The Japanese Journal of American Studies, No. 20 (2009)

Beyond the "Empire of Jim Crow": Race and War in Contemporary U.S. Globalism

*Nikhil Pal SINGH**

INTRODUCTION

> Across the empire of Jim Crow, from upper Dixie to the lower Delta, the descendants of slaves shamed our nation with the power of righteousness, and redeemed America at last from its original sin of slavery. . . . By resolving the contradiction at the heart of our democracy, America finally found its voice as a true champion of democracy beyond its shores.

Thus, spoke U.S. secretary of state Condoleezza Rice in late October 2005 in a speech at the University of Alabama, where Gov. George Wallace once famously vowed "segregation now . . . segregation forever." Before her speech, Rice visited the segregated school she attended as a girl, dramatically pronouncing Alabama "light years" ahead of those bygone days. She expressly claimed her personal experience as a "bridge" to those in the world who perceive American professions of "democracy promotion" as little more than hypocrisy and the arrogance of power. While the George W. Bush administration generally adopted a posture of tough-minded "meritocracy" and color-blindness when discussing issues of race, here Rice was enlisted as the

*Professor, New York University

administration's highest-ranking black official in order to claim the moral authority of the African American civil rights movement for the controversial—some would say failed—foreign policy of preemptive war, occupation, and nation building in the Middle East.[1]

The daughter of an ordained minister and child of the churchgoing black petite bourgeoisie, Rice is clearly well versed in the forms of civic religiosity and prophetic Christianity that from abolition onward have animated struggles for black equality in the United States. Additionally, she adeptly draws on the rhetorical tradition that Mary Dudziak terms "cold war civil rights," in which domestic advances against racial oppression are heralded (against a familiar litany of embarrassing racist incidents) as proof of the superiority of American democracy and the legitimacy of U.S. global leadership in the struggle against Communism.[2] Indeed, Rice's might be considered a mature, even hyperbolic, example of the latter discourse—not only because her influence and position is now presented as a sure index of racial progress—but because, unlike during the cold war, there are today few publicly visible alternative representations of the relationship of U.S. struggles for racial justice and U.S. foreign policy.

Coming in the aftermath of the racially significant embarrassment of Hurricane Katrina, controversies about falsified intelligence, revelations of torture and worsening security in Iraq, as well as another close, controversial presidential election in which 90 percent of African American voters opposed the ruling party, it would be easy to dismiss her carefully staged appearance as one more cheap publicity stunt. This would underestimate its meaning and import. The stubborn political dissent of veteran civil rights leader Rev. Joseph Lowery and others that punctuated the funerals of black freedom movement heroes Rosa Parks and Coretta Scott King made clear that the passing of members of its leading generation risked opening up all-too-live public contention over the meaning and memory of the African American civil rights movement. Similarly, hip-hop artist Kanye West's blunt political provocation during a telethon for Katrina victim relief—"George Bush doesn't care about black people"—briefly cut through the abject images, paternalist utterances, and bureaucratic ineptitude that cast blacks as a problem people, adding insult to the injury and devastation of New Orleans.[3]

These, however, may be the exceptions that prove a racial rule of the post–civil rights era: widening the bandwidth of elite discourse and interaction across the color line generally forecloses more radical, egalitarian interpretations of racial inequality and demands for its redress.[4] To put it another

way, the political narrative of race in the United States remains too far-reaching in its implications, and too unstable in its raw forms, to be taken "off-message" or to be left to amateurs. Governmental performances like Rice's might thus be viewed as official bids to enclose a messy terrain of cultural-political conflict. They highlight a shared archive of contextual knowledge, only to reverse the difficult "secularizing moment of doubt" demanded by meditation on serious, unresolved historical and political questions.[5] In the case of Rice, conventional tropes of American exceptionalism—anti-imperialism and democracy, innocence and providence, boundlessness and destiny—are enlisted to align the civil rights movement with the global projection of U.S. state power. Her maneuver consciously depoliticizes the domestic history of racial subordination and resistance by consigning it to the past, "a vestige," as she described Katrina's baleful effects, of the "Old South."[6] At the same time, it draws energy from the historical legacy and ordinary heroism of black freedom struggles in the explicit interest of freeing the contemporary state of war from the "contradictions" of race and empire.

In the remainder of this article I reflect further on how histories of U.S. racial construction and contention traverse the domains of the foreign and the domestic, and disrupt their neat separation. I have already begun to suggest some of the ways domestic racial contexts can be used to index the articulation of U.S. foreign policy. How does the practice of U.S. foreign relations in turn reshape the domestic narrative and common sense understanding of racial divisions? Have the links between race and foreign policy, particularly in the arena of black-white relations, been substantially altered during the post-civil rights era? More pointedly, how historically and politically distinguishable is what Rice calls the "empire of Jim Crow" from Thomas Jefferson's vaunted claim that the United States was "an empire for liberty"? To what extent does culturally and historically dense racial animus rather than more recent expressions of antiracist hope limn projections of U.S. power abroad? What is the actual the historical relationship between the civil rights movement and U.S. foreign policy? Finally, what intellectual traditions and historical precedents might inform alternative, more egalitarian ways of posing the relationship between race, justice, and power in the U.S. domestic arena and in the world at large?

I. THE "ANTIRACISM" OF U.S. GLOBAL POWER

In previous work I have argued that U.S. racial formations—particularly

surrounding the constitution of black life—are at once smaller and larger than the nation-state.[7] As a form of exclusion that has been elaborated within the ostensibly universalizing domain of national citizenship, histories of racialization in this sense constitute a limit internal to the nation-state that has had a wider, global significance. In some sense, this is related to what political theorists from Hannah Arendt to Etienne Balibar have recognized as the paradoxical universalism of the modern nation form: the citizen-subject as a bearer of human rights and national sovereignty as the ultimate guarantor of a "right to have rights." The modern form of the nation, in other words, is both particular and universal: universal in the idea of "the people" as the original locus of sovereignty and the idea of "humans" as the bearers of rights, particular in the sense of being a specific people, constituted through particular cultural discourses and institutional practices of boundary drawing.

Racial ideologies and distinctions are lodged at the center of this paradox—they both define national particularity and constantly threaten to undo and overspill its boundaries. As Balibar writes, "racism" can be understood as a "supplement" internal to the nation and nationalism that is "at once in excess of it, but indispensable to its constitution."[8] This can be observed in relationship to the peculiar oscillations of racial discourse that have characterized U.S. nationalism, and specifically notions of U.S. exceptionalism. Historically, the notion of "America as the cause of all mankind" (Thomas Paine) was rooted in avowedly white supremacist conceptions of the human individual. In its contemporary articulation—only added to by the Barack Obama presidential victory—the United States is the world's exceptional and exemplary nation-state because it represents a triumphal *overcoming* of racial divisions. As one commentator put it, in no other advanced country, not Britain, not France, not Germany, not Canada, would a black person be elected head of state. Or, as Obama put it in his acceptance speech on election night, "if there is anyone out there who still doubts that America is a place where all things are possible, who still wonders if the dream of our founders is alive in our time, who still questions the power of our democracy, tonight is your answer."[9]

Since World War II numerous commentators have plumbed the contradictions between the political universalism of what Gunnar Myrdal famously called "the American Creed" of liberty and democracy for all and what, despite their historical dominance, would subsequently be regarded as provincial, particularistic U.S. "folk traditions" of white supremacy. Generally, these discussions have been governed by an intellectual procedure separating

a "good, enduring, civic nationalism" from a "bad, departing, racial nationalism." They are ruled, in other words, by a clear hierarchy of value and teleology of progress. Moreover, since Myrdal so powerfully trained his gaze on the importance of the American Creed for the ordering of international affairs, few commentators have considered whether U.S. racial nationalism *qua collective racist feeling* has had any significant global reach. Considerations of the unprecedented U.S. atomic bombing of Japan occasionally threaten to breach this consensus; this is usually either soothed with the balm of relativism—was it really *worse*, some will ask, than the firebombing of Dresden or Tokyo, or the war crimes of the *other* side?—or the discussion is simply foreclosed, as with the Smithsonian controversy some years ago.[10] Even the U.S. war in Vietnam, in which atrocious tactics and effects against a backdrop of extensive antiwar protest yielded consistent charges that it was a criminal and *racist* war, continues to be widely understood in terms of a zealous, if possibly misguided, anti-Communism, or worse, as a cautionary tale about military restraint and the failure of national will.

Since World War II the enduring rhetorical thread of every U.S. military intervention abroad is that it represents the fight against a tyranny that poses a threat to humanity itself. Thus, the wars against fascism, communism, and now "terrorism" all share essentially the same narrative structure of positions and habits of perception: these are epochal, civilizational struggles to preserve liberal democracy against enemies bent on imperial expansion and political domination, including criminal potentials for extermination, enslavement, or torture that mark the threshold of the modern concept of human rights. Indeed, even when (as is sometimes the case today) the words *imperialism* or *empire* are admitted into the lexicon of concepts—such as, hegemony, global leadership, indispensable nation, world-ordering power, even globalization—most often used to publicly define and explain the goals and orientation of U.S. foreign policy, they are either metaphors or decidedly "soft power" concepts: the United States is an "empire-lite" in Michael Ignatieff's memorable formulation.

In his famous defense of the violent and globally unpopular U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, Ignatieff was emboldened to amplify this claim, arguing that even if the United States does preside over a kind of overseas empire—like, for example, what Chalmers Johnson has termed an "empire of bases"—it is nonetheless an exceptional empire because it is categorically unlike "those of times past built on conquest and the white man's burden."[11] Here again we observe the foundational importance of antiracism and an imagery of racial inclusion as legitimating rubrics for U.S. global power. Just as the figure of

Colin Powell was enlisted to sell the Iraq war to an incredulous United Nations, Condoleezza Rice has cast herself as a bridge to a hostile and skeptical world. The idea that the United States might engage in forms of racist warfare—let alone anything approximating "race war"—is, in this context, intellectually, politically, and morally out of bounds. The indefensibility of such a charge is demonstrated, not only by the fact of a racially integrated, now "multicultural," U.S. military establishment and political leadership cadre, but also by longstanding U.S. commitments to decolonization and national sovereignty around the world.

As historically unprecedented and significant as Obama's electoral victory is then, it is important to recognize how easily it has been folded into a much longer history of invocations of a demonstrated racial transcendence as the cornerstone of the "power of American democracy." Indeed, such discourse is certainly at least as old as the cold war—a moment in which racial division at home was repeatedly described as the nation's "Achilles heel" in the struggle against Soviet Communism and in defense of the "free world." Indeed, the 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon actually heightened tendencies to promote the transcendence of racial division, as African Americans and Latinos were seemingly incorporated into the cultural citizenship of nationalist sentiment (even as Arabs, Muslims and South Asians were being subjected to new forms of racial profiling). A spate of newspaper articles prominently testified to a new, unprecedented comity between black, brown, and white—including most improbably, new levels of trust between black communities and the New York City Police Department (NYPD), despite raw memories of the police killing and torture of unarmed black criminal suspects such as Amadou Diallo and Abner Louima in 1999.[12] As U.S. historian John Gaddis put it in a telling formulation, 9/11 had "irradiated" all Americans, altering the "DNA in our minds" with "consequences for years to come." Or as Brooklyn-based rapper Talib Kweli put it with greater irony: "We saluting flags, wrapping them around our heads, when niggaz ain't become American till 9/11."[13]

II. RACE AND WAR: THE HIDDEN CONTINUUM

A problem for all formulations of America's racial transcendence is that historically durable domestic racial divisions and inequalities, in housing, education, life expectancy, employment, policing, and wealth, have persisted—and not only as a memory or "vestige"—even after the civil rights achievement of full legal status for black people. Despite comforting imagery

and public relations conventions, the public policy agenda of the last quarter century, from the criminal justice system to education and social welfare, has moved in a consistent and uniformly hostile direction against the needs and interests of poor communities of color. Legal citizenship even when married to cultural citizenship—Americanness, if you will—has not been a reliable bulwark against durable forms of racial stigma and its ill social and political windfalls. Thus, as one of the earliest and most thoroughgoing liberal defenders of the Bush administration's *foreign* policy, the domestic racial division and neglect that Hurricane Katrina revealed to the wider world understandably exercised Ignatieff:

> The most terrible price of Katrina . . . was not the destruction of lives and property, terrible though this was. The worst of it was the damage done to the ties that bind Americans together. . . . The future of confidence in American government will depend not on the leaders who failed their trust but on the foot- soldiers who did not. . . . Millions of acts of common decency and bureaucratic courage will be necessary before all Americans, and not just the storm victims, feel that they live, once again, in a political community and not in a savage and lawless swamp.[14]

Significantly, what vexed Ignatieff and commentators like him is the violence that images of racial disparity revealed by Hurricane Katrina's aftermath had done to faith in Myrdal's American Creed (that is, the idea of the nation as a "political community") or the weakening of public trust in, as well as the cultural and affective underpinnings of, U.S. citizenship as a space of equal and universal social protection. In contrast to Rice, he acknowledged the contemporary (rather than atavistic) cultural force of antiblack racism as one of the sources of this violation. It is important to notice, however, that this recognition in the quoted passage is quickly overwhelmed by, and slides almost imperceptibly into, a very different type of cultural investment in the restorative potentialities of military humanism: a martial vision of "citizen-soldiers," sent into an abject space, to "once again" raise a civilization from a "savage, lawless swamp."

If one reads "Iraq" in place of "Katrina," Baghdad and New Orleans suddenly blur in a zone of indistinction. War is still the answer, but the racialized cast of the war at home cannot be hidden from view. Once again, Kanye West was even closer to the mark in his now infamous, unscripted intervention:

> I hate the way they portray us in the media. If you see a black family, it says, "They're looting." You see a white family, it says, "They're looking for food."

> And, you know it's been five days . . . with the way America is set up to help the poor, the black people, the less well-off, as slow as possible. . . . We already realize a lot of people that could help are at war right now, fighting another way. And they've given *them* permission to go down there and shoot *us*![15]

In the context of New Orleans, an extant national narrative of racial progress, common citizenship, and militarized foreign policy turned on itself like a snake eating its own tail. From all-too-familiar corruption and cronyism, including half-billion dollar, no-bid contracts awarded by the U.S. Navy to Halliburton subsidiary Kellogg, Brown and Root (KBR) in the immediate aftermath of the storm to the indiscriminate violence perpetrated by mercenaries from the Blackwater corporation deployed by the Department of Homeland Security to secure New Orleans' higher ground against predation from below to plans to permanently redzone (i.e., redline) the city's new swamplands in order to make New Orleans safer, smaller, and whiter—what Naomi Klein has called "disaster capitalism"—consistently brings home unpleasant comparisons with the theater of war. What few commentators fully observe is that the social contexts of racial(izing) division at home and civil(izing) warfare overseas do not only exist as uncanny parallel universes, they are in important respects aspects of the same economic, cultural, and political logic.[16]

In light of this discussion, it is worth meditating on how compulsively celebrations of overcoming or "getting beyond" race are tied to a reinscription of the continuously threatening, menacing, and violent potency of "racial" division. Both Ignatieff and Gaddis, for example, fuse an image of U.S. sovereignty as a sphere of biopolitical regulation and self-definition ("the DNA in our minds") with an image of apocalyptic or decivilizing violence, lying either just beyond or perhaps even within the civil order. In other words, the image of racial comity (those "ties that bind") are continuously constituted by and slide almost imperceptibly into a very different racialized imagery and lexicon: existential fear, anarchy, savagery, extermination, lawlessness, swamps. Lest we forget, following the Obama victory, the Associated Press reported that the "election . . . spurred hundreds of race threats, crimes."[17] Indeed, on election night, Obama himself rhapsodized the vindication of the "founding" behind bulletproof glass, implicitly linking one of the greatest moments of racial overcoming in the country's history with one of its greatest racial crimes.

African American collective existence has long manifest and negotiated the uncanny proximity of racism and war in American life. For African

Americans *participation* in the nation's wars has been understood as one of the surest routes to full citizenship, from the Civil War's famous black regiment to the frontier war's Buffalo soldiers to promised rewards for black participation in the twentieth century's world wars, best epitomized by W. E. B. Du Bois's call to "close ranks" during World War I. At the same time, black communities have just as frequently conceived warfare abroad in its intimate relationship to a persistent, ongoing, often undeclared *race war* at home. Thus, even as military service has been a means to imagine and a path to enact a movement from racial to national belonging, it has just as frequently amplified their disjuncture.

Thousands of slave men and women fled to the British side during the Revolutionary War. Indian country held promise of freedom from slavery for those who dared to cross its threshold. A century ago, black publics could hardly help but view the Philippine insurgency through the lens of domestic racial subjection; while bitter memories of the post–World War I Red scares and racial pogroms led to calls for a "double victory" against racism at home and fascism abroad during World War II. Indeed, World War II encapsulated the full range of contradictory possibilities within the race-war relation for African Americans, as race riots rocked the home front, while a heightened emphasis on cultural pluralism and modest efforts at domestic racial reform sought to highlight the difference between the world's democratic peoples and fascism.

By the 1960s, the sense of the intimate proximity of violent racial abjection, that is, "race-making" at home and war-making overseas had become integral to sophisticated black critical discourse. Radical activists such as Jack O'Dell argued that the contempt bred by familiarity with violating black life was the link that connected "Selma and Saigon." Soon, Dr. King would famously observe that the promises of the Great Society had been shot down on the battlefields of Vietnam and lament, "My own country is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today." Two decades later, when George W. Bush was "kicking the Vietnam Syndrome once and for all," rapper Ice Cube linked it to the epidemic of premature death in America's inner cities, memorably described the first Gulf War as a giant "drive-by shooting." (Kanye West's off-message remarks during Katrina relief were previously quoted.) While, most recently, the acquittal of the New York City police officers who killed an unarmed black man, Sean Bell, in a hail of gunfire last year prompted the family's minister to remark, "Here it's just like Iraq, we don't have any protection."

In these examples, racialized existence itself comes to be viewed as indis-

tinct from a warlike relation. They illuminate, I believe, in a concrete and compelling manner Foucault's famous inversion of Clausewitz's maxim: "War is politics by other means." Foucault suggests that modern politics itself operates under the logic and norm of war. Thus, he writes:

> While it is true that political power puts an end to war and establishes or attempts to establish the reign of peace in civil society, it certainly does not do so in order to suspend the effects of power or to neutralize the disequilibrium revealed by the last battle of war. According to this hypothesis, the role of political power is perpetually to use a sort of silent war to re-inscribe that relationship of force, and to re-inscribe it in institutions, economic inequalities, language, and even the bodies of individuals. What is at work beneath political power is essentially and above all a warlike relation.[18]

Foucault associates the development of the modern concept of race with the idea of warfare that constitutes a traumatic division within a population that comes to share a single sphere of political representation. We might say that race becomes the "name" for manifestations of divided collective experience that are, as he puts it, "anchored in a certain relationship of force that was established in and through war at a given moment that can be historically specified." At the same time, rather than tracking the concrete historical permutations of modern racial orders, Foucault suggests that by the late nineteenth century, "race war" had been absorbed by state regimes of biopolitical regulation, through which a military or warlike relationship is transformed into a biological, or quasi-biological, one. At this point, he writes that "the enemies who have to be done away with are not adversaries in the political sense of the term; they are threats, either external or internal, to the population and for the population." Biopolitics, in his account, functions along a continuum of managing social risks, birth and death, public health, criminality, and so forth, in the interests of ensuring life. Racism, in this account, only "breaks out" at the moment it becomes necessary for the state to kill in order to preserve life. Racism alone, Foucault writes, justifies the "murderous function of the State." It is "the mechanism that allows biopower to work."[19]

It has been commonplace to observe that racism and xenophobia are artifacts of war—integral to demonizing adversaries or enemies to justify killing them—a process that frequently draws from a historical reservoir of racist stereotypes and habits of thought. Many accounts of U.S. war-making emphasize the specific historical dimensions of this process in which an older racist vernacular is cut and mixed, transferred from one theater of war to an-

other or "exported" and "re-imported" across domestic and foreign terrains—from promising Filipino "gu-gus" the "home treatment" that was meted out to "colored peoples" inside the United States to the indistinction of the Japanese as an "enemy race" at home and abroad during World War II that underwrote internment at home and exterminist nuclear warfare in the Pacific Theater to descriptions of Vietnam as "Indian country" to Orientalist generalizations about the "Arab mind" or "Muslim rage" that have provided so many intellectual prerequisites for the new "long war" on "terror."

On the one hand, such accounts tend to see racism as something that is almost natural and inevitable (as in the idea that war requires dehumanization) and, at the same time, as something contingent or extreme, a means of justifying wars that are actually fought for more important and ultimately for more rational or pragmatic reasons. Thus, while I find much that is fascinating about Foucault's account of biopower, in the end, his account of modern racism remains wedded to this rather conventional functionalist *separation* of racism and war. This is perhaps because, with the exception of his discussion of National Socialism, he fails consider the actual scene and spaces of racial and colonial violence and their major permutations within twentieth-century war-making. Foucault's fixation on National Socialism as the apotheosis of "race war," moreover, subtly recapitulates the founding gesture of the post–World War II era in which the idea of "race war" marks the absolute boundaries of political rationality and the antithesis of the practice of liberal-democratic society, rather than its most enduring open secret.

III. FROM RACE WAR TO THE "WAR ON TERROR": A BRIEF AND TENTATIVE HISTORY

At this point, it might be fruitful to consider one of the earliest elaborations of the figure of "race war" in U.S. political culture: Jefferson's claim that the "deep rooted prejudices entertained by the whites: ten thousand recollections, by the blacks, of the injuries they have sustained" would eventually lead to a war of "extermination of one or the other race."[20] Race war in Jefferson's account is explicitly imagined as civil war—a recurring trauma associated with a divided collective experience that continually threatens an otherwise regulated civil life. In this sense it is also something that operates at the boundary and limit of sovereign power as a space of political representation and self-regulation, requiring the development of a separate security regime based on disciplinary administration, surveillance of populations, and control of borders. Indeed, even as he lamented the Indian removals for which he was

responsible, Andrew Jackson, described it as an inevitable process that operated beyond the reach of any human laws (much as today's "terrorists" and "enemy combatants" are imagined and constructed by the United States as the perpetrators of a global civil war and who therefore operate and exist outside the laws of war).

The point is that the wars of conquest and subjugation that founded the U.S. republic were elaborated contemporaneously with figures of human incommensurability that would only gradually be grouped under increasingly dense rubrics of race. Before it becomes a figure for science and biopolitical regulation, racial difference is largely conceptualized as a domain of recurrent and continuous warfare. As Paul Kramer notes in his important account of the Philippine-American War as a "race war," this was true even at a moment in which racial figures and frameworks were readily available for "export" into foreign terrains of U.S. military intervention. What Kramer's careful analysis shows is how state violence was advocated and expanded less in relation to the presence of a preexisting stable order of racial meanings than on the grounds that the Philippines was an irrevocably fractured, divided, nonsovereign space and thus always *already* a zone of ineluctable violence. As the antithesis of civil order, Philippine space was in need of vigilant intervention, surveillance, and regulation.[21]

War, in sum, is an exemplary *practice* of "race-making." Yet, an interesting question that remains embedded and thus far unexplained is how wars come to carry, transfer, and reconstitute historical inventories of racial meanings and racializing practices fashioned in other domains, including prior wars. As Amy Kaplan observes with respect to the Philippines, U.S. wars have a way of continuing the wars that preceded them. It is thus perhaps not surprising that a putatively "founding" logic of frontier violence is often the most usable of usable pasts. In an influential account of the cultural and intellectual traditions informing the making of U.S. foreign policy, Walter Russell Mead, for example, denominates Jacksonianism as the most influential strand of all. Less a set of conceptual arguments than an arena of popular affect and communal feeling, Jacksonianism, according to Mead, crystallizes those moments when U.S. nationality and citizenship have been mobilized not as a shared set of political traditions but rather as a form of imagined kinship. Mead argues that Jacksonian dispositions, forged in the context of frontier warfare, have been generalized over time into a set of cultural codes around honor, revenge, communal self-protection, and rough justice that now have wide currency among U.S. publics.

While he vaguely acknowledges their white-supremacist origins, Mead

nevertheless believes that Jacksonian sensibilities are now widely available and widely shared within U.S. political culture, particularly as formerly suspect minorities have learned and mastered the codes through demonstrations of martial prowess and military service. His account in this sense relies on a tacit racial bargain: Indian removal was a tragic, inevitable part of the civilizing process without any contemporary political effects, meanings, or implications, while racial slavery was a wrong that has been righted.[22] I would suggest, however, that Mead's use of Jacksonianism as threshold figure for those moments in which U.S. foreign relations become warlike actually reveals more than he supposes. Above all, Mead overlooks what actually constituted the significance of the Jacksonian synthesis in the first place: it articulated the regional nationalisms of the U.S. South and West—slave ownership and frontier expansion—into a single national complex.

As Michael Rogin observed years ago: Jacksonianism represented perhaps the first majority "Southern strategy" in U.S. political history, as it sought to emphasize the interests that the South shared with the rest of the country. This meant minimizing the importance of slavery while nationalizing expansion as an enlargement of the area of freedom. Although the Jacksonian synthesis forestalled and deepened the conflict over slavery, it also provided a quasi-spiritual model for national rebirth in the fact of the race and class conflicts of U.S. capitalist development: "regeneration in Western violence."[23] Given this context, it is fascinating to consider John Gaddis's account of the deeper historical traditions that he suggests inform contemporary U.S. national security doctrines:

> The United States had vast borders to defend, but only limited means with which to defend them. . . . There were, as well what we would call "non-state actors"—native Americans, pirates, marauders and other free agents—ready to raid lightly defended positions along an advancing frontier. . . . An expanding "civilization" spread out along an insecure frontier had the right of preemption. . . . In responding to the horrors that took place on September 11th, 2001 . . . the Bush administration, whether intentionally or not, has been drawing upon [this] set of traditions.[24]

Racial nationalism, I would argue, forged in wars of removal and expansion, remains the term that best defines the Jacksonian articulation of culture, kinship, and nationality within an ideology of American freedom. To be more precise, we might identify the decisive contribution of the Jacksonian (foreign policy) tradition to the reproduction of the distinctively "American"

(fictive) ethnicity and governmentality that furthers the development of the United States as a racial state, that is, the transference of culturally and biologically derived conceptions of kinship onto the empowering abstractions of nationality, and the concomitant accrual of governmental powers to monopolize distribution, recognition, and violence in the development of separate and unequal populations within a single space of political representation.

Undoubtedly, there is a risk of theoretical abstraction here, as well as of assuming sweeping continuities across time. To address this we might begin by considering how the fusing of the regional nationalisms of the South and West was tied to regional accumulation strategies and to the development of a specific *variety* of U.S. capitalism that Jan Nederveen Pieterse recently termed "Dixie capitalism." Obscured by the high-sounding, globally influential neoliberalism of Chicago school economics and the Washington consensus is the fact that the low taxes, low wages, low services "regime envisioned by free market advocates" was actually forged in the U.S. South (and West) in the aftermath of Reconstruction. A pioneer of carceral solutions to social inequality, the South not only resisted trade unions and the expansion of infrastructures of social protection throughout the twentieth century, it also literally and conceptually illuminated the pathways for capital's race to the bottom that began in the United States in the 1970s. Although the Sunbelt was ostensibly modernized under the auspices of the post–World War II defense boom, rather than transforming its political economy, this process instead added to its regional political and economic weight, forging its permanent symbiosis with an emerging military-industrial-prison complex.

Long a bastion of hostility to the forms of racial liberalism nested within New Deal liberalism, "the Southern model" not only outlasted the civil rights movement, its preponderant values were also carried throughout the country by what historian James Gregory has described as the other great internal migration of the mid-twentieth century, that of white Southerners to the West and Midwest that helped to fashion the cultural and electoral base of the modern conservative movement.[25] A complex matter, beyond what I have room to discuss here, is the role that the expansion of a Southern-derived white Protestant evangelical religion has played as a carrier of racial fears, imageries, and practices that were simultaneously being discredited by the black freedom movement. Too succinctly, one might observe a competition between two versions of activist Christianity, one challenging the durability of racial animus within the secular and materialist time of slavery and colonization by way of a patient counterhegemonic practice, and the other renewing forms of racial and quasi-racial identity within ethnonationalist frameworks of messi-

anic time, chosen peoples, and holy empires.

In light of this discussion, consider the following question: What if the "damage" that the *racial* does to the *civil*—those ties of fealty to creed and country that "bind Americans together"—is also an irreducible part of what has cemented those ties in the first place? It is an unfortunate aspect of U.S. political and intellectual culture, but it seems we are forced to keep remembering that the vaunted freedoms of formal citizenship in the United States are supplemented by a powerful matrix of ethnoclass and ethnoracial association and ascription as a means of allocating benefits and deficits of material distribution, symbolic recognition, and state violence. This creates a constitutive and insoluble set of problems as to where the boundaries of nation-state protection actually lie. Within state borders, legal citizenship provides little assurance, let alone guarantees, if the everyday life of cultural citizenship is based less on shared patriotic feeling or the notion of a community of common interests than on one or another form of imagined kinship. Meanwhile, beyond state borders, the ability to reliably distinguish friend and enemy, peaceful coexistence from existential threat, is always potentially impaired by a threshold of trust—and thus a sense of menace—so high that no framework of treaty obligations, international agreements, or rational efforts to balance opposing interests and concerns could possibly hope to contain it.

It might be helpful to think of this issue in concrete terms, from the other side and from the outside, as well. For the past several years, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has called for the closing of the Camp Delta prison complex at Guantanamo Bay on the grounds that the *explicitly sanctioned* U.S. interrogation practices—for example, hooding, shackling, force-feeding, simulated suffocation, and sensory deprivation, including forcing prisoners to stare into intense light and wear earphones blasting loud music—"must be assessed as amounting to torture" and do not accede to the standards of "most civilized nations." The Bush administration's response was a succinct and revealing non sequitur: "The detainees are being treated humanely. Remember these are terrorists." "Remember these are terrorists" is a vernacular—one might say Jacksonian—code for a sovereign state of exception, within which "the American people" are assumed to be appropriately and transparently hailed. (And, in the absence of significant popular outcry against torture, who can say that they haven't been so?) Its precise and intended effect is to draw a boundary between the humane, indeed the human, that is, "we, the people," and the always already elastic category "terrorist," containing someone who may *in abstracto* be a person

but who has permanently forfeited the "right to have rights," that is the right to any meaningful civil protection.

Now consider the all-too-literal prisoner's dilemma faced by racialized minorities in the United States in the aftermath of 9/11. If the new racial profiling of brown-skinned "Muslim-looking" Arab and South Asian men temporarily displaced African Americans as the primary suspect population of urban policing (in certain localities), it also gave new state sanction and legitimacy to policing tactics that for the first time were being actively challenged and discredited. More disturbing are the well-documented links between systematic torture and brutality within the vast domestic U.S. prison complex—where African Americans are the majority of the incarcerated—and the degree to which these have been reproduced, from the methodology, ethos, right down to the actual personnel, guards, administrators, and so forth in Iraq, Afghanistan, Guantanamo, and the expanding complex of U.S.-run prisons overseas. In other words, while the "terrorist" like the "criminal" may theoretically be of any "race" or "ethnicity," we must not only avow the fact that racial, religious, ethnic, and national origin discrimination remain central to making determinations about who is and who is not one but also, more importantly, that the creation of categories of persons without rights is enlivened by the narratives and practices of specifically U.S. traditions of racial warfare.[26]

What is the relationship between war-making and "race-making," to recall Tom Holt's phrase? What if the current war is not merely fueled by a preexisting racial or quasi-racial animus, what if it is also the means by which such animus is modified and reproduced? Finally, what if this is not only an unintended effect but an aspect of its all-too-human motivation? As Donald Rumsfeld stated in the last version of the National Defense Strategy of the United States: "Our strength as a nation state will continue to be challenged by those who employ a strategy of the weak using international fora, judicial processes and terrorism."[27] The antitheses and equivalences that are drawn here are quite alarming. They suggest that the George W. Bush era has represented not merely a return to an older colonial modeling of power but the consolidation and institutionalization of a very particular political reaction against *the forms of politicization* represented by the unfinished struggles for decolonization and civil rights—struggles, which despite differences in scope and ideology, raised unresolved questions, questions that arguably could not be resolved within the Keynesian-Westphalian framework of Euro-American sovereignty, such as who has "the right to have rights" and who is owed justice, which is to say in the last instance, who is a legitimate *political*

subject of contestation and adjudication around the fundamental questions of material distribution and cultural respect?

CONCLUSION: BEYOND RACE (AND) WAR

Returning to the epigraph from Condoleezza Rice with which I began this article, it is important to stress that the history of the black freedom movement raises specific problems of representation, narration, and memory. The labor of legions of scholars over the past three decades has started to crystallize a remarkably comprehensive picture of the long history, local people, indigenous organizing traditions, behind the scenes activism, international dimensions, and principled and often radical demands that made up the modern black freedom movement.[28] This body of work, however, does not correlate well with public knowledge and perception in the United States. The latter, for the most part, puts this movement under erasure by letting one part or phase—the legal codification of civil rights—stand in for the whole. Fixed on a static image of a singular leader, Martin Luther King Jr., frozen in time beside the Lincoln Memorial, it tends to believe that racial division and hierarchy have given way to patriotic acceptance and universal strivings for affluence across the color line. It has forgotten or ignored even King's ominous, uncannily relevant warnings made at the end of his life about "a deeper malady . . . the giant triplets of racism, extreme materialism and militarism" afflicting a nation engaged in a costly, immoral war and characterized by persistent poverty, inequality, and black spatial confinement in the nation's ghettos and prisons.[29]

King's assassination preempted determined efforts to destroy his reputation and to isolate him politically. His outspoken opposition to U.S. foreign policy in the late 1960s and his controversial decision to enlist the moral authority of the civil rights movement against its course was viewed as a wholesale betrayal by the Johnson administration and as vindication of the longstanding whisper and wire-tapping campaign against him from within the countersubversive agencies of the federal state.[30] By "breaking his silence" on Vietnam, King also broke a painstakingly calibrated compact that linked domestic advancements against racial inequality with accession to cold war militarization and global anti-Communism, (a pact that was sealed in the 1950s with the public silencing of an earlier generation's black luminaries, Paul Robeson and W. E. B. Du Bois). Even as King illuminated a relatively unbroken tradition of visionary black leadership in world affairs from across the political spectrum, influential sources of public opinion began to lay siege

to his credibility and his relevance. One year to the day of his coming out publicly against the war (an uncanny timing that still disturbs) King was dead.

King rejected the notion that the legal achievement of civil rights had inaugurated an era of normal politics for the racially excluded inside the United States, just as he challenged the belief that the *pax Americana* was a deliverer of a just and legitimate developmental framework for previously colonized peoples. Specifically, King's commitment to nonviolence led him to recognize the intertwining of a history of racial self-definition (i.e., white supremacy) and militarization in constituting the borders of established membership in the United States as a political community. Taking this stand surely did not make King a Communist (as FBI director J. Edgar Hoover asserted), but it did align him with a black intellectual tradition that conceptualized the global production of racialized disparity in terms of Euro-American genealogies of African slavery, colonial rule, class apartheid, and imperial statecraft. This approach refused to permit incremental racial integration within the United States to serve as an alibi for policies that continued to diverge from emergent postcolonial and postimperialist norms of world behavior. It presciently warned, moreover, of persistent, spiraling, and unpredictable violence as long as material deprivation and assaults on human dignity continued to assign the majority of the world's poor and powerless to sociocultural and spatial zones where the frayed, tattered ends of the social contract received the unforgiving cut of racialized governance.

As his preeminent chronicler writes, "American public discourse broadly denied King the standing to be heard on Vietnam."[31] Although intervening years have brought profound social change at local, national, and global scales, the disavowal that presaged King's death continues to constellate the present. In martyrdom, King has become a celebrated figure in a nation-state that ostentatiously declares an end to its historic devaluation of black life and trumpets benign uses of its military power. Unmistakable progress in black civic inclusion and political representation—culminating in the historic election of Barack Obama to the presidency—inspires a hopeful sense that we have entered a new era of racial comity *as well as* a new era of U.S. foreign policy. At the same time, wars on drugs and terror, waged disproportionately (and with disproportion) against black and brown populations, have expanded and filled U.S. prisons and extended their global reach. It is worth recalling that the rioting and rebellions of the black urban poor across hundreds of U.S. cities that followed King's assassination demanded the largest domestic mobilization of federal troops since the Civil War. Met with Southern elec-

toral strategy, antiurban public policy, law-and-order rhetoric, and street-level lockdown, the disrepair of the racial strife of the early *post*–civil rights period is still manifest in our own time. While the broad failure to reckon the destructive consequences and absorb the criminal irresponsibility of U.S. intervention in Vietnam still underwrites widespread belief in militarized solutions to foreign conflicts with wars in Iraq and Afghanistan approaching a decade.

Those who hope to change the political course of the United States do so as heirs to this ambiguous and bifurcated political inheritance. The remarkable gains of the civil rights era have constituted new thresholds of tolerance and inclusiveness within U.S. political culture. Yet, under the cover of such tolerance, it becomes increasingly difficult to connect the dots between the explicit exclusions and injustice of the past that persist in the social structures and institutions of the present. The legal demise of white supremacy and its seeming political and cultural decline as well (exemplified by the 2008 presidential election) inspires new investments in the U.S. nation-state as a horizon of social equality and just distribution. At the same time, with the sense of innocence and righteousness restored, robust reassertion of U.S. militarism still consigns radical visions demanding that we cut the knot binding the public welfare to the warfare state to the margins of U.S. political life.

At the end of his life Malcolm X said that all he was really doing was "helping correct America's human problem." These are words to ponder. At this point, it should be clear that the black freedom movement, too narrowly known today as the civil rights movement, is not the analogue but the near exact counterpoint to the ethos and tradition that has most recently been animating U.S. foreign policy. As Jesse Jackson remarked over a quarter century ago, despite the official power of cold war civil rights discourse, the actual cold war was characterized by continuous and ongoing efforts by the state to "isolate and challenge . . . the audacity of black involvement in foreign affairs."[32] When compared to figures like Claudia Jones, Paul Robeson, W. E. B. Du Bois, Martin Luther King Jr., and Jackson himself—all of whom felt the sting of public sanction and opprobrium—we can observe how contemporary black officials like Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice exist in a precisely inverse relationship to a longstanding tradition of black dissidence in foreign affairs. As for President Obama, it remains to be seen.

Nor it is necessary to speak only in terms of political dissidence. The context of Jackson's observation was the resignation of Andrew Young from his post as permanent U.S. representative to the United Nations in 1979. The UN

ambassadorship during Young's tenure in the Carter administration was a cabinet-level appointment, which gave Young coequal status with Cyrus Vance, the secretary of state, and Zbigniew Brzezinski, the national security advisor. Indeed, *this* was arguably the high-water mark of civil rights movement influence on official U.S. foreign policy, and the last time that an African American held such a lofty position within a U.S. presidential administration. Young used his offices vocally and courted controversy, lauding the "stabilizing" effects of Cuban troops in Angola, hearkening back to his and King's participation in antiwar marches to acknowledge new UN membership of a unified Vietnam, attacking white minority rule in Rhodesia and South Africa, and criticizing Israeli settlements in the occupied territories as a violation of international law and obstacle to future peace in the region.[33]

You may recall that Young resigned from his position in the face of public fury over his decision to meet privately with the UN representative of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) in contravention of the official U.S. "no talk" policy. Young (with tacit sanction from Carter) believed that if the United States was to play the role of honest broker in the Middle East, it had no choice but to avow an independent relationship with the legitimate political representative of the Palestinian people. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, this position was endorsed by 66 percent of Americans at that time. Formerly director of voter registration for SCLC, and then director of international affairs for the Rainbow/PUSH Coalition, Jack O'Dell had already reported to Young on the visit of a delegation of Arab Americans and African Americans he took to Lebanon to meet with the PLO earlier that summer. Upon Young's resignation, two high-profile black delegations, one led by Jesse Jackson and the other by Joseph Lowery, flew directly to Lebanon to meet with both PLO representatives and Israeli peace groups. Lowery summed up the emerging African American viewpoint: the crux of the Middle East crisis was the legacy of territorial dispossession, political exclusion, and nonrecognition—or the politicide—of the Palestinian people. Their modest conclusions: recognition of Israel within pre-1967 borders and a Palestinian homeland constructed on the principle that Palestinian representatives "must have a role in the map drawing."

These efforts, of course, resulted in no change in official U.S. policy. Moreover, the substantive foreign policy questions were quickly monopolized by discussions of black-Jewish tensions at home and the fatal fracturing of the old U.S. civil rights coalition. It is my belief that this was the last period of globally influential, independent, black-citizen diplomacy and civil rights foreign policy initiative. It is also significant that, a quarter century

later, we find ourselves in almost an identical, and in fact much worse, situation with respect to Israel-Palestine and Middle East peace. In the press conference announcing his resignation, Young explained why he pursued the course of action he did at such risk to his career:

> I have tried to interpret to our country some of the mood of the rest of the world. Unfortunately, but by birth, I come from the ranks of those who have known and identified with some level of oppression in the world, and by choice, I continue to identify with what I would say in biblical terms would be the least of my brothers.

With simplicity, humility, and even some old-time religion *writ small*, these words reflect a different—one is tempted to say postnationalist—foreign policy project and ethos, one that rejects both the shallow instrumentalism of official expressions of antiracism as well as the chauvinist unilateralism of settler-immigrant nationalism. Rooted in the other—dissenting—U.S. tradition and experience, it just may be indispensable to our efforts to ensure that the twenty-first century does not become another century of (racism and) war.

NOTES

[1] "Rice, in Alabama, Draws Parallels for Democracy Everywhere," *New York Times*, October 22, 2005, A4.

[2] Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

[3] Kanye West's September 2, 2005, NBC telethon appearance is quoted in Michael Eric Dyson, *Come of High Water: Hurricane Katrina and the Color of Disaster* (New York: Basic, 2006), 26–27.

[4] Rice's response to the post-Katrina charges of racism was telling. The U.S. "is about 100 percent ahead of anyplace else in the world in issues of race. . . . And I say that absolutely, fundamentally," she said. "You go to any other meeting around the world and show me the kind of diversity that you see in America's Cabinet, in America's foreign service, in America's business community, in America's journalistic community. . . . Show me that kind of diversity anyplace else in the world, and I'm prepared to be lectured about race." "Rice: Disaster shows 'ugly way' race, poverty collide," CNN.com, Tuesday, September 13, 2005. The new U.S. Supreme Court codifications of affirmative action rules proceed along the same lines; the policy is preserved insofar as it promotes the development of a multiracial elite.

[5] I borrow this phrase from Sharad Chari, "Song of Bush or Son of God: Politics and the Religious Subaltern in the United States, from Elsewhere," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 105, no. 1 (Winter 2006): 39.

[6] For Rice, the "collision of race and poverty" in New Orleans is "a vestige of particularly the Old South," as if contemporary racial discrimination is "merely the artifact discredited regional political economy." Also see Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights and Foreign Affairs, 1945–1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 7.

[7] Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy*

(Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004).

[8] Etienne Balibar, "The Nation Form," Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (London: Verso, 1991), 41.

[9] See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/11/04/obama-victory-speech_n_141194.html (accessed January 9, 2009).

[10] U.S. veterans' groups opposed and succeeded in canceling an exhibit at the U.S. national museum on the fiftieth anniversary of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that included debates about the motivations, military necessity, and moral legitimacy of the atomic bombings and included photographs of Japanese victims.

[11] Michael Ignatieff, "The Burden," *New York Times Magazine*, January 5, 2003, 41.

[12] "9/11 Helped Aftermath Helped Bridge the Racial Divide, New Yorkers say, Gingerly," *New York Times*, October 25, 2001, A25.

[13] John Lewis Gaddis, *Surprise, Security and the American Experience* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 9. Talib Kweli, "Around My Way," 2001 http://www.azlyrics.com/lyrics/talibkweli/aroundmyway.html (accessed March 2008).

[14] Michael Ignatieff, "The Broken Contract," *New York Times Magazine*, September 25, 2005.

[15] Quoted in Dyson, *Come of High Water*, 27 (emphasis added).

[16] Jeremy Scahill and Daniella Crespo, "Blackwater Mercenaries Deploy in New Orleans," Saturday, September 10, 2005, www.truthout.org. Klein cited in Dyson, *Come of High Water*, 67. Also see, Jan Nedervene Pieterse, *Empire or Globalization?* (New York: Routledge, 2004).

[17] http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/11/16/race-crimes-around-countr_n_144160.html (accessed November 16, 2008).

[18] Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France, 1975–1976* (New York: Picador, 2003), 14–15.

[19] "What in fact is racism? It is primarily a way of introducing a break into the domain of life that is under power's control: the break between what must live and what must die. . . . It is in short a way of establishing a biological-type caesura within a population that appears to be a biological domain. . . . At the end of the 19th-century, we have then a new racism modeled on war. It was, I think required because a bio-power that wished to wage war had to articulate the will to destroy the adversary with the risk that it might kill those whose lives it had, by definition to protect manage and multiply. The same could be said of criminality . . . and various *anomalies.*" Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 255–58. I am also heavily indebted to Lee Medevoi for this discussion. See Medevoi, "Global Society Must Be Defended: Biopolitics without Boundaries," *Social Text* 2007 25, no. 2 (1991): 53–79.

[20] Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1785; New York: Penguin, 1999).

[21] Paul Kramer, *The Blood of Government* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

[22] Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How it Changed the World* (New York: Rutledge, 2002).

[23] Michael Rogin, *Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975), 312.

[24] Gaddis, *Surprise, Security and the American Experience*, 78.

[25] The "rhetoric of freedom" that underlined Jackson's "victories in the Creek Wars and the Battle of Orleans" effectively denied that "the United States was a slave country," even as the defenders of the institution of slavery, by "blood, interest and sentiment . . . marched together with Jacksonian nationalism." Adam Rothman, *Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 220, 222.

[26] Robert Perkinson, "Some U.S. Prisons as Bad as Iraq," *Straits Times* interactive, May 27,

2004, http://www.november.org/stayinfo/breaking2/STIAsia.html (accessed February, 20, 2006). Hazel Trice Edney, "Experts Say U.S. Prisoners Are Subjected to Iraqi-Style Abuse," Tuesday, June 8, 2004, *Wilmington Journal* (North Carolina). Deborah Davies, "Torture Inc., America's Brutal Prisons," (based on BBC Channel 4 investigation), http://www.information-clearinghouse.info/article8451.htm (accessed February 20, 2006). For example, John Armstrong, appointed as the assistant director of operations for U.S. prisons in Iraq, resigned from his previous post as Virginia prisons' supervisor when he was named in two wrongful-death lawsuits at one of Virginia's supermax prisons. Lane McCotter, former director of the notoriously brutal Texas prison system, was hired to set up operations at Abu Ghraib in May 2003. Before that, McCotter led Utah's corrections department, but was forced to resign after the death of a schizophrenic inmate who had been stripped naked and strapped to a restraining chair for sixteen hours. Sgt. Ivan Frederick, the man directly in charge of the infamous Abu Ghraib "hard site," previously worked as a Virginia corrections officer, while Charles Graner, the most infamous of the Abu Ghraib torturers, had been a Pennsylvania prison guard since 1996.

[27] "U.S. Department of Defense New Briefing with Secretary Rumsfeld and Adm. Giambastiani," Feb. 1, 2006. http://www.defenselink.mil.transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=905. Accessed November 2008. Also see Richard Norton-Taylor and Suzanne Goldenberg, "Judge's Anger at U.S. Torture," *Guardian Unlimited*, February 17, 2006. Here, I am paraphrasing Carl Schmitt and Hannah Arendt to think through the relationship between racism, the state of exception, and what Arendt called "the death of the juridical person in man." Also see, Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer*: *Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

[28] Just a brief sampling of a vast scholarly terrain: Charles Payne, *I've Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007); John Dittmer, *Local People: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Mississippi* (Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995); Timothy Tyson, *Radio Free Dixie: Robert F. Williams and the Roots of Black Power* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Penny Von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997); Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004); Jean Theoharis and Komozi Woodard, *Freedom North: Black Freedom Struggles outside the South* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Martha Biondi, *To Stand and Fight: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Postwar New York City* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006); Brenda Gayle Plummer, *A Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Robert O. Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

[29] Martin Luther King Jr., "A Testament of Hope (1968)," reprinted in James Melvin Washington, ed., *Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, (New York: HarperOne, 1990).

[30] Taylor Branch, *At Canaan's Edge: America in the King Years, 1965–1968*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007).

[31] Taylor Branch, *At Canaan's Edge*, 596.

[32] Jesse Jackson, "The Challenge to live in One World," (Afro-Americans Stand Up for Peace in the Middle East, Palestine Human Rights Campaign: Washington, DC, 1980), 13.

[33] At this point in 1979 there were approximately forty thousand Jewish settlers in permanent West Bank settlements, or approximately one tenth the number that are now there today. Lee Clement, ed., *Andrew Young at the United Nations*, (Salisbury, NC: Documentary Publications, 1978).