Introduction and a Note on the US Imperial-Postcolonial Field

Cyrus Schayegh

John F. Kennedy is the most lastingly iconic twentieth-century US president.[1] Films about him and his administration and family abound.[2] Scholarship persists, even as its tenor has shifted twice, from reverence, in the 1960s and 1970s, to critique, in the 1970s to 1990s, to an uneasy balance since.[3] And historians continue to stress Kennedy's enduring attention to foreign affairs in general and postcolonial conditions in particular.[4] A journey across Asia in 1951 and a Mexican honeymoon in 1953; a high-profile senatorial speech supporting Algeria in 1957; frequent references to Africa on the campaign trail in 1960: this and much more culminated in President Kennedy becoming "in effect, Secretary of State for the third world."[5]

This volume's gist differs somewhat from those oft-cited—and exaggerating—words by Arthur Schlesinger Jr., though. While taking note of Kennedy's policies, we do not concentrate on them; or on the fact that his "vision remained trapped between the imperatives of security and the ambitions of idealism" and that his "foreign policy whipsawed between the extremes of confrontation and reconciliation"; or, again, on how Kennedy and his administration "engaged" postcolonial countries.[6] Rather, we explore how he was pulled in by postcolonial women and men: how they viewed and appropriated him. We look at the relationship between Kennedy and postcolonial people principally through their eyes, not his. Our stories play in postcolonial places more than in America. And most of our characters are postcolonial.

Further, this volume shows that many postcolonial men and women took to Kennedy not simply in reaction to his actions. They showed a keen interest in him because his public persona, rhetoric, symbolic politics, and some of his policies picked up their very own demand: for a better life, and to count and be heard in the world after a good century of European imperialism. Yes, Kennedy mastered "what marketers would call a 'brand'"[7] and skillfully crafted a political narrative[8] also regarding postcolonial countries. But his "powerful story" worked only because it "responded to the aspirations and political expectations of populations across the 'Global South,'" as Sönke Kunkel states in his chapter.

In this volume, then, Kennedy is a *Projektionsfläche*: a screen onto which postcolonial people projected their wishes and hopes. In effect, this book seeks simultaneously to provincialize and to de-provincialize—de-Americanize and globalize—Kennedy. In the final analysis it in fact is not strictly speaking about him. Rather, it asks what the postcolonial Kennedy can tell us about the changing shape of the globe's hierarchical

interconnectedness at a time when decolonization peaked, fully globalizing the Cold War, when old media grew and new media burst forth, and when the world was captivated by new frontiers and young explorers.

Here, one may take a leaf out of New Imperial History, which "treat[s] [European] metropole and colony in a single analytic field."[9] Domestic/foreign, inside/outside, postcolonial/American were more symbiotic than we tend to think. They formed a joint US imperial-postcolonial field. This view, I'd argue, is this volume's cumulative added value, the whole that is more than the sum of its parts. Hence, I will end on it, discussing it in this chapter's concluding section.

Historiography

This volume stands on broad shoulders. First and generally, historians have since the early 1990s recognized that in the Cold War postcolonial people were actors, not only acted upon.[10] And when one "tak[es] off the Cold War lenses," one sees decolonization as a process older than, and autonomous from, the Cold War, though intertwined with it.[11] Secondly and more specifically, recent multi-archival monographs have detailed postcolonial citizens' interest in Kennedy, and show that even while the United States under Kennedy mattered greatly—and often did harm[12]—postcolonial citizens' own agency and pasts crucially shaped their country's development, too.[13] In parallel, scholars of postwar US-postcolonial relations and, more generally, of the Cold War in the Third World have for a good decade now examined "interdependent domestic and international fields of political and social power," in Gilbert Joseph's words.[14] Thirdly, this volume is part of a movement to inter- and trans-nationalize US history, including diplomatic history. Born decades back, that movement crystallized in the 1990s and came of age the following decade.[15] A known practitioner, Matthew Connelly, described its agenda as follows: "Rather than continue to see diplomatic history as a subfield of U.S. history or any national history, I think we need to recognize that diplomatic history is instead a subfield of the larger and still expanding fields of international and transnational history." Not everybody signed off on this maximalist definition, though. In a response, Thomas Borstelmann described US diplomatic history as "the hinge between domestic U.S. history and world history: we function like a traditional Western barroom door, swinging both ways, and doing so easily, readily, continuously."[16] I will revisit this discussion at the very end of this chapter.

How does this volume contribute to these intersecting literatures? First, as outlined earlier, it suggests that Kennedy functioned as a *Projektionsfläche*; provincializes *and* de-provincializes him; and underwrites the idea of a joint US-postcolonial field. Secondly, its cast of actors is extensive, including elites as well as regular people, intellectuals and peasants, students and journalists and lawyers, to mention just some. And thirdly, even if the monographs in the second afore-noted scholarly field highlight postcolonial agency, they ultimately turn around issues to which Washington—under Kennedy and other postwar US presidents—was central, like the Alliance for Progress. In contrast, this volume demonstrates that many issues discussed by postcolonial actors

using Kennedy as a reference point were domestic in nature, and that their interest in the US president refracted postcolonial situations, hopes, and mindsets.

The chapters

Situation*s*; hope*s*; mindset*s*: this plural form is not accidental. While this edited volume pursues cohesion, focusing on one reference point—Kennedy—and a delimited timespan—the 1960s—its authors study various postcolonial appropriations of the US president. "Their" postcolonial world is not homogeneous. (Related, some parts and groups are more accessible to researchers than others, an epistemological issue noted for instance by Aaron Lillie and Diu-Huong Nguyen.) The authors also showcase numerous archives, employing a range of languages and embracing more than a dozen countries from the Americas to Europe, Africa, and Asia. And they deploy multiple methods: often textual study of archival documents and printed matter, but oral history and some quantitative analysis, too.

I have sorted the volume's chapters into three main themes. The four chapters of Part I, "Actors," study how Kennedy's America was seen as a colony by a critical African American intellectual elite (Sam Klug); how not only elites but also masses shaped perceptions of Kennedy in Africa (Philip E. Muehlenbeck); how in Kenya this held true "even" for peasants and what role media and Kennedy's policies played (Kara Moskowitz); and, in contrast, how few Brazilian peasants knew Kennedy and how urbanites who did were focused on his persona (Felipe Loureiro). Part II is titled "Appropriation: Domestic Contexts." Kennedy's acceptance of Irish self-views as a model for decolonization helped spark his ancestral homeland's enthusiasm for him (David P. Kilroy). Postcolonial media outlets helped diffuse Kennedy's charismatic persona for domestic commercial reasons, rather than simply following a politically driven US lead (Sönke Kunkel). In Morocco, domestic politics, not just regional and global affairs, explains why Kennedy's popularity waned in 1960–63 (David Stenner). And an Iranian's unrequited gift to Kennedy and other foreigners' gifts reveal ambiguities abroad about Washington's and its president's imperial nature (Cyrus Schayegh).

Part III is called "Appropriation, Cont'd: Antagonisms and Contestations." The PRC, while lambasting Kennedy, emulated his stepped-up cultural diplomacy (Matthew D. Johnson). During Kennedy's visit to Mexico, President Adolfo López Mateos and key officials framed his Alliance for Progress as merely a mirror of their long-ruling Partido Revolucionario Institucional's supposed progressiveness (Vanni Pettinà). In South Korea, paradoxically, both the authoritarian Park Chung Hee and his critics used Kennedy's rhetoric; interpretations clashed (Inga Kim Diederich). And in South Vietnam, counterintuitively, most Catholics came to loath Kennedy while some Communists liked him; and the communist North's critique was not entirely uniform (Aaron Lillie and Diu-Huong Nguyen). Finally, Part IV, "Intermediaries and Afterlives," contains three chapters. In India, US ambassador Kenneth Galbraith's familiarity with the subcontinent, economic expertise, and can-do attitude helped shape views of "his" president, too (Benjamin Siegel). In Turkey, African American

intellectual James Baldwin, a frequent visitor, helped shape critiques of John, and Robert, Kennedy's domestic and foreign policies during the 1960s (Begüm Adalet). And Robert Kennedy's and some US lawyers' concern about apartheid helped to keep the Kennedy name alive in black South Africa after 1963/1968 (Myra Ann Houser). Finally, Robert B. Rakove's conclusion provides a thoughtful analysis of these chapters.

Media

A number of themes cut across many chapters in these four parts. I'd like to pick out two. One is media. The appropriation of Kennedy bandwagoned on the expansion of older and newer media forms in the late colonial and postcolonial countries from the 1940s. From the Second World War if not because of it, Moskowitz notes, media expanded in Kenya. Founded in 1946, *al-ʿAlam* was consumed across Morocco (Stenner). More Africans bought a radio after the invention, in 1948, of the transistor (Moskowitz). And, a last example, in 1951, Vietnam's communists launched an organ, *Nhan Dan*, and other newspapers and radio stations were launched, too (Lillie and Nguyen).[17] By the late 1950s, then, "global mass communication" was in full transformation, as Kunkel argues. In consequence, the First Lady's 1962 White House tour film swept cinemas globally (Kunkel), not only US television.[18] The Mexican government printed an English-language newspaper just to advance its own interpretation of Kennedy's state visit, in 1962 (Pettinà). Korean newspaper articles on Kennedy, but not on domestic politicians, habitually featured a photograph (Diederich). Following Kennedy's election, an Iranian newspaper translated and serialized his *Profiles in Courage* (Schayegh) and a Korean press speed-translated James Burns's biography of him (Diederich). In India sales of biographies skyrocketed after the president's assassination (Siegel). Many an African villager owned a Kennedy picture, clipped from papers (Muehlenbeck). And Egyptian television aired Kennedy's funeral four times (Muehlenbeck). A contrast is illuminating: PRC newspapers rarely published pictures of Kennedy, caricaturing him instead (Johnson).

Media consumption was not passive. Postcolonial women and men interpreted Kennedy through images and texts that, while created by him, *they* found relevant and asked for. (Kennedy, US television, and the US audience were similarly symbiotic.[19]) Moreover, media was not vaguely "somewhere." Rather, media actors followed distinct directions. Kennedy reinforced the US Information Agency, placing texts and images about US policy and the president in postcolonial, and other, media outlets, and tracking "world public opinion";[20] and US officials gathered translations of postcolonial media, as Adalet shows for J. Edgar Hoover. In the reverse direction flowed postcolonial demands for US material on Kennedy. Sometimes, third places and actors mediated. Thus, the BBC broadcasted Kennedy's funeral, "birth[ing] . . . global television news."[21] (Circulation between postcolonial countries existed, too.[22]) As Loureiro notes for Brazil and Lillie and Nguyen for Vietnam, there were areas, often rural, where Kennedy remained barely known. Then again, views and images of him could circulate widely within a given country, sometimes involving diverse languages, like in Siegel's India. Moreover, newspapers could play an important role as translators, literally and

figuratively, as when Adalet's Turkish journalists interviewed James Baldwin also on the subject of Kennedy. Similarly, a Korean women's magazine "translated" Jacqueline for its readers as a wife who uses her skills for her husband's sake, Diederich shows. And Schayegh's study of gifts to Kennedy shows that postcolonial women and men translated Kennedy's persona and policies into a language meaningful to themselves.

Emotions and symbolic politics

A second theme is emotions and symbolic politics, also concerning race. Emotions are omnipresent in this volume. Take Kunkel's statement that postcolonial citizens "openly expressed their emotions for Kennedy"; the "awe" and "envy" in Lillie's and Nguyen's opening vignette; or Winnie Madikizela-Mandela's approach to Edward Kennedy, related by Houser. Think of views of Kennedy's "absolute honesty of purpose" (Kunkel) and "sincere" leadership (Loureiro). Or consider expressions of loss following the president's assassination (Muehlenbeck).[23] All this was not starry-eyed naivety: emotions were complex; feelings of loss co-existed with disappointment about policies, as Stenner shows. The mid-1950s to 1960s were a spell in which many dreamed of another world, lighter, more just, less violent. This juncture can be seen as an emotional disposition[24] of vigilant optimism, peaking in the early 1960s interlude between late European colonialism and the twin disappointment of postcolonial state authoritarianism and Western neocolonialism.[25] Kennedy registered this early postcolonial climate, whose relative lack of cynicism mirrored many contemporary Americans' mood; understood that Washington cannot only coerce but must convince; and reacted accordingly. He expanded "hearts and minds" institutions like the US Information Agency.[26] He had his way with words, as Lillie and Nguyen show when quoting a Vietnamese citizen who felt that Kennedy's inauguration "reinforced hopes of what might be."[27] And he and Jacqueline engaged in stage craft and symbolic politics.

They did so abroad: in Jacqueline's publicized boat ride on the Ganges River (Siegel); in their famed first visit to Paris, where she shone; during Kennedy's address to the Irish parliament (Kilroy); or during his "Ich bin ein Berliner" visit to Germany, a model of "politics as theater."[28] And they did so at home, too. They redesigned the White House as the policy and representational center of an empire-*cum*-democracy, combining imperial French aesthetics with clean lines and a certain "cool."[29] They projected impressions of their vibrant epicenter for world and worldly affairs abroad, for instance, facilitating the dissemination of Jacqueline's 1962 televised guided tour of the White House (Kunkel).

And much more than his predecessor, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Kennedy brought foreign dignitaries to the White House: not only Europeans but also Latin Americans (Kunkel), Asians (Diederich), and Africans (Muehlenbeck). Postcolonial media coverage followed suit, commenting also on visits by third countries' leaders (Stenner). This interest was not the least due to the Kennedys receiving some nonwhite guests not only downstairs but in the upstairs living quarters, too. This fact fascinatingly confirms that "while [Kennedy] scholars may bemoan the confusion of style and substance, oratory and action, it is often difficult to distinguish between them."[30] It stretches the

argument, generally, that "*le spectacle est essentiel au pouvoir*" ("spectacle is essential for power") and, specifically, that the president and his wife mastered public political theater.[31] Inviting nonwhite men who are not servants into the living quarters of the world's foremost white—if non-WASP, Irish Catholic—family, that is, into the sanctum also of the family's white woman, was a tremendously symbolic act regarding race. Kennedy saw himself as a human being, equal to people of color.[32]

In return, to many people of color, Kennedy was on an existential level on their side—was theirs, even. Libapu, a Kenyan farmer-carpenter who never saw a picture of him, told Moskowitz he had thought Kennedy is black, and one Frederick Kemboi mentioned that "we were thinking that Kennedy had some relationship with Africa." No surprise, then, that Kennedy was pictured not only with whites but nonwhites, too. African leaders used photos of themselves with Kennedy domestically, and Africans owned Kennedy pictures cut from newspapers (Muehlenbeck). In Alexandria, shop owners displayed portraits of their Egyptian and the US president. Iranians produced and bought tea sets bearing his portrait together with the habitual Safavid Shah Abbas sets.[33] And a 1962 front page of the Moroccan paper *Istiqlal* featured a fascinating multiple portrait (Figure 0.1).[34]

Moreover, if in the United States, "shortly after Kennedy died, it was common for [Kennedy] to be associated to the slaughtered heroes of myth: to Adonis, Baldr, Dionysus, Osiris, Tammuz, and even to Jesus himself,"[35] in postcolonial countries he was seen to have shared the fate of martyred heroes of decolonization like Patrice Lumumba (Muehlenbeck), and in Kenya, many named their children Kennedy (Moskowitz): very much "theirs," indeed.

This brings me to a note on the significance of Kennedy versus other US presidents for colonial subjects and postcolonial citizens. Three names that stand out are Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. All have been studied through non-American lenses.[36] Global interactions with them differed, for their times and fields of action—racial emancipation, national self-determination, and Great-Depression-era economics, respectively—differed, too. But all three also share something that separates them from Kennedy. They interested non-Americans principally for their policies, while Kennedy did so also for his persona. Who he was and projected to be—one's identification with him, put crudely—counted as much if not much more (Loureiro) than what he did.

If one explanation was Kennedy's approach to race, another was his age. The youngest US president ever elected and the first born in the twentieth century, in 1917, he presented himself as a genuinely new, forward-looking force. Many, though far from all, postcolonial men and women answered positively. This generational trait also situated Kennedy within a cast of young leaders and heroes of decolonization, while distancing him from his direct peers. Men like Anthony Eden, born in 1897, Nikita Khrushchev (1894), Eisenhower and Charles de Gaulle (1890), and Konrad Adenauer (1876) were, to paraphrase Thomas Borstelmann's description of Eisenhower, "children of the nineteenth century" and its racial hierarchies.[37] By contrast, Morocco's Hassan II was born in 1929, Che Guevara in 1928, Fidel Castro in 1926, Norodom Sihanouk in 1922, Nasser in 1918, Ahmed Ben Bella in 1916, Kwame Nkrumah in 1909, and Sukarno in 1901.[38]

Figure 0.1 Castro, Chou en-Lai, Kennedy, and Nehru side by side in the Moroccan paper *al-Istiqlal*.

This generational reality mattered to Kennedy. Here he is, addressing the Democratic National Convention in July 1960 to accept his nomination as presidential candidate in his famous "New Frontier" speech.

> All over the world, particularly in the newer nations, young men are coming to power—men who are not bound by the traditions of the past—men who are not blinded by the old fears and hates and rivalries—young men who can cast off the old slogans and delusions and suspicions. The Republican nominee-to-be [Richard Nixon], of course, is also a young man. But his approach is as old as McKinley. His party is the party of the past. . . . Their pledge is a pledge to the status quo—and today there can be no status quo. For I stand tonight facing west on what was once the last frontier . . . on the edge of a New Frontier—the frontier of the 1960's—a frontier of unknown opportunities and perils—a frontier of unfulfilled hopes and threats.[39]

Analyzing the US empire and postcolonial countries as a joint field

This passage was about more than generational politics, though. Kennedy put himself and an intrepid United States he hoped to lead in the same category as postcolonial countries and their young male leaders. More precisely, the resolve of "newer nations" to break through the status quo was an example Americans should follow (by electing Kennedy). No leader of the modern global North having accepted, however rhetorically, nonwhites as national role models, this view was unprecedented.[40]

It did have a context, however. In the 1950s, US sociologists had posited the emergence of "mass man" and "organization man," subservient to large corporations and emptied of authentic feelings and purpose.[41] Machinist cogs were replacing pioneering Frontier Man. This danger showed abroad, too. In Asia, wiry communist aid agents, living with the locals, were out-toughing and outsmarting flabby US counterparts. This, at least, was the indictment of "the most popular, influential, and controversial novel written in the 1950s about America's relations with Asia," *The Ugly American*, which sold six million copies. The book had a US hero, too, though: Homer Atkins. Can-do and salt of the earth, he showed how one could defeat communists abroad.[42] His story also suggested how and where Americans might best undo Organization Man and become their pioneering selves again: by ruggedly spreading wholesome US modernity, in the Third World. Through institutions like Kennedy's Peace Corps, in other words, which *The Ugly American* helped inspire, and about which pundit Norman Cousins remarked in 1961: "Idealism is back in style. The reason for it goes by the name of the American Peace Corps. Instead of dreary conversation about the meaninglessness of existence, students are now earnestly exchanging ideas about the different needs of communities in Asia and Africa."[43]

Read together, the afore-referenced texts point to an interesting possibility: that of analyzing the postwar US empire—a term from which we should not shy away—and postcolonial countries as one joint field.

This approach can build on Ann Stoler and Frederick Cooper's by now classic call to "treat [European] metropole and colony in a single analytic field." Especially in Britain, that call undergirded New Imperial History.[44] Seeing metropoles and colonies as mutually constitutive rather than categorically different, scholars have focused on connecting and overlapping places and biographies, bodies of knowledge, and political and cultural organizations and practices. And they have abandoned hub-and-spokes views of empire for less centrist terms like the "imperial web," which integrated presumably distinct quasi-national frontier settler stories within a broader imperial framework,[45] and "imperial formation."[46] Some also have pushed beyond Stoler's and Cooper's focus on empire, "extending [the] analytical focus to the multiple networks of exchange that arose from the imperial experience."[47]

But did not European and US empires differ, one formal and territorial, the other not, and hence, is not the European metropolitan-colonial field model useless for us? Not quite. Comparing London and Washington, Julian Go has argued that "formal and informal empire might be better thought of as two ends of a blurry continuum."[48]

Covering much bandwidth, each is heterogeneous, a patchwork; on top, the mixture of imperial practices—their distribution along the continuum—shifts over time.[49] While different, London's empire thus was less unlike Washington's than meets the eye, and vice versa. They interplayed, too, and Washington learned much from British (and other European) imperial practices. Moreover, consider the following six aspects. Not only postwar Washington but already the nineteenth-century British Empire facilitated globalization, if involuntarily, and was shaped by it.[50] Washington's fin-de-siècle Caribbean-central American-Pacific "insular and isthmian imperialism [formed] a formal infrastructure or ground floor on which later, less formal expansion could be built"; the United States could do so because Britain reduced its Latin American presence to focus on Germany.[51] Relations with nation-states were central to postwar Washington's exercise of power, for the US international empire was "an imperial project . . . which achieve[d] imperial ends" importantly "by working through the states of others";[52] however, respective issues were not entirely alien to London, which for instance granted far-reaching autonomy to interwar white settler colonies.[53] Postwar Washington's empire started with its crucial role, at London's and Moscow's sides, in defeating and occupying Germany and Japan, whose attempted imperial conquest of Eurasia had transformed (dare we say imperialized?) US national security doctrine,[54] and in whose affairs Washington remained involved. Postwar Washington has had more, and more far-flung, military bases than any other state, most governed by its own laws and manned overwhelmingly by its own citizens.[55] And last but not least, until the 1960s Cold War Washington relied on European empires.[56]

This analytical "joint US imperial-postcolonial field" needs to be handled with caution, however. It does not imply uniformity. First, as the international element—"achiev[ing] imperial ends by working through the states of others"[57]—was the key for imperial Washington, postcolonial countries are much more sovereign, and hence somewhat more distinct, than European colonies. Secondly, Washington has entertained widely different relationship to different countries; besides, its relationship to a given country often has changed over time. Thirdly, the postwar US empire faced a powerful state-based ideological counterforce, Soviet- and Chinese-led communism, which interfered with the US-postcolonial field: something unknown to nineteenth-century European empires. Fourthly, relations between postcolonial countries and Western postimperial entities like Britain, France, Germany, and the European Economic Community interfered with the field, too.[58] So did, fifthly, South-South relations, which principally after 1945 came to encompass a (politically crucial) interstate dimension. And sixthly, we need to ask how the postwar US empire's unprecedented global scope sits with a model focusing "only" on the postcolonial-US field. After all, Washington dominated the Western Hemisphere from around 1900; replaced imperial German and Japanese hegemony over West and East Eurasia in 1945; since then, has dominated the world's sea, air, and space commons, Soviet challenges notwithstanding; gradually replaced Britain in the Middle East after 1945; and pushed into decolonizing Africa from the late 1950s.

The pluriformity of the US imperial-postcolonial field is not exceptional, though. It characterized the afore-mentioned nineteenth- to mid-twentieth-century webs, formations, and exchange networks, too. But their postwar successor was more pluriform. Discourses and practices constitutive of European metropolitan-colonial

fields, though waning, had postwar echoes. Also, colonies of half a dozen European empires became dozens of postcolonial nation-states. And last, the US-postcolonial field intersected with three substantial postwar developments noted above: decolonization increased South-South inter*state* relations; state-based communism expanded and grew bolder; and Washington's posture and interests became truly world-embracing.

This last point means that the postwar US imperial-postcolonial field was not categorically separate in space, actors, and content. Conceptualizing its complex intersections with other developments is beyond this text, however. Having acknowledged the issue, I will outline the US imperial-postcolonial field as if it were separate, while occasionally referencing intersections.

Earlier, I suggested that from the later 1950s to the 1960s Americans saw postcolonial contemporaries not simply as underdeveloped Oriental Others in need of guidance but as optimist activists who were taking the world by the horns, daring to shape their future, and become history's spearhead (and this at a time when Sputnik scared Americans). Americans certainly believed that their own modernizational, economic, and political model was supreme, and would beat the Soviets. Still, the collective postcolonial emotional disposition impressed them, doubly because to them the Third World was perhaps *the* place where American individuals could become their pioneering selves again. In this sense, the US empire, more than leading, followed, and Kennedy, more than shaping his postcolonial contemporaries, reacted to their hopes and demands.[59]

Postcolonial actors helped constitute the joint US imperial-postcolonial field, too. In this volume, the primary example concerns some—but most decidedly not all—such actors voicing their struggles for existential freedom, sovereignty, and racial equality not only—though mainly—in a direct way but also by refracting it through the mirror of Kennedy.[60] To be crystal clear: they *most certainly* did not need Kennedy to know their struggle was legitimate. At the same time, he, who evinced interest in them, in a sense provided an ultimate legitimation. This was ironic, for it signaled an implicit recognition of being within the field of power of a new, international empire just when decolonization was about not being bound to foreign powers anymore.

Examples abound in this volume. Kunkel notes that Latin Americans took to calling Jacqueline Kennedy *la reina* (the queen). Muehlenbeck shows how African leaders used photographs with Kennedy to "boost their legitimacy at home. . . . Pictures of a 1959 meeting between Guinean President Sékou Touré and Kennedy, at Disneyland, when Kennedy was still a senator, were 'displayed even in the smallest villages,' and were highly prized by Guineans." Zebedeo Omwando, a farmer whose letter to Kennedy opens Moskowitz's chapter, treated the president as if he'd indeed be "*His* Highness," which is how he addressed him.[61] "The perception of a friendly, intimate relationship with a US president, who also offered material aid, appealed to rural Kenyans and blended readily into established patron-client relationships," Moskowitz concludes. At the core of my chapter stands the story of how an Iranian woman, Fakhri Garakani, wagered the US president would exchange gifts with her, a non-US citizen, following an Iranian pattern of gifts traded between unequals—as if he were her own leader. And I point out that ironically, foreigners whose political gifts explicitly rejected inequality between people and nations hoped that in exchange for their gift they might be heard by a most powerful man.

Let me sum up. Firstly, the US imperial-postcolonial field was symbiotic yet heterogeneous and unequal. It was not all-encompassing, though, that is, does not explain everything in the United States and postcolonial countries. It's a way to tackle a question occupying also other imperial historians: "how to write about such vastly different places, processes, and people as those contained within the nineteenth-century British Empire *at the same time.*"[62] Secondly, its content as covered here— others may see things differently—was an emotional disposition that ranged from the mid-1950s to the 1960s, peaking early that decade, and which was underwritten by specific culturo-political practices. Its focal point was an existential optimism in the feasibility and likelihood of a better future. That is, it included, but was about much more than, the parallels and links between African American and Third World liberation struggles, discussed here (Adalet, Houser, Klug, Kunkel, Moskowitz, Mühlenbeck, Stenner) and elsewhere.[63] Thirdly, the field's genesis was more complex, and its nature hence more ambiguous, than prewar European metropolitan-colonial fields. It emerged at the intersection of two equally historic postwar developments, the crystallization of anti-imperial liberation and the rise of a truly worldwide US empire; on top, that empire's modus operandi was international. Fourthly, the field was doubly unequal. Liberation struggles shaped it more than the US empire in terms of their historic, existential force.[64] But in terms of raw power it was the US empire that shaped it more, and by looking for it to legitimize their struggle, some postcolonial citizens recognized it implicitly if not explicitly. And fifth, the postwar US imperial-postcolonial field overlapped with other simultaneous developments, most importantly strengthening South-South interstate relations, the Cold War, and the persistence of minor power centers in the global North other than Moscow and Washington. Hence, it could be broadened and seen as forming part of wider fields.

Conclusion

Let me end on a historiographic note. A symbiotic view of "the postcolonial/American" and "the domestic/foreign," through the concept of "the joint field," makes a cautious step beyond certain conceptualizations current in three intersecting bodies of literature. It backs critiques of postwar US transnational history as a field that, while fruitfully undermining US exceptionalism, too often eschews empire.[65] Moreover, it goes one step further than concepts like "circuits" or "two-way street" that historians use to finesse our understanding of the United States' postwar nature as a great power that, however, was influenced by others, too. It does so by blurring, though not negating, distinctions between "outside" and "domestic."[66] And last, "the joint field," and more broadly speaking this volume as a whole, point to the possibility of supplementing certain depictions of the scholarly literature on US diplomatic history. Earlier, I cited Borstelmann's poetic image of that literature as "the hinge between domestic U.S. history and world history: we function like a traditional Western barroom door, swinging both ways, and doing so easily, readily, continuously."[67] This image is not wrong. And yet, if this volume demonstrates anything, it is the need to pay closer attention to when, how, and why that metaphorical door starts disappearing from view.

Notes

1   John Hellman, *The Kennedy Obsession: The American Myth of JFK* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997); Mark White, *Kennedy: A Cultural History of an American Icon* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013); Michael Hogan, *The Afterlife of John F. Kennedy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017); Lee Konstantinou, "The Camelot Presidency," in *Cambridge Companion to John F. Kennedy*, ed. Andrew Hoberek (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 149–63.

2   David Lubin, *Shooting Kennedy: JFK and the Culture of Images* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); Gregory Frame, "The Myth of John F. Kennedy in Film and Television," *Film & History* 46, no. 2 (2016): 21–34.

3   James Giglio, "Writing Kennedy," in *A Companion to John F. Kennedy*, ed. Marc Selverstone (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 7–30; Burton Kaufman, "John F. Kennedy as World Leader: A Perspective on the Literature," *DH* 17, no. 3 (1993): 447–69; Andrew Preston, "Kennedy, the Cold War, and the National Security State," in *Cambridge Companion*, 99.

4   Stephen Rabe, *John F. Kennedy: World Leader* (Washington: Potomac, 2010).

5   Arthur Schlesinger, *A Thousand Days* (Boston: Mariner, 1965), 509.

6   Quotes: Preston, "Kennedy," 90, and Robert Rakove, *Kennedy, Johnson, and the Nonaligned World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), xxi. Key texts include Rabe, *Kennedy*; Vaughn Rasberry, "JFK and the Global Anticolonial Movement," in *Cambridge Companion*, 118–33; Frank Costigliola, "US Foreign Policy from Kennedy to Johnson," in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, ed. Melvyn Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 112–33.

7   Hogan, *Afterlife*, 17.

8   Hellman, *Kennedy*, 99.

9   Ann Stoler and Frederick Cooper, "Between Metropole and Colony," in *Tensions of Empire*, ed. Ann Stoler and Frederick Cooper (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 4.

10 Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Christopher Goscha and Christian Ostermann, ed., *Connecting Histories: Decolonization and the Cold War in Southeast Asia, 1945-1962* (Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2009); Greg Brazinsky, *Winning the Third World: Sino-American Rivalry during the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2017); Samantha Christiansen and Zachary Scarlett, "Introduction," in *The Third World in the Global 1960s*, ed. Samantha Christiansen and Zachary Scarlett (New York: Berghanh, 2013), 1; Mark Bradley, "Decolonization, the Global South, and the Cold War, 1919-1962," in *Cambridge History of the Cold War*, 464–85; Robert McMahon, ed., *The Cold War in the Third World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

11 Matthew Connelly, "Taking off the Cold War Lenses," *AHR* 105, no. 3 (2000): 739–69. See also Prasenjit Duara, "The Cold War as a Historical Period," *JGH* 6 (2011): 457–80.

12 Stephen Rabe, *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages Cold War in Latin America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 86–118; Greg Grandin, *The Last Colonial Massacre: Latin America in the Cold War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

13 Thomas Field, *From Development to Dictatorship: Bolivia and the Alliance for Progress in the Kennedy Era* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014)*;* Gregg Brazinsky, *Nation Building in South Korea: Koreans, Americans, and the Making of a Democracy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

14 Gilbert Joseph, "What We Now Know and Should Know," in *In from the Cold: Latin America's New Encounter with the Cold War*, ed. Joseph and Daniela Spenser (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 4. See also Piero Gleijeses, *Conflicting Missions: Havana, Washington, and Africa, 1959-1976* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Tanya Harmer, *Allende's Chile and the Inter-American Cold War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011); Edward Miller, *Misalliance: Ngo Dinh Diem, the United States, and the Fate of South Vietnam* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013); Jonathan Brown, *Cuba's Revolutionary World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017).

15 Akira Iriye, "Culture and Power: International Relations as Intercultural Relations," *DH* 3 (1979): 115–28. Michael Hunt, "Internationalizing U.S. Diplomatic History," *DH* 15, no. 1 (1991): 1–11.

16 Matthew Connelly et al., "SHAFR in the World," *Passport* 42, no. 2 (2011): 5, 11. Other key texts include Akira Iriye, "Internationalizing International History," in *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, ed. Thomas Bender (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 47–62; Michael Hogan, "The 'Next Big Thing': The Future of Diplomatic History in a Global Age," *DH* 28, no. 1 (2004): 1–22; Robert McMahon, "Toward a Pluralist Vision," in *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, ed. Michael Hogan and Thomas Paterson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 35–50; Thomas Zeiler et al., "Diplomatic History Today," *JAmH* 95, no. 4 (2009): 1053–91; Erez Manela, "The United States in the World," in *American History Now*, ed. Eric Foner and Lisa McGirr (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011), 201–20; Andrew Preston and Doug Rossinow, "Introduction: America within the World," in *Outside In*, ed. Preston and Rossinow (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 1–18.

17 See also James Brennan, "Radio Cairo and the Decolonization of East Africa," in *Making a World after Empire*, ed. Christopher Lee (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2010), 173–95.

18 Hogan, *Afterlife*; Mary Watson, "A Tour of the White House," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (1998): 91–99.

19 Lubin, *Kennedy*; David Halberstam, "Introduction," in *The Kennedy Presidential Press Conferences*, ed. George Johnson (New York: Earl Coleman, 1978), i–iv.

20 Mark Haefele, "Kennedy, the USIA, and World Public Opinion," *DH* 25, no. 1 (2001): 63–84.

21 Aniko Bodroghkozy, "The BBC and the Black Weekend: Broadcasting the Kennedy Assassination and the Birth of Global Television News," *The Sixties* 9, no. 2 (2016): 242–60.

22 Christopher Lee, "Introduction," in *World after Empire*, 1–42; Nataša Mišković, "Introduction," in *The Non-Aligned Movement and the Cold War*, ed. Nataša Mišković et al. (London: Routledge, 2014), 1–18; Jürgen Dinkel, *The Non-Aligned Movement* (Leiden: Brill, 2018).

23 More broadly, see Philip Muehlenbeck, *Betting on the Africans: Kennedy's Courting of African Nationalist Leaders* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

24 Introductions to the history of emotions include Ute Frevert, *Emotions in History* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011); Piroska Nagy and Ute Frevert (comment), "History of Emotions," in *Debating New Approaches to History*, ed.

Marek Tamm and Peter Burke (London: Bloomsbury, 2019), 189–216. See also William Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 124–26, on "emotional regime."

25 This may be connected to the literature on the long / global 1960s: Christiansen and Scarlett, *Third World*; "The Sixties and the World Event," special issue of *boundary 2* 36, no. 1 (2009): 1–210; Chen Jian et al., eds., *The Routledge Handbook of the Global 1960s* (London: Routledge, 2018). A classic is Fredric Jameson, "Periodizing the 60s," in *The 60s without Apology*, ed. Sohnya Sayres et al. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 178–209.

26 Haefele, "Kennedy"; Gregory Tomlin, *Murrow's Cold War: Public Diplomacy for the Kennedy Administration* (Nebraska: Potomac, 2016); Jason Parker, *Hearts, Minds, Voices: U.S. Cold War Public Diplomacy and the Formation of the Third World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Frank Ninkovich, "U.S. Information Policy and Cultural Diplomacy," *Foreign Policy Association Headline Series* 308 (1996): 3–63.

27 Bui Diem, *In the Jaws of History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 117, quoted in Lillie and Nguyen's chapter.

28 Andreas Daum, *Kennedy in Berlin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 4.

29 Hogan, *Afterlife*.

30 Rasberry, "JFK," 120, citing Thomas Noer, *Cold War and Black Liberation* (1985), 34.

31 Julien Bonhomme and Nicolas Jaoul, "Grands hommes vus d'en bas," *Gradhiva* 11 (2010): 7.

32 Related, Anders Stephanson, "Senator John F. Kennedy: Anti-Imperialism and Utopian Deficit," *JAS* 48, no. 1 (2014): 1–24, argued that Kennedy saw decolonization not only as a function of the Cold War. For colonial backgrounds, see Ann Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010).

33 Rami Khouri and Nazanin Shahrokni, information to author, March 17, 2015, Beirut.

34 "Peace," *al-Istiqlal*, October 27, 1962, 1. I thank David Stenner for the image.

35 Godfrey Hodgson, "JFK and the 1960s," *The Sixties* 8, no. 2 (2015): 214.

36 Richard Carwardine and Jay Sexton, eds., *The Global Lincoln* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Kiran Patel, *The New Deal* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

37 Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 86.

38 Older were Mao Tsedong, Ho Chi Minh, and Jawaharlal Nehru, born in 1893, 1890, and 1889, respectively.

39 Available online: https://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/AS08q5oYz0SFUZg9uOi4 iw.aspx (accessed January 4, 2019).

40 This did not contradict Kennedy's belief that America was the world's modernizer: Michael Latham, *Modernization as Ideology* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

41 William Whyte, *The Organization Man* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956); Paul Goodman, *Growing Up Absurd* (New York: Random House, 1960); David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950).

42 Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 58. William Lederer and Eugene Burdick, *The Ugly American* (New York: Norton, 1958).

43 Quoted in Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman, *All You Need Is Love: The Peace Corps and the Spirit of the 1960s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 33.

44 Stoler and Cooper, "Between Metropole and Colony," 4.

45   Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).

46   Ann Stoler et al., eds., *Imperial Formations* (Santa Fe: SARP, 2007); Paul Kramer, "Power and Connection: Imperial Histories of the United States in the World," *AHR* 116, no. 5 (2011): 1349.

47   Durba Ghosh and Dane Kennedy, "Introduction," in *Decentring Empire*, ed. Durba Ghosh and Dane Kennedy (Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 2006), 2. An excellent overview is Alan Lester, "Imperial Circuits and Networks: Geographies of the British Empire," *History Compass* 4, no. 1 (2006): 124–41.

48   Julian Go, *Patterns of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 11. Similarly: Stephen Howe, *Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 15.

49   For Britain, see John Darwin, *The Empire Project* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

50   Gary Magee and Andrew Thompson, *Empire and Globalisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Martin Thomas and Andrew Thompson, "Empire and Globalisation," *IHR* 36, no. 1 (2014): 142–70.

51   Thomas McCormick, "From Old Empire to New," in *Colonial Crucible*, ed. Alfred McCoy and Francisco Scarano (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 73.

52   Kramer, "Power," 1366.

53   A. G. Hopkins, "Rethinking Decolonization," *PP* 200 (2008): 211–47; Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007). See also Antoinette Burton, ed., *After the Imperial Turn* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 5.

54   Andrew Preston, "Monsters Everywhere: A Genealogy of National Security," *DH* 38, no. 3 (2014): 477–500; Robert McMahon, "How the Periphery Became the Center," in *Foreign Policy at the Periphery*, ed. Bevan Sewell et al. (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2017), 19–35.

55   David Vine, *Base Nation* (New York: Metropolitan, 2015).

56   William Louis and Ronald Robinson, "The Imperialism of Decolonization," *JICH* 22 (1994): 462–511.

57   Kramer, "Power," 1366.

58   For the last, see Véronique Dimier, *The Invention of a European Development Aid Bureaucracy: Recycling Empire* (London: Palgrave, 2014). For the non-uniformity of the First and Second World cores, see Andrew Rotter, "Narratives of Core and Periphery," in *Foreign Policy at the Periphery*, 60.

59   The emotional-historical aspect here can be associated to the argument that the postwar United States developed a "sentimental discourse of integration that imagined the forging of bonds between Asians and Americans," positing a *certain* "racial equality" between the two: Klein, *Cold War Orientalism*, 17, 15.

60   For decolonization's existential dimension, touching the soul, as it were, see Yoav Di-Capua, *No Exit* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018).

61   My italics.

62   Lester, "Geographies," 127 (my italics).

63   Penny Von Eschen, *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937–1957* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997); Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Borstelmann, *Cold War*; Cynthia Young, *Soul Power: Culture, Radicalism, and the Making of a Third World Left* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); Nico Slate, *Colored Cosmopolitanism: The Shared Struggle for Freedom in the United States and India* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012); Brenda Plummer, *In Search*

of Power: African Americans in the Era of Decolonization, 1956–1974 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013); John Munro, *The Anticolonial Front: The African American Freedom Struggle and Global Decolonization, 1945–1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

64 Christiansen and Scarlett, "Introduction," 1; Young, *Soul Power*.

65 Kramer, "Power," 1380; Andrew Rotter, "Chaps Having Flaps: The Historiography of U.S. Foreign Relations, 1980-1995," in *America in the World*, ed. Frank Costigliola and Michael Hogan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 51–52. See also Jürgen Osterhammel, "Imperien," in *Transnationale Geschichte*, ed. Gunilla Budde et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 2006), 58. For the field, see Ian Tyrrell, "Reflections on the Transnational Turn in United States History," *JGH* 4 (2009): 453–74.

66 All quotes: Carl Guarneri, *Locating the United States in Twentieth-Century World History* (Washington: AHA, 2011), 23. There is a massive literature on "the United States in the World"; see, for example, Manela, "United States."

67 Related, see Andrew Johns and Mitchell Lerner, eds., Th*e Cold War at Home and Abroad: Domestic Politics and US Foreign Policy since 1945* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2018).