, 1946-1994* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2004); Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935-1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Penny von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).

In 1963, as foreign aid increased abroad and the civil rights movement accelerated at home Ellender did not censor himself, rather he seemed to reiterate and highlight the connection he saw between civil rights at home and foreign aid even more. In a television debate in mid-June 1963, following the Birmingham campaign in the spring, Ellender echoed the same remarks that also frequently found their way into the form letters he sent to constituents who had written to him concerning both civil rights and foreign aid. In the debate he declared that Liberia, Ethiopia, and Haiti were all "black" nations that had failed at governance. Ellender continued to reinforce his perception of African nations and implied that African Americans had similar ineffectiveness for political representation with a form letter he frequently replied to inquiries regarding solely the topic of civil rights. He began his letter by pointing out that he grew up with African Americans and never had a problem with them, but now many were following the civil rights leaders who wanted integration. The results of integration, Ellender argued would be inter-marrying and "social equality in every respect," clearly emphasizing his efforts to maintain white social and economic power.[388] He continued in the letter to argue against integration at home by citing foreign operations as evidence.

Ellender implied, without directly stating it, that African misgovernment and American foreign aid support of it was an example of the inability of African Americans to fully participate in American governance and seek social equality. In his civil rights form letter, having made the case that integration would lead to intermarriage and crime, he continued by establishing that the South was not the only part of the country with segregation and discrimination laws. Then, he claimed that African Americans in D.C. obtained their jobs, in many instances, because of their race rather than their abilities. Without making a clear transition, Ellender then abruptly writes,

---

[388] Allen J. Ellender to Frank L. Nikolay, 11 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

"I have visited every country in this world except Albania. Of all countries in the world only Ethiopia, Haiti and Liberia have been governed for many years by Negroes—Ethiopia for over two thousand years, Liberia and Haiti for well over a hundred years—and those three countries are, in my opinion, the most ineptly governed in the world. Again I ask, why?"[389] Ellender does not answer his own question, but the rhetorical nature of it when coupled with the previous statements of unfair preference given to minorities in the nation's capital, the message to his constituents regarding civil rights and foreign affairs was that they were one in the same in propping up (as opposed to developing) undeserving people.

Several months later, in September 1963, Ellender made his argument more clearly by continuing to connect African Americans and Africans "self-government" capabilities. He stated on a D.C. area TV program that African Americans "in the past [have learned] to depend on the whites and not themselves," adding that they "are somewhat like their ancestors." At which point he continued to repeat his remarks from December about Africans and their inability to self-govern.[390] These were the same views that he had used in his form letters and earlier in the summer of 1963 when he described what African American governance would looked like.

Using Washington D.C. as an example, Ellender also suggested once again that violence and crime were markers of African Americans and their inability to govern and participate in the politics, all in the context of repeating his remarks regarding Africa from December. In a TV debate with Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York, Ellender professed, "This great city is a cesspool, as far as crime is concerned." He continued saying that 56 percent of the population of D.C. was African American and that they controlled the schools. He said that 85 percent of schools were occupied by African Americans and had awful conditions. Ellender reasoned, "To

---

[389] Allen J. Ellender to Frank L. Nikolay, 11 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.
[390] "Ellender Says Negro Should 'Prepare' Self," *Washington Post,* 23 September 1963, A7.

me that simply shows their inability to govern." He then proceeded to reiterate his December

world tour comments about African self-government, effectively tying the lack of success

regarding civil rights and foreign aid together.[391] During the early years of the 1960s Ellender

continued to use similar remarks in the press and when composing responses to constituents'

concerns over civil rights and foreign aid.[392]

Ellender connected the two and used them interchangeably as a way to attack liberalism

and maintain racial hierarchies at home and abroad. Conservatives would easily adopt Ellender's

fascination with crime rates and relation to African Americans in the 1970s and 1980s, but

looking to its connection to international politics during these early years provides a broader

understanding of the origins of the coded racism of the 1980s with regards to urban crime rates.

Ellender's repeated comments on TV in mid-1963 resulted in the Kennedy State

Department having to once again deal with the fallout both domestically and internationally.

Ellender's comments resulted in a delegation of African diplomats calling for Kennedy to

disavow Ellender's statements.[393] A State Department memo detailed the message the protesting

diplomats had over Ellender's comments in June of 1963. They referred to his words as

"deliberate and repeated attacks…on the peoples, and Governments of Africa" and were

concerned over the lack of action taken by the Executive Branch over the remarks. Significantly,

they saw no useful purpose to the attacks since all of the nations protesting were on friendly

---

[391] "Negroes Are Making Capital A Cesspool, Ellender Asserts," *New York Times,* 17 June 1963, 12; "Calls Washington a 'Cesspool,'" *Chicago Tribune,* 17 June 1963, 6.

[392] Allen J. Ellender to Frank L. Nikolay, 11 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA; Allen J. Ellender to Amelle C. Bernard, 1 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA; Allen J. Ellender to Jerry Fitzpatrick, 1 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA; Allen J. Ellender to Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, et al., 18 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[393] Murrey Marder, "African Diplomats Ask Rebuttal by President of Ellender's Barbs," *Washington Post,* 26 June 1963, A6; "Terms Ellender's Attack on Black Slap at Brotherhood," *Chicago Daily Defender,* 25 June 1963, 3.

terms with the United States. They therefore concluded, "It seems that the distinguished Senator is launching such unfortunate attacks on Africa in order to help justify his support of racial discrimination."[394] The African diplomats could not ignore the domestic context of Ellender's remarks, and they recognized the symbolism that Africa, and therefore foreign aid policy towards Africa, had in the context of the South in the early 1960s. Still, despite the renewed diplomatic problems that Ellender's comments once again sparked, Kennedy and the State Department choose not to directly address them. Instead, they focused their public relations on the larger connection between civil rights and American prestige and foreign policy, rather than dealing with Ellender directly.

For his part, Ellender did not back down and continued to reinforce a vision of America that largely excluded African Americans from participating in civic life and that fought the liberal agenda. Throughout June and July of 1963, Ellender exchanged letters with Dr. Walker Percy. The debate between the two involved Ellender's comments about Africans and African Americans. Percy wrote to inform Ellender that the Senator was wrong to filibuster the civil rights bill that was before the legislature. Ellender responded with his standard reasoning of African American violence and crime, government meddling in local affairs, and of course his unprovoked observations about leadership in Ethiopia, Liberia, and Haiti.[395] Unlike other constituents who had written to Ellender, Percy was baffled by the inclusion of Ethiopia, Liberia, and Haiti as rationale for gradualism in civil rights legislation. He replied to the senator, "It is just that I cannot understand the main premise of your position. Whatever the Negro's

---

[394] Edward S. Little to McGeorge Bundy, Memorandum: Protest of Statements by Senator Ellender, 25 June 1963, Box 366, Folder Civil Rights Circular (4/63-5/63), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, Carl Kaysen, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[395] Dr. Walker Percy to Allen J. Ellender, 19 June 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA; Allen J. Ellender to Dr. Walker Percy, 1 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.

performance in Liberia or Haiti, the fact is that the Negro is in our country, through no doing of

his own, but because his ancestors were brought here as slaves. He is now an American citizen

like you and me, and entitled to the rights and privileges guaranteed him under the

Constitution."[396] Once again Ellender's only response was to reiterate his previous arguments

and send Percy his field reports from his world tour to Africa.[397] In all of these exchanges,

Ellender never clearly articulated why he cited his observations about Africa in the context of

engaging in a debate over domestic civil rights, but the inclusion of the comments as evidence

implied that Ellender saw foreign aid to Africa and civil rights legislation as one part of the same

policy that was eroding the white middle class at home and American power abroad. Ellender

argued and attacked liberal internationalism as embodied in development aid as the instigator.

Senator Ellender's repetitive attacks on foreign aid to Africa and his segregationist views

at home in 1963 were exceptionally problematic due to the events of the civil rights movement

that were happening simultaneously. Along with Ellender's form letters and repetition of his

remarks regarding Africans and African Americans ability to effectively govern themselves or

participate in governance, as the civil rights movement accelerated past the Montgomery bus

boycotts, the sit-ins, and freedom riders foreign aid became more pronounced in the civil rights

battle and garnered more attention through the charismatic mouthpiece for segregationists,

George Wallace. The events in Alabama in 1963 became both a domestic and international

flashpoint in the efforts of activists and the federal government to combat the hypocrisy between

the declared American ideals and those practiced. George Wallace's brand of segregation in

Alabama therefore provides a window into the way foreign aid became a symbol for

---

[396] Dr. Walker Percy to Allen J. Ellender, 5 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.
[397] Allen J. Ellender to Dr. Walker Percy, 18 July 1963, Box 821, Folder 1963 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA.

segregationists to attack, and therefore an important step in building a conservative internationalist counter to internationalism.

"The Washington Do-Gooders are always telling us that everything we do will affect our 'image' overseas": George C. Wallace, Segregationists, and the Co-Opting of Foreign Aid to Combat Civil Rights

In the spring of 1963, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's (SCLC) campaign to challenge and publicize segregation in Birmingham, Alabama culminated with Bull Connor's police force brutally attacking African American youth. The stories and images of the "children's campaign" made their way into the press around the world. The Soviet paper, *Pravda,* published a cartoon of police intimidating a black child, and "the Birmingham story was told in many languages."[398] Federal officials worried such publicity would harm America's image in the midst of tension with the Soviet Union. The United States promoted itself as the leader of the free world, but racial tensions at home made many around the globe question the American definition of freedom and equality. As a response, the federal government engaged in a sustained public relations campaign to tell a specific story about race and American democracy. Government officials acknowledged that the American racial situation was not perfect, but had improved. The official position held that democracy, not communism, provided the vehicle through which social justice could be achieved, no matter how gradual.[399]

In the spring and into the summer months of 1963, President Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and officials at USIA solidified their efforts to control the message about American

---

[398] Wallace quoted in Henry Hampton and others, *Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years,* 3 DVD (120 minutes each), PBS Video, 2006.
[399] Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 13.

race relations that was being sent abroad.[400] While simultaneously running damage control

regarding Ellender's diplomatic blunders, the State Department also dealt with broader issues

relating to the connection between civil rights and foreign policy during the Cold War. They

reaffirmed the importance of the progressive race story being told.[401] A telegram from USIA in

Africa to the State Department reported, "The most effective force in our favor in Africa is

action by President Kennedy and [the] Federal government to promote and enforce equal rights."

Furthermore, USIA suggested avoiding over-optimism when discussing civil rights to Africans.

Instead, civil rights developments should be "described as [the] beginning of [a] final great

process."[402] The USIA's suggestions to the State Department echoed the official message of the

Kennedy administration on the issue of public relations with regards to civil rights.

USIA also reported on the various reactions to Birmingham from around the world,

demonstrating that newly independent nations were very much concerned about racial issues in

the United States. One such example was an open letter composed to Kennedy by independent

African states gathered at the Addis Ababa Summit Conference on May 21, 1963. The open

letter connected the American situation to colonialism, stating that colonialism and race

discrimination were "the fundamental issues for the future of civilization." It also pointed out the

basic paradox in the United States' domestic situation and its global image. The foreign ministers

at the conference had condemned places like South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, and Rhodesia,

while pointing out the United States had acted no differently in Birmingham. Recognizing the

core issue the letter argued, "The only offences which these people have committed are that they

---

[400] Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 189.

[401] For more on how the United States government tried to shape the story of race in America as a progressive one see Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

[402] Telegram to the Secretary of State from Governor Williams, 26 June 1963, Box 366, Folder Civil Rights Circular (4/63-5/63), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, Carl Kaysen, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

are black and that they have demanded the right to be free and to hold their heads up as equal citizens of the United States."[403] Diplomatically, because Kennedy and Rusk were concerned with disassociating the US from imperialism and the racial status quo, Birmingham undermined Kennedy's efforts.

In early June, Kennedy and his advisors were trying to determine how best to broach the topic of the American image abroad regarding civil rights. Among the suggestions was an all-out civil rights public relations campaign that would send summaries of Federal civil rights action and a message on civil rights from the President to the Ambassadors in Africa.[404] The draft of the telegram that the administration sent to African posts gave detailed information of the imperfect racial tensions in the United States, but made it clear that the administration was working to rectify the situation.[405] The administration also sent a list of accomplishments in civil rights to remind African leaders of the progress that the administration had made.[406] To back up his message, Kennedy sent principal officers in Africa a summary of his civil rights message in June 1963, explaining how he was asking Congress for new civil rights legislation.[407] The efforts of the administration, State Department, and USIA in distributing a very particular message about civil rights speaks to the global significance that American racism had and its perceived connection to colonial exploitation in the Third World.

---

[403] Memorandum to the Secretary of State, 23 May 1963, Box 366, Folder Civil Rights Circular (4/63-5/63), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, Carl Kaysen, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[404] G. Mennen Williams to Carl Kaysen, Memorandum: Messages Concerning Civil Rights for African Posts, 5 June 1963, Box 366, Folder Civil Rights Circular (4/63-5/63), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, Carl Kaysen, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[405] "Draft Telgram: Outline Summary of US policy and Action with Respect to Civil Rights," Box 366 Folder Civil Rights Circular (4/63-5/63), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, Carl Kaysen, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[406] "Kennedy Administration Accomplishments in Civil Rights," June 1963, Box 366 Folder Civil Rights Circular (4/63-5/63), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, Carl Kaysen, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

[407] "From the President for Ambassadors and Principal Officers," Box 366 Folder Civil Rights Circular (4/63-5/63), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, Carl Kaysen, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.

Kennedy's civil rights speech delivered on June 11, 1963 signified a key turning point in civil rights at home and was couched in a global framework. Immediately in his speech, Kennedy articulated that the ability of any American to consume and attend school where they pleased was part of a "worldwide struggle to promote and protect the rights of all who wish to be free." He declared, "We preach freedom around the world, and we mean it, and we cherish our freedom here at home, but are we to say to the world…that this is the land of the free except for the Negroes; that we have no second-class citizens except Negroes; that we have no class or caste system, no ghettoes, no master race except with respect to Negroes?" He emphasized that all of these rights along with voting were the rights of American citizenship, highlighting the effort to have equality before the law. Like segregationists did in regards to states' rights, Kennedy too aligned his statement as a constitutional right granted to all American citizens. Even more threating to segregationists was not just the President's stance on granting legal protection and equality, but that he said race also had no place in American life.[408] Such a proclamation signaled the federal government's effort to promote and support a new domestic racial dynamic, which segregationists found threatening as they tried to maintain their "traditional" American racial landscape.

Adding insult to injury for segregationists was the global reaction to Kennedy's civil rights address. A USIA report to the President highlighted the overwhelmingly positive reaction from key Cold War battlegrounds. The report detailed that Moscow Radio continued to issue proclamations against the American "racists and fascists," whose actions called in the "advertised" American way of life and system of capitalism. However, USIA reported that the press of major nations in Africa, such as Ghana, Nigeria, Morocco, and others praised Kennedy's

---

[408] John F. Kennedy, "Report to the American People on Civil Rights," 11 June 1963, http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/LH8F_0Mzv0e6Ro1yEm74Ng.aspx (accessed 9 August 2013).

speech. The press in countries across East Asia and Latin America also reported similar praise.[409] Kennedy had successfully deflected a domestic and international racial crisis based on his speech. He followed his speech by asking Congress for a Civil Rights Bill, which would highlight further the official progressive racial story embraced by liberals in their Cold War fight. All of which threatened "traditional" American racial social structures, as well as global ones.

In addition to being representative of the use of symbolism surrounding foreign aid, Wallace was also a key figure in planting the roots of the New Right coalition that would come to dominate American politics in the 1980s. An important part of this political transformation in the United States was the creation of coded language to discuss race. Historian Dan Carter concludes that Wallace was the "most influential loser" in the 20th century American politics because of his skill in taking his southern segregationist message to the national scene.[410] Part of this was the ability to tap into international fears as well as domestic ones, especially concerning race. He was skilled at turning international events into morality stories about what could happen at home if the liberal agenda was allowed to continue.

Wallace was a key figure in planting the roots of the New Right coalition that came to dominate American politics in the 1980s. An important part of this political transformation in the United States was the creation of coded language to discuss race. Historian Dan Carter labels Wallace was the "most influential loser" in the 20th century American politics because of his skill in taking his southern segregationist message to the national scene.[411] Part of this was his ability

---

[409] USIA to President Kennedy, Memorandum: Reactions to Your June 11 Civil Rights Speech, 14 June 1963, Box 366 Folder Civil Rights Circular (4/63-5/63), Papers of President Kennedy, National Security Files, Carl Kaysen, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA.
[410] Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), 468.
[411] Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), 468.

to tap into international fears as well as domestic ones, especially concerning race. During his

gubernatorial campaign of 1962, Wallace cultivated this technique. Carter argues that he

"adopted a kind of soft-porn racism in which fear and hatred could be mobilized without

mentioning race itself."[412] This "soft-porn racism" did not just apply to domestic issues, where

historians often cite topics like education and busing. International concerns also fit into this

framework.

Segregationists clearly did not support the federal government's progressive racial story

and felt resentment over the amount of pressure that other nations were putting on the South.

One way they began to combat attacks from abroad was by integrating foreign aid into the

debate. When confronted at a press conference with these concerns of international ill-will

towards the United States regarding the racial protests in Birmingham, Alabama Governor

George C. Wallace defiantly proclaimed, "It seems that other parts of the world ought to be

concerned about what we think of them instead of what they think of us. After all, we're feeding

most of them and whenever they start rejecting twenty-five cents of each dollar foreign aid

money that we send to them then I'll be concerned about their attitude towards us, but until they

reject that twenty-five cents out of each dollar that southern taxpayers pay of foreign aid to these

countries I will never be concerned about their attitude." He continued, "In the first place, the

average man in Africa and Asia doesn't even know where he is, much less where Alabama is."[413]

Wallace's declaration is illustrative of the way in which conservative politicians began to

build a political fiction and conservative internationalism to counter liberal internationalism. He

did not just employ isolationist rhetoric and redbaiting—tactics frequently used during the Cold

---

[412] Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 4.

[413] Henry Hampton and others, *Eyes on the Prize: America's Civil Rights Years,* 3 DVD (120 minutes each), PBS Video, 2006.

War to discredit civil rights reform—he also inserted foreign aid into the debate[414] Echoing

Ellender's critiques of Africans and African Americans, he exploited the tense domestic civil

rights standoff as a platform to attack American foreign policy, specifically the practice of

foreign aid. In doing so, he not only attacked civil rights, but also the ability of people around the

world to critique American society, one of the key rationales liberal activists had used since the

end of World War II to justify legal reforms in civil rights. Wallace's exaggerated claims of

foreign aid allowed him to project his domestic stance onto international politics, thereby coding

international politics with domestic meaning.

Wallace's comments over Africans and foreign aid in 1963 ran directly against the

attitudes of development and internationalism and started to create an alternative vision of the

role of the United States in the world. In November 1963, Birmingham continued to have

international notoriety due to the September 15, 1963 Sixteenth Street Baptist Church bombing

that killed four girls, leading to Wallace's appearance on a Boston TV program to discuss civil

rights with Governor Philip Hoff of Vermont. In the debate, Wallace used state sovereignty to

justify segregation as he had since the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision. Wallace would

take his state rights justification even further though now that the civil rights movement had

accelerated. Critique of foreign aid offered a platform that Wallace could use to discredit foreign

influence in American domestic affairs.

Wallace used foreign aid as a way to draw connections between state and national

sovereignty, which allowed him to present an alternative approach to foreign affairs based on

segregationists' domestic priorities. When Hoff brought up the importance that civil rights

---

[414] For more on red-baiting in the civil rights movement see: Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1988); Brenda Plummer Gayle, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle, Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004).

played in combatting "totalitarian nations" and their global influence, Wallace reiterated his comments from the spring, saying that Americans' "hard-earned money" was helping people all over the world without expecting them to change their local traditions and culture. He continued, "When we go into other parts of the world, we say obey local traditions and customs even though we do not agree with them…the average person in this place doesn't know where he is, much less where Alabama or Mississippi is, and if he did, he wouldn't care what is happening over here…I think we ought to quit caring about being petted like a little poodle dog by other parts of the world, we ought to be respected and whenever they start rejecting 25 per cent of foreign aid dollars on the ground that it comes from the old Confederacy and it is tainted, then I will worry about our image in the other parts of the world."[415] More so than his Birmingham news conference, this attack on foreign aid drew parallels between southern states' rights and national sovereignty. His refined remarks condemned the President and State Department's efforts to address the concerns of African nations regarding American civil rights. Instead, Wallace promoted a unilateral approach to foreign affairs with a nationalistic fervor.

Wallace's January 14, 1963 Gubernatorial Inaugural Address highlighted his political methodology, especially in terms of how he connected international events to domestic ones. The speech was co-written by Asa Earl Carter. Since the 1950s, Carter had been a race-baiting pamphleteer and right-wing radio announcer. His targets were blacks, Jews, Yankees, and any other ethnicity that challenged the supremacy of Anglo-Saxons. He also was the founder of his own Ku Klux Klan organization that was responsible, among many other crimes, for assaulting Nat King Cole and beating civil rights activist Fred Shuttlesworth and stabbing Shuttlesworth's wife. The Inaugural Address that Carter wrote was the political bargain that Wallace made. It

---

[415] "Interview with Gov. Wallace and Gov. Philip Hoff of Vermont," WNAC-TV, 3 November 1963, Box SG034327, Administrative Files, 1958-1968, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

guaranteed him national attention while at the same time committing him to the political fringe.[416]

Wallace's justifications for segregation in his inaugural address drew on familiar defenses for segregation in the thinly veiled defenses of state's rights, constitutional protection, and federal government overreach. The speech began with standard political fare. However, it quickly ramped up and Carter's influence was visible as Wallace declared from, "the Great Anglo-Saxon Southland…I draw the line in the dust and toss the gauntlet before the feet of tyranny…and I say…segregation now…segregation tomorrow…segregation forever." He continued by echoing Ellender's concern over the safety of D.C. in light of the integration that was occurring there. Although by post-civil rights era standards segregation seems inherently racist, Wallace wrapped up his demand for continued segregation in constitutional questions about the central government's reach.

In the speech, Wallace acknowledged the southern regionalism in his argument, and attempted to expand it to a national level. He called on other regions of the United States to join the "Southern philosophy."[417] His inaugural speech alone was not enough to rally the rest of the nation to the "southern philosophy. It did suggest that he was thinking beyond the borders of Alabama, and intended to take his message to a national stage. Even though he had begun to place his domestic racial views into discussions of sovereignty and racial views. His message was still not one that resonated gained much traction beyond the American South. It did however represent an important step in creating a conservative vision to counter liberal internationalism.

---

[416] Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 2, 4. Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), 106-107.

[417] George C. Wallace, "The Inaugural Address of Governor George C. Wallace," 14 January 1963, http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/singleitem/collection/voices/id/2952/rec/5 (accessed 7 July 2013), 2-3.

Wallace proceeded to make clear that the centralization of the government was a product

of liberalism and that it was just as devastating globally as it was domestically. Secular, pseudo-

intellectual politicians were destroying "individual rights" in favor of "human rights" with their

"propaganda." He then continued to reason that globally it was actually the white populations

who were the victims of racism. Wallace reasoned, "As the *national* racism of Hitler's Germany

persecuted a *national* minority…so the *international* racism of the liberals seek to persecute the

international white minority to the whim of the *international* colored majority…so that we are

footballed about according to the favor of the Afro-Asian bloc." Wallace blamed liberal

internationalism for advocating the overthrow of the global racial order that segregation and

colonialism had made. Using a similar method as Ellender, Wallace detailed the consequences of

what the world that liberalism reconstructed would look like by connecting international events

to domestic images that the audience could easily relate to. He mused, "The Belgian survivors of

the Congo cannot present their case to a war crimes commission…nor the Portuguese or

Angola…nor the survivors of Castro…nor the citizens of Oxford, Mississippi."[418] Wallace's

dismay over and connection between the demise of colonialism abroad and collapsing

segregation at home provided his white audience with a way to understand the dangers to their

socio-economic position at home in the events happening in Africa.

Wallace continued, articulating that liberalism undermined the very identity of America,

linking it to communism. He stated, "The true brotherhood of America, of respecting the

separateness of others…and uniting in effort…has been so twisted and distorted from its original

concept that there is small wonder that communism is winning the world." Wallace argued in his

inaugural address that communism was wining because it promoted "amalgamation," which

---

[418] George C. Wallace, "The Inaugural Address of Governor George C. Wallace," 14 January 1963, http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/singleitem/collection/voices/id/2952/rec/5 (accessed 7 July 2013), 6.

would lead to the destruction of the American "system of government." In making this argument he linked liberalism to communism and the piece that tied it all together was the liberal theory that "poverty, discrimination and lack of opportunity is the cause of communism." Wallace argued that this was a false theory. Evoking images of the post-Civil War South, Wallace said the South would be the biggest communist bloc if the liberal theory were correct.

In suggesting that liberal policies in and outside of the United States were allowing communism to win, Wallace directly attacked foreign aid. With his comments, Wallace had dismissed the rationale for both domestic and foreign aid. Foreign aid was "handouts" to help those who should be helping themselves, Wallace contended. Resentfully he claimed, "There were no government hand-outs, no Marshall Plan aid, no coddling to make sure that *our* people would not suffer…Not for one single instant did they ever consider the easy way of federal dictatorship and amalgamation in return for fat bellies."[419] In sum, Wallace's Inaugural Address undermined the core development theories of liberalism and the foreign aid it promoted. Race was inherent in his critique, but it was also ensconced in his discussion that equated foreign aid to communism and amalgamation. To oppose integration and foreign aid served as a way to oppose the remaking of American social structures, specifically race. All the while, Wallace and his colleagues could claim they were simply protecting the nation against the threat of communism, a valid concern during the high Cold War years.

In a less diplomatic manner than Ellender, Wallace used Africa to justify segregation at home. Wallace's fear of amalgamation carried into his comments regarding Africa and foreign aid and who was allowed to participate in the political conversation about these topics. *Newsweek* reported in 1964 that Wallace matter-of-factly stated, "All these countries with

---

[419] George C. Wallace, "The Inaugural Address of Governor George C. Wallace," 14 January 1963, http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/singleitem/collection/voices/id/2952/rec/5 (accessed 7 July 2013), 9-10.

niggers in 'em have stayed the same for a thousand years. Tell me any place where white people and niggers mix."[420] Wallace's remarks, even more clearly than Ellender's in 1962 and 1963, suggested that maintaining segregation at home and some form of colonialism abroad was the appropriate governmental response to the inabilities of non-white populations. That Wallace said this is perhaps not all that surprising. When paired with comments made a year earlier in the midst of the racial upheavals in Birmingham, Wallace contributed to a vision that African Americans and Africans were the same, both of which were primitive and incapable of effective governance. He told a Mississippi crowd about a Ugandan leader that did not like what was occurring in Birmingham. Wallace told his audience, "I guess he was leaning on his spear when he said it."[421] Combined, these remarks demonstrate not only a stereotype of Africans as primitive and without history, but in the context of the African leadership's concern over American domestic race issues, comments like Wallace's and Ellender's took away from Africans the ability to participate in international affairs based solely on racial categories. This allowed segregationists to maintain their vision of the United States as a unilateral superpower in the world system dominated by Anglo-Saxons.

One of the key techniques that Wallace and his segregationist contemporaries used to combat civil rights was to accuse activists as being communist agitators or anti-American, critiques which were easily transferrable to liberal advocates of foreign aid. Throughout the turbulent civil rights battles of 1962 and 1963 in Alabama, Wallace frequently employed the methods of red-baiting to attack both foreign aid and civil rights, resulting in the farther entrenchment of foreign aid in the discussion of civil rights at home. The outcome was that Wallace was able to tie liberal social projects, both domestic and global to a nefarious

---

[420] "Wallace: Welcome Home You Living Doll," *Newsweek,* 1 June 1964, 18.
[421] Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press), 7.

communist conspiracy, echoing Castle's concerns over foreign aid.[422] For example, in a 1967

oral history interview, Wallace still maintained that communists had infiltrated the civil rights

movement and that they were attacking the "property ownership system," making it impossible

to negotiate with them.[423] Wallace and his contemporaries expanded their domestic vision of

racial equality being akin to communism to the international stage by claiming foreign aid was a

socialist program. He articulated this not only in his inaugural address, but also frequently agreed

with his constituents who characterized foreign aid as a socialist, "give-away" program.[424]

Wallace therefore put foreign aid into a larger global critique of liberalism. To Wallace, it was a

tool that promoted racial equality through hand-outs as opposed to the "American" meritocracy.

Known for his oratory ability and fiery speeches, Wallace brought many of his

complaints against civil rights and foreign aid together a month after Kennedy's June 11th civil

rights address when he spoke before the South Carolina Broadcasters Association. He reiterated

many of his previous complaints against liberalism and civil rights, particularly that Martin

Luther King, Jr. was a communist agitator and the "demonstrators" were actually violent black

mobs in American cities that proved the need for the "Southern philosophy" of government raise

to power. Like Passman who attacked the social scientists for both their civil rights and

development theories, Wallace condemned liberal theories as "sociological theories as

expounded by foreign socialists." Echoing Ellender, he argued that these "foreign socialists"

---

[422] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 250.

[423] George C. Wallace, interviewed by John Stewart, 25 May 1967, John F. Kennedy Library, 11; For another example: Eugene Cook, "The Ugly Truth about the NAACP: An Address by Attorney General Eugene Cook before the 55th Annual Convention of the Peace Offices Association of Georgia," date unknown, Box SG19970, Folder 18, Administrative Assistants' Files, M-P, George Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL. Wallace also directly accused Martin Luther King, Jr. of being a Communist and suggested that the State Department was actively supporting him by providing him transportation in Alabama see: "Statement of Governor Wallace," 15 October 1963, Box SG19968, Folder 4, Administrative Assistants' Files, J-L, 1959-1971, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[424] Tom L. Gibson to George C. Wallace, 28 May 1962, Box SG030839, Folder 1962 Correspondence, General, Administrative Assistants' Files, 1962, George Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

were using race and civil rights to farther their own political ends. Wallace said the result of this dangerous political philosophy was that "the lives of millions of our citizens has been endangered." Of course, the citizens endangered in his argument were white citizens that risked losing their place in the social order, which Wallace argued would happen violently.[425]

Foreign aid entered Wallace's speech when he once again repeated his comments regarding the legitimacy of other countries' ability to speak about racial conditions in the South due to the exaggerated amount of aid he claimed they received. Wallace placed the importance that foreigners had in dictating domestic and international policy squarely on the shoulders of "Washington Do-Gooders." He repeated that the rest of the world should be concerned about what the United States thought of them, hinting at a racial rationale for unilateral foreign policy.[426]

While placing blame on "Washington Do-Gooders" for both international and domestic upheaval, Wallace also made clear that the minorities and liberals were both easily swayed into their political ideologies, which "traditional" Southern philosophy could save the nation from. Agreeing with Castle's critique, he blamed the present violence and racial distress on the minority bloc being easily won with policies of appeasement. In doing so he articulated an early conservative critique of "interest politics" that would later be co-opted into so-called "color-blind" politics as a reaction against multiculturalism.

Wallace reinforced traditional socio-racial hierarchy at home by arguing that African Americans were reaching beyond what they should, and the centralized government was the

[425] Governor George C. Wallace, "Speech Before the South Carolina Broadcasters Association," 15 July 1963, Box SG034327, Folder 7-15-63, Administrative Files, 1958-1968, George Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.
[426] Governor George C. Wallace, "Speech Before the South Carolina Broadcasters Association," 15 July 1963, Box SG034327, Folder 7-15-63, Administrative Files, 1958-1968, George Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

impetus for it. He reasoned, "We have already had the Courts of this country tell us that we can't read the Bible and we can't pray—now the Congress is trying to tell us that it is going to take our property away in order to appease Negroes who would still be in the African brush if the white people of this country had not raised their standards and helped them progress in an atmosphere of peace and harmony."[427] Wallace's remarks implied that the federal government was abusing its power to try to create a new social order, all while making it clear that African Americans were only where they were due to white uplift. Now, with liberal interference things had turned violent in Wallace's observations. Here, he also used religion to start building a foundation for future conservative movements. His ability to attached racial meaning to government, religion, and foreign policy proved to be bricks in the foundation of a conservative internationalism.

Wallace serves as a transitional figure in understanding how civil rights and foreign aid intersected. He helped build not just a new conservative coalition, but one that was rooted in international events as well as domestic. Historians of the New Right and the American conservative movement have long struggled with rectifying the way social conservatism and economic conservatism met on common ground. Even more than Ellender's and Passman's more economically-based complaints regarding foreign aid, Wallace's remarks make visible the political move towards a coalition of economic and social conservatives, which echoed the transformation of Castle's defense against foreign aid from 1957-1959. The marriage between fiscal conservatives and segregationists proved a useful political tool as the civil rights

---

[427] Governor George C. Wallace, "Speech Before the South Carolina Broadcasters Association," 15 July 1963, Box SG034327, Folder 7-15-63, Administrative Files, 1958-1968, George Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL. This quote seems to align with a newspaper article that Wallace kept on file which stated "The idealists and 'do-gooders' have been telling the Negroes that the *can* and *should* COMPETE with the whites in every type of industry, business, and social and political activity…They have not only WRECKED the minds and characters of *millions* of American teenagers by their teachings of child psychology and 'progressive education'; but now they have proposed to CHANGE THE VERY CREATION OF GOD." Roderick C. Meredith, "Race Explosion—What does It Mean?," August 1963, *The Plain Truth,* Box SG19972, Folder 15, Administrative Assistants' Files, R-S, 1957-1970, George Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

movement progressed, and it became less politically viable for them to make outright racist

proclamations. Foreign aid, based on the foundation they had built during the 1950s and early

1960s, therefore had been imbued with racial symbolism. It could then be employed by the likes

of Wallace, Passman, and Ellender to talk about race outside of the American South without

outright discussing civil rights.

Foreign aid also proved to be a point of intersection with religious conservatives and

segregationists as well, which provided another pillar for the growing conservative coalition to

build on. Wallace frequently brought up religion when critiquing foreign aid. For example, by

pairing his comments about the courts refusing to allow public prayer in 1963 with the image of

the federal government redistributing property to allow African Americans more socioeconomic

equality, he implied that segregation was on the same level as protection of religion under the

Constitution, a view that many of his supporters agreed with. This carried easily over to the

debate on foreign aid where Wallace argued that the internationalism (that he dubbed

"international racism") promoted by liberals would lead to the persecution of an international

white minority. The internationalism that liberals endorsed posed the same threat abroad as their

policies did domestically to American traditions and the strength of the nation-state, Wallace

contended.[428]

The fact that Wallace called liberal internationalism "international racism," is significant

in understanding his move towards nationalizing southern internationalism via his efforts to

remove race from the discussion. Meaning, in accusing liberal internationalists of subjugating the

"global white minority," Wallace started the process of co-opting civil rights liberalism. He

suggested that the focus on race itself was racist. Wallace was therefore using the "color-blind

---

[428] Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 298-299.

racism" that would allow him to take his southern message to a national audience.[429] As Wallace frequently mentioned when deriding foreign aid and Third World influence in American domestic race concerns, the United States allowed aid countries to maintain their cultures and religions and segregation was the South's culture and religion. Therefore, economic conservatives and social conservatives could find common ground in the opposition to foreign aid.

In the early 1960s, President John F. Kennedy, the State Department, and USIA combatted the negative image of the United States throughout the Third World caused by civil right clashes throughout the South, such as Birmingham in 1963. Foreign aid abroad and civil rights legal reforms at home allowed Kennedy and USIA to control the image of the United States as one of progress in regards to racial equality, which could only be achieved through the vehicle of American democracy. This liberal, progressive race story when paired with development aid abroad challenged segregationists' domestic and global socio-economic hierarchies. Segregationists thus set out to discredit liberalism antiracial (in theory) programs at home in abroad. In doing so, they grafted domestic racial meaning to foreign aid, discrediting both. Instead they offered an alternative vision for America's role in the world that rested on unilateral and nationalist policies in an effort to maintain the status quo in racial hierarchies at home and abroad.

Governor George C. Wallace's rise to political prominence in Alabama offers a window into understanding how segregationists crafted an opposition surrounding foreign aid that was rife with domestic civil rights reference points. The result was that not only was Wallace and his segregationists allies able to attack civil rights, they were also able to discredit liberal

---

[429] Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 12; Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race, Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 44.

development aid. Wallace had therefore created a foundation in which foreign aid had domestic

racial significance. This was an important step in creating a conservative internationalism that

countered liberal internationalism because it allowed segregationists to take their crusade to a

national level in the second-half of the 1960s. Wallace and his allies were able to use foreign aid

as a proxy to discuss their opposition to civil rights with a national audience when and where

outright racist declarations were not palatable and a political liability due to the racial symbolism

they had attached to their opposition to foreign aid. During the early 1960s though, this rhetoric

surrounding foreign aid was largely isolated to the American South where like-minded

segregationists dominated politics. The beginnings of how the racial symbolism surrounding

foreign aid worked on a national scale can be seen in the growing conservative media.

"The world must learn to help itself:" Reverend Wayne Poucher and Foreign Aid in Conservative Media

  The extremism of Wallace, and to a lesser degree Ellender and Passman, over race and

foreign aid, filtered into the media in a more palatable form for the nation. *Life Line* began as a

15-minute radio program in 1958 and by 1964 the program was also producing newsletters and

over three hundred radio stations carried it. H. L. Hunt, a conservative media mogul, created the

program as an educational and religious effort. Hunt hired Reverend Wayne Poucher to be the

program's announcer. Like other conservative commentators and politicians at the time, Poucher

feared the erosion of the "American spirit," which he defined as "initiative and self-reliance."

Although Poucher echoed his contemporary conservatives' fear of the decay of patriotism and

Americanism (much like Ellender and Wallace) he never went as far as the politicians.

According to media scholar Heather Hendershot, Poucher frequently pointed out that *Life Line*

did not "attack minority groups, disparage labor unions, or directly accuse people or

organizations of being communist." The problem with this was it did not leave Poucher a whole lot to discuss with his right-wing listeners except capitalism and attacking excess government spending. As a result, one of Poucher's favorite topics was foreign aid.

Like other critics of foreign aid, Poucher argued that the world had to learn to help itself, but despite his efforts to avoid attacking minority groups, the racial meaning behind his words was never far away for the astute listener. In 1963, while Birmingham and other civil rights battles ignited across the South, Poucher remained silent on the topic. Instead he bemoaned that American tax money was being spent ineffectively on things like "teaching monkeys arithmetic, storing duck and goose feathers, and buying the wrong cloth for uniform pants pockets."[430] This largely served as an attack on liberal inefficient spending without naming it as such. However, due to the conservative connection of civil rights to foreign aid in the 1950s and early 1960s and the context of Birmingham in 1963, Poucher's listeners had a basis to regard foreign aid critiques as a larger critique of liberalism and civil rights reform.

In addition, Poucher's dry radio program was religious in nature and often connected liberal programs (without actually naming them) to moral and spiritual decay in the United States. Poucher claimed that the "American spirit" was being surrendered to "social and economic mess of pottage." Furthermore, in an effort to be productive Poucher attempted to offer solutions. His attempt to solve the ills of American society without government programs involved church and community volunteerism. Poucher told his listeners "there would be possibility of America ever becoming a welfare state," if they loved their neighbors like they

---

[430] Heather Hendershot, *What's Fair on the Air?: Cold War Right-Wing Broadcasting and Public Interest* (Chicago: University Chicago Press, 2011), 45-47.

loved themselves.[431] Without actually identifying them, Poucher had effectively discredited liberal and government programs to like-minded listeners as not only wasteful, but immoral.

Like Wallace, Poucher participated in an attack on liberal domestic and international programs that bridged the gap between fiscal and social conservatives. In his effort to not directly name any of the usual suspects, such as communists and minorities, for the ills he saw eroding his vision of American society, Poucher relied heavily on symbolism and hidden meanings in his critiques of government programs. Poucher therefore participated in the historical process of building a conservative coalition. His national audience represented an early, if small, example of how the symbolism surrounding conservative attacks on liberal domestic and international programs provided a means for racial messages to carry weight and influence beyond segregationists and the American South.

"We are the 'drunken sailor' of world finance:" Otto E. Passman and the Southern Fight against Foreign Aid

Unlike Wallace and the conservative media's move to build a national message in which debate about foreign aid could speak to changing domestic race issues, Representative Otto E. Passman of Northeast Louisiana continued to hone his fiscal conservatism for his southern audience. In doing so he continued to deride government spending habits on liberal political programs, especially foreign aid. Simultaneously, Passman continued to fight against legal desegregation. Although racist claims entered Passman's discussions of foreign aid, they in themselves were not exceptional. Instead, what connected his critiques of both foreign aid and civil rights was that of a large central government overstepping its mandate. Like any good southern democrat, Passman buttressed his arguments against government interference in claims

---

[431] Heather Hendershot, *What's Fair on the Air?: Cold War Right-Wing Broadcasting and Public Interest* (Chicago: University Chicago Press, 2011), 46.

of sovereignty and states' rights. With the passage of the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 though,

Passman used his fiscal conservative values to connect his opposition to foreign aid and civil

rights to each other more explicitly. He did so by emphasizing the size and level of interference

of the federal government, which further helped establish a way that conservatives could talk

about race without directly referencing race, a key foundation in the formation of a conservative

internationalism.

Passman's fiscal conservatism meant that he initially used aid to attack liberal

internationalist spending. In February of 1960, in response to a high school student's question

regarding his stance on foreign aid, he summarized, "Stated briefly, our foreign aid program, on

the whole is a wasteful package for the schemers, the dreamers, and the one-worlders."[432]

Passman's blame of "one-worlders" and essentially international idealists, easily aligned with

those of his colleagues who also opposed foreign aid, like Senator Ellender. Furthermore,

Passman specifically echoed Castle, by accusing foreign aid supporters of catering to special

interests and pressure groups to fund a "Frankenstein-like monstrosity."[433] However, unlike

Castle, Passman did not directly reference minority groups. Still, his attack against development

aid steeped his argument in the size of the federal government, and constituents easily interpreted

his fiscal conservatism as having domestic racial meaning as well.

C.C. Starr wrote Passman about his concern over what interest groups demanding foreign

aid meant for the United States and tied it to domestic racial issues. He warned Passman that he

would face pressure from "every minority group, and pro-any country-but-the-USA, to increase

---

[432] Otto E. Passman, 25 February 1960, "Questions for Congressman Passman—Ouachita Parish High School," General Files, Folder 23 Speeches--Passman, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.
[433] Otto E. Passman, 15 August 1957, General Files, Folder 08 Foreign Aid 1957, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

foreign aid."[434] Starr implied that minority groups were the ones pushing for aid, and more importantly, that their demands were un-American. Here, Starr employed a similar line of logic as Castle. The ability of Passman, his allies, and constituents to paint foreign aid as un-American and derived from minority demands with or without directly stating it was a powerful rhetorical tool. More specifically, it aided in crafting a conservative internationalism that rested on nationalistic ideals by dismissing an internationalist program (foreign aid) as un-American. In part, this made it easy for Passman and his allies to remove racist language from their opposition because they were able to attack the growth of the central government under the likes of Kennedy and his predecessors, which would prove palatable to audiences beyond the American South.

Even if Passman choose to attack liberals and the growth of the central government in his critiques against foreign aid, his constituents interpreted his message through a domestic lens. Some constituents wrote to Passman to express their concern over what his opposition meant for the United States abroad. One worried about the "disastrous effects" that cutting foreign aid would have to the "nation's prestige," repeating one of the many arguments that supporters used to rally others to the cause of development aid.[435] Two others wrote to Passman, and specifically noted that cutting aid would shake the confidence that "millions of Asians and Africans" had in the United States and its ability to support them against communist threats.[436] Whereas these constituents were vague in naming exactly how foreign aid cuts harmed American image abroad, others more explicitly interpreted Passman's opposition in racial terms.

---

[434] C.C. Starr to Otto E. Passman, 30 January 1959, Foreign Aid Files, Folder 18—Foreign Aid-National Opposition 1958, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.
[435] Mrs. Patricia A. Davis to Otto E. Passman, 2 June 1960, Foreign Aid Files, Folder 2 Foreign Aid—National Support, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.
[436] Dr. George A. Lipsky and Dr. Abraham M. Hirsch to Otto E. Passman, telegram, 14 June 1960, Foreign Aid Files, Folder 2 Foreign Aid—National Support, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

Despite the fact that Passman crafted his attacks against foreign aid in terms of government waste, voters were quick to pick up on implicit racial meanings behind his words. Those who supported foreign aid leveled criticism against his opposition to it. Mrs. Herbert N. Cohn wrote to Passman and accused him of maintaining colonial structures in the Third World by purposefully denying development funding which would help build schools in Africa below the Sahara. Mrs. Cohn went on to accuse Passman of being "narrow" and "parochial."[437] Significantly, she wrote to Passman from New York. Even though Passman framed his public addresses largely for a southern audience, foreign aid and its symbolism assured that a small national audience took notice of what his opposition meant in terms of global racial hierarchies. This further demonstrates that the foundation for a nationally appealing (or in this case unappealing) rhetoric surrounding foreign aid and its global racial symbolism was emerging.

On the topic of segregation, Representative Otto E. Passman was hopeful that 1960 and a new presidential election would return the United States to its "traditional" political and social landscape. In a December 1960 speech on the Constitution and school desegregation he began, "If the 1950's were a decade of woolly thinking and loss of national purpose, the year 1960 has produced a bumper crop of national soul-searching. Over and over again, Americans have been told that they must reject the false and the fatuous aspects of their national life, and return to the basic American ideals. The era of cant and claptrap has been declared dead…Our Nation can survive only by being true to its heritage." He continued by pointing blame towards "every current political or sociological fad."[438] These sociological and political trends he spoke of was a

---

[437] Mrs. Herbert N. Cohn to Otto E. Passman, 14 June 1960, Foreign Aid Files, Folder 2 Foreign Aid—National Support, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

[438] Peter M. Sussman, "The Constitution and School Desegregation (Appropriate introductory remarks): A Draft Statement Prepared According to the Instruction of the Honorable Otto E. Passman," 14 December 1960, General Files, Folder 17: Segregation, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

not so subtle attack on the New Deal liberalism and "cult of expertise" that had dominated American politics as well as the sociological justifications cited in the majority decision of 1954's *Brown v. Board of Education* that paved the way for federal school desegregation. Passman's attack on the "sociological fad" in government alluded to the Kennedy administration's enthusiastic use of social scientists in implementing his agenda.

Passman's critiques represented political attempts to fight against liberalism promoted by shoring up a more nationalistic, traditional perception of the country. In the same speech on school desegregation he continued, "By the same sort of peculiar 'newthink,' a group of men who unquestionably accepted racial segregation as a way of life are now discovered to have written a document that prohibits segregated schools!" Here, Passman was referring to the Supreme Court reinterpreting the Constitution to overturn separate but equal facilities. He argued secular, intellectual liberals were to blame. He lamented, "If it [the Supreme Court] can be adjusted to conform to sociology today, it can be perverted to conform to the finding of astrology tomorrow. If this trend continues unchecked, our Constitutional Federal Republic is doomed to be replaced by an amorphous society, without law, without continuity, without framework. I do not believe that Americans whether Northern, Southern, or Western, will let that happen."[439] By attacking the intellectual justifications behind desegregation, Passman also implied that those who supported it were ushering un-American policies that would destroy America.

Constituents in favor of segregation also found parallels between the shifting international racial hierarchies and the events at home, and took the opportunity to inform Passman of the lessons the United States could learn from international incidents. Dr. B. E.

---

[439] Peter M. Sussman, "The Constitution and School Desegregation (Appropriate introductory remarks): A Draft Statement Prepared According to the Instruction of the Honorable Otto E. Passman," 14 December 1960, General Files, Folder 17: Segregation, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

Masters wrote to Passman, "What is going in the Congo now, mass raping of white women, murder of white men by Africans, has been going on all over the U.S. (especially in the South), ever since the depraved and Communist-minded U.S. Supreme Court issued its Un-Constitutional integration edict."[440] Masters' comments parroted those of Ellender regarding the Congo and the warning it held for the American South. That Passman had not publically made the same connection, but his supporters were still able to, demonstrates the growing power that the segregationist interpretations of international involvement had. This helped take the segregationist message to a national audience due to its ability to carry racial meaning without out right mentioning race.

Passman's separate discussion of segregation and civil rights echoes his critiques of foreign aid spending without directly connecting the two. Passman argued that the question of integration was a "whipping boy" to "disguise an all-out attack upon constitutional guaranteed freedoms of the American people." He continued by framing it specifically as an attack against the "Southland" where he made the cause that civil liberties did not equate to "social equality." The "result" was the Federal government subjected the South to "tyranny" out of a "misguided sense of compassion for racial minorities." Passman concluded that "something called 'liberalism'" was the key instigator in the tyranny being inflicted upon the South.[441]

The common denominator in his attack on civil rights and foreign aid was federal government run amok in the hands of "liberals" or "one-worlders" and undermining the Constitution. Passman acknowledged the connection he was making between the central government and civil rights. In 1960, he told the Citizens Council in Monroe that American

---

[440] Dr. B. E. Masters to Otto E. Passman, 8 July 1960, General Files, Folder 17 Segregation, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

[441] "From the Office of Otto E. Passman," 1 March 1957, General Files, Folder 07—Newspapers and Publicity, January-May undated material, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, LA.

southerners live with racial problems and therefore truly understood them. In doing so, he continued to reinforce the regionalism inherent in his remarks. Yet, he also made it clear that race was not the true issue. He reasoned, "Really, the race problem is secondary. It actually pales into insignificance, if fact, in comparison with the real issue, which is one of individual freedom as opposed to an all-powerful central government."[442] Passman, like Ellender and Wallace, presented a message to his southern constituents that the true reason legislation and legal rulings were attacking southern social structures was rooted in the growth of the government at the cost of state and individual liberties. This echoed his critiques of foreign aid as government overreach. As civil rights accelerated at home, Passman moved to a more direct connection between civil rights and foreign aid. Resulting in a more coherent political rhetoric against liberal internationalism.

Passman elaborated that special interests and minority groups fueled the growth of the government that was impeding the "southern way of life". In form letters to respond to constituents opposed to racial desegregation he echoed his own and Castle's critique of foreign aid, by suggesting that civil rights were also simply an interest-group generated political scheme. He wrote, "It is a real inspiration to know that so many of our fine citizens like you are watching some of the stupid blunders our ambitious politicians are making. It is to be regretted that so many will resort to political expediency to further their own interests."[443] The similarity in language and whom Passman assigned blame to later proved to be a useful rhetorical device that he and fellow conservatives could use to discuss race on a national scale without appearing outright racist. This language and symbolism surrounding foreign aid was serve as a key tool in

[442] "Suggested notes for use in connection with talk to Citizens Council at Monroe and similar meetings," 17 November 1960, General Files, Folder 17 Segregation, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collection and Archives, Monroe, LA.
[443] Otto E. Passman to Mattie Ethel Watson, 6 September 1960, General Files, Folder 17 Segregation, 1960, Otto E. Passman Papers, University of Louisiana at Monroe, Special Collection and Archives, Monroe, LA.

building a conservative internationalism that was nationalistic and unilateral so that

segregationists could attempt to control or stop the changing global racial hierarchies.

By the time the civil rights bill passed Congress in 1964, Passman had more clearly

connected his domestic racial beliefs to his opposition to development aid. He did so by

continuing to use his fiscal conservatism to attack liberalism's government program "overreach"

both at home and abroad. The Civil Rights Bill of 1964 passed Congress in early July in part due

to President Kennedy's assassination. The bill was originally introduced to Congress after

Kennedy's landmark civil rights speech on June 11, 1963, a speech that occurred amid the

domestic racial upheaval of Birmingham and American concern over the United States' image

abroad. After the 1964 passage of the Civil Rights Bill, the civil rights movement started to enter

another phase, turning towards the North and shifting focus from legal protection to socio-

economic justice. Conservatives therefore continued to make a strong connection between

foreign aid and civil rights. In a speech given in Raleigh, North Carolina in late September 1964,

Passman highlighted the ways in which foreign aid and domestic welfare programs to the poor

were destroying American capitalism and democracy. He declared, "The myth of government

paternalism and irresponsible welfarism must be exposed. Most of the federal handouts are

intended to control the people for voting and political purposes. We are dissipating our wealth,

forming a socialistic government in America that supports socialistic governments all over the

world."[444] Here, Passman echoed comments made by Castle in his 1959 postscript and Ellender

in 1962 regarding the politicization of foreign aid and its use as a symbolism by certain groups to

win votes.

---

[444] Otto Eton Passman, "Address before the Citizens for the Preservation of Constitutional Government," 28 September 1964, Raleigh, North Carolina, Box SG19972, Folder 37, George C. Wallace Papers, Administrative Assistants' Files, R-S (1957-1970), Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

More than Poucher, Castle, Wallace, and Ellender, Passman leaned heavily on fiscal conservatism in his speech and started to connect foreign aid to the growing welfare programs as coming from the same political ideology, which he believed threatened traditional American values and economy. In his 1964 speech Passman went on a tangent about domestic aid programs. He pointed out that these were not programs reminiscent of the TVA New Deal aid that developed rivers, harbors, flood control, and soil conservation. Instead, the "super-duper, socialistic programs planned" that concerned Passman were the hallmarks of President Johnson's proposed Great Society such as, "accelerated public works program, mass transit, war on poverty, Appalachian aid, medicare, the food-stamp plan and Federal aid to education." He then proceeded to transition back into the topic of his talk, foreign aid, by connecting the two as "rivers of waste occasioned by the extravagance and inefficiency of our domestic and global aid program." He accused recipients of aid as wanting guns and bullets instead of bread and butter. This reinforced the image of aid handed out by liberals going to thugs and corrupt governments abroad and racial violence at home. In Passman's depiction of foreign aid, it was American citizens "bleeding" to give money to corrupt nations.[445]

Passman also critiqued aid as a multilateral endeavor, highlighting the growing resentment among segregationists for liberal internationalism and its multilateral, United Nations approach. Passman argued that if aid must continue, the United States needed to keep control of it rather than sending it through international organizations. To send it through the United Nations did little to benefit American security, Passman argued.[446] This criticism aligned with

---

[445] Otto Eton Passman, "Address before the Citizens for the Preservation of Constitutional Government," 28 September 1964, Raleigh, North Carolina, Box SG19972, Folder 37, George C. Wallace Papers, Administrative Assistants' Files, R-S (1957-1970), Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.
[446] Otto Eton Passman, "Address before the Citizens for the Preservation of Constitutional Government," 28 September 1964, Raleigh, North Carolina, Box SG19972, Folder 37, George C. Wallace Papers, Administrative Assistants' Files, R-S (1957-1970), Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

Ellender's 1962 world tour remarks, in which he had suggested that new member nations from the Third World essentially sold their UN vote to the highest bidder. In his study of the American South in foreign affairs, Joseph Fry argues that southern democrats originally supported the United Nations because they saw it as the realization of Wilsonian internationalism. However, he observes, "The South's low opinion of nonwhites and developing nations and its increasing refusal to support internationalist projects were also apparent in the region's growing opposition to foreign aid."[447] This growing opposition to foreign aid and the United Nations as a vehicle of it, as Passman and Ellender's remarks reveal, occurred as civil rights activism increased at home and decolonization abroad. Looking at the international context of conservative domestic concerns reveals that segregationists struggled to maintain the socioeconomic world order based on racial categories in the face of a liberal political ideology that aimed to do just the opposite.

By tying civil rights to foreign aid, segregationists like Passman, Ellender, and Wallace had turned foreign aid into a symbol of race revolutions at home and abroad. The symbolism took on a political fiction of corrupt, violent, and ineffective leaders that wasted American tax dollars. Using this language surrounding foreign aid, segregationists opposed to foreign aid were able to create a foundation for a conservative internationalism that was rooted in nationalism and unilateral approaches to foreign affairs that in part sought to maintain existing racial hierarchies around the world. This worldview allowed them to attach domestic racial meaning to foreign aid. The result would be that foreign aid's domestic racial symbolism allowed segregationists to present their conservative internationalism and backlash to domestic policies to an audience outside of the American South.

Conclusion:

---

[447] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002),6, 251.

As Kennedy entered the White House, he wanted to focus on foreign policy. Development and modernization theory provided him a way to do so while still addressing the most pressing domestic concern of the early 1960s, the civil rights movement. Thus, foreign aid was a symbol for not just global development but also changing domestic racial landscapes. Segregationists such as Ellender, Passman, and Wallace responded by attacking foreign aid and civil rights as symptoms of the liberalism and internationalism out of control. The conservative vision they countered with was nationalistic and unilateral in an effort to maintain domestic and global socioeconomic hierarchies defined by race.

The history of foreign aid from 1961 to 1964 provides a window into how segregationists started to solidify an internationalist vision of their own to counter the prevailing liberal internationalism. This conservative internationalism was a response to the collapse of racial segregation at home as the civil rights movement began to gain momentum. The conservative internationalism therefore relied on a nationalistic and unilateral approach to reject both federal and international influence in state affairs based on claims of sovereignty. Over the course of just a few years the face of both foreign aid and domestic racial hierarchies rapidly began to transform. The result was that segregationists felt as though they were losing social, economic, and political control. In an effort to hold on to the status quo, segregationists integrated domestic racial discussions into their fiscal conservative arguments against foreign aid spending. The result of efforts such as Wallace, Passman, and Ellender laid the foundation for a rhetoric surrounding foreign aid that offered a way to discuss race with a national audience by eliminating outright racist declarations.

Entering the presidential election in 1964, Governor George C. Wallace had to find a way to tap into the white resentment that had made him a charismatic and vocal leader in the South

and to have his message resonate in the North and West. Foreign aid became one way to support existing racial hierarchies both at home and abroad without advocating for racism or segregation. Instead, the creation of a political fiction in the 1950s and 1960s by overwhelming southern members of Congress, such as Allen Ellender and Otto Passman, allowed conservatives to utilize foreign aid debates as a proxy for discussing race. Furthermore, Johnson's Great Society programs and War on Poverty allowed conservatives to connect foreign aid and domestic aid all within the context of what they characterized as "wasteful handouts." The next chapter explores how Wallace embraced this methodology and carried it onto the national political scene. What had largely been a southern discussion about liberal internationalism would become the standard way for the opposition to attack foreign aid, imbuing such attacks with domestic racial implications and spreading misunderstanding about American foreign aid programs.

Chapter IV:

"To Persecute the Intentional White Minority to the Whim of the International Colored Majority":
Foreign Aid in the Era of White Backlash, 1964-1973

In mid-July 1963, just over a month since the Birmingham demonstrations and his subsequent "Stand in the Schoolhouse Door" speech that had catapulted him to national fame, Governor George C. Wallace stood before the Senate Committee on Commerce giving his testimony against Senate Bill 1732 or what would become the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As part of his lengthy defense of segregation, Wallace reiterated many of the same themes about the role of race in internationalism that he had begun to cultivate in Alabama. In taking the same message to the Senate, Wallace was beginning the process of expanding and refining the southern internationalist message for a national audience. This meant not only shoring up white political, social, and economic power at home, but also internationally. Emphasizing the symbolic connection between foreign aid and domestic civil rights in order to discredit both, was a key element of Wallace's southern internationalism that he made part of the national political scene in 1963.

Like his contemporaries, Wallace leaned heavily on the idea of racially imbued citizenship, coded in terms of sovereignty (both in terms of state and internationally). He emphasized to Congress that he was a governor of a "sovereign state" and that liberal overreach had interfered with that state sovereignty, which was especially offensive to Wallace because he argued it dismissed the very premise of America's legal foundations. Wallace was sure to remind the Senate that those legal foundations were Anglo-Saxon in nature. He further connected civilization and limited government that he saw as the part of the America's legal heritage to white conquest, "The primary reason our forefathers came from Europe to carve this nation out

of a raw and savage wilderness was for the purpose of using, controlling and enjoying their private property and to pursue their chosen professions without fear of interference from kings, tyrants, despots, and I might add, Presidents."[448] In making this statement, Wallace not only reemphasized his belief in American exceptionalism, but also defined it in terms of "state sovereignty" that scoffed at centralized government. His categorization of "presidents" among the ranks of "kings, tyrants, and despots" drove home the point that the liberal presidents since World War II were the ones threatening the basic principles of American law.

In Wallace's estimation, the erosion of state sovereignty and the erosion of the principles of American law occurring at the hands of liberals, was the result of yielding American democracy to minorities. Wallace articulated to the committee that the "spectacle" and "guerrilla warfare" of the civil rights movement had emboldened African Americans to demand even more government intervention. The result, Wallace concluded, was that they no longer just wanted equal treatment. Instead, to the determent of the majority of citizens, African Americans demanded "preferential treatment." Wallace was sure to equate these minority threats in terms of mob rule and violence that endangered "the majority" of American citizens. He cited letters from his constituents as his evidence, saying, "People who write me want their elected representatives to start representing them and not the minority bloc voting mobsters."[449] In this sense, Wallace tried to reinforce an image of American citizenship in which the white population controlled political power. To do so, he depicted African Americans as violent and working against American democracy via corruption, as his use of "mobsters" as a descriptor implies. To give

---

[448] "Statement by George C. Wallace Governor of Alabama Before the Senate Committee on Commerce in Opposition to Senate Bill 1732," 15 July 1963, Box SGO30859, Folder Statements by Governor, ca. 1963-1968, Administrative Files 1963-1968, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[449] "Statement by George C. Wallace Governor of Alabama Before the Senate Committee on Commerce in Opposition to Senate Bill 1732," 15 July 1963, Box SGO30859, Folder Statements by Governor, ca. 1963-1968, Administrative Files 1963-1968, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

into civil rights demands in Wallace's view was to sidestep American democracy in favor of lawlessness at the hands of a demographic that wanted preferential treatment from a willing central government.

In refining his message for the Congressional audience, Wallace made sure to remind the larger American public that not only did foreign influence drive civil rights, but that liberals extended preferential treatment internationally too, at the expense of American pocketbooks. At the Senate hearing, Wallace reiterated the same message that he had declared just over a month earlier in Birmingham. He dismissed the idea that the United States had to worry about its image abroad. Then, he again made sure to shore up his argument in nationalistic rhetoric that denied that the Third World nations had any right to comment on United States domestic affairs, bringing foreign aid into the conversation. Wallace declared to the Senate Committee, "I will worry about our image in the rest of the world when these foreign countries begin to return 25 per cent of the foreign aid we are sending them because it comes from the South. In my judgment, the rest of the world should be more concerned with what we think of them since we feel bound and determined to provide their support." He concluded, "And while we are speaking of an image, the federal government should worry about the image it is creating in the South and to freedom-loving people everywhere."[450] Here, Wallace had retreated to the South as the wronged party at the hands of the federal government. But, he did so in an effort to highlight that the Southern ideals were in fact, the true American ideals. His critique of foreign aid aligned easily with the themes in his critique of civil rights as un-American, and in part instigated by a borderline tyrannical central government.

---

[450] "Statement by George C. Wallace Governor of Alabama Before the Senate Committee on Commerce in Opposition to Senate Bill 1732," 15 July 1963, Box SGO30859, Folder Statements by Governor, ca. 1963-1968, Administrative Files 1963-1968, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

Wallace continued to refine a southern internationalism to combat the anti-racist ideals of liberal internationalism by reiterating his words about foreign aid in his defense of segregation. That he chose to include his attack on foreign aid as part of his message to a national audience indicates that he thought turning foreign aid into a symbol of the excesses of liberalism resonated with the larger public. This chapter therefore illustrates how domestic civil rights debates influenced the opposition to American foreign aid policy by tracing the ways in which segregationists refined southern internationalism to build a national conservative coalition. It argues that facing an increasingly militant civil rights movement and a failing war in Vietnam, segregationists employed the political fiction of Third World aid recipients as corrupt beggars to attack the liberal agenda at home and abroad. That political fiction encapsulated a shared understanding amongst diverse political interests, helping build a conservative alternative to liberal internationalism. This conservative alternative was coalition based and allowed for an approach to foreign affairs that sought to maintain traditional racial hierarchies at home and abroad via unilateral and nationalistic approaches all without any actual mention of race. They used foreign aid as a symbol for antiracist, liberal policies.

In taking his message of the tyranny of the minority to the Senate, Wallace took an important step in presenting a racialized message that spoke to those outside of the American South. This was a key part of what race theorist Howard Winant describes as the adaptation of old racial hierarchies in the era of civil rights and decolonization.[451] In suggesting that African Americans were demanding preferential treatment, Wallace was beginning the process that Nikhil Pal Singh described as the "discourse of civil rights liberalism" that was being adopted by conservatives, in which they equated "ending racism with eliminating racial reference within

---

[451] Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), xiii-xiv.

juridical discourse and public policy."[452] Wallace's claim that civil rights had moved to calls for preferential treatment and that criminal minorities were controlling American politics, suggested that racial designations were undermining American democracy, which made white resistance to civil rights a national issue, as opposed to a southern one.

In 1965, Wallace further refined his message for the larger-white American population making southern white resistance a national issue and deemphasizing efforts by the government and activists to level the playing field. He declared, "We see today a foreign philosophy that says to the people, 'You need not bother to work and meet the qualifications of a free man.' All you must do, is demonstrate and cause chaos, and create a situation whereby our propagandists, masquerading as newsmen, may destroy faith in local law enforcement and may impugn the decency of local law enforcement so that we may take all police powers unto central government."[453] Wallace thus connected fears of a large central government (at the cost of state sovereignty), propaganda, and foreign influence on American politics to opposition to the civil rights movement--echoing the themes that foreign aid opponents cultivated in the 1950s. This message of civil rights activists trying to undermine the American system of proclaimed equality appealed to Americans outside the South. Wallace and his contemporaries' message became that liberal policies to correct legal, economic, and social inequalities for minorities were un-American, since citizens had the same opportunities and just had to work for it.

Increasingly in the 1960s, as civil rights began to achieve legal goals, the rhetoric surrounding race in the United States changed to one where derogatory terms and support of

---

[452] Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 2004), 10.

[453] Statement by Governor George C. Wallace, 25 March 1965, Box SGO30859, Folder Statements by Governor, ca. 1963-1968, Administrative Files 1963-1968, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

segregation became less acceptable in political discourse.[454] Due to segregationists' careful

crafting of a political fiction around foreign aid, by 1964 foreign aid was a symbol for the

wayward influence of liberal internationalists who had sold the nation to the whims of the Third

World. Therefore, foreign aid became a way to attack liberal policies that sought to correct racial

injustices at home as the larger American public increasingly flinched at outright bombastic

declarations of "segregation now, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever."[455] The result was

that foreign aid was a key element in segregationist's efforts to take their southern

internationalist message to a national audience and help to lay the foundation for a conservative

coalition that would come to dominate American politics after 1968.

By looking at how segregationists used foreign aid in their efforts to adapt old racial

hierarchies to the changing ones of the decolonization age, we can see that the basis for the rise

of the New American Right had earlier roots that went beyond domestic concerns. Historians

have attributed the growth of the conservative coalition to the right's ability to connect domestic

concerns of communism, government growth, taxation, civil rights, and perceived decay of

morality to liberalism, a message that resonated in the sunbelt suburbs.[456] However, when we

---

[454] For example in a 1965 letter that Wallace kept for reference, Henry E. Garratt suggested that segregation had become a hated word. See: Henry E. Garrett (Professor Emeritus of Psychology, Columbia University) to Cecil Jackson (assistant to George C. Wallace), 1 April 1965, Box SGO22384, Folder Civil Right (1 October 1964-13 April 1965), Administrative Files 1963-1979, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[455] George C. Wallace, "The Inaugural Address of Governor George C. Wallace," 14 January 1963, http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/singleitem/collection/voices/id/2952/rec/5 (accessed 7 July 2013).

[456] Historians initially interpreted the rise of conservatism in American political history as reactionary response to civil rights based in the South. Since these initial histories, historians have argued for a more nuanced account of the rise of the right, taking into account grassroots movements, socio-economic factors, and the importance of the Sunbelt suburbs. For more on the evolution of the historiography of American conservatism in the twentieth century see: Michael Kazin, "The Grass-Roots Right: New Histories of U.S. Conservatism in the Twentieth Century," *The American Historical Review* 97, no. 1 (1992): 136-155; Thomas J. Sugrue, "Crabgrass-Roots Politics: Race, Rights, and the Reaction against Liberalism in the North, 1940-1964," *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (1995): 551-578; Daniel Bell, ed. *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955); Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995); Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996); Alan Crawford, *Thunder on the Right: The 'New Right' and the Politics of Resentment* (New York: Pantheon, 1980); Thomas Byrne Edsall and

look to international politics, we can see a conservative coalition that happened not just over domestic concerns, but also over the intersection between the domestic and international. Segregationists Historian Dan Carter, describes George Wallace as succeeding in using his southern view to shape "crabgrass" campaigns over issues like education, neighborhood preservation, busing, taxation, and public safety throughout the North and West to create a national political movement.[457] However, there was an international message to Wallace's and his contemporaries' methodology as well. Their refinement of foreign aid as a symbol for liberal antiracism run amok at home and abroad allowed them to attack racial justice on a national scale and deflect claims that they were racist by suggesting that using government money, at home or abroad based on racial opportunities was un-democratic and offered preferential treatment. Thus, the opposition to foreign aid used it in national debates as a proxy issue for domestic civil rights that carried appeal beyond the South.

The mid-to-late 1960s represented a dynamic change in the civil rights and foreign aid policies in the United States, as well as other economic, social, and political shifts in American life. After the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the civil rights movement of 1966 fragmented, with a large number of activists leaving behind the civic

---

Mary D. Edsall, *Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights, and Taxes on American Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991); Godfrey Hodgson, *The World Turned Right Side Up: A History of the Conservative Ascendancy in America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996); Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays* (New York: Vintage Books, 2008); Kevin Kruse, *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Matthew D. Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Stephan Lesher, *George Wallace: American Populist* (Boston: Da Capo Press, 1994); Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); R. O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

[457] Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), xi-xii; Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), xiv.

nationalistic and non-violence of the mainstream movement.[458] In the prevalent popular narrative

of the civil rights era, Black Power emerges in 1966 at the Meredith March with Stokley

Carmichael's defiant speech demanding "Black Power." Armed resistance, therefore, became the

defining characteristic of Black Power. The narrative then portrays Black Power as essentially

antithetical to the more mainstream nonviolent tactics of the civil rights movement, and thus

Black Power plays the role of a tragic coda to the civil rights movement's legacy.[459] Still, as the

recent historiography has demonstrated, Black Power did not suddenly burst forth from Stokley

Carmichael's speech in 1966.[460] It had more complicated origins that had roots in early self-

defense and nationalist ideologies, and therefore developed before 1966 around issues of class,

tactics, masculinity, anticolonialism, and revolutionary worldviews. Following Simon Wendt's

characterization though, this chapter sees 1966 as a key turning point in the civil rights

movement and Black Power because despite its earlier origins, the levels of organization in the

Black Power movement were not present before 1966.[461]

The more revolutionary turn in the civil rights movement that occurred with the

emergence of Black Power created a more favorable environment for Wallace and others to take

their segregationist message to the national stage. Black Power activists demanded socio-

economic equality, not just equality before the law. Considering that the civil rights movement

also expanded to the North and West after 1965, the conditions for widespread white backlash

against civil rights were present for Wallace and others to exploit, in their efforts to combat

---

[458] Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 299.

[459] Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006), xvii.

[460] Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006), 303.

[461] Simon Wendt, "The Roots of Black Power?: Armed Resistance and the Radicalization of the Civil Rights Movement," in *The Black Power Movement: Rethinking the Civil Rights-Black Power Era,* ed. Peniel E. Joseph (New York: Routledge, 2006), 158.

liberalism on a national political level.[462] Furthermore, Black Power activists were more explicit

than previous manifestations of the black freedom struggle in linking the racial issue at home to

neocolonialism and exploitation of the Third World.[463] Johnson's Great Society programs that

sought to mitigate years of socio-economic inequality threatened de facto segregation in the

northern cities and the racial privilege that came with white supremacy that both northern and

southern white American citizens clung to.[464] Thus, Wallace and his contemporaries' ability to

discuss race without talking about race via issues like busing, housing, and welfare programs

allowed them to attack American liberal programs and build a national base around racial issues.

The result was an important step in the process of adapting old racial hierarchies to liberal

attempts to refashion the world in nonracial terms.

---

[462] Harvard Sitkoff, *The Struggle for Black Equality,* 25th Anniversary Edtion, (New York: Hill and Wang, 2008), 200; Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006), xvii; Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 301.

[463] Akbar Muhammad Ahmad, "The Revolutionary Action Movement," in *Black Power: In the Belly of the Beast,* ed. Judson L. Jeffries (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006), 255; Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of the Black Power in America* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006), xvii; Jama Lazerow and Yohuru Williams, eds., *In Search of the Black Panther Party: New Perspectives on a Revolutionary Movement* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 2; Robert O. Self, "The Black Panther Party and the Long Civil Rights Era," in *In Search of the Black Panther Party: New Perspectives on a Revolutionary Movement,* ed. Jama Lazerow and Yohuru Williams (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 17-18; "Davarian L. Baldwin, "'Culture Is a Weapon in Our Struggle for Liberation': The Black Panther Party and the Cultural Politics of Decolonization," in *In Search of the Black Panther Party: New Perspectives on a Revolutionary Movement,* eds. Jama Lazerow and Yohuru Williams (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 298; James Edward Smethurst, *The Black Arts Movement: Literary Nationalism in the 1960s and 1970s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 7, 58, 177; Cleveland Donald, Jr., "Cornell: Confrontation in Black and White," in *Divided We Stand: Reflections on the Crisis at Cornell,* eds. Cushing Strout and David Grossvogel (New York: Anchor Books, 1970): 151-204; W.E. Perkins and J.E. Higginson, "Black Students: Reformists or Revolutionaries?" in *The New American Revolution,* eds. Roderick Aya and Norman Miller (New York: The Free Press, 1971): 195-222; Robert Chrisman, "Observations on Race and Class at San Francisco States," in *Black Power and Student Rebellion,* eds. James McEvoy and Abraham Miller (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1969): 222-232; Peniel E. Joseph, "Black Studies, Student Activism, and the Black Power Movement," in *The Black Power Movement: Rethinking the Civil Rights-Black Power Era,* ed. Peniel E. Joseph (New York: Routledge, 2006): 251-277; Stephen Michael Ward, "'Ours Too Was a Struggle for a Better World': Activist Intellectuals and the Radical Promise of the Black Power Movement, 1962-1972," PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2002. Stephen Ward, "The Third World Women's Alliance: Black Feminist Radicalism and Black Power Politics," in *The Black Power Movement: Rethinking the Civil Rights-Black Power Era,* ed. Peniel E. Joseph (New York: Routledge, 2006), 120.

[464] Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 291-292; James T. Patterson, *American's Struggle against Poverty in Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 100-102; Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 9-10.

Domestic issues were not the only ones that segregationists used to attack liberal antiracist policies to gain a national base during the mid-to-late 1960s. Development and foreign aid policies also lent themselves to the production of a southern internationalism counterpart to liberal internationalism. Southern internationalism centered on preserving eroding white global power expressed in segregation and colonial policies. Building on the previous connections segregationists had made between civil rights and foreign aid during the 1950s, segregationists were able to employ foreign aid as a symbol of liberalism gone too far in part because of the shifts in domestic policies, but also because of the changes in international affairs at the time. Due to Vietnam, by the end of Johnson's presidency, foreign aid was firmly associated with controversy. Not only did southerners continue to vote against foreign aid, but now former supporters also joined them in opposing foreign aid.[465] Segregationists built on their southern internationalism and employed their political fiction surrounding foreign aid alongside other racially coded domestic issues to help create a base for a conservative coalition that had international and domestic roots.

Building on their previous work of connecting foreign aid to domestic civil rights, segregationists were able to benefit from the upheaval of these years and take their message to a national level. In 1965, Johnson even feared that foreign aid would be the undoing of his accomplishments. According to Nick Cullather, Johnson worried that foreign aid would be the lynchpin that unraveled his programs in Vietnam, civil rights, voting rights, Medicare, and Medicaid. Cullather observes, "For Johnson, politics was a process; seemingly unrelated issues

---

[465] Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 245.

were linked through personalities and timing."[466] As the previous chapters have demonstrated, Johnson was not wrong in his concern over political issues being connected.

The process of building an southern internationalism defined by opposition to development aid and domestic racial reform allowed segregationists to talk about race on a national scale, without really bringing up race, due to the racial symbolism they had attached to foreign aid in the previous decade. This chapter demonstrates this process by first focusing on Ellender's continued methods of dissuading support for civil rights and foreign aid by using the symbolism of race in foreign aid, concluding with an examination of George Wallace's national presidential campaigns to demonstrate the way the segregationists' political fiction surrounding foreign aid was presented to the national public, resulting in the normalization of racial coding in foreign aid. All of which marked the beginning of the ascendency of conservative internationalism to counter liberal internationalism.

"We ought to run that man for President; he talks like an AMERICAN!": Ellender and the Continued Opposition to Foreign Aid

The growing opposition to foreign and domestic aid programs, as articulated by Ellender, easily lent itself to the southern ideal of state sovereignty and abhorrence for a strong, central government. One of Ellender's supporters demanded that the "southern senators and congressmen" put an end to "pork barrel" spending by eliminating all aid programs and welfare. The author of the letter believed that such programs were leading the United States into socialism. Furthermore, the letter echoed Ellender's comments from 1962 and employed the political fiction surrounding foreign aid. He wrote that he was sick of his money going to corrupt

---

[466] Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 213.

and greedy politicians overseas, who did not even know what to do with the money.[467] The message repeated earlier declarations by Ellender and his contemporaries that connected ineptitude in the Third World to liberal fool-heartedness of oversized government under liberalism. Furthermore, aid to the Third World came from the same political ideology as domestic aid programs. Ellender's supporters repeating the connections between domestic and international aid, as well as the racial implications of the connection demonstrates the rhetoric and methods that other politicians—like George Wallace—could use as proxies for talking about domestic and global racial hierarchies without directly mentioning them.

As George Wallace utilized foreign aid as a symbol to fight civil rights in 1963, Senator Allen J. Ellender also continued his crusade to cut foreign aid. In doing so, he repeatedly reiterated his words from his 1962 African Tour that questioned the abilities of Africans to self-govern and effectively use the money that the United States was sending abroad. On a radio program in November 1963, Ellender discussed military aid to Africa. Ellender first acknowledged that some military aid might have been justifiable due to concerns for internal security. However, he also believed that the result was that military aid, like its cousin foreign aid, had been politicized. He especially thought this to be true of military aid to Africa, so he believed that the aid to Africa was indefensible.[468]

At the root of Ellender's opposition to military aid to Africa in 1963 was his concern for maintaining colonial rule in Africa. Ellender said, "There is also the fact that any military assistance we give may come to be used against the Portuguese in Angola and Mozambique and against the whites of South Africa…And if the whites are ever driven out of Southern Africa, as I

---

[467] M. Arthur Dodgen to Allen J. Ellender, 25 March 1963, Box 760, Folder 1963 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[468] "Text of Radio Address Recorded by Senator Allen J. Ellender," Station WWL, New Orleans, 16 November 1963, Box 760, Folder 1963 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

said in my report, the Belgian Congo situation will seem to be a picnic by comparison."[469] Ellender made sure to reference his controversial 1962 trip comments that suggested that Africans were incapable of self-governance. He further reinforced his sentiments that self-rule in Africa would lead to chaos by referencing the still-fresh images of the Belgian Congo after the assassination of Patrice Lumumba. The result was not only an indictment against home rule in Africa, but also a subtle reminder of what black protest had wrought in the United States.

The fact that Ellender choose to use the Congo to illustrate what he believed to be the anarchy of home rule in Africa highlighted the connection between domestic and international racial upheaval. The coverage of the Congo crisis in the United States had offered alarmist accounts about the dangers to the Belgians in the Congo following independence. Meanwhile, the Congo crisis helped solidify a global pan-Africanist vision of American imperialism in the postcolonial world. This view included the idea of a "domestic colonial" or "internal colonial" within the United States regarding the nonwhite population. The assassination of Patrice Lumumba with the involvement of the CIA while the UN stood by led to African American protests at the UN in New York City. In the 1960s the American press portrayed these protesters as radical, communist-influenced individuals.[470] Thus, in reminding his listeners of the anarchy that African independence brought abroad, Ellender subtly alluded to the ways in which African and African American liberation movements were connected and the so-called anarchy such movements could cause at home.

---

[469] "Text of Radio Address Recorded by Senator Allen J. Ellender," Station WWL, New Orleans, 16 November 1963, Box 760, Folder 1963 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[470] Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 186-187. Singh notes that in all actuality the black protesters at the UN were not antithetical to the mainstream civil rights movement.

By 1963 Ellender's supporters had embraced his political fiction about foreign aid and started to also articulate their frustrations over liberal policies at home and abroad. One such constituent told Ellender, "I'm sure many people feel as I do when I say I'm tired of us trying to support the whole world. Lets take care of our own people first (and I don't mean the people who live off the welfare programs…)."[471] The fact that the author wanted the money to come back home, but not spent on certain citizens, indicated that Ellender's constituents saw a connection between domestic and foreign aid programs. Even more significantly, for the present study, that they believed that the recipients of aid from the United States government, domestic or international, were freeloaders of at the expense of the American people, or rather, the southern American people.

Ellender's constituents were now repeating his interpretation of foreign aid and internationalism that he had crafted during the previous decade. One letter in 1963 essentially reiterated the conservative international critiques of the previous decade. Caroline Dormon wrote to Ellender to commend him on his continued opposition to foreign aid. The foundation of her support rested in what she perceived to be the lesser qualities of the recipients. Less diplomatic in her wording than Ellender had been, she wrote, "You were absolutely right in your statement that the savage, illiterate African nations could not rule themselves without assistance from Whites—but you were torn asunder for it! For my part, I think the U.N. is a total failure…The very idea of those African savages having a vote equal to that of the U.S.!"[472] Although Dormon never explicitly spelled out a clear connection between civil rights and foreign aid, years later she again wrote to Ellender, but this time on the topic of the War on Poverty. Her second letter

---

[471] Mrs. S. E. Ballard to Allen J. Ellender, 26 August 1963, Box 760, Folder 1963 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[472] Caroline Dormon to Allen J. Ellender, 8 February 1963, Box 760, Folder 1963 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

emphasized that the recipients of domestic aid as lazy and violent.[473] In doing so, Dormon not only emphasized the connection between race and poverty relief in the United States, but also used similar language to what Ellender had used to discredit aid.

The fact that Ellender himself supported technical assistance to a degree and therefore did not go as far as Dormon in condemning all aid to Africa demonstrates the power that the segregationist racial symbolism had regarding foreign aid.[474] As civil rights were accelerating within the United States, the public's adoption of the political fiction that presented foreign aid as threatening American power at the hands of incapable Africans was not accidental, but rather the result of segregationist efforts to maintain white power at home and abroad.[475] As Dormon's 1968 letter demonstrates that political fiction took on increasing significance as the civil rights movement moved north and demanded socio-economic (not just legal) justice. The result was that segregationists' racial attitudes and rhetoric were easily adapted to foreign aid and domestic poverty relief, specifically the discrediting of the capabilities of the recipients. Segregationists had created an image of foreign aid that represented what they perceived to be the dangers of antiracist liberal international ideals, which also extended to domestic programs.

Ellender's constituents were quick to pick up on the implication that Ellender and others had made regarding the connection between the domestic programs of President Johnson's Great Society and sending foreign aid abroad. To many who had listened to Ellender's and others' rhetoric regarding foreign aid, Johnson's War against Poverty was nothing more than a domestic

---

[473] Caroline Dormon to Allen J. Ellender, 12 March 1968, Box 917, Folder 1968 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[474] Allen J. Ellender to George J. Malochee, 24 October 1963, Box 760, Folder 1963 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA; Allen J. Ellender to Annie Roberson, 14 March 1967, Box 900, Folder 1967 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[475] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 148.

version of foreign aid. By 1968, Ellender's constituents articulated the connection clearly. One

letter stated, "It would appear that this Foreign 'give-away' program in conjunction with our

domestic 'give-away' program has just about bankrupted our country."[476] The letter's use of the

disparaging term "give-away" for both programs implied that to the author, they were one and

the same. In addition, other letters Ellender received regarding both foreign aid and poverty relief

programs echoed earlier ones that suggested that the money was needed at home and not abroad.

Yet, that money was not to be spent in poverty programs for fear of entrenching communist

ideologies that would incite African Americans to violence and idleness.[477]

The themes imbedded in conservative internationalism to combat the programs of its

liberal counterpart intersected with each other when segregationists discussed their opposition of

poverty relief programs. First, the distrust of federal government intrusion took center stage. One

letter from a constituent, Erwin Engert, Sr., on the topic of "open housing" vehemently criticized

the federal government's interference in "a man's castle," or home. Second, Engert echoed

Ellender's 1962 remarks on African self-rule aboutthe chaos that black rule—at home or

abroad—brought by highlighting violent rioting. Furthermore, he reinforced the idea that the

demands of African Americans were to have everything the "white man has worked for all his

life" without working. Engert finally concluded his letter stating, "The Negro has never,

throughout history, been able to establish a civilization let alone maintain one."[478] In including

---

[476] W. H. Saunders, Jr. to Allen J. Ellender, 26 April 1968, Box 919, Folder 1968 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[477] Thomas M. Dwyer to Allen J. Ellender, 6 August 1968, Box 919, Folder 1968 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA; Mr. LaPorte to Allen J. Ellender, undated 1968, Box 917, Folder 1968 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA; Bruce Baird, Jr. to Allen J. Ellender, 11 April 1968, Box 917, Folder 1968 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA; Hollie A. Wilkes to Russell Long, Allen J. Ellender, and John Rarick, 6 April 1968, Box 917, Folder 1968 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

[478] Erwin Engert, Sr. to Allen J. Ellender, 8 March 1968, Box 917, Folder 1968 Legislation—Civil Rights, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

his last indictment against foreign aid Engert had employed Ellender's political fiction about aid recipients in Africa as a means to further his argument against poverty relief to the urban poor. The common thread running through the critiques was a desire to avoid American government spending that tried to correct socio-economic inequalities at home and abroad, in part, due to the rapidly changing socio-historical processes that civil rights and decolonization initiated. Ellender made this theme of conservative internationalism clear when he defended the international white rule.

As part of his attack against shifting domestic and international racial dynamics, Ellender also used ineffective foreign aid as an attack on independent Africa. As civil rights continued to expand in the United States through the 1960s, and international human rights took on increasing significance in foreign policy, Ellender did not back away from the political fiction he created surrounding foreign aid. In fact, he doubled-down on his dismissive 1962 remarks regarding the ability of Africans to self-govern when it looked like liberal internationalism was threatening white power abroad. Already witnessing white power and segregation under legal and de facto attack in the United States, Ellender was quick to defend the international white conservative alliance he had helped forge in the 1950s when the United Nations issued sanctions against the white-rule minority UDI government in Rhodesia in 1967. Specifically, he once again fell back on his critique of the inability of black Africans to govern themselves.

Ellender believed the events that had occurred internationally since his original 1962 remarks served as evidence that his assessment of American money being wasted on independent Africa was correct. In 1967, he wrote regarding his 1962 trip, "At that time, I stated that darkness would fall on every country in Africa if the Europeans were driven out and the control of government functions were placed in the hands of those incompetent to govern...I believe that

subsequent events have amply demonstrated the correctness of my views."[479] Essentially, Ellender had once again voiced his support of western colonial control of Africa—a view he had been refining since suggesting Great Britain move its population to the former colonies of the Commonwealth. The result was both politicians and the public alike could easily project the same image of chaos and inability back on the United States in the late 1960s. Ellender had laid the rhetorical foundation where discussion of race could be diverted through disparaging remarks about government aid, domestic or international, as being communist and going to those who were corrupt, violent, lazy, and as antithetical to the American work ethic.

That Ellender's constituents used the same political fiction he had built around foreign aid demonstrates the growing influence of that political fiction. In part this influence was due to the growth of the civil rights movement towards a more explicitly socio-economic justice orientation that focused on northern urban centers. The changing domestic context made Ellender's condemnation of foreign aid recipients in Africa more significant, and constituents readily agreed with his view of foreign aid and used it as an attack against the domestic poverty relief programs of Johnson's Great Society. The result was that just as liberal internationalists carried global antiracist ideologies to the home front, so too did conservative internationalists create a racial vision of domestic programs. Although Ellender's message demonstrates the way that political fiction was adopted by the general public and used to attack civil rights programs, his message was still regionally contained. George Wallace's presidential campaign in the 1960s demonstrate how the segregationist political fiction surrounding foreign aid went national, and was used to discuss race without directly referencing race and segregation.

---

[479] Allen J. Ellender to Roy C. Brogley, Sr., 8 Febuaray 1967, Box 900, Folder 1967 Legislation—Foreign Aid, Allen J. Ellender Papers, Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, LA.

"'Racist' is a term brought into prominence by communist propaganda": George C. Wallace's Presidential Campaigns, Racial Coding, and Southern Segregationists Go National

In 1963 as Alabama Governor George C. Wallace was preparing for a *Meet the Press* interview he feared he would be asked questions about foreign affairs since he was thinking about running for president in 1964. After his appearance he told an aide, "I don't need a foreign policy! All they wanted to know about was niggers, and I'm the expert!"[480] In his 1964 presidential campaign he proceeded to build his foreign policy plank by imbuing his critiques of Democratic foreign policy with domestic racial fears. This was not a new strategy though for Wallace, and instead drew from his political repertoire. He had used foreign policy as a way of attacking domestic civil rights earlier in his career.[481] The result was that in Wallace's political rhetoric involving foreign policy, foreign aid became a symbol of the same political ideology that was threatening the southern socio-racial order.

Wallace's 1964 and 1968 presidential campaigns represent the strongest efforts to shift integration from a Southern issue to a national one.[482] As his 1963 statements to the press and Congress demonstrate, Wallace used foreign aid as an attack point to change segregation into a national issue. The result was to discredit liberal internationalism and the outside influence it brought on American domestic policy. In his presidential campaigns Wallace left no doubt about who he thought was to blame for American international and domestic failings. He claimed that the out-of-touch, intellectual bureaucrats that forced integration at home were the same ones leading the United States astray in foreign policy. Leaning heavily on nationalistic, unilateral

---

[480] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 141; Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1995), 138.
[481] See chapters 2 and 3.
[482] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 153.

arguments, Wallace argued that the liberal internationalists were financing radical, anti-American governments around the world, and certainly not making any friends.[483] Already in 1963, foreign aid was a key element in Wallace's efforts to displace liberal internationalism and make segregation a national issue.

In Alabama, George Wallace had successfully cultivated a political message where civil rights and foreign aid were connected by liberal internationalism. He had even gone so far in his 1962 inaugural address to suggest that globally it was the white population that was suffering under racism. Wallace reasoned, "As the *national* racism of Hitler's Germany persecuted a *national* minority…so the *international* racism of the liberals seek to persecute the *international* white minority to the whim of the *international* colored majority…so that we are footballed about according to the favor of the Afro-Asian bloc." Wallace blamed liberal internationalism for advocating the overthrow of the global racial order that segregation and colonialism had made. Using a similar method as Ellender, Wallace detailed the consequences of what the world that liberalism reconstructed would look like by connecting international events to domestic images that the audience could easily relate to. He mused, "The Belgian survivors of the Congo cannot present their case to a war crimes commission…nor the Portuguese or Angola…nor the survivors of Castro…nor the citizens of Oxford, Mississippi."[484] This message easily transferred over to national politics, and Wallace further crafted the international events and foreign aid into symbols that could readily be used to discuss domestic racial issues.

Even before his presidential campaigns, Wallace was encouraged by the support he had gotten from elsewhere in the United States. The theme of propagandists forcing antiracist policy

---

[483] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 154.

[484] George C. Wallace, "The Inaugural Address of Governor George C. Wallace," 14 January 1963, http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/singleitem/collection/voices/id/2952/rec/5 (accessed 7 July 2013), 6.

on the public was one of the arguments that attracted non-Southerners to Wallace. For example,

in 1962, Charles McWilliams wrote to Wallace. He claimed to be a northerner who was forced

out of the Midwest because racial conditions had deteriorated so much. McWilliams told

Wallace that he believed most Northerners were with them, but that African Americans had

taken over mass media. One of the things that McWilliams' conspiracy theory entailed was that

African Americans were hiding violent crimes from the public with their control of media. The

solution was to create a network of independent radio stations that could become a "Radio Free

America" network. McWilliams identified liberals as the guilty party in allowing African

Americans to spread their so-called propaganda, yet themselves not sending their children to

integrated schools and neighborhoods.[485] The message echoed the earlier efforts of

segregationists to claim that liberal propaganda manipulated the image of segregation.

Also repeating earlier efforts to discredit liberal policies, Wallace received support on the

topic of foreign aid and his perception of the abilities of its recipients. In 1962, Tom Gibson sent

Wallace two of his articles from the *Colorado Springs Gazette Telegraph.* In one, he derided

recipients of the "give-away program" as lazy, incompetent, and inefficient. Gibson concluded,

"Their [aid recipients] own failure to order their natural lives so as to exploit efficiently what

nature had given them. They lack honesty, competence and organization and to give them

finances to develop their nation by taking away from the taxpayers shows lack of intelligence on

our part."[486] Of course Gibson's comments were racist, but moreover, he connected it to the

themes of the segregationist opposition to foreign aid by emphasizing a nationalistic and

---

[485] Charles McWilliams to George C. Wallace, 3 October 1962, Box SG030830, Folder General Correspondence 1962—Miscellaneous, Administrative Files, 1962; 1966, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[486] Tom L. Gibson to George C. Wallace, 28 May 1962, Box SG030830, Folder General Correspondence 1962—Miscellaneous, Administrative Files, 1962; 1966, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

unilateral sentiment. Furthermore, he repeated Senator Ellender's earlier comments and

obsession with maintaining Western control over the resources of the former colonies. Wallace

wholeheartedly agreed with Gibson. He replied, "I feel that this is a matter that concerns people

not only in the South but all over the United States and I hope that you and I can be successful in

rallying people from other sections to the cause of constitutional government."[487] Wallace

therefore not only received early national support for his cause, but he acknowledged seeking a

national audience to support "constitutional government." Foreign aid played an important role

in his ability to discuss national politics due to what it meant beyond finances to the public. In

this case that significance was attached to maintaining colonial racial socio-racial hierarchies.

Another key element of Wallace's attempt to make segregation a national issue and

combat liberal internationalism was his efforts to maintain and expand the segregationist, white

global alliance that Ellender and others had started to cultivate during the 1950s and which

defined southern internationalism. Thomas Noer argues that 1968 represents the last resistance of

organized white resistance in American politics. He concludes that after 1968, segregationists

learned from their counterparts in the civil rights movement and started to stress white,

international unity. He states, "It is paradoxical that a movement that was occasionally jingoistic,

often isolationist, and always scornful of the rest of the world now proclaims global solidarity

and international white unity."[488] Noer, however, choose to focus on nongovernment entities, and

characterizes isolationism as completely withdrawn from the world. When we consider

segregationist politicians, we see that segregationists had been building an international white

---

[487] George C. Wallace to Tom L. Gibson, 19 June 1962, Box SG030830, Folder General Correspondence 1962—Miscellaneous, Administrative Files, 1962; 1966, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[488] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 158.

supremacy alliance since the 1950s and would continue to throughout the 1960s. Furthermore, conservative internationalism did not encourage withdrawing from the world, but rather wanted unilateral, nationalistic control over foreign policy.

Wallace did not necessarily have to try hard to court white supremacist regimes abroad as they were often searching for allies in the West. He did, however, make sure to use his national platform to plainly spell out where he stood on the issue of Rhodesia and South Africa. In 1968, while running for President, he stated that he strongly disagreed with then-current economic sanctions on Rhodesia and South Africa. He promised the public that he would do everything in his abilities to get the sanctions lifted. Most importantly, Wallace made sure to highlight that the sanctions should be lifted because South Africa and Rhodesia were "good friends and allies."[489] Not only did such a statement emphasize the Cold War importance of anticommunist allies abroad, but also the use of friendship stressed a familiarity between the two countries that was not purely strategic. Rather, without directly addressing it, Wallace hinted at shared socio-racial models that the United States shared with minority-ruled nations in southern Africa, which helped to build an international white supremacist alliance.

Wallace received praise from his white supremacist allies in Rhodesia and South Africa, further embedding the alliance into part of conservative internationalism. Douglas Garner, writing for the under-secretary of external services in Rhodesia, sent a letter to Wallace thanking him for his support against Great Britain's sanctions in 1966. Garner made sure to emphasis that they were fighting the "Afro-Asian and Communist blocs of the United Nations."[490] Using the threat of communist expansion to maintain white rule mirrored the communist-infiltrated civil

[489] George C. Wallace, "Statement of Former Alabama Governor George C. Wallace Prepared for Delivery to the National Press Club," 7 October 1968, Box SG034328, Folder Statement—Press Releases, Administrative Files, 1958-1969, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.
[490] Douglas Garner to George C. Wallace, 22 February 1966, Box SG19972, Folder 3, Administrative Assistants' Files, R-S, 1957-1970, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

rights argument of segregationists.[491] In addition, Garner's denouncement of the UN paralleled the South's own rejection of internationalism. Rhodesia and the American South therefore made easy allies, and utilized the same rhetoric to discuss racial hierarchies without directly mentioning them. Instead, they steeped their nationalistic declarations in claims of sovereignty and anti-communism.

Aware of segregationists' efforts to maintain international and domestic racial hierarchies, the white rule minority in southern Africa also tried to build up a white supremacist alliance and garner support in the United States. In early 1966 the Prime Minister of Rhodesia's UDI government, Ian D. Smith sent a message to America. Smith emphasized the communist influence and results of African nationalistic movements. He wrote, "Astoundingly the philosophy of the West seems to be: 'If violence and mayhem are visited by black Africans, that is as it should be. But if a white African presumes to protect his heritage against the black instruments of communism then nothing suffices but his complete extinction.'"[492] Deflecting the issue to communism and the Cold War framework made it appear as if race was not the factor in white-rule of Africa. Rather, his claim that they were only protecting their heritage against black communist encroachment in the face of "extinction" repeated the same theme of a persecuted international white minority that Wallace had declared in early 1963. This was no coincident as Smith intentionally courted the American South for support based on shared racial ideologies.

Smith also tried to emphasize that the United States and Rhodesia shared a similar history, one that referenced the United States' racial national citizenship. Smith believed that

---

[491] For more on how segregationists utilized anticommunism to combat the civil rights movement see: Jeff Woods, *Black Struggle, Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004).

[492] Ian D. Smith, "Message to America from the Prime Minister read at a meeting of the Louisiana Chamber of Commerce," 15 February 1966, Box AG19972, Folder 3, Administrative Assistants' Files, R-S, 1957-1970, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

they had made a unique stand against communism in Africa and could not understand why the United States would not support them, since he reasoned that they were following in America's footsteps. Smith wrote, "It is a source of amazement to us therefore that the great United States should align itself with Britain in the imposition of sanctions and embargoes upon us in Rhodesia whose only apparent offense in our determination to uphold yours and our way of life against growing communist pressures."[493] Smith played to the conservative international rhetoric by frame "way of life" in terms of defending against communist encroachment. However, "yours and our way of life" could also have racial meanings, especially since he had previously tied black African politics to communism. The language of defending a certain way of life easily appealed to southern segregationists who felt that their socio-historical racial order was under attack by liberal internationalists at home and in the UN. The result was Wallace was able to use support for South Africa and Rhodesia as a way to talk about race and garner international support for the South.[494]

By 1967 domestic and global events had also given Wallace support in the growing conservative media, which helped further entrench the segregationists' cause as a national issue. Dan Smoot was a former FBI agent that had made his career in the media as a conservative commentator. Even when his first program, *Facts Forum,* when he attempted to maintain neutrality, Smoot's conservative leanings often were present, especially in issues like foreign aid, which he called "quixotic stupidity" and argued that as a policy it sacrificed security in the name of internationalism.[495] Smoot also published a weekly newsletter, *The Dan Smoot Report,* which

---

[493] Ian D. Smith, "Message to America from the Prime Minister read at a meeting of the Louisiana Chamber of Commerce, 15 February 1966, Box SG19972, Folder 3, Administrative Assistants' Files, R-S, 1957-1970, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[494] See chapter 2 for more on how segregationists cultivated and used an international white supremacist alliance.

[495] Heather Hendershot, *What's Fair on the Air?: Cold War Right-Wing Broadcasting and Public Interest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 38-39.

found its way to not only many homes across America, but also to the desks of members of

congress, governors, and other politicians. Allen Ellender, Otto Passman, and George Wallace

were among those subscribers. Wallace often collected Smoot's newsletters for speech reference

materials. Furthermore, constituents would often send copies of the *Smoot Report* to Wallace and

others to point out and agree with something he had written.[496] Therefore, Smoot and

conservatives had a mutually influencing relationship on each other.

The *Smoot Report* from March 6, 1967 clearly articulated an attack against liberal

internationalism while at the same time shoring up support for a global white unity. First, Smoot

argued that the Republic of South Africa was a target of a "liberal-communist-UN" attack—

fought with propaganda—against "white civilization" in southern Africa. He suggested that

African and Asian countries had wanted to go to war with South Africa, but they lacked the

means, strength, and leadership to do so. Therefore, they sought out "white western nations to do

their dirty work." In describing the situation in South Africa as such Smoot highlighted other

elements of southern internationalism that had been articulated in the previous decade, including:

dismissing liberal internationalism as communist propaganda, placing "white civilization" at the

top of a global racial hierarchy, discrediting the inability of African and Asian nations to self-

govern, and the Third World's manipulation of "white" nations. Thus, Smoot had attacked liberal

internationalism in the same way Ellender, Passman, Wallace, and their colleagues had. In

addition, he also tried to reinforce the alliance between white supremacist states by the United

---

[496] C.C. Mosely to Lurleen Wallace, 24 March 1967, Box SG033647, Folder Miscellaneious letters to Lurleen Wallace April 1967, Administrative Files, 1958-1968, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

States and Great Britain did not intervene because of the strong "cultural, economic and traditional ties" between the people of the three nations.[497]

Smoot also used his platform in the conservative media to discuss foreign aid directly where he leaned heavily on how other conservatives had classified foreign aid and its recipients. He accused foreign aid money going to communists or pro-communist governments. The money was only contributing to anti-American attitudes abroad, Smoot suggested. Significantly, Smoot wrote, "Our high officials practically grovel before African politicians who demand U.S. aid while insulting us publicly and increasing their own people's hatred of America."[498] Without directly using racist attacks, Smoot painted an image in which western countries were bowing to African and Asians. This image aligned with Wallace's inaugural declaration that a global white minority was bending to the will of an international black majority, something he referred to as the "international racism of liberals."[499] By arguing that the United States was only fueling communists in Africa, Smoot illustrated an important aspect of how segregationists' methods of denouncing foreign aid, due to its domestic significance, could be adapted for the national audience. To critique foreign aid segregationists could attack it as communist and driving anti-American attitudes. The result was that race was implied, but ultimately Smoot and his political allies relied on nationalistic declarations to carry their message.

With an international white supremacist global alliance encouraging him and a growing conservative media that echoed many of the foundations of a conservative internationalism, Wallace entered the 1968 presidential election armed with a political fiction about foreign aid

---

[497] Dan Smoot, *The Dan Smoot Report* 13, no. 10 (6 March 1967), Box SG033647, Folder Miscellanies letters to Lurleen Wallace April 1967, Administrative Files, 1958-1968, George C. Wallace, Administrative Files 1958-1996, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[498] Dan Smoot, *The Dan Smoot Report* 13, no. 10 (6 March 1967), Box SG033647, Folder Miscellanies letters to Lurleen Wallace April 1967, Administrative Files, 1958-1968, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[499] George C. Wallace, "The Inaugural Address of Governor George C. Wallace," 14 January 1963, http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/singleitem/collection/voices/id/2952/rec/5 (accessed 7 July 2013), 6.

that allowed him to take the segregationist message to the national level. Unlike when he ran in the 1964 Democratic primaries Wallace did not run on the Democratic ticket. Instead, he ran as a candidate for the American Independent Party. Despite all of his declarations stating otherwise, Wallace did not believe he could win in 1968. His goal was to build on the small, but growing, national base that he gained in 1964 and during the following years as he fought civil rights with hopes of setting himself up for a 1972 run. In addition, the best outcome he hoped for was to draw enough voters away from the mainstream candidates to hopefully throw the election to the House of Representatives. Everywhere Wallace went in the country on his campaign he pedaled a segregationist message while rarely mentioning it. He preferred to stick to domestic issues whenever possible, but when foreign policy did come up, Wallace stuck to the themes of southern internationalism focusing on American interests, militaristic and unilateral interventions, and anticommunism, all of which reinforced his unspoken belief in global white superiority. The result was that his support grew steadily in the spring and summer of 1968.[500]

The racial meaning embedded in the political fiction of foreign aid, played a role in Wallace's ability to discuss race in international politics that resonated with the population outside of the South. Historian Dan Carter argues, "Wallace skillfully pulled from the American political fabric that strands of xenophobia, racism, and a 'plain folk' cultural outlook that equated the cosmopolitan currents of the 1960s with moral corruption and weakness. His genius was his ability to voice his listeners' sense of betrayal—of victimhood—and to refocus their anger."[501] The issues that Carter cites that Wallace used are focused on domestic concerns, but Wallace could not ignore foreign policy either. The racial implications of Wallace's rhetoric surrounding

---

[500] Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 15-17.

[501] Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 17.

foreign aid played into not only American's domestic feelings of victimhood, but also their fears about American power abroad. In tapping into these fears, Wallace clearly placed the blame at the feet of liberals.

Wallace refined his message regarding foreign aid that he had been using since Birmingham, but the message still made it clear that liberals were to blame for leading the nation astray domestically and internationally due to the international influence their policies allowed in American affairs. In a press release regarding Vietnam, Wallace's Presidential Campaign reiterated his words, "We can have the liberal trend in our country that says that we must please folks 10,000 miles away by changing some traditions in this country and I am getting sick and tired of that. Since they are spending our money, I think we ought to let them worry about what we think of them sometimes instead of us always worrying about what they think of us."[502] The "them" Wallace referred to were Africans and Asians, but he did not mention inability of the aid recipients like he had in earlier iterations of the critique of liberal foreign aid policy.

Instead, he let the fact that liberals had apparently sold the United States to the whims of lesser nations—as he implied when he suggested recipients should be worried about their image in the United States—appeal to resentment in the general public over what they perceived to be failing American values at home and power abroad. This echoed his more blatant racist declaration from his 1963 inaugural address where he stated, the international colored majority as prosecuting the international white minority and Afro-Asian communist bloc was dictating global politics.[503] Gone now, on the national stage, was reference to international racism of liberals and an international white minority that liberals and the Third World persecuted. Left in

---

[502] Wallace for President Campaign, Press Release on Vietnam, 4 July 1968, Box SG034328, Folder Statement—Press Releases, Administrative Files, 1958-1969, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[503] George C. Wallace, "The Inaugural Address of Governor George C. Wallace," 14 January 1963, http://digital.archives.alabama.gov/cdm/singleitem/collection/voices/id/2952/rec/5 (accessed 7 July 2013), 6.

Wallace's rhetoric though was the fact that foreign aid continued to allow outsiders from Africa and Asia to dictate American policy and that the central government enable it to happen and welcomed it. Wallace's efforts to reform foreign aid policy were therefore, in part, an effort to stop the decay of old racial hierarchies at home and abroad.

Although Wallace adamantly maintained that his 1968 campaign declaration had nothing to do with race, but rather was about states' rights and local control of politics he all but admitted that local government and the issues he associated with it were racial issues. In a 1968 interview with Sam Donaldson, Wallace stated, "Well, if you want to equate race questions with local government, then we can equate it. But I say that being for local government, being for law and order has today been equated by some of those in the news media with being a race question. It is a sad day in our country when we can't talk about local government in New York and California without being charged as being a racist."[504] By associating the local government question and what it meant in racial terms with New York and California, Wallace intentionally set out to emphasize a message that was not based in the South and (at least on the surface) not racist. The result was rather than talking about race, he talked about busing, states' rights, and the growth of the federal government.

When pushed on the matter though, Wallace revealed that racism was a part of his message. In the 1968 interview, Donaldson repeated Wallace's remarks from his inaugural address regarding the prosecution a white international minority at the hands of a tyrannical black international majority. Donaldson continued by asking, "Now isn't that equating it with race?" Wallace's answer was frank and expressed nostalgia for the days of the colonial powers in the world. He placed blame at the feet of liberals, replying,

---

[504] George C. Wallace interviewed by Sam Donaldson and Tome Jerriel, "Issues and Answers," ABC, 16 June 1968, Box SG034328, Folder Issues and Answers, Administrative Files, 1958-1969, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

> Yes, sir…that is true. We have found that policy in this country on colonial questions were dictated by votes in this country and not in what we consider the best interests of the United States. We know that the liberals in this country helped to destroy the colonial possession of the great powers of the world before it was time to destroy colonial positions, and before it was time to give them their freedom and as a consequence, the vacuum, we find that communism and every other sort of disorder has moved into these places.[505]

He response expressed key elements of conservative internationalism including nationalistic foreign policy, communist encroachment in the Third World, and inability of self-governance in the Third World. Wallace's defense of colonial rule of the former-colonies suggested that he supported the maintenance of old socio-racial hierarchies at home and abroad, which allowed him to talk about race at home through the window of American foreign policy.

Importantly though, Wallace did not acknowledge racism in the domestic context. He deflected to the international sphere and conservative internationalism when Donaldson pushed him on where race stood in his campaign. Specifically he used support of the global white supremacist alliance as an example of how domestic civil rights had threatened the United States and global stability. He argued that Rhodesia and South Africa were the two nations in Africa with the highest standard of living, and they were key allies in the Vietnam War, yet the Untied States had endorsed sanctions against them. He told Donaldson, "Our whole basic foreign policy on the question of stripping countries like England and other of their colonial possessions, prior to the time those people were able to acquire independence, was to satisfy voting elements in this country of the United States. Today, Rhodesia and South Africa, two of the finest little countries in the world, are being sanctioned by this country, for what reason? Because of voting blocs in

---

[505] George C. Wallace interviewed by Sam Donaldson and Tome Jerriel, "Issues and Answers," ABC, 16 June 1968, Box SG034328, Folder Issues and Answers, Administrative Files, 1958-1969, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

this country."[506] Wallace dismissed the anticolonial rhetoric of internationalism and accused

minority bloc voters in the United States of harming American foreign policy abroad. Without

directly mentioning which "voting elements" had led the United States astray abroad, Wallace

implied that the black international freedom struggle had led to chaos abroad, and granted too

much power to minorities in the United States. Foreign aid was one manifestation of liberal

internationalism that allowed this to happen, and thus a way to attack shifting global racial

hierarchies.

That is not to say that Wallace was impractical. He did not believe that foreign aid could

be eliminated completely, and instead provided a nationalistic, unilateral approach that appealed

to a public that was weary of the Vietnam War and liberal international policies. In a statement

that was devoid of Wallace's typical hyperbolic rhetoric, he argued that aid should be granted on

purely national interest-based assessments. Any nation that opposed U.S. actions around the

world would not be eligible for foreign aid under Wallace's plan. Foreign aid, Wallace insisted,

had to be earned by the nations requesting it. He concluded, "We will eliminate waste and

corruption from these programs and we will use foreign aid as an instrument of foreign policy in

such a manner as to further the interest of our own nation." Wallace's suggestion for foreign aid

was to use it domestically instead of abroad where it benefited "no Americans." In addition he

believed that foreign aid, when granted should be solely for American interests and national

security via military aid.[507] This nationalistic version of foreign aid that Wallace advocated for

---

[506] George C. Wallace interviewed by Sam Donaldson and Tome Jerriel, "Issues and Answers," ABC, 16 June 1968, Box SG034328, Folder Issues and Answers, Administrative Files, 1958-1969, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[507] George C. Wallace, "Statement of Former Alabama Governor George C. Wallace Prepared for Delivery to the National Press Club," 7 October 1968, Box SG034328, Folder Statement—Press Releases, Administrative Files, 1958-1969, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

was an effort to eliminate any voice that non-western countries had in international politics, which ran counter to the ideals of liberal internationalism.

Wallace also tapped into the political fiction surrounding foreign aid that Ellender and others had built that emphasized corruption and lack of abilities among aid recipients. In suggesting that aid recipients, under his watch, would not be corrupt or incapable of using assistance for "the good of their people," Wallace reinforced the image of African and Asian aid recipients as simultaneously helpless and corrupt, power-hungry thugs.[508] This image was one that the public could easily apply to domestic policy too, as welfare and aid programs attempted to help correct social injustices that were in part rooted in socio-historical racial inequalities. In his TV campaign ads, Wallace declared that he was going to stop the "give away" to anti-Americans abroad, along with promising to end forced busing and restore law and order to the country by protecting citizens' safety and property.[509] The fact that Wallace listed foreign aid in his campaign ad amongst other racially coded topics is significant. Importantly, he used the language of the political fiction—in which the money was a handout that went to corrupt, anti-Americanists—to present a unilateral, nationalistic argument against liberal development policies. Wallace presented an argument to the public in which foreign aid stemmed from liberal policies, which were endangering women and children (busing and crime) while at the same time threatening the nation by leaving it vulnerable to the will of anti-Americanist elements abroad.

In his campaign Wallace was able to then bring foreign aid back to the domestic front and use it as a symbol for federal government interference in the daily lives of Americans, which included civil rights. During his California campaign, Wallace attacked the mainstays of

---

[508] George C. Wallace, "Statement of Former Alabama Governor George C. Wallace Prepared for Delivery to the National Press Club," 7 October 1968, Box SG034328, Folder Statement—Press Releases, Administrative Files, 1958-1969, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[509] George C. Wallace, "Stand Up for American: Busing/Law and Order," 1968, http://www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968 (accessed 12 December 2012).

liberalism including "pseudo-intellectuals" who argued that "society's to blame" for the decay of law and order in the United States. Without outright making any racist statements, Wallace argued that liberals had led the country astray, and government control needed to be returned to the local levels. He argued that the federal government dictated how domestic institutions could spend tax revenue, yet when foreign aid was sent abroad it went "without any strings attached." He proceeded to connect taxing to busing issues, and argued that American wanted the "freedom of choice."[510] The implication that Wallace made was that liberal internationalism allowed Africans and Asians abroad more control and freedom than Americans at home who were opposed to busing. Such an argument easily spoke to the white resentment over the changing landscape of racial and socio-economic hierarchies in the United States as well as abroad.

Wallace was unsuccessful in his 1968 presidential bid, but the political fiction and rhetorical style he used to discuss race without directly referencing it was a lasting legacy of his campaign. Dan Carter argues, "It was clear that George Wallace had been the first politician to sense and then to exploit the changes America came to know by many names: white backlash, the silent majority, the alienated voters…but as George Wallace neared the limits of his political popularity, he opened the door for his successors to manipulate and exploit the politics of anger."[511] Still the politics of anger he used were not solely rooted in domestic issues. Instead, they were part of a growing conservative internationalism that advocated for nationalistic foreign policy. Wallace used international issues to gain national support for the opposition to civil rights by exploiting foreign aid as a way to discuss civil rights without directly mentioning them.[512] In

---

[510] "Wallace '68 California" (film), Bob Walters Collection, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[511] Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996), 23.

[512] Thomas Noer, "Segregationists and the World: The Foreign Policy of the White Resistance," in Brenda Gayle Plummer, ed., *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 158.

doing so, Wallace had built on a foundation of political fiction surrounding foreign aid that revolved around denouncing liberal internationalism and its policies as communist and anti-American, as well as criticizing aid recipients as corrupt despots who were incapable of using the aid. Wallace also simultaneously helped reinforce a global white supremacist network and used that network to shore up domestic support of maintaining global racial hierarchies inherent in segregation and colonialism. Wallace's campaigns represent the moment when the political fiction and racial symbolism of foreign aid entered the national political conversation.

Conclusion:

Increasingly in the 1960s civil rights gains had made outright racism less socially acceptable, yet the message of segregationists did not go away. Just like the civil rights movement shifted to a more national, socio-economic justice platform, so too did the backlash against it. Building on the previous decade's groundwork, segregationists turned to the political fiction and global white supremacist alliance as a way to attack the misguided antiracist ideologies of liberal internationalists. Segregationists like Wallace and Ellender argued that liberal internationalists had sold the nation out to Third World radicals and communists in exchange for minority friends abroad and votes at home. Foreign aid, therefore, became a key element in segregationist's efforts to take their message to a national audience. The result of their efforts was an important step in the process of adapting old racial hierarchies to liberal attempts to refashion the world in nonracial terms.

Looking at both Ellender's and Wallace's continued connecting of domestic civil rights and foreign aid to racial terms demonstrates the way that segregationists were able to use the political fiction surrounding foreign aid in a national context. They received support from the

general public by emphasizing the communist, corrupt, and ineffective perception of foreign aid as heralded by the federal government. Instead, they offered an alternative where aid was to be granted on a unilateral basis to like-minded nations. The results marked the beginning of the ascendency of conservative internationalism to counter liberal internationalism.

Conclusion:

Having charted the development of what I have termed southern internationalism around the issue of foreign aid, and having shown the importance that the role of that alternative southern vision for American international engagement had on political development during the post-World War II era, it is important to take a moment to contemplate the significance of that history and its continued legacy. In the proceeding four chapters I have used foreign aid as an entry point into understanding how the liberal internationalist programs of the Cold War faced opposition from representatives in the American South. The chapters build the argument that southern representatives, such as Otto E. Passman and Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana, were not merely parochial segregationists that were only concerned with what was happening in their "own backyard." Rather by using foreign aid as a window into their worldview and stances on foreign policy and national security issues, this dissertation shows that they opposed foreign aid because they had an alternative vision for controlling decolonization. That vision was connected to their efforts to maintain white supremacist racial hierarchies around the world. To these segregationists, a threat to imperial or neocolonial control in the Third World was just as much as a threat to segregation in the American South.

Forming throughout the 1950s and 1960s, this southern internationalism attempted to combat the connection between the American civil rights and Third World nationalist movements. Nationalism, anticommunism, sovereignty (both state and national), militarism and unilateralism defined southern internationalism. Most importantly though, southern internationalists adhered to a global white supremacist racial hierarchy that segregation and imperialism upheld. The belief in the superiority of whiteness manifested itself in the other key characteristics and foreign policy ideals of southern internationalism. Their faith in a global

white supremacist racial hierarchy was the underlining ideology and anticommunism and militaristic unilateralism were the manifestations of that political ideology. Liberal internationalism, expressed in foreign aid endeavors, represented a threat to Western control in the Third World and segregation at home due to the antiracist ideologies it sought to achieve. The antiracist aspirations of liberal internationalism took on domestic significance in the Cold War context, which made domestic civil rights reform a diplomatic imperative due to the harm it caused to American attempts to win allies in the Third World to contain the spread of communism.[513]

Southern internationalists therefore combatted liberal internationalism by crafting a political rhetoric and message that attached racial meaning and symbolism to foreign aid with the goal to discredit international aid and its recipients based on their racist worldview. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, segregationists refined their message against foreign aid and eliminated direct mention of race during the 1960s. The result was that in the public sphere the racial symbolism and political fiction of aid recipients as inefficient, corrupt beggars became more powerful than the reality of foreign aid.

The prevalence of the racial symbolism that segregationist attached to foreign aid proved to be an important piece of a conservative coalition in the 1960s, and more specifically a

---

[513] Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 14; Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Carol Anderson, *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Kevin K. Gaines, *American African in Ghana: Black Expatriates and the Civil Rights Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Gerald Horne, *Black and Red: W.E.B. DuBois and the Afro-American Response to the Cold War, 1944-1963* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986); Michael L. Krenn, *Black Diplomacy: African Americans and the State Department, 1945-1967* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1999); Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination* (Boulder: Westview, 1988); James H. Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935-1961* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Penny von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004).

conservative internationalist conception of national security policy. Segregationists, therefore,

crafted foreign aid into a symbol and example for both domestic and international racial disorder,

and used it to demonstrate the chaos non-white socio-political power could create at home if

liberal internationalists' antiracial goals had gone unchecked. Due to this racial symbolism that

segregationists created, foreign aid was one way to take their regionalist international agenda to a

national audience. George C. Wallace's presidential campaigns especially demonstrate the

transition from a southern internationalism to its alignment to a national based conservative

coalition. In speaking about the failings of foreign aid, Wallace was able to evoke imagines of

racial upheaval at home and abroad while implying non-white inferiority, all while avoiding any

direct mention of race.[514] Once direct mention of race was eliminated from the conversation,

other political causes, such as the religious right and fiscal conservatives could find common

ground regarding shared objectives and means.[515] The result was a conservative coalition that

partly rested on southern internationalism.

In the early 1970s, with the conservative political ascendency occurring, foreign aid,

conservative politics, and civil rights had all undergone changes, securing the longevity of the

---

[514] For an example of how Wallace discussed race and foreign aid while dismissing that his stance on the topics had anything to do with race see: George C. Wallace interviewed by Sam Donaldson and Tome Jerriel, "Issues and Answers," ABC, 16 June 1968, Box SG034328, Folder Issues and Answers, Administrative Files, 1958-1969, George C. Wallace Papers, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, AL.

[515] The historiography on the formation of the conservative coalition that developed into the New Right largely focuses on discussion of domestic issues, but like southern internationalism, coded racial meanings of political issues were never far from the conversation. For more on the domestic origins of the New Right coalition see: Michael Kazin, "The Grass-Roots Right: New Histories of U.S. Conservatism in the Twentieth Century," *The American Historical Review* 97, no. 1 (1992): 136-155; Thomas J. Sugrue, "Crabgrass-Roots Politics: Race, Rights, and the Reaction against Liberalism in the North, 1940-1964," *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (1995): 551-578; Daniel Bell, ed. *The New American Right* (New York: Criterion Books, 1955); Dan T. Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995); Godfrey Hodgson, *The World Turned Right Side Up: A History of the Conservative Ascendancy in America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996); Kevin Kruse, *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Matthew D. Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

southern internationalist foreign aid political fiction in the public discussions of foreign aid. In large part because of the Vietnam War, the reorientation of foreign aid with the New Direction policies under Carter represented a larger shift in foreign policy and the role that Congress played in it. Rather than the focus that Kennedy had placed on economic development, the New Direction policies in the 1970s focused on human needs and later, in the 1980s, the focus shifted once again to environmental issues. This continued shifting nature of foreign aid resulted in increasing opposition to foreign aid from both the political left and the political right.[516] The result was that the rhetoric and discourse surrounding the debate over foreign aid shifted as well, but since southern internationalists had developed a racially code political fiction surrounding foreign aid, the meanings of the earlier debates remained embedded in the way the public and politicians discussed foreign aid.

In civil rights history the 1970s and conservative ascendency represented a shift from legal-based sustained action towards demands for socio-economic justice in the Black Power movement. Stokley Carmichael's 1966 demand for "Black Power," often marks the beginnings of the Black Power ideology's prevalence, but it had more complicated origins that had roots in early self-defense and nationalist ideologies, and therefore developed before 1966 around issues of class, tactics, masculinity, anticolonialism, and revolutionary worldviews.[517] The role of internationalism and anticolonial solidarity as a defining ideology of Black Power distinguished

---

[516] Vernon W. Ruttan, *United States Development Assistance Policy: The Domestic Politics of Foreign Economic Aid* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 94; 104-105.

[517] Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006), xvii; Harvard Sitkoff, *The Struggle for Black Equality,* 25th Anniversary ed. (New York: Hill and Wang, 2008), 36; Ernest Allen Jr., "Religious Heterodoxy and Nationalist Tradition: The Continuing Evolution of the Nation of Islam," *The Black Scholar* 26, no. 3-4 (1997), 12; John Woodford, "Testing America's Promise of Free Speech: *Muhammad Speaks in the 1960s, A Memoir," Voices of the African Diaspora* 7, no. 3 (1991), 8; Timothy B. Tyson, *Radio Free Dixie: Robert F. Williams and the Roots of Black Power* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 3; Lance Hill, *The Deacons for Defense: Armed Resistance and the Civil Rights Movement* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 272; Simon Wendt, "The Roots of Black Power?: Armed Resistance and the Radicalization of the Civil Rights Movement," in *The Black Power Movement: Rethinking the Civil Rights-Black Power Era,* ed. Peniel E. Joseph (New York: Routledge, 2006), 158.

Black Power from other manifestations of the black freedom struggle.[518] However, with the

entrenchment of racial coding that came with the conservative ascendency in the 1970s, the

internationalist, Black Power demands for socio-economic justice were often met with white

backlash.

My dissertation sheds light on the rise of American conservatism in the postwar period.

Exploring the connection in the histories of foreign aid with civil rights opposition, I challenge

the assumption that southerners were parochial and isolationists. Instead, it reveals that

segregationists had their own desires to control what they saw to be the disorder of

decolonization, and they made attempts to institutionalize their alternative foreign policy

ideology. That alternative vision was firmly rooted in their domestic view of how the world

should be arranged. Segregationists therefore constructed a political fiction surrounding

American foreign aid and turning it into a symbol of the excesses of liberal internationalism at

home and abroad. The political fiction allowed political ideologues to connect foreign aid with

---

[518] Akbar Muhammad Ahmad, "The Revolutionary Action Movement," in *Black Power: In the Belly of the Beast,* ed. Judson L. Jeffries (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006), 255; Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of the Black Power in America* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006), xvii; Jama Lazerow and Yohuru Williams, eds., *In Search of the Black Panther Party: New Perspectives on a Revolutionary Movement* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 2; Robert O. Self, "The Black Panther Party and the Long Civil Rights Era," in *In Search of the Black Panther Party: New Perspectives on a Revolutionary Movement,* ed. Jama Lazerow and Yohuru Williams (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 17-18; "Davarian L. Baldwin, "'Culture Is a Weapon in Our Struggle for Liberation': The Black Panther Party and the Cultural Politics of Decolonization," in *In Search of the Black Panther Party: New Perspectives on a Revolutionary Movement,* eds. Jama Lazerow and Yohuru Williams (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 298; James Edward Smethurst, *The Black Arts Movement: Literary Nationalism in the 1960s and 1970s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 7, 58, 177; Cleveland Donald, Jr., "Cornell: Confrontation in Black and White," in *Divided We Stand: Reflections on the Crisis at Cornell,* eds. Cushing Strout and David Grossvogel (New York: Anchor Books, 1970): 151-204; W.E. Perkins and J.E. Higginson, "Black Students: Reformists or Revolutionaries?" in *The New American Revolution,* eds. Roderick Aya and Norman Miller (New York: The Free Press, 1971): 195-222; Robert Chrisman, "Observations on Race and Class at San Francisco States," in *Black Power and Student Rebellion,* eds. James McEvoy and Abraham Miller (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1969): 222-232; Peniel E. Joseph, "Black Studies, Student Activism, and the Black Power Movement," in *The Black Power Movement: Rethinking the Civil Rights-Black Power Era,* ed. Peniel E. Joseph (New York: Routledge, 2006): 251-277; Stephen Michael Ward, "'Ours Too Was a Struggle for a Better World': Activist Intellectuals and the Radical Promise of the Black Power Movement, 1962-1972," PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2002. Stephen Ward, "The Third World Women's Alliance: Black Feminist Radicalism and Black Power Politics," in *The Black Power Movement: Rethinking the Civil Rights-Black Power Era,* ed. Peniel E. Joseph (New York: Routledge, 2006), 120.

the civil rights movement and attach racial symbolism to those agendas, coding foreign aid in the language of white backlash. This southern internationalism formed one of the political traditions of the later conservative internationalism in which segregationists presented foreign aid as an international version of welfare. The inherent racial meanings in these critiques of liberal spending at home and abroad laid the foundation for the political paradigm to shift towards new conservatism in the early 1970s.

It was the New Right political discourse that stemmed from the ability of southern internationalism to harness white backlash while eliminating direct mention of race that remains hegemonic today. As a result, racism remains an "artifact of the past," while still being ever present.[519] Meaning, in eliminating all reference to race with "color-blind" racial political rhetoric, both internationally and domestically, southern internationalists and their conservative coalition allies created what Howard Winant has dubbed a "neoconservative project" that in addition to racial issues, is a "quasi-imperial defense" of political and cultural Western tenets.[520] Thus, not only were the southern internationalists' efforts to discuss race without mentioning race directly successful, but their political tactics have contributed to the entrenchment of such "color-blind" racism and even helped to recreate informal imperial relationships on a global scale. Considering the relevancy to understanding the continued role global racial hierarchies play and the prevailing "color-blind" racism that dominates American political discourse on race, my dissertation provides an important part of the story of how racial language has become embedded in the rhetoric surrounding foreign aid.

---

[519] Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 44.

[520] Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 59.

Understanding that segregationists had an alternative vision for controlling

decolonization has importance for us in understanding how that vision contributed to the

conservative internationalism that came to dominate American foreign affairs after the Vietnam

War and continues to influence the direction of American foreign policy. In addition, it

illuminates how, especially regarding foreign aid, that southern internationalist vision entrenched

an image of foreign aid as international welfare--along with all the racial meanings attached to it-

-to foreign aid today. For example, in a recent article arguing against foreign aid, the

conservative magazine of the John Birch Society, *The New American* published an online article,

titled, "Exporting Welfare." The author of the article, Laurence M. Vance, fervently reminds

readers, that even after the 1979 restructuring of the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare into the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services,

that the programs that have become "income security" and "public assistance" programs are still

"welfare," even if the term has "fallen into disuse." Laurence's affirmation reminding readers

that these programs are "welfare" implies that there is a specific meaning to the readers and

himself that conveys a certain set of meaning and symbolism embedded in that rhetoric.[521] Given

the pejorative that conservatives have turned welfare into in American political rhetoric, Vance's

insistence on using the term suggests he intentionally wants to remind his reader of the

derogatory images associated with the term.

Echoing the southern internationalists, Vance continues by reinforcing the tired troupe

that "welfare" programs are communist in nature and thus un-American. He writes, "All federal

welfare programs are clearly illegitimate and unconstitutional functions of the federal

government. They are socialistic, they are collectivist…they are social-engineering schemes,

---

[521] Laurence M. Vance, "Exporting Welfare," *The New American,* 7 August 2014, http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/18870-exporting-welfare (accessed 10 August 2014).

they shift responsibility from the individual to society and from facilities to the state, they contribute to class warfare, they crowd out genuine charity, and they are the means by which the government takes $2 trillion a year from some Americans and gives it to other Americans."[522] Vance's attack against "welfare" programs repeats many of the same attacks southern internationalist used against foreign aid in the 1950s and 1960s. The reliance on derogatory symbolism wrapped up in fears of socialist and communist encroachment, uses the same political strategy that southern internationalists used in their attacks on foreign aid, especially once those attacks were taken to a national audience.

Even more to the point, Vance's article is actually about foreign aid, but he sees no difference between domestic and international aid programs. For Vance it is a given that foreign aid is simply an international version of welfare. He writes, "There is another euphemism for a welfare scheme that is far worse than any of those mentioned above: foreign aid." He concludes that it is bad enough that the United States has welfare programs, but it is worse when "welfare is exported."[523] Demonstrating the longevity and continued legacy of southern internationalism on how foreign aid is discussed in today's political discourse, Vance--channeling what could have easily been taken straight from Wallace's presidential campaign playbook--reasons that foreign aid is also harmful because it sends money "courtesy of U.S. taxpayers, to countries that most Americans couldn't find on a map and in some cases have never even heard of."[524] Vance's rationale that American ignorance of world geography as a reason to not give what he suggests is just an international form of welfare, demonstrates how southern internationalism shaped the

---

[522] Laurence M. Vance, "Exporting Welfare," *The New American,* 7 August 2014, http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/18870-exporting-welfare (accessed 10 August 2014).
[523] Laurence M. Vance, "Exporting Welfare," *The New American,* 7 August 2014, http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/18870-exporting-welfare (accessed 10 August 2014).
[524] Laurence M. Vance, "Exporting Welfare," *The New American,* 7 August 2014, http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/18870-exporting-welfare (accessed 10 August 2014).

way that foreign aid is discussed today. Much like domestic welfare programs have attached

racial and socio-economic meanings, so too does foreign aid thanks to the careful calculations of

segregationists and their efforts to build an alternative foreign policy agenda in the face of

changing global racial hierarchies.

Furthermore, foreign aid continues to hold symbolism as a battleground for domestic

social and cultural wars to play out on internationally. In a similar manner to how southern

internationalists attached racial issues to foreign aid, today, American "culture wars" regarding

sexuality and gender are also debated on an international scale via foreign aid. In 2012, when the

Republican Party presented their party platform at their convention, they directly addressed

foreign aid. Under a section fittingly titled, "American Exceptionalism," the platform stated,

"Foreign aid should serve our national interest, an essential part of which is the peaceful

development of less advanced and vulnerable societies in critical parts of the world…In short,

aid money should follow positive outcomes, not pleas for more cash in the same corrupt official

pockets…The effectiveness of our foreign aid has been limited by the cultural agenda of the

current Administration, attempting to impose on foreign countries, especially the peoples of

Africa, legalized abortion and the homosexual rights agenda."[525] Much like foreign aid in the

1950s and 1960s took on importance for domestic racial issues for liberals and conservatives

alike, foreign aid today still serves as an important symbolic battleground for domestic issues, as

well as liberal and conservative efforts to control and shape the world in their vision. In addition,

conservatives then connect those domestic issues to foreign policy methods. In this case, the

Republican Party suggests that foreign aid should be given only with national interest in mind,

---

[525] Republican Party, 2012 Platform, https://www.gop.com/platform/american-exceptionalism/ (accessed 17 January 2015); Zack Beauchamp, "GOP Draft Platform: 'Homosexual Agenda' Advanced by Obama Foreign Aid," 27 August 2012, http://thinkprogress.org/lgbt/2012/08/27/748741/gop-draft-platform-homosexual-agenda-advanced-by-obama-foreign-aid/?mobile=nc (accessed 28 August 2012).

echoing the earlier nationalistic foreign policy of southern and conservative internationalism. In insisting on a national interest orientated foreign policy, the Republican Party is also combatting the inclusion of birth control and LGBTQ rights as part of foreign aid conditions.

The influence of southern internationalism remains today in the way the public and politicians discuss foreign aid, with regards to the characterization of aid recipients and how racial coding continues to prevail in the discussion surrounding foreign assistance. At the same time, the symbolism and domestic significance of liberal and conservative efforts to engage with the world with their different visions of internationalism continues to evolve and take on new meanings.

Bibliography

Manuscript Collections

Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, Alabama
Administrative Assistants' Files, Alabama Governor
Administrative Files, Alabama Governor
Alabama Pamphlets Collection
Bob Walters George C. Wallace Presidential Campaign Collection
Governor George Wallace Papers
Segregation Files

John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum, Boston, Massachusetts
John Kenneth Galbraith, Office Files
Carl Kaysen, Office Files
Papers of John F. Kennedy: Presidential Papers, Office Files
National Security Files
Walt W. Rostow, Office Files
Theodore C. Sorensen, Office Files
Telephone Recordings
US Agency for International Development Records

Miller Center, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia
Presidential Recordings: http://millercenter.org/academic/presidentialrecordings

Nicholls State University Archives, Thibodaux, Louisiana
Allen J. Ellender Papers

Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS
Wilcox Collection of Contemporary Political Movements

Harry S. Truman Presidential Library, Independence, Missouri
Stanley Andrews Papers
Lucius D. Battle Papers
Henry G. Bennett Papers
David E. Bell Papers
Clark M. Clifford Papers
George M. Elsey Papers
Benjamin H. Hardy Papers
Paul G. Hoffman Papers
John H. Ohly Papers
Walter S. Salant Papers
Harry S. Truman Papers: Official Files
Harry S. Truman Papers: President's Personal File
Harry S. Truman Papers: Staff Member and Office Files, David E. Bell Files
Harry S. Truman Papers: Staff Member and Office Files, Clark M. Clifford Files

Harry S. Truman Papers: Staff Member and Office Files, David D. Lloyd Files

University of Louisiana at Monroe Special Collections and Archives, Monroe, Louisiana
Otto E. Passman Collection

Oral Histories

John F. Kennedy Presidential Library
David E. Bell
Edwin R. Bayley
Frank Church
Lucius D. Clay
Frank M. Coffin
Charles W. Cole
Silvio O. Conte
Charles F. Darlington
Ed Dragon
Allen J. Ellender
Clyde T. Ellis
James L. Farmer
Myer Feldmand
Hubert H. Humphrey
Walt W. Rostow
George C. Wallace

Harry S. Truman Library
Stanley Andrews
David E. Bell
Clark M. Clifford
Douglas Ensminger
Samuel P. Hayes
Christine Hardy Little
Paul G. Hoffman
John H. Ohly
William E. Warne

Newspapers and Periodicals
Atlantic Daily World
Chicago Defender
Chicago Tribune
Commentary
Los Angeles Times
National Review
New York Times
The Crusader
Wall Street Journal

Washington Post

Published Sources

Memoirs, Autobiographies, Documents, and Collections

Acheson, Dean. *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1987.

Castle, Eugene W. *The Great Giveaway: The Realities of Foreign Aid.* Washington, D.C.: Life Line Book Club, 1959.

Congressional Record. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ferrell, Robert H., ed. *Off the Record: The Private Papers of Harry S. Truman.* New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

Forman, James. *The Making of Black Revolutionaries.* Illustrated Edition. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997.

Gallup, George H. *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion, 1935-1971.* New York: Random House, 1972.

Humphrey, Hubert H. *The Cause Is Mankind: A Liberal Program for Modern America.* New York: Praeger, 1964.

McCarthy, Joseph R. *America's Retreat from Victory: The Story of George Catlett Marshall.* Boston: The Americanist Library, 1951.

Rostow, Walt Whitman. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Sorensen, Theodore C. *Decision-Making in the White House: The Olive Branch or the Arrows.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Truman, Harry S. *Memoirs. Vol. II. Years of Trial and Hope.* New York: Doubleday, 1956.

"The Black Scholar Interviews Robert F. Williams." *The Black Scholar* 2, no. 5 (1970): 2-14.

Truman, Harry S. *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency.* Edited by Dennis Merrill. Vol. 13 Establishing the Marshall Plan, 1947-1948. Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 1999.

Truman, Harry S. *Documentary History of the Truman Presidency.* Edited by Dennis Merrill. Vol. 27 The Point Four Program. Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 1999.

Tully, Andrew and Milton Britten. *Where Did Your Money Go?: The Foreign Aid Story.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964.

U.S. Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United States.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wallace, George. *Stand Up for America.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.

Williams, Robert F. *Negroes with Guns.* Edited by Marc Schleifer. New York: Marzani and Munsell, 1962.

Articles

Allen (Mkalimoto), Ernie. "Revolutionary Black Culture: The Cultural Arm of Revolutionary Nationalism." *Negro Digest* (1969): 11-17.

Brown, Scott. "The US Organization, Black Power Vanguard Politics, and the United Front Ideal: Los Angeles and Beyond." *The Black Scholar* 31, no. 3 (2001): 21-30.

Cha-Jua, Sundiata Keita and Clarence Lang. "The 'Long Movement' as Vampire: Temporal and Spatial Fallacies in Recent Black Freedom Studies." *The Journal of African American History* 92, no. 2 (2007): 265-288.

Cowie, Jefferson and Nick Salvatore. "The Long Exception: Rethinking the Place of the New Deal in American History." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 74, no. 1 (2008): 3-32.

Cullather, Nick. "Development? It's History." *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 4 (2000): 641-653.

Demirel-Pegg, Tijen and James Moskowitz. " US Aid Allocation: The Nexus of Human Rights, Democracy, and Development." *Journal of Peace Research* 46, no. 2 (2009): 181-198.

Fry, Joseph A. et al. "Special Forum: Domestic Regionalism and U.S. Foreign Relations." *Diplomatic History* 36, no. 3 (2012): 451-514.

Gaines, Kevin. "The Civil Rights Movement in World Perspective." *OAH Magazine of History* 21, no. 1 (2007): 57-64.

Gerstle, Gary. "The Protean Character of American Liberalism." *The American Historical Review* 99, no. 4 (1994): 1043-1073.

Grant, James P. "Perspectives on Development Aid: World War II to Today and Beyond." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 442 (1979): 1-12.

Hall, Jacquelyn. "The Long Civil Rights Movement and the Political Uses of the Past." *Journal*

of American History 91, no. 4 (2005): 1233-1263.

Helleiner, Eric. "The Development Mandate of International Institutions: Where Did it Come From?" *Studies in Comparative International Development* 44, no. 3 (2009): 189-211.

Jones, Matthew. "A 'Segregated' Aisa?: Race, the Bandung Conference, and Pan-Asianist Fears in American Thought and Policy, 1954-1955." *Diplomatic History* 29, no. 5 (2005): 841-868.

Kazin, Michael. "The Grass-Roots Right: New Histories of U.S. Conservatism in the Twentieth Century." *The American Historical Review* 97, no. 1 (1992): 136-155.

Klingberg, Frank L. "The Historical Alternation of Moods in American Foreign Policy." *World Politics* 4, no. 2 (1952): 239-273.

McKinzie, Richard D. and Theodore A. Wilson. "Point Four: The Helping Hand." *American History Illustrated* 7, no. 5 (1972): 32-41.

McVety, Amanda Kay. "Pursuing Progress: Point Four in Ethiopia." *Diplomatic History* 32, no. 3 (2008): 371-403.

Meernik, James, Eric L. Krueger, and Steven C. Poe. "Testing Models of U.S. Foreign Policy: Foreign Aid during and after the Cold War." *The Journal of Politics* 60, no. 1 (1998): 63-85.

Meriwether, James H. "'Worth a Lot of Negro Votes': Black Voters, Africa, and the 1960 Presidential Campaign." *The Journal of American History* 95, no. 3 (2008): 737-763.

Merril, Dennis. "The Truman Doctrine: Containing Communism and Modernity." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (2006): 27-37.

Morgenthau, Hans. "A Political Theory of Foreign Aid." *American Political Science Review* 56, no. 2 (1962): 301-309.

Painter, David S. "Oil and the American Century." *Journal of American History* 99, no. 1 (2012): 24-39.

Parker, Jason. "Cold War II: The Eisenhower Administration, the Bandung Conference, and the Reperiodization of the Postwar Era." *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 5 (2006): 867-892.

Parker, Jason. "'Made-in-America Revolutions'? The 'Black University' and the American Role in the Decolonization of the Black Atlantic." *The Journal of American History* 96, no. 3 (2009): 727-750.

Romano, Renee. "No Diplomatic Immunity: African Diplomats, the State Department, and Civil Rights, 1961-1964." *The Journal of American History* 87, no. 2 (2000): 546-579.

Rucker, Walter. "Crusader in Exile: Robert F. Williams and the International Struggle for Black Freedom in America." *The Black Scholar* 36, no. 2-3 (2006): 19-34.

Schwalbe, Carol B. "Images of Brutality: The Portrayal of U.S. Racial Violence in News Photographs Published Overseas (1957-1963)." *American Journalism* 23, no. 4 (2006): 57-64.

Sugrue, Thomas J. "Crabgrass-Roots Politics: Race, Rights, and the Reaction against Liberalism in the North, 1940-1964." *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (1995): 551-578.

Tyson, Timothy B. "Robert F. Williams, 'Black Power,' and the Roots of the African American Freedom Struggle." *The Journal of American History* 85, no. 2 (1998): 540-570.

Wilkins, Roger. "What Africa means to Blacks." *Foreign Policy,* no. 15 (Summer 1974): 130-142.

Books

Anderson, Carol. *Eyes off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Bauer, P.T. *Reality and Rhetoric: Studies in the Economics of Development.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Becnel, Thomas A. *Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana: A Biography.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995.

Bell, Daniel, ed. *The New American Right.* New York: Criterion Books, 1955.

Borgwardt, Elizabeth. *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.

Borstelmann, Thomas. *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern Africa in the Early Cold War.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Borstelmann, Thomas. *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Borstelmann, Thomas. *The 1970s: A New Global History from Civil Rights to Economic Inequality.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Brands, H. W. *The Strange Death of American Liberalism.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Brinkley, Alan. *The End of Reform: New Deal Liberalism in Recession and War.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.

Calderisi, Robert. *The Trouble with Africa: Why Foreign Aid Isn't Working.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Campbell, James T. *Middle Passages: African American Journeys to Africa, 1787-2005.* New York: Penguin Books, 2006.

Carter, Dan T. *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995.

Carter, Dan T. *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996.

Chester, Edward W. *Sectionalism, Politics, and American Diplomacy.* Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975.

Crawford, Alan. *Thunder on the Right: The 'New Right' and the Politics of Resentment.* New York: Pantheon, 1980.

Crockatt, Richard. *The Fifty Years War: The United States and the Soviet Union in World Politics, 1941-1991.* New York: Routledge, 1995.

Cobbs Hoffman, Elizabeth. *All You Need is Love: The Peace Corps and the Spirit of the 1960s.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Cohen, Lizabeth. *A Consumer's Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America.* New York: Vintage Books, 2003.

Cohen, Lizabeth. *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Collier, Paul. *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Cowie, Jefferson. *Stayin' Alive: The 1970s and the Last Days of the Working Class.* New York: The New Press, 2010.

Cullather, Nick. *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle against Poverty in Asia.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Dallek, Robert. *Ronald Reagan: The Politics of Symbolism.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Dochuk, Darren. *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the*

Rise of Evangelical Conservatism. New York: W.W. Norton, 2010.

Dudziak, Mary L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Durr, Kenneth D. *Behind the Backlash: White Working-Class Politics in Baltimore, 1940-1980.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Easterly, William. *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good.* New York: Penguin Press, 2006.

Edsall, Thomas Byrne. *The Politics of Inequality.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1984.

Edsall, Thomas Byrne and Mary D. Edsall. *Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights, and Taxes on American Politics.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1991.

Ekbladh, David. *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Engerman, David C. *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Engerman, David C., Nils Gilman, Mark H. Haefele, and Michael E. Latham, eds. *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.

Ferguson, Niall, Charles Maier, Erez Manela, and Daniel Sargent, eds. *The Shock of the Global: The 1970s in Perspective.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Formisano, Ronald. *Boston Against Busing: Race, Class, and Ethnicity in the 1960s and 1970s.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Franser, Steve and Gary Gerstle, eds. *The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order, 1930-1980.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Fry, Joseph A. *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002.

Gaines, Kevin K. *American Africans in Ghana: Black Expatriates and the Civil Rights Era.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Gerstle, Gary. *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage.* Revised ed. New York: Bantam Books, 1993.

Hanlon, Joseph, Armado Barrientos, and David Hulme. *Just Give Money to the Poor: The Development Revolutions from the Global South.* Sterling, VA: Kurmarian Press, 2010.

Hendershot, Heather. *What's Fair on the Air: Cold War Right-Wing Broadcasting and Public Interest.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Henry, Charles P., ed. *Foreign Policy and the Black (Inter)National Interest.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.

Hill, Lance. *The Deacons for Defense: Armed Resistance and the Civil Rights Movement.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Hixson, Walter L. *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1941-1961.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Hodgson, Godfrey. *The World Turned Right Side Up: A History of the Conservative Ascendancy in America.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996.

Hofstadter, Richard. *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays.* New York: Vintage Books, 2008. First published 1952.

Hunt, Michael H. *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Horne, Gerald. *Black and Red: W.E.B. DuBois and the Afro-American Response to the Cold War, 1944-1963.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986.

Iriye, Akira. *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Isserman, Maurice and Michael Kazin. *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Roots Too: White Ethnic Revival in Post-Civil Rights America.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Jackson, Thomas F. *From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Martin Luther King Jr., and the Struggle for Economic Justice.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Jeffries, Judson L., ed. *Black Power: In the Belly of the Beast.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006.

Joseph, Peniel E., ed. *The Black Power Movement: Rethinking the Civil Rights-Black Power Era.* New York: Routledge, 2006.

Joseph, Peniel E., ed. *Neighborhood Rebels: Black Power at the Local Level.* New York:

Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Joseph, Peniel E. *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006.

Kalman, Laura. *Right Star Rising: A New Politics, 1974-1980.* New York: W.W. Norton, 2010.

Katznelson, Ira. *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time.* New York: W.W. Norton, 2013.

Kaufman, Burton Ira. *Trade and Aid: Eisenhower's Foreign Economic Policy, 1953-1961.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

Krenn, Michael L. *Black Diplomacy: African Americans and the State Department, 1945-1967.* Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1999.

Kissinger, Henry. *Diplomacy.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.

Kolko, Gabriel. *Confronting the Third World: United States Foreign Policy, 1945-1980.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.

Kruse, Kevin. *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Kruse, Kevin M. and Stephen Tuck, eds. *Fog of War: The Second World War and the Civil Rights Movement.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Lancaster, Carol. *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Lancaster, Carol. *Aid to Africa: So Much To Do, So Little Done.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Lassiter, Matthew D. *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Latham, Michael E. *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Latham, Michael E. *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Lauren, Paul Gordon. *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination.* Boulder: Westview, 1988.

Lawrence, Mark Atwook and Francis J. Gavin, eds. *Beyond the Cold War: Lyndon Johnson and*

the New Global Challenges of the 1960s. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Lazerow, Jama and Yohuru Williams, eds. *In Search of the Black Panther Party: New Perspectives on a Revolutionary Movement.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

Leffler, Melvyn P. *For The Soul of Mankind: The United States, The Soviet Union, and The Cold War.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2007.

Lerche, Charles O. Jr. *The Uncertain South: Its Changing Patterns of Politics in Foreign Policy.* Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964.

Lesher, Stephan. *George Wallace: American Populist.* Boston: Da Capo Press, 1994.

Lumsdaine, David Halloran. *Moral Vision in International Politics: The Foreign Aid Regime, 1949-1989.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Mahoney, Richard D. *JFK: Ordeal in Africa.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Maren, Michael. *The Road To Hell: The Ravaging Effects of Foreign Aid and International Charity.* New York: The Free Press, 1997.

Matusow, Allen J. *The Unraveling of America: A History of Liberalism in the 1960s.* New York: Perennial, 1985.

May, Ernest R. and Janet Fraser, eds. *Campaign '72: The Managers Speak.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

McVety, Amanda Kay. *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Policy in Ethiopia.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Meriwether, James H. *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935-1961.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

McDougall, Walter A. *Promised Land, Crusader State: The American Encounter with the World Since 1776.* New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.

McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

McMahon, Robert J. *The Cold War: A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Moyo, Dambisa. *Dead Aid: Why Aid is Not Working and How There is a Better Way for Africa.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009.

Muehlenbeck, Philip E. *Betting on the Africans: John F. Kennedy's Courting of African*

Nationalist Leaders. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Muehlenbeck, Philip E., ed. *Race, Ethnicity, and the Cold War: A Global Perspective.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2012.

Myrdal, Gunnar. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy.* New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1944.

Nau, Henry R. *Conservative Internationalism: Armed Diplomacy under Jefferson, Polk, Truman, and Reagan.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Nesbitt, Francis Njubi. *Race for Sanctions: African Americans against Apartheid, 1946-1994.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2004.

Noer, Thomas J. *Cold War and Black Liberation: The United States and White Rule in Africa, 1948-1968.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1985.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States: Form the 1960s to the 1980s.* New York: Routledge, 1986.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s.* New York: Routledge, 1994.

Packenham, Robert A. *Liberal America and the Third World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Painter, David S. *The Cold War: An International History.* New York: Routledge, 1999.

Parker, Jason C. *Brother's Keeper: The United States, Race, and Empire in the British Caribbean, 1937-1962.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Pator, Robert A. *Congress and the Politics of U.S. Foreign Economic Policy, 1929-1976.* Berkley: University of California Press, 1980.

Peet, Richard. *Unholy Trinity: The IMF, World Bank and WTO.* 2nd ed. London: Zed Books, 2009.

Perlstein, Rick. *Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America.* New York: Scribner, 2008.

Picard, Louis A. and Terry F. Buss. *A Fragile Balance: Re-examining the History of Foreign Aid, Security, and Diplomacy.* Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press, 2009.

Plummer, Brenda Gayle. *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935-1960* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Plummer, Brenda Gayle, ed. *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights, and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Rosenberg, Jonathan. *How Far the Promised Land?: World Affairs and the American Civil Rights Movement from the First World War to Vietnam.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Ruttan, Vernon W. *United States Development Assistance Policy: The Domestic Politics of Foreign Economic Aid.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Sachs, Jeffrey D. *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Times.* New York: Penguin Press, 2005.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. *The Vital Center: The Politics of Freedom.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1949.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. *The Crisis of Confidence: Ideas, Power, and Violence in America.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. *Robert Kennedy and His Times.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society.* Revised ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1998.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. *The Cycles of American History.* Boston: Mariner Books, 1999.

Schulman, Bruce. *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Society, Politics, and Culture.* New York: Da Capo Press, 2002.

Self, R. O. *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Sitkoff, Harvard. *The Struggle for Black Equality.* 25th Anniversary Edition. New York: Hill and Wang, 2008.

Singh, Nikhil Pal. *Black Is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Sokol, Jason. *There Goes My Everything: White Southerners in the Age of Civil Rights, 1945-1975.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006.

Solber, Carl. *Hubert Humphrey: A Biography*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1984

Staples, Amy L. S. *The Birth of Development: How the World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, and World Health Organization Changed the World, 1945-1965.* Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2006.

Sugrue, Thomas J. *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North.* New York: Random House, 2008.

Sugrue, Thomas J. *Not Even Past: Barack Obama and the Burden of Race.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Suri, Jeremi. *Power and Protest: Global Revolutions and the Rise of Détente.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Taffet, Jeffrey F. *Foreign Aid as Foreign Policy: The Alliance for Progress in Latin America.* New York: Routledge, 2007.

Tarp, Finn and Peter Hjertholm, eds. *Foreign Aid and Development: Lessons Learnt and Directions for the Future.* New York: Rutledge, 2000.

Theoharis, Jeanne F. and Komozi Woodard, eds. *Freedom North: Black Freedom Struggles Outside the South, 1940-1980.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Tyson, Timothy B. *Radio Free Dixie: Robert F. Williams and the Roots of Black Power.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Von Eschen, Penny. *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Von Eschen, Penny. *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Wendt, Simon. *The Spirit and the Shotgun: Armed Resistance and the Struggle for Civil Rights.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007.

Westad, Odd Arne. *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Winant, Howard. *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Woods, Jeff. *Black Struggle, Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948-1968.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004.

Zimmerman, Andrew. *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.