

2013

H-Diplo

H-Diplo Roundtable Review

www.h-net.org/~diplo/roundtables

Volume XIV, No. 30 (2013)

6 May 2013

Roundtable Editors: Thomas Maddux and Diane Labrosse

Roundtable Web/Production Editor: George Fujii

Commissioned for H-Diplo by Thomas Maddux

Introduction by Andy DeRoche, Front Range Community College

Alvin B. Tillery, Jr. *Between Homeland and Motherland: Africa, U.S. Foreign Policy, and Black Leadership in America.* Cornell University Press, 2011. ISBN: 978-0-8014-4897-3 (hardcover, \$73.50); 978-0-8014-7734-8 (paperback, \$22.95).

Stable URL: <http://www.h-net.org/~diplo/roundtables/PDF/Roundtable-XIV-30.pdf>

Contents

Introduction by Andy DeRoche, Front Range Community College	2
Review by Mark Sawyer, University of California, Los Angeles	7
Review by George White, Jr., York College, CUNY.....	10
Review by Leah M. Wright, Wesleyan University.....	16
Author's Response by Alvin B. Tillery, Jr., Rutgers University	21

Copyright © 2013 H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online.

H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for non-profit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author(s), web location, date of publication, H-Diplo, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online. For other uses, contact the H-Diplo editorial staff at h-diplo@h-net.msu.edu.

Introduction by Andy DeRoche, Front Range Community College

Alvin Tillery has produced a fascinating study of the complicated relationship between leading African Americans and United States policy toward Africa. This book is particularly remarkable for its ambitious scope, covering nearly two hundred years of history, and for featuring several thought-provoking specific case studies such as those on the extraordinary African-American entrepreneur and sailor Paul Cuffe, and Charles Diggs, the long time U.S. Representative from Michigan and founder of the congressional black caucus.¹ Furthermore, *Between Homeland and Motherland* is concise and clearly-argued, and it should be read carefully by all students of African-American history and U.S. foreign policy. The three esteemed participants in this roundtable all found much to commend in Tillery's book.

Leah Wright opens her review by praising the provocative questions that Tillery's book asks of its readers, and believes that he essentially succeeded in his quest to inspire readers to reconsider several important issues in the history of African-American involvement with Africa. Wright concurs with Tillery's main argument, which is that many previous explanations for black Americans' motivations when engaging with Africa have over-emphasized the importance of 'transnationalism,' or racial and ethnic ties to their ancestral continent, and should also consider factors such as domestic U.S. politics and the self-interest of black elites.

Wright is particularly impressed by Tillery's reassessment of Marcus Garvey, the Jamaican-born leader of an influential "back-to-Africa" movement in the 1910s and 1920s, and his explanation as to why other African-American leaders criticized Garvey and his message. She found very compelling his contention that black elites' paternalism toward the masses caused them to worry that Garvey would take advantage of them, and these other elites believed that they were the ones who should be telling the common people of color what was best for them. In Wright's view, this analysis by Tillery is "valuable." Similarly, Wright concurs with Tillery's examination of the anti-colonialism of the upper echelons of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) from the 1930s into the early Cold War era. She judges this section to be "a significant historical contribution," and one that is "very persuasive." Finally, Wright lauds Tillery for his careful analysis of the anti-apartheid efforts of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) in the 1970s and 1980s, and their later opposition to the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) of May 2000.

Wright does offer a few mild criticisms of *Between Homeland and Motherland*. Chief among these is her suggestion that Tillery should have paid more attention to black conservative voices such as the journalist George Schuyler. She also wonders (and rightly so) why such

¹ For recent publications with additional details about the important contributions to U.S. foreign relations by Charles Diggs see Brenda Gayle Plummer, *In Search of Power: African Americans in the Era of Decolonization, 1956-1974* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 253-259; Andy DeRoche, "KK, the Godfather, and the Duke: Maintaining Positive Relations between Zambia and the United States in Spite of Nixon's Other Priorities," *Safundi* (January 2011): 97-121, especially 99.

an important figure as E. Frederic Morrow, a special assistant to President Dwight Eisenhower, does not appear in the narrative. In Wright's view, Tillery could have incorporated useful material from Morrow's papers in the Dwight Eisenhower Presidential Library in Kansas. In Wright's conclusion, however, she returns to the positive notes that sound throughout most of her essay, and characterizes Tillery's book as a "careful and ambitious" one that adds "depth and complexity" to the literature on African Americans' historical relationship with Africa.

Reviewer Mark Sawyer of the University of California at Los Angeles gives high marks for the broad sweep of *Between Homeland and Motherland*, as well as the provocative conceptual questions that drive the narrative. According to Sawyer this combination creates "an extremely interesting book," and one that is "welcome in the world of political science." In a field that Sawyer fears often prefers "methodological tricks" rather than substance, Tillery's work is a very stimulating and concrete contribution based on careful analysis of historic events.

In particular, Sawyer praises Tillery for his explanation of black elites' views on the nineteenth century colonization movement which created Liberia, his examination of the Harry S. Truman years, and his argument that the 1970s anti-apartheid activism of CBC members such as Diggs was not simply a symbolic undertaking. Regarding this last example, Sawyer is especially impressed and observes that "Tillery puts this mode of argumentation to rest." While Sawyer admits some concerns about who will actually read *From Homeland to Motherland*, he believes that a wide range of scholars and students should do so. In his laudatory conclusion he reiterates that Tillery certainly has made a "signal contribution to several fields," but closes by wondering "are those fields ready for it?"

The most thorough of the three reviews, by George White, is also generally positive about Tillery's book. White judges *From Homeland to Motherland* to be a "superb monograph" in which Tillery displays an admirable willingness to engage with scholarship from outside his field and utilizes "sharp, focused prose" to dissect several key events in the history of black American relations with Africa spread out across some two hundred years. White also lauds Tillery for revolving the entire story around the key question of how we can best explain "the complex ideational dynamics that shape the behavior of black politicians, social movement activists, and intellectuals as they engage with issues in U.S. foreign policy toward Africa."

White points out the effectiveness of several of Tillery's specific examples, such as his discussions of Paul Cuffe and Frederick Douglass, and his re-evaluation of the famous debate between W.E.B. DuBois and Booker T. Washington. Furthermore, White is particularly impressed by Tillery's analysis of the efforts to overturn apartheid by Charles Diggs and other members of the CBC in the 1970s and beyond. White adds to Tillery's discussion of Diggs by pointing out that in several important instances, most notably by attending the trial of the killers of Emmett Till in Mississippi, Diggs demonstrated that he was serving a "broader constituency than the people in his home district." White concludes his praise by applauding Tillery for skillfully tracing the earlier work by the CBC to the

1986 passage of the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act, which had so much support in the wider U.S. Congress by 1986 that legislators overturned a veto by the extremely popular president, Ronald Reagan.

White does offer some constructive criticism, however, questioning why voices of African-American women are not heard more often in *From Homeland to Motherland*. Including the views of powerful females such as renowned journalist and anti-lynching activist Ida Wells-Barnett, or Diane Nash, one of the earliest members of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, in White's astute assessment, would have made this excellent book even better. In his conclusion White returns to his earlier positive take on Tillery's work, and contends convincingly that the book provides us with a "wonderful analytic framework within which to evaluate the actions of the Obama administration in light of the expanding U.S. military footprint in Africa." This is an excellent point by White about the potential usefulness of Tillery's tome, and one with which I wholeheartedly agree.

Indeed, my reaction upon reading *From Homeland to Motherland* was very similar to the laudatory responses offered by the three reviewers. I share their admiration for the scope of this study, and the excellent selection of specific examples such as Charles Diggs and Paul Cuffe. One minor detail about Cuffe that Tillery perhaps should have included is the fact that the great African-American sailor actually met with President James Madison in the White House in 1812 to discuss Sierra Leone, and that Madison from then on considered Cuffe one of the leading experts on Africa in the nation.²

The section on the 1950s in *From Homeland to Motherland* is generally excellent, although one minor error caught my eye. When discussing Martin Luther King's attendance at Ghana's independence ceremony in 1957, Tillery states that King was "just 36 years old." (123) He was in fact only 28 years old, and considering that he was only 39 when he died in 1968, it is perhaps more important to be precise about King's age than many other people's age, because it helps us understand how much he accomplished as such a young man, and in so tragically short of a life. This of course takes nothing away from the insightfulness of Tillery's analysis about black American views on Africa during the early Cold War. Two final suggestions occurred to me while reflecting on this fine piece of scholarship. First, in his wonderful opening section in which he examines the debates over the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) and contends convincingly that some members of the CBC such as then Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr. opposed the measure due to domestic political concerns, Tillery might have also noted the strong support for the AGOA by other leading black Americans such as former ambassador Andrew Young.³ Second, Tillery's reinterpretation of the influence of "transnationalism" (1) on African-American debates

² For details on the Cuffe/Madison meeting and its impact on Madison's thinking and U.S. policy see Sheldon Harris, *Paul Cuffe: Black America and the African Return* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972), 58-60. Tillery did use Harris as a source but did not include these important aspects of Cuffe's life.

³ On Young's support for the AGOA see Andrew DeRoche, *Andrew Young: Civil Rights Ambassador* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2003), 166-168.

over U.S. foreign relations is, for the most part, helpful and thought-provoking. In crafting his definition, however, Tillery should have consulted one of the original sources for the term, which was a brilliant 1916 article by Randolph Bourne, the renowned intellectual.⁴ Bourne's eloquent words, penned nearly one hundred years ago in the midst of World War I, a time when the country was torn apart by arguments over immigration, citizenship, and foreign relations similar to the debates of the early twenty-first century, are still true and inspirational: "America is coming to be, not a nationality but a trans-nationality, a weaving back and forth, with the other lands, of many threads of all sizes and colors."⁵ Perhaps if President Obama reads Tillery's book, takes it to heart, and overhauls U.S. foreign policy, Bourne's prediction will finally come true.

Participants:

Alvin B. Tillery, Jr. is Associate Professor and Vice-Chair for Undergraduate Studies in the Department of Political Science at Rutgers University—New Brunswick. He is currently writing a book on African American attitudes toward immigration from 1850-1965.

Andy DeRoche teaches history at Front Range Community College and international affairs at the University of Colorado. He currently serves as an H-Diplo editor for African topics. His major publications include a study of US/Zimbabwe relations and a biography of Andrew Young. He is working on a book about Zambia's relations with the United States during the Kaunda era.

Mark Sawyer is currently a Professor of African American Studies and Political Science at UCLA, the Director of the Center for the Study of Race, Ethnicity and Politics and the Chair of the UCLA Interdisciplinary Program in Afro-American Studies. He received his Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Chicago in December of 1999. His published work includes a book entitled, *Racial Politics in Post Revolutionary Cuba* that received the DuBois Award for the best book by the National Conference of Black Political Scientists and the Ralph Bunche Award from the American Political Science Association. He also co-edited a volume entitled, *Just Neighbors? Research on African American Latino Research in the United States*. He has written articles on the intersection between race and gender in modern Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic and additional work on the impact of race relations on democratic transition in Cuba. He also has interest in the area of race, immigration and citizenship around the globe.

An Associate Professor of History, **George White, Jr.** works in the Department of History & Philosophy at York College, City University of New York. He received his Ph.D. from Temple University and is the author of *Holding the Line: Race, Racism, and American Foreign Policy Toward Africa, 1953-1961* and, more recently, "Big Ballin'!?: Vice President Nixon And The Creation Of The Bureau Of African Affairs In The U.S. Department Of State," in the August

⁴ Randolph Bourne, "Trans-national America," *Atlantic Monthly* (July 1916), 86-97.

⁵ Bourne, 96.

2010 edition of *Passport*. He is currently working on a book-length manuscript regarding the experiences of an African American minister who served as an Army Chaplain during World War II.

Leah M. Wright is an Assistant Professor of History & African American Studies at Wesleyan University. She received her B.A. in history from Dartmouth College and her M.A. and Ph.D. in history from Princeton University. Her research interests include 20th Century United States political and social history and modern African American history. Her writing has been published in the *Journal of Federal History*, *Souls*, *Oxford African American Studies Center Online/African American National Biography*, as well as in the anthology *Making the South Red: When, Where, Why, and How the South Became Republican*. Currently, Leah is working on a book, *The Loneliness of the Black Conservative: Pragmatic Politics and the Pursuit of Power*; her project offers new insight into the relationship between African American politics, the American civil rights movement, and the Republican Party.

What historians have come to identify as the “Long Civil Rights Movement,” has organized the approach to African American History for approximately a decade, but had much less expression in political science. Works by Robin D.G. Kelley, Penny Von Eschen, Brenda Guy Plummer, Nikhil Singh, Mary Dudziak and Steven Hahn have sought to expand both the time frame and the ideological scope of the civil rights struggle¹. It is worth mentioning that Azzaa Salamm Layton’s *International Politics and Civil Rights Policies in the United States, 1941-1960* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000) covers at least a part of the Cold War Period, but political scientists for both conceptual and methodological reasons, with few exceptions, have tended to approach the African American struggle in discreet time frames and using a dominant methodology. This is in part due to the coming of age of the study of black politics in the dual eras of the rise of behavioralism and the rise and fall of urban black political power in the Post-Civil Rights Era.

Thus, the kind of historical sweep driven by a topic or conceptual question as covered in Alvin B. Tillery’s *Between Homeland and Motherland: Africa and US Foreign Policy and Black Leadership in America* is a departure from that norm and it makes for an extremely interesting book. By focusing on the relationship on African American political engagement with Africa Tillery is able to break some of the limitations of explorations of black politics both in ideological terms and in moving beyond the shores of the U.S.

Tillery focuses his study on leaders, black media and elected officials to demonstrate in different eras there were different foci of concern within the black community with regard to Africa. Tillery explores public discourse and more importantly the black press in order to establish strands of debate within the black community.

The book is welcome in the world of political science. While less the case in the field of black politics, so much of the work that field is driven by the dominance of behavioralism and survey research. Given that large-scale surveys are certainly not available for the nineteenth century, the systematic analysis of black newspapers is a refreshing approach to problem-driven research, rather than research driven by methods. Conceptually the book is also strong. Tillery allows the question to drive his approach and it is deeply refreshing in a field that has begun to favor methodological tricks over substance.

¹ Robin D.G. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002). Penny Von Eschen, *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anti-Colonialism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997); Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Rising Winds: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935-1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Nikhil Singh, *Black is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005); Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); and Steven Hahn, *A Nation Under our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South from Slavery to the Great Migration* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004).

A look into a few chapters offers a trove of insight on many matters, for example, the topic of Liberia colonization, which was the first major Africa policy debate among black elites. The debate overtime also demonstrated the perspective and limitations of discourse in the black community. For example while Tillery demonstrates that black leaders differed on the approach to Liberia and the project, there was unanimous antipathy toward the American Colonization Society and similar near unanimous demand for support of international recognition of Liberia.

One of the more interesting sections of the book outlines the ways in which Cold War politics under President Harry Truman created a feedback loop that changed the course of black politics in the U.S. Organizations like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) were under pressure to purge communists like W.E.B. DuBois and Paul Robeson from their ranks in order to facilitate reforms by the Federal Government. This chapter sets the stage for understanding the resurgence of radicalism in the 1960's which has often been seen by some students of black politics as an aberration, rather than a much more central manifestation of the topic

The more contemporary chapters explore ground that is largely ignored by contemporary political science. The role of Black actors and organizations in the anti-Apartheid movement receives scant treatment in studies of late twentieth century black politics that largely focus on urban electoral movements. However, as Tillery demonstrates, anti-Apartheid activism formed a central concern for black political actors at all levels. Outside of the historical context that Tillery provides, claims by the political scientist Carol Swain that engagement with foreign policy was some form of distraction and purely symbolic gain credence.² Tillery puts this mode of argumentation to rest. The Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) led but also reflected historical concerns of black political actors both within and outside of elected office, relative to Africa. Rather than episodic concern, engagement with Africa was at best sustained and at worst cyclical.

My only concern about this book is its audience. Scholars of the African Diaspora have been less concerned with the relationship between social movement actors, black media, and the state. The question of Diasporic transnationalism is not even on the radar for scholars of Congress or scholars of international relations who still prefer to think of foreign policy as resulting from a unitary rational state as a primary actor. Even more troubling, scholars of black politics, like Swain, have often dismissed transnational black politics as symbolic elite engagement, or ignored them altogether. Questions about about foreign affairs, Africa, or the Diaspora more generally, have for the most part been absent from surveys of black public opinion. That is, scholars have often not even asked the questions about the motherland or many other issues related to the African Diaspora that would enable them to incorporate them into our understanding of Black public opinion. At the same time, stalwarts of African Diaspora studies might desire a more robust theoretical discussion of shades and modes of Pan-Africanism than appears in the book, but that should not stop

² Carol Swain, *Black Faces, Black Interests: The Representations of African Americans in Congress* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993).

them from reading and learning from the book. The broader point is that Tillery has made a signal contribution to several fields. The question is, are those fields ready for it?

In *Between Homeland and Motherland: Africa, U.S. Foreign Policy, and Black Leadership in America*, Alvin Tillery has given us a wonderful piece of scholarship that will challenge much of the conventional thinking regarding the complicated relationship between African Americans and the people and issues of the continent of Africa. Although Tillery brings to bear his considerable disciplinary skills, this work also stands out because of his willingness to engage scholarship outside of his field. Written in sharp, focused prose, *Between Homeland and Motherland* dissects the interaction among African Americans regarding Africa and reaches many provocative conclusions.

Between Homeland and Motherland explores the behavior of black leadership toward Africa over the course of two centuries. Tillery asserts that transnationalism – a sense of shared identity among blacks and between African Americans and Africa – cannot fully explain Black elite behavior toward the continent. However, his object is not to dismantle the transnational explanation but to expand upon it. In the opening pages, Tillery concedes that much of his analysis confirms the strength of transnationalism as an explanatory framework. Nonetheless, he hypothesizes that a “strategic behavior model of black elite activism” offers crucial insights into the engagement with Africa by generations of black leaders (13). Tillery is a skillful writer and shrewd analyst of schools of thought in both political science and history. Throughout the text, Tillery navigates the tensions among individuals and between citizens and the State. The result is a superb monograph which should have a wide-reaching impact across disciplines.

This review will examine this chronicle, its strengths and limitations, and its place within the extant scholarly literature.

Between Homeland and Motherland is fascinating, in part, because of the ambition of its project. On the one hand, it reads like a complex primer on bridging scholarly gaps within and between disciplines. Tillery acknowledges that part of his aim is to create a cross-fertilization between competing movements within political science in response to a challenge to the field issued by the eminent political scientist Hanes Walton (9). Walton encouraged scholars fascinated by the intersection of race and political outcomes to give greater attention to institutions and the social milieu in which they operate. The multi-archival research base reflects the author’s wide reading across disciplines and his analysis “employ[s] several qualitative methods and statistical modeling (10).” On the other hand, it is remarkably straightforward as it drives through its examination of a single question: how do we explain “the complex ideational dynamics that shape the behavior of black politicians, social movement activists, and intellectuals as they engage with issues in U.S. foreign policy toward Africa? (ix)”

Tillery breaks down the centuries-long analysis into five chapters. Chapter One explores the paradoxes of black emigration to Liberia. In this chapter, Tillery examines the cases of ‘Liberia Fever’ that struck many Americans in the nineteenth century. The examination begins in the Early National period in American history and continues into the counter-

Reconstruction era following the Civil War. Tillery points out that black elites had contrasting views of Liberia – of Africa, generally – as a sanctuary for oppressed peoples. These views were shaped by white support for emigration as a way of ridding the nation of its free black population and strengthening slavery. For example, the impact of Paul Cuffee’s successful voyage to ‘repatriate’ forty Blacks to Sierra Leone was undermined by the recruitment efforts of the American Colonization Society (ACS). Cuffee, convinced that emigration was a viable option for American blacks, was stunned to find a lukewarm response to his success within the black community. Tillery asserts that such ambivalence is not surprising because overwhelming majorities of black folk rejected the racist appeals of the ACS, which they associated with any type of migration to Liberia. (16-17)

Following the American Civil War, a delegation of Americo-Liberians were disappointed that black people did not respond more favorably to their emigrationist entreaties. Even with the rise in white vigilante violence and massive resistance to black assertions of freedom, black leaders remained divided over the question of emigration. Tillery’s analysis suggests that any affective ties that black leaders felt for Africa were secondary to these leaders’ perceived domestic interests. Tillery asserts that champions like Frederick Douglass supported U.S. recognition of Liberia not because they hoped that nation could become a new homeland for African Americans but because such diplomatic recognition could spur the recognition of black civil rights in the U.S.

This line of inquiry carries into Chapter Two, wherein Tillery examines the conflicts between Booker T. Washington and exodus writ large along with the tensions among the leading Pan-Africanists, Williams DuBois and Marcus Garvey. The competition between the latter’s views of Pan-Africanism has been discussed extensively in the historical literature. Tillery asserts that “a clash of personalities” (50) is not a sufficient explanation for the rift between two leaders whose assessments largely overlapped. Invoking the strategic behavior mode of analysis, Tillery explains that DuBois and other elites objected to Garvey’s vision because they thought that his idea of disgorging Africa from European colonialism – not to mention his unimpressive organizational skills - was actually a threat to the domestic interests of the black masses. Thus, Tillery distinguishes what he regards as the Pan-Africanism of DuBois and A. Phillip Randolph from what he considers to be Garvey’s ‘Black Imperialism,’ opining that the division between DuBois and Garvey rested on conflicting assumptions about what was best for Black communities rather than an ego-driven schism between cultural titans.

Chapter Three addresses the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People’s NAACP’s efforts to shape American diplomacy with Africa from the mid-1930s into the early Cold War period. Tillery acknowledges the “pragmatic Pan Africanism” of the NAACP in the first three decades of the twentieth century, as well as DuBois’ criticisms of the group in the wake of its “slow-footed response” to the Italian-Ethiopian War (76). Yet, Tillery views the NAACP’s actions in the 1940s and 50s as being consistent with the opinions of the majority of African Americans, a view that challenges the prevailing scholarly consensus on both the influence of the Black Left and the reticence of African Americans to openly embrace the continent of their forebears. Tillery argues that the organization’s anti-communist anti-colonialism grew out of its concerns for the continued viability of the black

human rights struggle, as well as skepticism about the Communist Party-of the United States (CPUSA). His content analysis of black newspapers suggests that most editorialists and readers agreed with the NAACP approach and held its work in higher esteem than that of organizational rivals like the Committee on African Affairs (CAA). Tillery does not suggest that the NAACP was 'better' on Africa than the CAA, simply that scholars have not given the organization its due and that its leaders always saw support for Africa as a crucial part of its domestic reform program.

In Chapter Four, Tillery continues the examination of black leadership in the early Cold War by tackling their various approaches to the issue of African Decolonization. Although the author acknowledges that leaders like Malcolm X and activists like the members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) played important roles in helping to launch a third wave of Pan Africanism, Tillery argues that the overlooked actions of DuBois, Ralph Bunche, and William Hastie – among others – deserves examination in order to create a fuller picture of the struggle. Tillery shows that Bunche and Hastie articulated a Pan Africanism that focused on colonization the world over, considering a principally race-based ideology to be “both passé and morally dubious.” (105). In contrast, DuBois championed a Pan Africanism that focused on African struggles and, as the author demonstrates through content analysis, the old lion received wider support among editorialists and the black masses.

In addition, the author asserts that “the visions of Africa held by the Black community” (108) were shaped both by domestic needs and by four seminal events in the period: the Defiance Campaign in South Africa; the Mau Mau Rebellion in Kenya; the independence of Ghana; and the Crisis in Lumumba’s Congo. Herein Tillery argues that not only did African Americans have a strong sense of linked fate with the ‘motherland’ but that support for certain developments on the continent varied based on the tactics used by Africans. To wit, black masses and leaders supported the Defiance Campaign because it mirrored the non-violent civil disobedience that had taken place for generations in black communities. On the other hand, blacks were much more ambivalent about the Mau Mau Rebellion because of its willingness to use violence as a tactic in the struggle for self-determination.

The final substantive chapter of the book, “We Are a Power Bloc,” examines the emergence of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) as a leadership cadre that sought to influence U.S. foreign policy toward the motherland. The chapter includes a treasure trove of oral history interviews with many of the original members of the CBC but the star of this portion of the text is former Michigan Representative Charles Diggs. Diggs first won election to Congress in 1954 and cut his teeth in an institution that sought to defend white privilege within its realm as ardently as any segregationist (130). Diggs articulated the sentiment that he served a much broader constituency than the people in his home district; his presence at the 1955 murder trial of Roy Bryant and J. W. Milam – the men who lynched Emmett Till – spoke to this commitment; Till was a Black teenager from Chicago who was kidnapped, tortured, and killed in Mississippi supposedly for talking to a White woman. Influenced by New York Democratic representative Adam Clayton Powell, Diggs became an internationalist and pushed the founding members of the CBC to hone their legislative skills through a focus on foreign affairs. Consequently, the CBC-backed legislative

campaign seeking sanctions against the apartheid government in South Africa was more than just the politics of symbolism; this campaign allowed the members of the CBC to engage with Africa and speak to the concerns of many of their constituents, while expanding their influence in a hostile institution. Tillery notes that the willingness of the CBC to collaborate with organizations like TransAfrica in the wider Free South Africa Movement ultimately led to the passage of the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 (CAAA). However, the author's view that black elite engagement with Africa grew, in part, out of domestic needs fits with the passage of the CAAA in the mid-1980s and with the split within the CBC in 1999 over the African Growth and Opportunity Act – the latter being the tale that forms the bookends of the analysis.

To his credit, *Between Homeland and Motherland* accomplishes the task that Tillery gave himself. *Between Homeland and Motherland* does more than poke holes in a particular school of thought. Tillery's "alternative theory holds that the decisions that minority elites make about mobilizing in the foreign policymaking arena on behalf of their ancestral homelands emerge from strategic calculations that seek to balance the value of the engagement against the costs accrued in the domestic arena (150)." What makes Tillery's argument so compelling is his deft use of a wide array of sources, his interdisciplinary approach, and the broad applicability of his theory. Although acknowledging that black America is a unique minority group, the author believes that the "strategic behavior model" (154) articulated in the book can be applied to other groups as well. An additional benefit is that Tillery's theory implies that elite engagement in U.S. diplomacy toward a homeland does not necessarily imply an assimilation crisis within the racial or ethnic group in question.

Because of the provocative nature of the author's thesis and the persuasive evidence he provides to support it, *Between Homeland and Motherland* is certain to draw a wide audience and a large, likely favorable, response. It complements the work of such scholars as Kevin Gaines, Carol Anderson, and Michael Dawson, while challenging or testing the ideas articulated by James Meriwether, Carol Swain, Penny Von Eschen and others. ¹Having said this, the book's overall success overshadows certain shortcomings.

Tillery's discourse conflates black leadership with prominent black men. Although many of the institutions and organizations which he examines were dominated by men, one cannot help but wonder about the silence of black women in the text. It seems impossible to

¹ Carol Anderson, *Eyes Off the Prize: the United Nation and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944-1955* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Michael Dawson, *Behind the Mule: Race and Class in African American Politics* (Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1994); Kevin Gaines, *Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics, and Culture in the Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); James Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935-1961* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935-1962* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Carol Swain, *Black Faces, Black Interests: The Representation of African Americans in Congress* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1993); Penny Von Eschen, *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anti-Colonialism* (Ithaca, NY.: Cornell University Press, 1997).

imagine that women like Charlotte Forten, Ida B. Wells-Barnett, Anna Julia Cooper, or Mary McLeod Bethune had no opinion on Africa or emigration. Indeed, could it be that the NAACP's Edith Sampson had no influence on the strategies developed or executed by Walter White or Roy Wilkins? Equally troubling is the author's use of certain jargon or sub-topics that are distracting. For instance, the author relies on the term "paternalism" (34) when discussing black leadership, though it is not always clear what the term means and how it fits within the larger argument. In the second chapter, the author describes Garvey's views as "Black Imperialism" (60) but this assessment seems like a strained analogy. Finally, the author invokes the term "Black authenticity" (103) in the fourth chapter and grounds it in the ideas of the social critic Stanley Crouch. This reader found the use of the phrase confusing because it refers to a concept that means different things to different people, because these meanings are hotly contested, and because some of the connotations seem fallacious. For instance, this phrase is used to describe the ways in which low-achieving black students supposedly taunt their high-performing peers for acting "white" by excelling in school. This alleged crisis is refuted by anecdotal evidence of the experiences of many high-achieving black students – this author among them – and by recent sociological research.² This reader finds the use of the phrase forced and misguided since Crouch's critical eye is often overwhelmed by his slippery grasp of American history.

In the fourth chapter, the author made a strategic choice to focus on the activities of the burgeoning Congressional Black Caucus. His choice is commendable and provides fresh insights. Nonetheless, the author's choice leaves it to others to discern the views of the activists who propelled America toward true democracy even as they pondered the idea of being a "black colony" within the United States. Thus, we are left to wonder how the strategic behavior model might explain the work of SNCC leaders like Diane Nash and Kwame Toure (nee Stokely Carmichael) or others like Ella Baker, Elaine Brown, or Kathleen Cleaver, all of whom interacted with African dignitaries and students either in the U.S. or abroad.

Between Homeland and Motherland makes a fantastic companion to new scholarship in this area by emerging scholars (*Colored Cosmopolitanism* by Nico Slate, *Black Internationalist Feminism* by Cheryl Higashida, and *In the Cause of Freedom* by Minkah Makalani) and veteran intellectuals (Gerald Horne's, *Negro Comrades of the Crown*, Robin D. G. Kelley's *Africa Speaks, America Answers*, and Minter/Hovey/Cobb's *No Easy Victories*).³ Moreover,

² Karolyn Tyson, *Integration Interrupted: Tracking, Black Students & Acting White After Brown* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

³ Cheryl Higashida, *Black Internationalist Feminism: Women Writers of the Black Left, 1945-1995* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2011); Minkah Makalani, *In the Cause of Freedom: Radical Black Internationalism from Harlem to London, 1917-1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011); Nico Slate, *Colored Cosmopolitanism: The Shared Struggle for Freedom in the United States and India* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012); see also Gerald Horne, *Negro Comrades of the Crown: African Americans and the British Empire Fight the U.S. Before Emancipation* (New York: New York University Press, 2012); Robin D.G. Kelley, *Africa Speaks, America Answers: Modern Jazz in Revolutionary Times* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012); Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Window on Freedom: Race, Civil Rights and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1988* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

this reader finds Tillery's work to be enlightening because it surreptitiously makes one look forward even as we look back upon two hundred years of community-building across the Black Atlantic. In this respect, the book provides a wonderful analytic framework within which to evaluate the actions of the Obama administration in light of the expanding U.S. military footprint in Africa, a proxy war in Somalia that is exacerbating that country's humanitarian crisis, and an offensive, multi-lateral air war against Libya that seems like a neo-colonial coup. Tillery's *Between Homeland and Motherland* combines many of the best elements of diplomatic history, African American history, and political science to weave a story that will find receptive audiences in multiple fields.

Between Homeland and Motherland: Africa, U.S. Foreign Policy, and Black Leadership in America opens with a provocative question. Highlighting Illinois Representative Jesse Jackson, Jr.'s outwardly perplexing rejection of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), Alvin B. Tillery ponders: why would a black politician support legislation to "protect" African countries from relationships they eagerly pursued? Better yet – how would this opposition allow Jackson – and other black American politicians – to forge "affective ties" with his ancestral homeland? (1 – 3) These kinds of questions are at the core of *Between Homeland and Motherland*, as Tillery attempts to answer those "empirical puzzles" or moments that exist outside the boundaries of contemporary scholarly explanations (2). Indeed, in *Between Homeland and Motherland*, Tillery takes great care to engage the prominent theoretical arguments and debates across multiple fields; and in many ways, he successfully compels his audience to reconsider many of these ground-breaking theses.

Historically, scholars have struggled to make sense of black elites' contradictory behaviors and attitudes; while such struggles are not unique to the arena of U.S. foreign policy, intellectuals have spent decades hyper-focusing on the way in which 'Africa' – as both a continent and an identity – has influenced African American behavior and ideology. Traditionally, scholars make sense of this relationship by pointing to a theory of "linked fate," or, as Michael Dawson observes, the belief that "upper- and middle-income blacks" display a deep-rooted connection to other blacks by virtue of their shared ancestry, history, and experience.¹ When applied to foreign policy, however, this theory of 'linked fate' simultaneously forces scholars to rely heavily on theories of transnationalism. Simply put, scholars have long assumed that affective ties to an ancestral homeland are the sole motivator for black elite political behavior.

And yet, as Tillery rightly points out, nothing could be further from the truth – scholarly overreliance on transnationalism has failed to reconcile the often-contradictory behavior of the black elite throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In this respect, Tillery revises our understanding of transnationalism as a theory, arguing that while important, it is rarely sufficient to compel black elites to advocate on behalf of Africa within the U.S. foreign policy arena. A transnationalist approach, Tillery argues, does not guarantee that black Americans will work constructively on behalf of the interests of the African continent; on the contrary – African American elites will only work for Africa when it bears little to no political cost, or when it generates positive benefits among domestic constituents. In other words, Tillery highlights not only the deeply ingrained paternalism of the black elite toward their domestic constituents, but also points out that their political loyalty is driven by domestic concerns rather than a purely global outlook.

¹ Michael C. Dawson, *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 11.

Between Homeland and Motherland begins in the nineteenth century, exploring the opposition of black elites to the exodus movements of the era. Here then, the author offers a unique political science contribution to the historical works of scholars like Nell Painter, Kevin Gaines, James Grossman, and Evelyn Higginbotham.² Through rigorous content analysis of nineteenth century black periodicals, Tillery demonstrates that black elites both supported emigration – when they believed it would advance black rights domestically – and rejected such policies when they appeared harmful to “homefront rights” (21). Ultimately, Tillery suggests, black elites overwhelmingly worked to block ‘exodus’ policies during this period, viewing emigration to an ancestral homeland as incongruous to black Americans’ homeland rights. The author extends this argument into his second chapter, in an examination largely focused on the black elite’s response to Garveyism and the United Negro Improvement Association (UNIA); in short, Tillery rejects the traditional “clash of personalities theory,” instead suggesting that black elites viewed Garveyism as a threat to the black masses, because the movement’s emphasis on emigration and repatriation to Africa “revived the specter of the late-nineteenth-century emigration movements” (70). This chapter should prove particularly helpful to scholars of Garveyism in that it begins to answer a significant, longstanding question: why would black elites oppose Garveyism – one of the most successful Pan-Africanist movements in modern American history – at a time when most of these leaders were committed to transnationalism in U.S. foreign policy? Tillery argues that black leaders also rejected Garvey out of a sense of paternalism and linked fate; specifically, black elites were hypersensitive to the alleged needs of the black masses and feared that Marcus Garvey would take advantage of African Americans, thereby damaging black credibility in the battle for homefront rights.

Tillery’s theory of black elite paternalism is valuable here for a number of reasons. As Cathy Cohen writes in *The Boundaries of Blackness: Aids and the Breakdown of Black Politics*, the black elite was often an “example for and regulator of appropriate behavior by the masses.”³ In a similar vein, as Tillery explains in the first few chapters of *Between Homeland and Motherland*, “members of the black elite continued to view themselves as the only capable defenders of the interests of downtrodden blacks in the public sphere.” (28) Members of the black elite believed that grassroots movements were “prime” examples of why “downtrodden blacks needed their representation” (28). This theme of black paternalism in foreign policy is one that Tillery traces throughout *Between Homeland and Motherland*, and one that ties class and foreign policy debates to the postwar era and the twentieth century civil rights movement. For example, Tillery offers a significant historical contribution by looking at the foreign policy role of black elite groups like the National

² For more information, please see: Nell Painter, *Exodusters: Black Migration to Kansas After Reconstruction* (W.W. Norton & Company, 1992); Kevin Gaines, *Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics, and Culture in the Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); James Grossman, *Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners, and the Great Migration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); and Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, *Righteous Discontent: The Women’s Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994).

³ Cathy Cohen, *The Boundaries of Blackness: Aids and the Breakdown of Black Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 71.

Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) between 1935 and 1957. The author rejects the argument that the rise of the Cold War and the national security state forced the NAACP to reject its transnational commitment out of fear of persecution, and that this so-called shift facilitated the collapse of black anti-colonial politics. Instead, Tillery suggests that groups like the NAACP *always* saw anti-colonial agitation as connected to their homefront politics; indeed, this behavior – marked by its anticommunist agenda – was well in line with the organization’s prewar behavior. Tillery’s work (which should be a nice compliment to legal historian Mary Dudziak’s *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*) suggests that this pragmatic, if perhaps elitist, approach actually advanced the NAACP’s cause with bureaucrats in the Executive Office and the State Department; moreover, Tillery suggests that the organization’s anticommunist approach may not have shocked “the black masses” because the “community overwhelmingly supported President Harry Truman’s efforts to contain communism and viewed the NAACP’s alliance with his administration as a boon to both the black community and to Africa” (78).⁴ Tillery’s content analysis here is very persuasive, in that he illustrates that the “Truman approach” had broad support among African American communities between 1944 to 1955; significantly, the author also found that there was no decline in anti-colonial voices in black newspapers during this period (94).

It is important to note that Tillery is not rejecting the argument of those scholars that focused on black radical activism during this period; instead, he enriches our understanding of the historical period by honing in on the actions of black elite moderates and their changing relationship to the black masses. Tillery also highlights this changing relationship when he looks at black politics during the 1950s and 1960s; of particular importance is his suggestion that black elites and the masses both rewrote their notions of authenticity in response to African decolonization movements; in doing so, both groups adopted a kind of consensus, attempting to incorporate positive portrayals of African countries independence with African American identity. (119)

In closing *Between Homeland and Motherland*, Tillery returns to his opening example of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), examining the members’ foreign policy interventions since the 1960s. The content analysis – of bills between 1969 and 1987 – is excellent and much needed, and introduces a new picture of CBC members and their domestic and international motivations. Tillery’s contrast between members’ support of the Free South Africa Movement (FSAM) and their later rejection of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) is especially compelling; members supported the FSAM not only because of affective ties to black South Africans living under apartheid, but more so to maintain control, domestically, as the leading force on the issue. In a sense, controlling the anti-apartheid debate provided CBC members with Congressional clout that proved useful in their primary domestic battles. Interestingly, the same strategic motivations compelled CBC members to reject the AGOA; as Tillery writes, the CBC members “who opposed the AGOA were largely forthcoming about the fact that they did so because they viewed the

⁴ Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

measure as a threat to their [domestic] constituencies” (145). The author rightly points out that those members whose districts had higher unemployment rates, lower median incomes, and were located in the southern United States were much more likely to vote against the AGOA; thus, as Tillery highlights, this type of behavior was consistent with the type of ‘black engagement’ with foreign policy and Africa throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

While Tillery’s book is clearly a strong contribution to the field of black politics and foreign policy, there are some areas that falter in their treatment of the broader subject matter. Within the text, Tillery focuses on the most prominent voices among black elites. This is noteworthy when thinking about the author’s model of analysis; he moves beyond the boundaries of conventional radical politics and introduces his audience to moderate and influential political figures and movements. And yet, there’s very little analysis of conservatism as a mode of thought and behavior among African Americans. At times, Tillery hints at a subtext of social and political conservatism motivator factors (in his discussion of anticommunism, the NAACP, and the black masses, for instance), but there’s little in-depth exploration of the ideological differences that separate these black elite groups and figures. Where does the rabid anticommunism of a Zora Neale Hurston belong in this discussion? Or the conservatism of syndicated black journalist and prominent writer George Schuyler?

It is true that these two figures represent two extreme examples in the ideological discussion of African Americans and foreign policy; nevertheless, there’s a very real possibility that they, and others, may have played a significant role in this larger foreign policy debate. Moreover, one wonders how prominent black Republican figures like E. Frederic Morrow – a special assistant within the Eisenhower White House – might have figured into Tillery’s larger narrative. How did Morrow’s views on African independence influence Vice-President Richard Nixon’s foreign policy views during the 1950s and forward? Indeed, Morrow was one of several African Americans to accompany Vice President Richard Nixon on his trip to Ghana in the late 1950s, a point which James Meriwether touches on in his article, “‘Worth a Lot of Negro Votes’: Black Voters, Africa, and the 1960 Presidential Campaign.”⁵ Here then, Morrow’s records from the Dwight Eisenhower Presidential Library and Archives could have been an excellent source for quantitative and qualitative content analysis.

Moreover, a reading of the dimensions of black conservatism would have added tremendously to Tillery’s arguments about linked fate and paternalism; indeed, it appears that Tillery is arguing that black paternalism in foreign policy, in some ways, is an inherently conservative concept. To these ends, a qualitative and quantitative content analysis of a black conservative policy journal, like the *Lincoln Review*, could have revealed the ways in which black conservative thinkers positioned and institutionalized their paternalism throughout Congress and the Executive Office; such an analysis would also add

⁵ James H. Meriwether, “‘Worth a Lot of Negro Votes’: Black Voters, Africa, and the 1960 Presidential Campaign,” *The Journal of American History* (2008) 95 (3): 737-763.

a unique and new dimension to the larger debate among African American radicals, liberals, and moderates over the fate of the “black masses.”

Nevertheless, these are minor concerns – ones that are perhaps outside the scope of Tillery’s project. Indeed, *Between Homeland and Motherland* expands and revises the existing debates, thereby opening the floodgates for the kind of scholarship that would broadly examine the ideological contours of black politics and foreign policy. Overall, this is an exciting project and a welcome addition to the scholarly field. Tillery’s work is careful and ambitious, thoughtfully tackling an extensive time period and adding depth and complexity to our understanding of black elites’ beliefs and ideas on foreign policy, emigration, Diaspora, and Pan-Africanism. This is a book that should be embraced by political scientists, historians, and foreign policy scholars alike.

Author's Response by Alvin B. Tillery, Jr., Rutgers University

When I began the research for *Between Homeland and Motherland: Africa, U.S. Foreign Policy, and Black Leadership in America*, I had three main goals. First, I wanted to provide an account of the Black elite's engagement with issues in U.S. foreign policy toward Africa that would allow us to understand why Pan-African initiatives waxed and waned over time. Second, I wanted to challenge the dominant interpretations of Pan-Africanism (and other transnational movements)—that it was a threat to both national security and our nation's status as a diverse democracy—which held sway in American political science in the last decades of the twentieth century.¹ Finally, building on the examples set by scholars like Hanes Walton, Linda Faye Williams, and Michael Dawson—all giants in the field of African American politics—I wanted to produce a book that took seriously the insights of historians.² (To be honest, I also hoped that maybe a historian or two would actually read the book.)

The incredibly generous reviews of the book proffered in this forum by Mark Sawyer, George White, and Leah Wright, three scholars whom I greatly admire and try to emulate in my work, convinces me that I have achieved at least some of what I set out to do in the project. More important, by pointing out flaws in the work, amplifying themes that I touched open only to briefly, and filling gaps in my knowledge about sources, their keen analytical gazes have allowed me to see the book through fresh eyes. This response represents my humble attempt to communicate what I now see thanks to my colleagues' critical engagement with the text.

Let me say at the outset that I view all of the major critiques that the three reviewers make in this forum as justified. In short, I agree with George White that the most problematic aspect of the book is my failure to use gender as an analytic framework. I also agree with Leah Wright that providing an account of the distinctive role that black conservatives played in the U.S. foreign policy-making arena in the middle of the twentieth century would have enriched the book in a number of ways. Finally, Mark Sawyer's concern that, in my hurry to build a general theory of Pan-Africanism, I neglected to provide a "robust theoretical discussion of the shades and modes" of that complex ideological construct is, in my view, spot on. Thus, the main thrust of this response is simply to explain how my approach to the subject matter generated these errors and to provide a few thoughts about

¹ Samuel P. Huntington, "The Erosion of American National Interests," *Foreign Affairs* (October 1997): 28-50; Bruce D. Porter, "Can American Democracy Survive?" *Commentary* (November 1993): 37-40; James Schlesinger, "Fragmentation and Hubris: A Shaky Basis for American Leadership." *National Interest* 49 (Fall 1997): 3-10.

² Hanes Walton, Jr., *African American Power and Politics: The Political Context Variable* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997); Michael C. Dawson, *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African American Political Ideologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Linda Faye Williams, *The Constraint of Race: Legacies of White Skin Privilege in America* (College Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004).

how the book would be different if I had the wise counsel my colleagues provide in these reviews at the start of the process.

In my view, the sins of omission that White and Wright point out in my book are a function of my training as a social scientist. Whereas I gleefully accept Mark Sawyer's kind praise that I went beyond the bounds of the disciplinary training that he and I share by engaging primary documents and using a mixed-method approach to build theoretical insights about the phenomenon of Pan-Africanism, White's and Wright's comments have convinced me that I did not go far enough in thinking outside of the box on one issue: defining the units of analysis. A fundamental rule of political science research is that portable theories of human behavior are only achievable when the data points that researchers compare across place, space and time are similar (or as we would say at the same level). Thus, at the start of every project, most political scientists take great pains to define their units of analysis—presidents, senators, governors, etc.—and set up rules about how they will make comparisons between each observation of the unit.

When I began writing *Between Homeland and Motherland*, I chose to define my units of analysis very narrowly: black elites (intellectuals, social movement leaders, elected officials) who actually tried to influence the course of U.S. foreign policy toward Africa through action. In other words, the study focuses primarily on the men and women who actively lobbied the U.S. government, corresponded with high-level officials and tried to build narrowly-tailored social movements aimed at shaping U.S. foreign policies toward Africa. I made this choice for several reasons. First, the dominant theory in political science is that the more influence in and access to the halls of power where foreign policy decisions about their ancestral homelands are made, the more likely that minority groups will be to engage in behavior that will prove them disloyal and lead to the Balkanization of U.S. foreign policy. In order to respond to these charges, I had to focus on the same types of elites—members of Congress, the heads of civic organizations, etc.—that have historically had both access and influence within the U.S. foreign policy-making arena. Second, my argument is essentially that there is a paradox of power at work on black elites when they try to shape U.S. foreign policy toward their homelands. In other words, my argument is that the more the black elites in my book saw themselves as having a stake in the American system, the more strategic they became about balancing the benefits of their Pan-African activities against their interests on the home front. So, in order to provide what we in political science would call a 'strong test' of this theory, I focused squarely on those elites that had the greatest access to the halls of power and actually tried to use this access to shape U.S. foreign policies toward the African homeland.

There is no doubt, as Sawyer, White and Wright astutely point out, that this strategy did produce some troubling distortions in the analytic narratives that I present in the book. For example, while the voices of Mary McCloud Bethune, Dorothy Height, Carolyn Cheeks-Kilpatrick and a few other women who attained access to the U.S. foreign policy-making arena by virtue of their leadership roles in important civic and political institutions are featured in the book, I must admit that my research strategy reproduced in the book the troubling society-wide gender dynamics that these exceptional women struggled against throughout their entire careers. So, if I could write the book again, I would certainly be

more attentive to this dynamic and bring the voices of more women into the text. At the same time, the fact that the black women who do figure prominently in the book behaved in precisely the same ways that their male counterparts did leads me to have confidence in the theory-building enterprise that animated the project in the first place.

I believe that the same methodological blinders that limited my analysis of gender also prevented me from presenting the more nuanced treatments of conservatism and Pan-Africanism that Wright and Sawyer rightly suggest would have improved the book. Whereas my tight focus on certain types of elites led me to forgo a gendered analysis of black elite behavior in the U.S. foreign policy-making arena, it was my decisions to use very broad definitions of both Pan-Africanism and ‘home front’ interest that generated these oversights. For example, in my account Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. Du Bois and Marcus Garvey are all Pan-Africanists for the simple reasons that they held affinities for the peoples of the continent and tried to shape U.S. foreign policy. My treatment suggests that the main difference between Washington and Du Bois on the one hand and Garvey on the other was that the former were limited by their desire to preserve the African American community’s place in the United States and Garvey saw no future for the race in America. What Sawyer suggests is that these divergent calculations were probably also a function of the distinct ideas that comprised Garvey’s variant of Pan-Africanism. I must agree with this assessment and say that I wish I had thought to add this layer of complexity to the analysis. And, I truly hope that subsequent researchers take up Sawyer’s charge.

Leah Wright makes essentially the same case about conservatism that Sawyer makes about Pan-Africanism. Here, too, I say, *mea culpa*, but with a caveat. While there is no doubt that the work would have benefited from a more nuanced treatment of how conservatism shaped the motives of the black elites who gained access to the U.S. foreign policy-making arena, I would like to defend my choices by saying that Brenda Gayle Plummer has already provided a thorough treatment of this issue in her magisterial work on black globalism in the middle decades of the twentieth century.³ Moreover, I expect that Wright’s forthcoming book on African American conservatives, *The Loneliness of the Black Conservative*, will make further groundbreaking contributions to this literature.⁴ Despite this caveat, Wright is correct that a greater focus on how the black elite engaged with the ideology of conservatism and also conservative black leaders—like E. Frederick Morrow—would have improved the book. Indeed, it is quite likely that members of the black elite like Martin Luther King, Jr. and Dorothy Height received signals about access to the administration from figures like Morrow, just like they did from white bureaucrats like G. Mennen Williams in the Kennedy administration. Ultimately, though, I do not believe that a focus on partisan differences between black elites would have changed the outcomes in any of the cases that I examined in the analytic narratives presented in the book. This is the case because partisan differences between black elites did not begin to crystalize into hardened

³ Brenda Gayle Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935-1960* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

⁴ Leah Michele Wright, *The Loneliness of the Black Conservative* (Princeton University Press, 2014).

ideological differences over race and race relations until several years after the Reagan Revolution.

Again, I thank Professors Sawyer, White and Wright for their serious and kind treatments of my book and for continuing to provide me with inspirational examples in their own scholarship.

Copyright © 2013 H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online. H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, H-Diplo, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online. For any other proposed use, contact the H-Diplo Editors at h-diplo@h-net.msu.edu.
