The Cold War in a Global Frame:
Shape-shifting "Race" and the U.S. Encounter with European and Japanese Colonialism

Penny Von Eschen

I begin this essay in a very basic way by explicitly asking what a global approach to history can bring to a discussion of U.S. hegemonic projects in Asia. In the simplest sense, I argue that the nature of U.S. hegemonic projects has been obscured by the dominance of regional as well as national frames, suggesting that in a study of the Cold War, a global lens will quickly bring the centrality of U.S. responses to crises in colonialism to the fore. Drawing on the rich scholarship on U.S. hegemonic projects throughout Asia, the Pacific Islands, and Africa, I suggest that focusing on the final days and aftermath of European and Japanese colonialism is critical to understanding early (and simultaneous) U.S. Cold War responses across the Pacific and Atlantic; as well as to grasping the broadest dimensions of the Cold War in Asia. To appreciate the centrality of colonialism in the shaping of the Cold War in Asia and globally, one must reject a U.S.-Soviet centered account of the outbreak of new hostilities in 1947. Instead, one must begin with the accelerated challenges to colonialism during WWII and their fundamental implications for the Cold War. Against readings of a unique "American Century," I argue that U.S. attempts, however successful or unsuccessful, to reestablish approximate forms of older colonial relations are best read in relation to European intransigence in the face of anti-colonial challenges. I begin therefore, not in Manchuria or Korea, where this essay shall end, but in the seemingly far-flung post-war camps of Senegal.

In Ousmane Sembéne's 1987 film *Camp de Thiaroye* (Thierno Faty Sow shared director and screenwriter credit), Senegalese Sergeant-Major Diatta, who has fought with the 1st Free French Army against the Italians and Germans, first in the Libyan desert into Tripoli, and then in the liberation of Paris, sits in his room at Camp de Thiaroye, playing recordings of jazz saxophonist Charlie Parker. The camp, located in Senegal, is a staging ground for the demobilization of African colonial troops who have disembarked in Dakar at the conclusion of their service with French forces. Many are arriving from recently liberated German Prisoner of War camps. But Camp Thiaroye itself is little better than a P.O.W. camp and fuels Diatta's growing disillusionment with French colonial racism. The solace he finds in jazz, and the audaciously inventive horn of Parker, heard through

recordings acquired during the war, suggests the new knowledge presented through contact, with black American soldiers. The film also suggests that new black diasporic sensibilities had emerged from such wartime contacts. Jazz, as well as the American-accented English that Diatta has learned during the war, symbolize the alternative black subjectivities that inform his rebellion against French colonial authority. As Diatta grapples with the recalcitrant French empire, he learns of a 1942 massacre in his village carried out by French authorities, but now disavowed by his superior officer as having occurred under the Vichy regime.

In this essay, I consider Sembéne's film as a point of departure to offer a cautionary tale about the importance of World War II as a catalyst for U.S. civil rights struggles and global challenges to racial hierarchies. At first glance, there is much in the film to support conventional views that the war was a catalyst for the expansion of civil rights and global anticolonial movements. After all, as dramatized in *Camp de Thiaroye*, Allied claims to support democracy while denying civil and political rights to people of African descent sharpened colonial peoples' critiques of colonialism and racism. Encounters between peoples from different parts of the colonized world and between black and brown peoples in the metropoles and colonies opened new avenues for the circulation of cultural and political manifestations of rights-consciousness. Such alternative perspectives encouraged and enabled challenges to colonial and racist regimes. Nazism and the horrors of the Holocaust discredited racism, and Europe's empires faltered under the pressures of war. Colonizers faced vigorous challenges as the war created vacuums of power and posed urgent questions about who and what would fill them. The tumult and transformations of war permeated the global stage on which civil rights and anticolonial struggles would play themselves out. Surely, World War II was a powerful stimulus for global demands for freedom, an end to racial hierarchies, and self-determination.[1]

But far from a simple celebration of black diasporic ties, Sembéne's film unfolds as a tragedy and a historical critique of post-war colonialism, as Diatta's anger at the

---

[1] Parts of this essay have appeared in a modified form in Kevin M. Kruse and Stephen Tuck, eds., *Fog of War: The Second World War and Civil Rights* (New York: 2012). On African American interaction with the anti-colonial world, see Penny M. Von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism 1937–57* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997); Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Policy*, (Chapel Hill, 1996); Winston James, *Holding Aloft the Banner of Ethiopia: Caribbean Radicalism in early Twentieth-Century America* (London: Verso, 1998); James Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935–1961* (Chapel Hill, 2002); Kevin K. Gaines, *American Africans in Ghana: Black Expatriates in the Civil Rights Era* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2006).

realization that Vichy collaborators are being put in charge of the colonies leads to his demise. The story of Sergeant-Major Diatta in *Camp de Thiaroye,* suggests the shared racism of colonial authorities, whether French or German. Indeed, Sembéne draws our attention to the reinstatement of colonialism after the war, reminding us that the positive impact of World War II on global race relations co-existed with the dogged persistence of systemic racial subjugation. An early post-war critique of French imperial racism anticipated the disillusionment portrayed in Sembene's film. In his 1948 manifesto *Discourse on Colonialism*, Aimé Césaire argued that World War II emphatically did not democratize metropolitan culture. Particularly in France, but throughout the colonized world, one found a persistence of the belief in the "civilizing mission" and of rhetoric of benevolent paternalism, which sought to obscure the murderous exercise of colonial violence, such as the 1948 French massacre in Madagascar.[2]

At the war's end, Senegalese soldiers returned to broken promises. They were denied pay and pensions, and forced to endure menial to brutal working conditions. Across the Atlantic black American soldiers and civilians soon learned that not only did their wartime contributions go unappreciated, even worse was the fact that black veterans in uniform inspired violent rage rather than respect, resulting in physical assaults and lynchings in the South. Such indignities during and after the war offered bitter testimony that the war had not democratized the allied nations who claimed to have fought to save democracy from the fascists. As acknowledged in the belated, 2007 U.S. government recognition of the surviving members of the Tuskegee Airmen, black Air Force combat veterans who distinguished themselves during the war, their heroism and patriotism was no match for the endemic insults of a segregated society.

A global consideration of race, civil rights, and colonialism suggests not only a cautionary tale, but also the need to de-center the war itself. In this essay, I situate World War II and the early Cold War in the context of colonial conquest, anticolonial struggle, and attendant challenges to regimes built on racial hierarchy, arguing that such a consideration is critical if we are to understand the stakes of the war and the postwar world. The essay considers first the war and then the post-war developments through centering questions of colonialism, arguing that time-lines shift, and multiple temporalities emerge when viewed through this lens. As the U.S. emerged from the war as the dominant global power, its claim to support anti-colonial movements was belied by its backing of European

---

[2] Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, first published in France, 1955 (New York: Monthly Review, New press ed., 2001).

allies as they tried to hold onto colonial possessions. The U.S. further showed a reluctance to make a clean break from colonialism with its occupation of former Japanese colonies such as Korea and Micronesia. Rather than renouncing the colonial histories of Europe and Japan, even as officials came to disavow older legal forms of discrimination, the United States extended colonial racial hierarchies in unprecedented and unpredictable ways.

However much Nazism had discredited ideas of race, far from abandoning racial formations, the extension of U.S. power depended on the social production of new forms of race thinking as well as the unthinking "common-sense" employment of previously held assumptions. Global politics in the post-war world cannot be understood without attention to the ways in which race and racism were made and remade during and after the war. Historians have explored multiple ways in which racialized readings of the geopolitical order informed post-war interventions and conflicts – from Korea and Vietnam, to Algeria, Iran, the Congo, and Guatemala, along with efforts to garner public support and the self-justification of such policies and objectives, depended in part on tried and trued forms of racial thinking.[3] For example, even as the State Department embraced racial integration as the solution to America's Achilles Heel, the Eisenhower administration viewed Congolese Prime Minster Patrice Lumumba through the racialized optics of political immaturity and irrationality. Yet U.S. liberal internationalists efforts to "lead the free world," from assertions of "soft-power" to the hyper-extraction of mineral and other resources of the global south and widespread covert and overt military interventions also depended on and indeed produced new modes of racial formation and thinking.

The structural relationship of most formerly colonized peoples to the Fordist economy at its productive height has been an especially neglected arena in the study of the post-war Fordist economy. Thomas Holt has argued that throughout the Fordist era, struggles for civil rights revolved around access to consumption. But from a global view, vast numbers of formerly colonized peoples were locked into the under-examined extractive dimension of Fordism, with suppressed wages that severely curtailed access to consumer benefits. Indeed, Fordism is typically characterized as mass production/mass consumption, virtually ignoring the extractive process. The later part of this essay suggests

---

[3] For recent important framings of global politics through a focus on colonialism, see Heonik Kwon, *The Other Cold War* (New York, 2010); Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War* (Cambridge, 2005); Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (Oxford, 2007). See also, Pransejit Duara, "The Cold War and the Imperialism of Nation States" and Penny Von Eschen, "Locating the Transnational in the Cold War," in Richard Immerman and Petra Goode, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Cold War* (New York: 2012).

a frame for considering the remaking of race and the new social and political production of difference in the encounter of the United States with postwar independence movements, as well as in the political and military protection of the extractive nodes of the global Fordist economy on which the increasing wealth and relative equality of the west depended. It is worth noting that in discussing production of new inequalities in the wake of the war, I in no way intend to diminish or underestimate the vibrant social and political movements of that era. To the contrary, the complex dimensions of such movements are better appreciated with a fuller portrait of their milieu and challenges, as they faced emergent structures that cannot be grasped through notions of continuity vs. change.

Rethinking the Timelines of World War II and the Cold War through Colonialism

Scholarly and popular accounts typically date World War II from 1939–1945, with the beginning cited as the German invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939 and the British and French declaration of war against Germany two days later, and for the Pacific war, the Japanese attacks on China and the United States. But for many African American and colonized observers of the war, World War II had begun with the 1935 Italian invasion of Ethiopia; and the indifference of the western powers to this blatant fascist attack was an egregious act of racism.[4] Reading World War II through the longer history of colonialism – Ethiopia had successfully repulsed invading Italian armies in 1896 as part of Africans' military resistance to European colonialism – situates Italy's invasion within the colonial scramble for land touched off by the 1884–1885 European partition of Africa in Berlin, as well as the first in a wave of foreign invasions spurred by the global economic crises of the 1930s. Indeed, this colonial framework reminds us that Germany, although tacitly constrained as its southern African colonies became League of Nation mandates after World War I, was thoroughly steeped in the policy of colonialism. In *The Origins of Nazi Violence*, Enzo Traverso notes that Hitler cited colonial projects as models for the expansion of the Third Reich. In August of 1941, Hitler told a group of his officers "what India was for England, the eastern territories will be for us."[5] He believed that "if the English were to be ejected, India would waste away. Our role in the East would be analogous to that of the English in India."[6] In another declaration of the colonial nature of

---

[4] William Scott, *The Sons of Sheba's Race: African-Americans and the Italo-Ethiopian War, 1935–1941* (Indiana University Press, 1993).

[5] Enzo Traverso, *The Origins of Nazi Violence* (New York: New Press, 2003), p. 71.

[6] Ibid.

the war, Erich Koch, the Reich commissioner in the Ukraine, said that he had waged a colonial war "as among Negroes." [7] In addition to such direct comparisons to colonial conquest, Traverso argues that "deportation, dehumanization, and racial extermination as understood by Hitler," were fully modern phenomena, "firmly anchored in the history of western imperialism" and in the major trends of European history since the eighteenth century.[8] Scholars of Germany have increasingly argued that Nazi technologies of violence and genocide were developed in the laboratory of German colonialism. Historian Isabelle Hull has explored the question of what Nazi militarism learned from colonial violence. Hull works backward from World War II, analyzing the Prusso-German military from the founding of the German Empire in 1817, and focusing on such German atrocities as occurred in the Herero Uprising in Namibia on January 11, 1904, following the order of Lieutenant-General Lothar to exterminate the Herero tribe within German colonial borders.[9]

The war brought the importance of colonies to Europe into sharp relief as it fomented debates about colonialism. Winston Churchill objected to the idea that the 1942 Atlantic Charter would extend democratic freedoms to the colonies. "We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British empire." Churchill understood clearly what was at stake in the war and he insisted on distinguishing strategic and tactical war considerations – such as that of the Atlantic Charter – from their clear implications for colonial and racial subject peoples of equality, self-determination and anticolonial freedom. African American and anticolonial activists seized on President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's support for extending the freedoms of the charter to colonized peoples, and sought to exploit the split between Churchill and Roosevelt. With his inimitable sarcasm, the writer George S. Schuyler noted in his *Pittsburgh Courier* column that "Soft-hearted people may feel that these African, Asiatic, and Malaysian people should come under the provision of the Atlantic Charter. They do not stop to think how many companies would go into bankruptcy, how many aristocratic Nordic families would be reduced to working for a living, how impoverished all the missionaries, explorers, archaeologists, artists and others who live off the bounties of colonialism would be." [10] The African American political cartoonist Jay Jackson

---

[7] Ibid., p. 72.
[8] Ibid., p. 73.
[9] Isabel V. Hull, *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005).
[10] Quoted in Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, p. 27.

portrayed England as too drunk from imbibing white supremacy to see that immediate independence for colonized peoples would be the best-Allied wartime strategy.[11]

The temporality of war in the Pacific also appears differently when viewed through the lens of colonialism. Scholars of East Asia have questioned the common periodization of World War II, and especially the focus on the 1941–45 conflict, arguing, "within the Asia-Pacific zone, different peoples remember the war through different temporalities." As Arif Dirlik explains, "For the Chinese, World War II has always been first and foremost the Anti-Japanese Resistance War, with its origins in predating World War II as viewed from Europe or the United States. In China, the war "would begin at least with the 1931 Japanese invasion of northeastern China and include Japan's establishment of the puppet state of Manchukuo in 1932, as well as the beginning of full-scale hostilities in July 1937."[12] For Korea, Vietnam, the Philippines, and the Marshallese islands, the war was part of the long struggle for national liberation from colonialism (Japanese, French, and U.S.), beginning long before World War II and continuing long after its conclusion.[13]

People throughout Asian and African diasporas watched the war in the Pacific with great interest, with many arguing that the rapidity with which European and American colonies fell to the Japanese in the Pacific war, can only be explained by the unwillingness of local populations to fight to preserve colonial rule. From Burma, to French-controlled Vietnam (Indochina) and Dutch-ruled Indonesia, colonies quickly fell to the Japanese. As the *Chicago Defender* journalist John Badger succinctly put it, "colonialism is incapable of defending a territory [or] population under its control." [14] Reporting on a colonial conference in Britain at which speakers discussed the collapse of Malaya, Singapore, and Burma, the Trinidad-born, U.S.-educated, and London-based journalist George Padmore explained that native peoples either "remained passive, considering the war as a struggle between two sets of imperialism which did not concern them," or as in Burma, "joined up with the invader in the hopes of getting the land back which had been appropriated from them." [15] Reflecting a pervasive discourse on race and colonialism among African

---

[11] Ibid., p. 24.

[12] T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama, introduction to *Perilous Memories: the Asia-Pacific War(s)* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), p. 3.

[13] Arif Dirlik, "Trapped in History on the Way to Utopia: East Asia's Great War Fifty Years Later," in *Perilous Memories*, p. 320. On the Marshallese Islands, see Laurence M. Carruci, "The Source of the Force on Marshallese Cosmology," in Geoffrey White and Lamont Lindstrom, eds., *The Pacific Theater: Island Representations of World War II* (University of Hawaii Press, 1989).

[14] Quoted in Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, p. 23.

[15] Ibid.

Americans, Walter White, director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Peoples (NAACP), argued that British policy was making India as much as a push-over for the Japanese as Burma, whose long-suffering people wondered, "If we are going to be exploited, what matters if our exploiters be yellow or white?"[16]

While in India, the dominant position was the non-cooperation with Britain advocated by Mohandas Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, Subhash Chandra Bose, another leader of the Indian National Congress, took an alternative position that my enemy's enemy is my friend. Arrested eleven times by the British Raj, Bose fled India for Germany, where he hoped to gain support from Hitler to raise an army that would attack the British in India. In German P.O.W. camps, Bose recruited roughly 3,000 Indian soldiers who had signed on to the British fight against fascism but now switched their allegiance to Germany. Bose, a leftist, quickly became disillusioned when Hitler's armies invaded the Soviet Union and he suspected that the British were using him. He fled to Japan and recruited Indian POWs in Malaysia and Burma. The recent release of British government documents reveals that British officials were profoundly shocked by such widespread defections and that Bose's efforts sparked a crisis in British confidence in their ability to maintain the empire.[17]

The refusal of Indian leaders to support the British in the war against Germany without the immediate guarantee of independence was widely celebrated throughout the colonial world and the African diaspora. A 1942 survey by the *Pittsburgh Courier* of 10,000 black Americans reported that 87.8 percent supported India's insistence on self-rule as a necessary condition for support of Britain. In a stark demonstration of the anti-colonial priorities of black leftists most often assumed to be closest to the Communist Party, Paul Robeson and Max Yergan, leaders of the Council on African Affairs, directly challenged the Commintern and CPUSA position that anti-imperialism needed to be put on the back burner until fascism was defeated by organizing a 1942 "Rally for the Cause of Free India."[18] Indeed, in an era where much of popular front politics became caught up in the wartime politics of unity with the Soviet Union, the independence of anti-colonial leftists from Soviet as well as American policies remains striking.[19] The dominant views expressed

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Christopher Alan Balay and Timothy Norman Harper, *Forgotten Wars: Freedom and Revolution on Southeast Asia* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), pp. 19–23. On the release and implications of these documents, see Mike Thompson, "Hitler's Secret Army," BBC Now (September 23, 2004).

[18] Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, p. 29.

[19] Most of the recent scholarship in black internationalism including the work of such historians as Martha Biondi, Kevin Gaines, Gerald Horne, Robin D. G. Kelley, James Meriwether, and Nikhil Singh, bears out this observation of a richly contested and critical black anticolonial left.

among leaders in the London-based International African Service Bureau and African American opinion leaders were strongly antifascist but insisted that freedom from colonial and racial subjugation was the necessary precondition and litmus test for democracy. Journalists and activists alike extended the "Double-V" campaign of victory over fascism and racism to a triple-V campaign against, fascism, racism, and *colonialism*.

Like the position taken by Bose in India, some African Americans, especially on the west coast, overlooked Japanese imperialism and supported Japan as a non-white power fighting white imperialism. George Lipsitz has documented the sympathy for Japan among African Americans. Whether Malcolm X's statement to U.S. Army induction officers that he was "frantic to join the Japanese army" may have been a strategic ploy to get out of service or in part naive, it was clearly an indictment of U.S. racism and a refusal to fight to maintain a Jim Crow society.[20] More recently, Marc Gallicchio has documented a black "counter-narrative" of internationalism centered on Japan, that reached back to 1905 and celebrations of Japan's defeat of Russia, and remained a significant influence through the 1930s and into the war years.[21]

From the vantage point of colonialism and the Pacific theater of war, scholars have also viewed Pan-Asianism as a complicating factor in World War II, but with a greater emphasis on the history of Japanese empire and colonialism. People living under Japanese colonial rule viewed Japan's ideological propagation of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere during the 1940s with a nuanced skepticism born of previous and on-going experience and knowledge of Japanese invasions, massacres, and colonial rule, resulting in wary, strategic, and hardly freely chosen collaborations. As Naoki Sakai has argued, "In the early 1940s, systematic campaigns to mobilize local students and youths to join the military were under way, not only in Japan proper but also in the annexed territories of the Japanese empire, such as Taiwan and Korea. […] Perhaps the most salient feature of government rhetoric can be found in its emphasis on voluntarism. […] Publicly propagated was the fantastic scenario that these [volunteers] wanted to be 'Japanese,' and therefore volunteered to die as 'Japanese.'"[22] "[I]t is misleading to argue that the rhetoric

---

[20] George Lipsitz, "Frantic to Join…the Japanese Army": Soldiers and Civilians Confront the Asian Pacific War," in Lisa Lowe and David Lloyd, eds., *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital* (Duke University Press, 1997).

[21] Marc Gallicchio, "Memory and the Lost Relationship between Black Americans and Japan," in Marc Gallicchio, ed., *The Unpredictability of the Past: Memories of the Asian-Pacific War in U.S.-East Asian Relations* (Duke University Press, 2007), pp. 255–286; idem, *The African American Encounter with Japan and China: Black Internationalism in Asia* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2000).

[22] Naoki Sakai, "Two Negations: The Fear of Being Excluded and the Logic of Self-Esteem," in

of imperial nationalism […] primarily serves to disguise the presence of ethnic and racial discrimination within the empire. For, perhaps more important, it was a response to colonial anxiety and had to be invented in order to prevent the mutiny of minorities."[23] Wartime collaboration in Korea for example, must be understood in the context of Japan's annexation of Korea in 1910 and sustained Korean protests against Japanese rule. Indeed, the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea, which had operated in exile since the 1919 Korean Declaration of Independence and the Japanese suppression of 1 March 1919 protests against Japanese rule, took advantage of wartime disruption to reorganize in Korea. Among those who had experienced multiple colonial rulers – European and Japanese – (as in the case of Micronesia), or who now faced Japanese occupation after decades of European rule, a "wait and see" attitude prevailed. [24] Indeed, Japanese aggression prompted the Bengali Poet and passionate advocate of cultural Pan-Asianism, Tagore, to abandon the position.

U.S. policy makers were keenly aware of the potential power of Japanese racial propaganda, and never separated this issue from what in their perspective, was the aim of winning-the-peace through the reincorporation of Japan into the U.S. hegemonic sphere. A view of race and civil rights in the context of the long history of colonialism is critical to understanding U.S.-Japanese postwar relations as well as the war itself. The frequently remarked viciousness and brutality of the war in the Pacific was in part, as John Dower has demonstrated, a product of the two sides racialized-demonization of the opponent. It was also the result of the clash of two empires that had long been competing in the Pacific as the Japanese colonized Korea, Micronesia, and parts of China and the U.S. made incursions into China, annexed Hawaii, and colonized the Philippines and Guam.

During World War II, U.S. officials argued that employing Japanese Americans in global propaganda efforts, especially through having them join the armed forces, could counter Japanese charges that the "war was a racial conflict." [25] This strategy was realized in President Franklin Roosevelt's public announcement of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team in early February 1943.[26] In what the historian T. Fujitani argues was a highly

---

Richard Calichman, ed., *Contemporary Japanese Thought* (Columbia University Press, 2005), p. 164.

[23] Ibid., p. 170.

[24] Stephen Hay has argued that Pan-Asianism was untenable because its promoters projected what they understood as the essence of their own societies onto the rest of Asia. *Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China, and India* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

[25] Ibid.

[26] T. Fujitani, "The Reischauer Memo: Mr. Moto, Hirohito, and Japanese American Soldiers:

instrumentalist approach to Japan, strategists advocated launching psychological war with the Japanese in tandem with their argument for establishing a post-war "puppet emporer system in Japan." Thus, argues, Fujitani, as early as 1942, U.S. officials approached propaganda and psychological warfare with an eye to incorporating "Japan, its emperor, and Japanese Americans into a new U.S. hegemony with America now cast as inclusive of Asians."[27] Indeed, the scholarship of Akira Iriye and that of Bruce Cumings demonstrates the crucial importance of understanding the U.S.-Japan conflict in the broader history of competing Japanese and U.S. imperialisms. Until mid-1941, Iriye argues, Japan was a junior hegemon in its Asian sphere of influence, still dependent on U.S. power in the region. When U.S. leaders shocked Japanese official by embargoing oil to Japan, Japanese leaders concluded that the only alternative was war. Yet by 1942, shortly into the war, "a small cadre of internationalist in the American State Department and in Japan began moving on remarkably parallel lines to reintegrate Japan into the postwar American hegemonic regime."[28] Thus, as Fujitani has argued, the 1952 McCarran-Walter Acts making it possible for Japanese to become naturalized U.S. citizens and the earlier trans-war extensions of the right to naturalize to Chinese immigrants (1943) and Filipino and Asian Indians (1946) can be seen as a larger strategy of containing race in a U.S.-run world. The remaking of race vis-à-vis Japan took place on multiple levels as the new advocacy of "model minorities" went hand in hand with the reintegration of Japan as the junior capitalist partner in Asia.

The U.S. position as a victor in Japan and the prolonged military presence through occupation and military bases enabled the reconstruction of Japan as a dependable U.S. Asian ally. Naoko Shibusawa has argued for the importance of metaphors of maturity and gender in the American shift from imagining Japan as a racialized brutal enemy to the rapid acceptance of Japan as a worthy postwar ally. General Douglas MacArthur, who oversaw the U.S. occupation of Japan from 1945–1951, described Japan as "like a twelve year old boy." Such images allowed Americans to see Japan as an unthreatening dependent and therefore, as a worthy Cold War ally.[29]

Critical Asian Studies 33, no. 3 (2001), pp. 379–402, esp. 390.

[27] Ibid., pp. 379–402.

[28] Akira Iriye, *Power and Culture: The Japanese-American War, 1941-1945* (Harvard University Press, 1981); Bruce Cumings, "Archaeology, Descent, Emergence: Japan in the British/ American Hegemony, 1900-1950," in Masao Miyoshi and H. D. Harootunian, eds., *Japan in the World* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993), p. 109.

[29] Naoko Shibusawa, *America's Geisha Ally: Reimagining the Japanese Enemy* (Harvard University Press, 2006).

As dominant understandings of race shifted from overt racism grounded in claims of innate biological difference to claims of difference rooted in modernization models, Japan's aggression could be explained as an earlier immature warlike state of a people now fast developing under proper democratic tutelage into worthy allies. Unlike the mature German who should have known better and was therefore responsible for its actions, Japan could be forgiven for childish impulses. The work of Yuka Tsuchiya on the U.S. occupation of Japan explores the occupation in the context of continuities with earlier Japanese as well as American modernizing projects and in light of both nations imperial ambitions in Asia. Exploring United States Information films produced for Japanese audiences, Tsuchiya demonstrates that not only did Japanese filmmakers use these productions for their own ends, but also the image of a classless society typically conveyed in the films served Japanese economic reconstruction as well as U.S. hegemony.[30] Thus, both nations benefited enormously from Japan's reintegration into the global capitalist economy as the junior partner of the U.S, and their mutual investment in the denial of their imperial histories in Asia and the Pacific.

Considerations of these entangled imperial histories once again call into question the temporality of the war. As Dirlik argues, for East Asia, the date of August 15, 1945 was decisive only for Japan. Five days earlier, when American policymakers divided the Korean peninsula at the 38th parallel on the night of August 10–11, without the consultation of the Korean Provisional government that had formed during the war, Japanese colonialism was replaced by American occupation. While U.S. historians tend to see the Korean War as the first major U.S. intervention in the Cold War, in the frame of colonialism, as for the Viet Mihn Central Committee that met on August 16, 1945 and called for a Vietnamese general insurrection, the war was another phase in a long struggle against foreign occupation. Indeed, Dirlik questions the very term World War as it "invokes a discreet historical event, with a beginning and an end."[31]

Remaking Race in the American Century

The consolidation of the U.S. position as the ascendant world power and the dawn of the Cold War, had a profound impact on the future of the struggle for civil rights and global challenges to white supremacy. In the United States, successful wartime alliances and

---

[30] Yuka Tsuchiya, "Imagined America in Occupied Japan: Re-Educational Films Shown by the U.S. Forces to the Japanese," *The Japanese Journal of American Studies* 13 (2002), pp. 193–213; John Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: 1999).
[31] Dirlik, "Trapped in History," p. 302.

support for the United Nations provided a forum for a range of African American activists and intellectuals, who viewed the abolition of colonialism as a necessary condition for a democratic and just world.[32] These observers were thus chagrined, first by Winston Churchill's Iron Curtain speech and then, when the Truman Doctrine ended the wartime alliance between the U.S. and Soviet Union. For such African Americans as W.E.B. Du Bois, the Cold War usurped prospects of a democratic world order as embodied in the hopes of anticolonial activists sparked by the formation of the United Nations. A *Baltimore Afro-American* editorial argued that Churchill's proposed Anglo-American alliance would assure "[a] continuation of imperialism and eventually plunge us into war with Russia on the other side."[33] Arguing that British interests were in jeopardy in Greece, Egypt, India and Indonesia, the editorial concluded: "We shudder to contemplate the fate of colonials already oppressed under the British heel should such an imperialist partnership become a reality."[34]

If as Césaire observed, colonial metropolitan societies had resisted democratization under wartime conditions, in the United States as well, the wartime struggles for the expansion of democracy met with indecisive and uneven outcomes. The most far-reaching demands for political and economic equality, including the linking of civil rights to anti-colonial struggles abroad were abruptly altered and in many cases thoroughly repressed in early Cold War.[35] The Truman Doctrine, announced before Congress on March 12, 1947, outlined a global struggle against Communism, and the Loyalty Oath act Attorney General's List of Subversive Organizations that quickly followed, declared the criticism of American foreign policy that had been an integral part of black American wartime and immediate post-wartime politics beyond the pale of acceptable discourse. While such radical advocates of anti-colonialism as Paul Robeson and W.E.B. DuBois were prosecuted and last their passports, others such as the NAACP's Walter White became architects of a new anticommunist liberalism. White, long an anti-communist, had also been a scathing critic of U.S. foreign policy when it bolstered colonial powers and he had initially viewed the belligerence of the Truman Doctrine with great alarm. Yet fearing the destruction of the NAACP, as anti-communism came to dominate politics, he moved toward an anti-

---

[32] For an excellent discussion of the range and depth of the work of the NAACP at the United Nations, see Carol Anderson, *Eyes Off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[33] Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, pp. 98–99.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid., chapter 5, "Domesticating Anti-colonialism" and chapter 7, "Remapping Africa, Rewriting Race."

colonialism that was justified by anti-communism, arguing that the abuses of colonialism opened the doors to Communists and that it was imperative that Asia and Africa remain in the Western orbit.[36]

The acceptance by White and other key African American leaders of the proposition that the United States, as leader of the free world, was engaged in a fundamental struggle with the Soviet Union had a profound impact on anti-colonial and civil rights struggles. Scholarship over the past fifteen years exploring previously unexamined dimensions of the 1940s civil rights movement demonstrates that, rather than raising expectations, civil rights politics narrowed during the Truman administration as a result of the contraction of public discourse and the collapse of the left during the early Cold War years, with the formation of Truman's committee on Civil Rights, White and others began to craft the dominant argument of the anti-communist civil rights liberals. The new argument seized on international criticism of American racism to argue that antidiscrimination measures were necessary for the United States in its struggle against Communism. The dominant liberal argument against racism, using anti-Communism to justify the fight against racism and for civil rights, conceded the high ground to anti-communism. [37]

The sharp contraction of public discourse and broad attacks on the popular front organizations diffused and defeated the "autonomous labor-oriented civil rights movement" that had thrived in the mid-forties. The powerful remobilization of business between 1946 and 1948 afforded anti-Communist labor leaders power within the circles of the corporate elite, blocked the social agenda of labor evident during World War II. As Robert Korstad and Nelson Lichtenstein have argued, "the rise of anti-communism shattered the Popular Front coalition on civil rights, while the retreat and containment of the union movement deprived black activists of the political and social space necessary to carry on an independent struggle."[38]

---

[36] Ibid., pp. 107–109, 114–121.

[37] Ibid., pp. 109–110. See also, Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton University Press, 2000).

[38] Robert Korstad and Nelson Lichtenstein, "Opportunities Found and Lost: Labor Radicals and the Early Civil Rights Movement," *Journal of American History* 75, no. 3 (1988), p. 811; Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, pp. 112–114; Robert L. Zangrando, *The NAACP Crusade against Lynching, 1909–1950* (Temple University Press, 1980). As the historian Robert L. Zangrando has shown, the campaign promises of 1948 failed to translate into legislation and "the Eighty-first Congress became a graveyard for the items in the civil rights package and the resting place for the NAACP's thirty-two-year-drive toward a federal anti-lynching law. And like Barbara Griffith and Michael Honey, who have traced the pulling back of labor's efforts to organize the South and labor's abandonment of a civil rights agenda, these scholars have tied the curtailment of the civil rights movement to the growing conservatism of the labor movement."

The narrowing of labor's agenda had a direct and powerful impact on global labor politics and on anticolonial movements. In what the historian Patrick Renshaw has described as the fusion of domestic and foreign policies, as Communists were expelled from unions in America, American labor supported anticommunist unions abroad even when that meant collaborating with former Nazis and other fascists. In 1949 CIO unions left the World Federation of Trade Unions, and both the AFL and CIO took the lead in setting up the new-anti-communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. CIO support for African labor during World War II had been an important feature of the globally inflected civil rights politics that had embraced anti-colonialism. But after the CIOs departure from the WFTU, the role of U.S. labor in Africa, as well as in well-documented Cases, would be filtered through the close liaison of the AFL and the State Department – with support from the CIA.[39]

American labor's collaboration with former Nazis and other fascists stands in ironic contrast to the central rhetorical place of Nazism in discrediting racism. As many grew uncomfortable with overt racism reminiscent of the Nazis, the rewriting of race in this repressive political environment was a double-edged sword for racialized populations. Altered political and rhetorical strategies in the fight against discrimination during the Cold War era had far-reaching consequences for the definitions and meanings of racism. Some civil rights activists equated racism with Nazism in order to legitimize their struggle. Throughout World War II, African Americans and many in the colonized world had portrayed Nazism as one consequence of imperialism and one manifestation of racism, seeing antifascism as a critical component of democratic politics but not to the exclusion of anticolonialism. Now, Nazism became the standard of evil, and antiracist struggles appealed to similarities between racism and Nazism for their legitimacy. According to the new syllogism, Hitler was evil and un-American, Hilterism equals racism, and therefore racism is evil and un-American. The actions of Alabama police against black Americans were called "Gestapo tactics." However powerful the argument, it took the case against racism out of its American context and out of the context of colonialism as well. And in positing Nazism and racism as unique, ahistorical evils, it took both out of the context of

---

[39] George Lipsitz, *Rainbow at Midnight: Labor and Culture in the 1940s* (University of Illinois Press, 1994), pp. 190-192; Barabar S. Griffith, *The Crisis of American Labor: Operation Dixie and the Defeat of the CIO* (Philadelphia, 1988); Michael K. Honey, *Southern Labor and Black Civil Rights*: *Organizing Memphis Worker* (Urbana, 1993); Patrick Renshaw, *American Labor and Consensus Capitalism, 1935–90* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1991), pp. 123–124; Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, p. 114.

history.[40]

Not only did this argument sever fascism from the history of colonialism, but in stark contrast to wide-ranging analyses of the political economy of colonialism and racism promoted by black Americans during World War II, by the early 1950s racism was consistently portrayed as a primordial trait of "backward" peoples and countries, not a modern development located in specific social and economic practices. Like the functionalist modernization paradigm that emerged in the social sciences, the popular notion of racism as an outmoded, dysfunctional practice that would gradually disappear as nations progressed obscured human agency and responsibility in the creation and maintenance of political, economic, and social institutions.[41] Far from "outmoded" in the popular language of the day, "race" was made anew in the complex political and social work of war and U.S. economic expansion in formerly colonized areas.

U.S. Power and Shape-Shifting Racial Formations

Understanding the consolidation of global hegemony by the United States during the prolonged unraveling of European colonialism through programs of global economic integration, covert action, and proxy wars throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America necessitates reading both World War II and the Cold War in terms of the history of colonialism.[42] As Pransenjit Duara has argued, historical periodization need not be seen as an "ontological condition." Scholars of World War II and the Cold War must broaden their vision, engaging the contradictions and conflicts produced by anti-colonialism and decolonization.[43] For Duara, "decolonization was one of the most important political developments of the twentieth century because it turned the world into the stage of history." For Duara, questions of what replaces colonial control after independence and the extent to which current historical approaches are adequate to describe the transformative processes of decolonization remain paramount.[44]

---

[40] Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, p. 153.

[41] Ibid., p. 156.

[42] For a more extended discussion of this point, see Penny Von Eschen, "Duke Ellington Plays Baghdad: Rethinking Hard and Soft Power from the Outside In," in Manisha Sinha and Penny Von Eschen, eds., *Contested Democracy: Freedom, Race, and Power in American History* (New York: 2007).

[43] Prrasenjit Duara, "Transnationalism and the Challenge of National Histories," in Thomas Bender, ed., *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), p. 30; Rashid Khalidi, *Resurrecting Empire: Western Footprints and America's Perilous Path in the Middle East* (New York: Beacon, 2004).

[44] Pransenjit Duara, *Decolonization: Perspectives From Then and Now* (London: Routledge,

Despite concerted and sustained attempts by U.S. policy-makers to distance themselves from European colonialism, as seen in the tragic examples of Vietnam and the Congo, the United States nearly always backed up its colonial allies and acted to protect mutual economic interests through direct or covert interventions; tying the United States in these cases respectively, to French and Belgian colonialism. Thus, at the very moment when U.S. officials attempted to combat global criticism of American race relations – the "Achilles Heel" in the Cold War battle for hearts and minds – deepening encounters of the United States with postwar independence movements entailed the social production of new forms of race thinking as well as the unthinking "common-sense" employment of previously held assumptions. [45]

To better appreciate how the United States became entangled in colonial wars, it is worth outlining attempted strategies that sought to distinguish the United States from colonial powers. U.S. policymakers first attempted to defend their claim to leading the "free world" by distancing themselves from European colonialism. In the vision of Henry Luce's "American Century," formulated during World War II and profoundly influencing U.S. wartime and post-war objectives, U.S. policymakers envisioned an American-led, globally integrated capitalist economy. In theory, colonialism had no place in that vision. U.S. policymakers not only objected to the privileged access to resources and markets that colonialism afforded the European powers, but as noted above, understood the benefits of promoting racial liberalism in an effort to combat worldwide criticisms of U.S. racism. For the most part, U.S. policy-makers did not seek to take over European forms of colonialism.[46] Asserting instead the right of the United States to lead the "free world," they pursued a project of global economic integration through modernization and development. Those American policy-makers committed themselves to making sure that the West had privileged access to the world's markets, industrial infrastructure, and raw materials.

Yet in the many areas where the accelerated anticolonial activity of World War II carried into armed conflict between independence movements and colonial powers, ultimately the United States nearly always backed up its colonial allies when they faced

---

2004), p. 1. On African American interaction with the anti-colonial world, see Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*; Winston James, *Holding Aloft the Banner of Ethiopia: Caribbean Radicalism in Early Twentieth-Century America* (London: Verso, 1998); Kevin K. Gaines, *American Africans in Ghana.*

[45] I have written about policy-makers attempts to distinguish the United States from European colonial powers in Penny Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (Cambridge, 2004).

[46] Ibid.

challenges to their rule. Only in rare cases, such as Indonesia, where the U.S. judged the Dutch to be so intransigent as to be driving the Indonesians into the hand of the communists, and the 1956 Suez crisis, when the U.S. defied Britain and France and eventually forced them to withdraw troops they had amassed to challenge Gamel Abdel Nasser after he nationalized the Canal, did the United States directly challenge its European allies in matters of colonial control.[47]

In the face of persistent attempts on the part of formerly colonized peoples to regain control of their resources, the United States became extensively involved in colonial wars such as that of the French in Vietnam and the Belgian instigation of Kantanga secession and ensuing crisis in the Congo. U.S. policy-makers made repeated use of (often covert) military force, making the term "Cold War" a misnomer for the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East, where democratic challenges often met with violent suppression by either proxies or covert operatives, or both.[48] By the mid-1950s, the CIA had already carried out covert actions in the Iran, Indonesia, and Guatemala.[49] Certainly many policy-makers viewed these actions as a necessary evil. The "common-sense" of covert action depended on a world-view that viewed the Soviet Union as a dangerous enemy that fundamentally threatened "the American way of life." But in confronting a seemingly ubiquitous Soviet threat, American policy-makers repeatedly conflated nationalism and communism.

The consistent conflation of nationalism and communism and the resort to overthrows of governments and willingness to aid and enter into war depended on new racialisms developed as U.S. policymakers confronted powerful Asian and African leaders, as well as on deeply inscribed racial hierarchies that devalued African and Asian, and Latin American lives. As several scholars have shown, the ouster of leaders throughout the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Latin America depended on ethnocentric assumptions about non-Western leaders that prohibited American policy-makers from viewing them as independent political agents. From the CIA overthrow of Mussaddiq in Iran, fueled in part by Time-Life Magazines portrayals of Mussaddiq as effeminate and fanatical, to the ouster

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] See Bruce Cumings, "The Wicked Witch of the West is Dead: Long Live the Wicked Witch of the East," and Walter LaFeber, "An End to Which Cold War?" in Michael J. Hogan, ed., *The End of the Cold War: Its Meanings and Implications* (New York, 1992).

[49] Ibid.; Uadrey R. Kahin and George McT. Kahin, *Subversion as Foreign Policy: The Secret Eisenhower and Dulles Debacle in Indonesia* (New York: The New Press, 1995); Robert J. McMahon, *Colonialism and the Cold War: The United States and the Struggle for Indonesian Independence, 1945–1949* (Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1981).

and assassination of Patrice Lumumba in the Congo in 1961, U.S. policy-makers tended to see leaders in these regions as pawns or potential pawns of the Soviets.[50] Despite the complexity of America's global relationships, when control over crucial strategic resources such as oil and uranium were at stake, American policy-makers brooked no ambiguity when it came to assessing the allegiances of national leaders, and cast these leaders as untrustworthy in highly racialized terms.[51] In both Iran and the Congo, aborted democracies were immediately replaced with pro-western dictatorships that would stay in power for decades, allowing the super exploitation of resources and people for the benefit of a small number of elites, and severely undermining civil and human rights.

The American war in Vietnam is a devastating example of the tendency of the U.S. to ultimately back-up its colonial allies. Historians have struggled to explain America's longest war, a war that shaped the character of American politics and society for decades to come. The war has been considered as an inevitable byproduct of Cold War assumptions and even as an example of the sheer excess of liberal ideology as it was not an obvious economic or strategic investment. Historians have less often considered the war as an ill-advised byproduct of the U.S. commitment to colonial France. With the United States initially sympathetic to Ho Chi Minh's revolution, when the de Gaulle government found itself both embattled by the communist left and incapable of defending its colonial empire, the U.S. reversed its position and came to the aid of France, increasingly taking on the job of propping up successive South Vietnamese governments tottering precariously atop an inherited colonial state structure.[52]

As France fought to hold control of Algeria in its prolonged war for independence, and as the U.S. continued to take on the mantle of defending colonial regimes in southern Africa, U.S. officials were contemptuous of the non-aligned politics advocated by Jawaharlal Nehru in India, Nasser in Egypt (and the short-lived United Arab Republic), and

---

[50] Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Harvard University Press, 2003); John Foran, "Discursive Subversions: *Time* Magazine, the CIA Overthrow of Mussaddiq, and the Installation of the Shah," in Christian G. Appy, ed., *Cold War Constructions: The Political Culture of United States Imperialism, 1945–1966* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000), pp. 157–182; Michael Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

[51] Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945–1961* (University of California Press, 2003).

[52] For stellar examples of books that view America's war in Vietnam in the context of colonial history, see Marilyn B. Young, *Vietnam Wars: 1945–1990* (New York, 1991); Mark Bradley, *Imagining Vietnam and America: The Making of Postcolonial Vietnam, 1919–1950* (Chapel Hill, 2000).

Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana.[53] From the early 1950s, nations around the globe announced with growing frequency that they would not be subjugated by either the West or the East and declared their intentions to be neutral, "non-aligned states," forming their own "Third World." For example, in 1954 when the United States, in order to combat communism, established the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) and wanted to include all the states in the region, India, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia resisted pressure to join and asserted their resolve to remain "neutral" in the Cold War.[54] When Asian and African nations gathered in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955, the West, as Paul Gordon Lauren has observed, reacted with "silence, vacillation, or opposition." U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles condemned the meeting as "an obsolete, immoral, and short-sighted conception." [55] U.S hostility toward India and non-alignment contrasted sharply with Pakistani military support from the United States that reached back to partition and continues to this day.[56]

Historians are increasingly exploring the ways in which new forms of racial inequality were produced in the context of unprecedented U.S. and western confrontations with new African, Asian, and Middle Eastern nation-states. The historian Thomas Borstelmann has looked carefully at the racial assumptions of U.S. policy-makers as they encountered African and Asian leaders, offering a fascinating anatomy of U.S. racism by generation and region, from the entrenched and deeply held racism of an older generation of southerners to the paternalism of Lyndon B. Johnson, to the crude and casual racism of Richard Nixon. Relationships in combat zones and on military bases, as well as those spawned by post-war corporate ventures, produced new forms of racial subjugation. The sexual and racial violence endemic to U.S. military base communities, as wartime bases were consolidated and expanded in the postwar period, has been widely documented by scholars. The gendered and racialized exploitation that developed around the "archipelago

---

[53] On U.S. views of Middle Eastern non-alignment, see Douglas Little, *American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945* (Chapel Hill, 2002); on U.S. diplomacy and views of non-alignment in Ghana and Africa, see Kevin K. Gaines, *American Africans in Ghana.*

[54] The signatories of the SEATO treaty were the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand. See Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, pp. 168–173; Paul Gordon Lauren, *Power and Prejudice: The Politics of Diplomacy and Racial Discrimination* (Boulder: 1988), p. 209.

[55] Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 214; Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, pp. 170–171.

[56] Mahmood Mamdani, *Good Muslim: Bad Muslim, The Cold War and Roots of Terror* (New York: Pantheon, 2004). See also, Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge, 2005); David F. Schmitz, *The United States and Right Wing Dictatorships, 1965-1989* (Cambridge, 2006).

empire" of U.S. bases dotting the globe, built on and extended practices that developed during World War II (and earlier wars) as in the enslavement of Korean women to serve Japanese men in brothels during WWII, to the post-war sex trade sanctioned by the South Korean government and U.S. military.[57]

Beyond the bases, U.S. corporations not only continued to extend Jim Crow based labor relations throughout the Western hemisphere, but also extended such arrangements into former parts of the British and French empires. The political scientist Robert Vitalis has explored U.S. corporate imposition of Jim Crow segregationist labor and housing laws for Arab workers in the oil fields and refineries of Saudi Arabia. The Arabian American Oil Company was formed in 1944, and from the beginning ARAMCO's camps in Dhahran in the eastern province of Saudi Arabia were organized on the basis of racial segregation. Vitalis places the Middle East in the context of decades of experience by the owners of ARAMCO – Texaco, Chevron, Exxon, and Mobil – in setting up similar camps with segregated labor forces and workers paid differently according to race, in locals from Mexico, to Venezuela, and Texas. ARAMCO, like other U.S.-based companies, portrayed itself as a private enterprise versions of the Marshall Plan. Vitalis's research shows that contrary to ARAMCO's claims to have been a modernizing and developing force that treated its workers better than those in other oil fields, in Iran, *prior* to the 1953 CIA coup overthrowing the democratically elected government of Muhammad Musaddiq, the democratic institutions of parliament, the press, and unions all facilitated reforms in the oil industry that were much farther reaching than those of ARAMCO in Saudi Arabia.[58]

As indicated by the U.S.-export of inequities in the oil industry, in order to understand post-war racial formation, it is critical to pay attention to the structural relationship of many formerly colonized peoples to the Fordist economy as its productive height, and the multiple ramifications of western commitment to these industries. In the post-45 period, the raw materials necessary for U.S. wealth and power were densely concentrated in sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East. In ensuring the uninterrupted flow of raw materials to the west, U.S. support of dictators in the Congo also ensured the development and elaboration of notorious Belgian colonial labor practices. The resulting

---

[57] Sandra Sturdevant and Brenda Stoltzfus, *Let the Goodtimes Roll: Prostitution and the U.S. Military* (New York: Norton, 1993); Yoko Fukumura and Martha Matsuoka, "Redefining Security: Okinawa Women's Resistance to U.S. Militarism," in Nancy A. Naples and Manisha Desai, eds., *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics* (Routledge, 2002); Choe Sang-Hun, "Ex- Prostitutes Say South Korea and U. S. Enabled Sex Trade Near Bases," *New York Times* (January, 2009).
[58] Robert Vitalis, *America's Kingdom: Mythmaking on the Saudi Oil Frontier* (Palo Alto, 2006).

impoverishment of the population of the most resource-rich country in the world, along with the extensive arming of the country for western cold war objectives, produced the conditions for later wars of genocide. As these wars reproduced images of "primitive Africa," and posit Africa as fundamentally a "problem," it is critical to recognize these particular racial formations not simply as a persistence of older racial hierarchies but rather as formations that were produced in a murderous alchemy of colonialism and what was cast as the economic and political imperatives of the "post-colonial" leader of the free world.

In the final scene of *Camp de Thiaroye*, in a truck full of Senegalese soldiers, one soldier plays Lily Marlene on a harmonica, a song associated with the anti-fascist resistance. In the context of the tragic developments of the film, this is a stark reminder that the democratic hopes of wartime would be played out and sorely tested in a world of colonial intransigence. The historian Utsumi Aiko has also invoked the harmonica as a symbol of the war in his childhood Tokyo. "We played the harmonica," Utsumi remembered, and "we would hear the harmonica in the street as well. Wounded soldiers who stood in front of train stations soliciting money played the harmonica while singing sorrowful war songs: "here in Manchuria hundreds of miles from our honorable country…" That tune overlapped with images of mutilated bodies of soldiers playing harmonicas for the crowd, leaving an impression of the war's tragedy."[59] For Utsumi, the haunting image of impoverished veterans playing war-era songs on the streets led to the discovery and grappling with the conscription of Koreans and other Japanese colonials, who were later stripped of Japanese nationality and left without support. Whether in the European and North African, or in the Pacific theatre of war, for colonized people the democratic hopes of wartime were betrayed in the aftermath of war. From the colonial violence and massacres during and after World War II dramatized in Sembéne's fictional account of Diatta's return to Senegal, to the stripping of Korean soldiers' ability to receive government compensation, colonial and imperial power along with the racial hierarchies that had been contested during the World War II took on new life in often strange and unexpected ways in the post-war world. Indeed, the prolonged wars for national independence and the conflicts of the later part of the twentieth century – too often lumped under the unexamined rubric of cold war – are incomprehensible without first reading World War II and the Cold War through the long history of colonialism and the strange careers of political and social worlds built on racial hierarchies.

---

[59] Utsumi Aiko, "Korean 'Imperial Soldiers': Remembering Colonialism and Crimes against Allied POWS," in *Perilous Memories*, p. 197.