RADBOUD UNIVERSITY NIJMEGEN

Developing the Third World

Orientalist and Cold War Rhetoric in Truman's Point IV Program

TIM HENDRIKS

S4006100

27-09-2016

NIJMEGEN

THE NETHERLANDS

Engelse Taal en Cultuur

Teacher who will receive this document: Dr. M. Valenta

Title of document: Developing the Third World: Orientalist and Cold War

Rhetoric in Truman's Point IV Program.

Name of course: Master thesis

Date of submission: 30-09-2016

The work submitted here is the sole responsibility of the undersigned, who

has neither committed plagiarism nor colluded in its production.

Signed

Name of student: Tim Hendriks

Student number: 4006100

Acknowledgements

Before you lies the thesis that marks the end of my time as a student at Radboud University Nijmegen. It has been a struggle at times, but I enjoyed my time here overall. Starting my education here with a Bachelor's degree in History, I quickly realized this was not where my future was. Over the course of my time as student of history, I became more and more interested in the United States and its place in the world. Switching to American Studies after completing my Bachelor's Program, then, became a logical step. Bringing into my Master's education a sense of historical awareness has always tainted my perception, yet never obstructed it. Even though I completed the Master's Program with much enthusiasm and joy, I could not have done it without the support of a few people.

First and foremost, I want to thank my parents for their unwavering support and my friends for proofreading this thesis, and many other papers I have written over the course of my education. I want to thank Dr. Markha Valenta for accommodating the tight schedule I was on for writing this thesis and supporting me with constructive criticism. A special thanks goes out to Dr. Sheyda Jahanbani of the University of Kansas who helped me in coming up with this topic and accessing the primary sources at the Truman Library and Museum in Independence, Missouri, that were used in this thesis. Lastly, a thank you to whomever may read this, that you find my research worthy enough of your time.

Table of Contents

Introduction

On December 22nd, 1951, an aircraft operated by Misrair, currently known as Egyptair, crashed a few miles from the airport of Tehran, Iran.[1] This scheduled flight from Baghdad to Tehran had fifteen passengers on board, including one Henry Bennett. Henry Bennett, and several other Americans were on their way to Tehran as United States government officials. They were not on some covert operation orchestrated by the CIA as we often see in Hollywood blockbusters, nor were they in any way involved in the coup d'état that rocked Iran some two years later. Henry Bennett, along with three other Americans on board, were part of the TCA, the Technical Cooperation Administration. Created in 1950, this government agency was to implement the Point IV Program set out by President Truman in his inaugural address in 1949.

This program came out of a new strategy developed by the United States government to contain the spread of communism. The Cold War, often seen solely as the clash between the democratic west and the communist east, was not only fought where the two met in Berlin and other places along the Iron Curtain. Odd Arne Westad argues that the Cold War led to American and Soviet interventions in what is now called the Third World. These interventions shaped the way political and social changes took place in these areas. If it had not been for the Cold War, these regions would have developed totally differently and would not be same regions they are today. These interventions led to ideological alliances between the Third World and either the democratic west or the communist east. In these interventions, Westad underscores the most important part was not exploitation, but control and improvement of the region.[2] Western dominance over the Third World is an aspect of Edward Said's view on Orientalism, which details the way the west regards the Third World.

---

[1] "Air Crash Near Tehran", *The Times* (London) ,24 December 1951, (52192), col D, p. 4.
[2] Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*, (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press; 2007), 3-5.

American fear and loathing of the communist ideology stared in the 1920s, following the Bolshevist revolution in 1917. It proved a rival to what Westad calls Americanism, as it provided the people living in Russia at the time a way of challenging their social and economic conditions without implementing the American model.[3] This American anti-communist agenda was at the core of United States' post war Third World involvement. American involvement in the Third World gave rise to the massive inequality between the First and Third World we see today, according to Westad.[4] This is not due to the want of trying. Rather, as Westad argues, it was due to combination of ideological predilections, racial stereotyping and the political and strategic aims that were in place due to the Cold War. These interventions were therefore often seen as defensive interventions, intended to defend the Third World from falling to communism. Development played a crucial role in the strategic aspects, as it would provide the Third World with a means of defending themselves against communism. In reality, development meant becoming more like America and following their model.[5] The Point IV Program was the first program put in place by President Truman that set out to achieve this. This thesis will examine the way the Point IV Program was intended to achieve this.

This thesis has relevance in two different ways. First off, the Point IV Program is an aspect of American foreign policy in the early years of the Cold War that has not been examined extensively yet. Secondly, when looking at Edward Said's views on Orientalism, he details a shift from British and French Orientalism to American Orientalism. However, there seems to be a gap, as his documentation of American Orientalism does not start until the late 1950s and early 1960s. Therefore, this thesis will partially fill in this gap by examining American Orientalism in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

The first chapter will detail the theoretical background this thesis will utilize to examine the Point IV Program. The theory will focus on constructivist approaches to international relations and the way this Orientalism is interwoven with constructivism. The second chapter will examine the history, or pedigree, of the Point IV Program. A program as large as the Point IV Program had to be based on

---

[3] Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War*, (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press; 2007), 17.
[4] This perspective of Westad overlooks the colonial regimes of the 19th and early 20th century.
[5] Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War*, (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press; 2007), 110-111.

previous attempts of aiding and developing the poorer regions in the world. The United States was not alone in this ideological struggle. Therefore will the third chapter detail the United States' role in establishing the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions. The organizations played an important role in implementing the Point IV Program. Finally, the last part of this thesis will detail the rhetoric of the Point IV Program. This part is based on primary sources researched at the Truman Library in Independence, Missouri. The arguments found in these primary sources that were used to convince the general public, Congress and public investors will then be related to the theoretical framework set out in the first chapter. The general question, then, that this thesis attempts to answer is what was the historical background of the Point IV Program and how can Orientalism be found in the program's rhetoric?

A Constructivist Approach to International Relations

The history of United States foreign policy is a long, and often times, a paradoxical and confusing one. When the relationship between the United States and the United Nations is examined, for example, these contradictions are abound. Even though the United States was leading in creating the United Nations, the United States does not always abide by its laws set in place. The invasion of Iraq in 2003, for instance, was not sanctioned by the United Nations.[6] How can a nation that holds democratic principles as one of its leading virtues so blatantly ignore those principles at other times? There seems to be a discrepancy in American policy when it comes to domestic democracy and foreign democracy. The virtue it strives to uphold is maintaining a democracy at home, while at the same time exporting democracies abroad. However, in creating stable and friendly regimes abroad, this virtue is at times undermined. One such example is the overthrowing of the government of President Allende in Chile, who was elected democratically. But, because his regime was socialist, verging on communist, the United States, allegedly, orchestrated a coup d'état.[7]

A similar example is the annexation of the Philippines. While the United States went to war with Spain over Cuba and the Philippines, it was not their goal, at first, to annex the Philippines. However, when the war was over, the United States decided to stay in the Philippines, aid in its development to prepare the country for eventual self-governance and self-reliance.[8] The question that beckons then is what are the leading principles in shaping American foreign policy that can lead to such distinct and diverse actions?

---

[6] Compare Alexander Thompson, *Channels of Power: The UN Security Council and U.S. Statecraft in Iraq* (New York; Cornell University Press; 2009), 138-139, and Nick Ritchie and Paul Rogers, *The Political Road to War with Iraq: Bush, 9/11 and the Drive to Overthrow Saddam* (New York; Routledge; 2007), 72-83.

[7] James Petras and Morris Morley, *The United States and Chile: Imperialism and the Overthrow of the Allende Government* (New York; Monthly Review Press; 1975).

[8] Julian Go, "The Provinciality of American Empire: 'Liberal Exceptionalism' and U.S. Colonial Rule, 1898-1912, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 49, No. 1 (January 2007), 74-108.

Explaining these various actions, that often seem contradictory, can be done in various ways. This chapter will first briefly detail the classical approach to international relations, which pits realism against liberalism. Following this dichotomy, this chapter details two leading academics who offer a different approach. Though the explanations are distinct from each other and have several differences, they show overlap in other areas. The first explanation is offered by Walter Russell Mead, who examines American Grand Strategy and defines four schools of thought that influence this Grand Strategy and each other. Following his explanation, this chapter details the historian Michael Hunt's ideas, whose approach to American foreign policy is more constructivist. Following these explanations, this chapter will use Edward Said's views on Orientalism examine this constructivist approach further, and relate it to the Point IV Program.

Traditionally, the field of international relations has been the battleground for the Great Debate between realism and liberalism, and the question which of these discourses can explain what is happening in international relations best. Classical realism regards nation-states as the historical actors in a playing field that is naturally anarchic. There is no higher power than the state. Anarchy then, realists contend, is the cause of war as actors try to acquire power in a continuous power struggle. Realists are sceptical of universal moral principles.[9] In their view, racial hierarchy could not be an explanation for expansionism, as moral principles could not explain such a course of action. Rather, expansionism would be fuelled by the constant desire of safeguarding the nation by acquiring as much power as possible within the anarchic world system. Survival is at the core of the national interest, not providing help to others in their struggle to survive. This, then, also highlights the limits of realism. It assumes that every state has the same interests and its choice of action is rather limited.

In international relations, realism is most often opposed to liberalism, or idealism. Liberalists agree with realists in that war is a recurring aspect of an anarchic system. However, this anarchy is not the cause of war. Rather, the causes for war lie in imperialism, failed regimes or an overall failure of

---

[9] Tim Dunne and Brian C. Schmidt, "Realism", in *The Globalisation of World Politics*, eds. John Baylis and Steve Smith (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008), 100.

the balance of power. A key aspect of liberalism is the belief that free trade would lead to a more peaceful world. Furthermore, liberalists believe that democracy will lead to a more peaceful world. Aiding people in establishing or strengthening democracy, then, would be a viable argument for liberalists to explain American expansionism. Helping the nation-state as actors in creating a community of collective security through a democratic peace, liberalists would make use of international organizations with the goal of regulating an anarchic world.[10]

Neither of these discourses can effectively explain every aspect of international relations, not even after these discourses have evolved over time into neo-realism and neo-liberalism. However, following the views of Walter Russell Mead and Michael Hunt, a possible answer to this juxtaposition may be possible.

Walter Russell Mead is a leading academic on American foreign policy. Not only an academic, who held positions at Bard College and Yale University, Mead is also an editor for *The American Interest*. Critical of leading interpretations of foreign policy, created by both high placed government officials such as Robert McNamara, Dean Rusk and Zbigniew Brzezinski, and university professors and national media, that seemed to oscillate from commitment to isolationism and back to commitment, Mead offers a new perspective.[11] Mead argues that, even though there is no long-standing and well defined American Grand Strategy, all the aspects of a Grand Strategy can be discerned through the course of history and contemporary American foreign policy. The first element Mead details is an American monopoly in the Western Hemisphere, while pressing to maintain a balance of power in other major theatres around the globe. An foreign intervention in these areas, such as the Middle East and Asia, that could shift the balance of power could lead to an American response.

The second aspect is that of sea and air power which is put in place to support American economic development. Historically, naval power was needed to keep trade routes safe so that

---

[10] Tim Dunne, "Liberalism", in *The Globalisation of World Politics*, eds. John Baylis and Steve Smith (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008), 114-120.

[11] Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How it Changed the World* (New York; Routledge; 2002), 5-8.

commerce could continue uninterrupted, even if there was an ongoing conflict. Furthermore, Mead contents this economic power has been used by the United States to pacify countries and this is still the case in contemporary policy. After World War Two, Germany and Japan were allowed to participate in the American led economic system. This would enrich them and pacify them, rather than provide them with incentive to topple this economic system.

The American objective of transforming international politics is the third and last aspect of American Grand Strategy. A key element of this is spreading democracy around the world as this would make the world a safer place.[12] All these elements of American Grand Strategy are influenced by four historical schools of thought. These schools are not set in stone, as policy makers are not bound to one or the other, but rather use elements from different schools.

The first two schools described by Mead are similar, but consider different approaches. The first school is that Hamiltonian school. The primary task of the American government, according to Hamiltonians, is promoting American enterprise at home and abroad. Therefore, they believe there should be a strong alliance between big business and the American government. This would not only create domestic stability, but it would provide rich opportunities for American business abroad. Hamiltonians view capitalism as the bringer of peace, which clashed with communist thought which believed that capitalism was the bringer of evil. To support their capitalist endeavours, the United States would need a strong navy to protect their trade routes and safeguard their interests.[13] The second school of thought defined by Mead is the Wilsonian school. Wilsonians believe that the United States has a moral obligation to spread democratic values around the world. In doing so, a peaceful international community would be created and all would abide the rule of law. Wilsonianism, then, links Great Power politics to the spread of a country's ideals, in this case democracy. By spreading democracy around the world, Wilsonians believe wars can be prevented, as democracies tend to less

---

[12] Walter Russell Mead, "American Grand Strategy in a World at Risk", *Orbis*, vol. 49, no. 4 (Fall 2005), 589-591.
[13] Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How it Changed the World* (New York; Routledge; 2002), 99-105.

bellicose than dictatorships or monarchies.[14] This school of thought differs from the Hamiltonian perspective through more emphasis on morality and law and less on economic aspects. Though the Hamiltonian and Wilsonian schools differ in their approach, both schools agree on the role of the United States in geopolitics. The United States should take up a leading role in the world.

This is not the case for the third and fourth school as described by Mead. The third school he details is the Jeffersonian school. In contrast to the previously mentioned school of thought, Jeffersonians believe the United States should not be entangled in foreign affairs. Rather, democracy should be focussed on domestic affairs. The national government's goal should be to safeguard democracy in the continental United States rather than spreading it across the oceans. Historically, Jeffersonians are sceptical of the Hamiltonian and Wilsonian tradition as these traditions will increase the risks of war. The fourth school though, does not necessarily have a problem with the risks of war. The last school of thought is what Mead calls the Jacksonian school. Jacksonians believe the main goal of the government should be both economic well-being of the nation and its physical security. Their motto, as detailed by Mead, is "don't tread on me!" While the United States should not actively intervene in international disputes that could lead to a war, if the United States is attacked a total victory should be the only goal.[15]

As noted before, these traditions are not set in stone. All four traditions have changed their perspective on what would traditionally be some of their key aspects. The Hamiltonians dropped their protectionist stance and allowed for free trade. The Wilsonians established a link between their quest for a moral world order and American hegemony. Both the Jeffersonians and the Jacksonians provided support during the Cold War, even though, traditionally, they disliked great-power politics.[16] These four schools of thought have shaped American foreign policy and still affect policy makers today. Michael Hunt's view differs in some aspects from Mead's, but there is considerable overlap between the two. Hunt's view thus warrants further examination.

---

[14] Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence* (New York; Routledge; 2002), 162-166.
[15] Walter Russell Mead, "American Grand Strategy in a World at Risk", *Orbis*, vol. 49, no. 4 (Fall 2005), 593-594.
[16] Ibid.

Hunt, a historian of United States foreign relations teaching at the University of North Carolina, argues that when looking at American foreign policy during the 19th and early 20th century, four distinct policies or doctrines, though they do supplement each other, can be seen. The two most influential doctrines were the Open Door policy and the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine of 1823 was a response to perceived European intrusion into the western hemisphere. It states that the United States regarded the western hemisphere of paramount interest to American foreign policy. The United States and Europe had two distinct destinies. Though it had little teeth at its conception, Theodore Roosevelt gave it teeth in 1905 with his corollary. He established to United States as the policemen of the hemisphere, both to guard towards further European intrusion and to assert good behavior on part of the Latin American states.[17]

While the Monroe Doctrine was aimed at Latin America, the Open Door policy was aimed at Asia. Even though put into effect at a later moment then the Monroe Doctrine, as it was not conceived until 1899, it proved to be just as important in determining American goals in the region as the Monroe Doctrine was in the western hemisphere. The Open Door policy was first implemented by President McKinley's Secretary of State John Hay. While at first it was only used to assert American economic interests by claiming equal treatment for American commerce in China, a year after its implementation it came to include an American commitment to include Chinese independence. China became an important interest in American foreign policy and it was safeguarded against intrusion much as Latin America was.[18]

While the approach to Asia and Latin America included active involvement, this was not the case towards Europe. America's first president George Washington already advised against political involvement in European affairs in his farewell address. "The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. […] Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none; or a very

---

[17] Michael Hunt, "Traditions of American Diplomacy: From Colony to Great Power", in *American Foreign Relations Reconsidered, 1890-1993*, ed. Gordon Martel, 6-7.
[18] Ibid.

remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities." [19]

Foreign policy makers of the 19th and 20th century have taken this advice to heart. Economic and commercial ties were established and maintained through a new policy, that of Freedom of the Seas. A policy underscored by the Hamiltonians to safeguard American trade relations.[20] This policy affirms the role of the United States as a neutral power when it comes to European politics. The policy safeguards to safe passage of American merchant ships to maintain trade relations with Europe, as the European states were important economic partners.[21] These policies as defined by Hunt show commonality with the aspects of foreign policy as defined by Mead.

While Freedom of the Seas was implemented to safeguard American commercial interests, it did not protect against political involvement in Europe. The doctrine of isolationism was implemented to do just that. Often times, the United States is regarded as isolationist in 19th and early 20th century. As Hunt indicates, this is merely the fact towards Europe. The Monroe Doctrine and Open Door policy allow for American involvement in other parts of the world, yet isolationism towards Europe keeps them free from political entanglement, while Freedom of the Seas allows for commercial interests, which is in line with what George Washington advised. Together with the Monroe Doctrine, that safeguarded the western hemisphere against European intrusion, and Freedom of the Seas, isolationism separated the United States politically from European affairs and made the Atlantic Ocean into a natural and political barrier.[22]

---

[19] George Washington, "Farewell Address" (September 19, 1796). Web.
Avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp (Retrieved September 27, 2016).
[20] Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How it Changed the World* (New York; Routledge; 2002), 107.
[21] Michael Hunt, "Traditions of American Diplomacy: From Colony to Great Power", in *American Foreign Relations Reconsidered, 1890-1993*, ed. Gordon Martel, 8.
[22] Ibid., 8-10.

These policies and doctrines might seem paradoxical at times. Yet they have informal, ideological policies in common. Hunt goes on to define three informal policies that explain the aforementioned doctrines, three informal policies that were important in explaining policies then, later on in the 20th century and even contemporary policies.

The first and foremost of these policies underlying American doctrines is a commitment to the pursuit of national greatness. There were various perspectives on how this pursuit should be orchestrated. The architect of Federalist foreign policy Alexander Hamilton perceived this pursuit of national greatness to mean the promotion of liberty overseas. As national resources grew, the scope of promoting liberty abroad would grow along with it. Opposed to this view was Thomas Jefferson, who took a more conservative approach to the pursuit of national greatness. Rather than guaranteeing freedom overseas, Jefferson believed the United States should become a model of the ideal state. Getting involved in politics abroad would endanger American society, much like Washington believed. By the 20th century, the Hamiltonian view had become the most dominant, yet it would come under attack when the United States faced crises of which the First and Second World War were the most important.[23]

The second informal policy detailed by Hunt was the conception of a racial hierarchy that could serve both as a check to expansionism, but could also very well be used as a justification. This idea stated that within the races and ethnicities of the world there was a ranking with the Anglo-Saxon Americans at the top and blacks at the bottom. Skin color thus became an important signifier of worth. As much as we would like to deny this and think that the Civil Rights Movement ended this race thinking, this belief was passed on through generations and found itself becoming an irresistible legacy in American foreign policy making.[24]

The third and final element highlighted by Hunt is that of ambivalence towards revolutionary social change, in particular social revolutions. All revolutionary struggles would be judged against

---

[23] Michael Hunt, "Traditions of American Diplomacy: From Colony to Great Power", in *American Foreign Relations Reconsidered, 1890-1993*, ed. Gordon Martel, 10-12.
[24] Ibid., 12-14.

America's own struggle for independence. The result of that comparison would dictate whether the revolution would be supported or not. This would be measured by regarding several factors. "Revolution was a solemn affair, to be conducted with a minimum of disorder, led by respectable citizens, harnessed to moderate political goals, and happily concluded only after a balanced constitution – essential to safeguarding human and property rights – was securely in place."[25]

These revolutionary struggles were relatable to the racial hierarchy. The white Anglo-Saxons struggled, but succeeded in their revolution. The further down the racial ladder, the greater the chance of revolutionary failure would be. The fact that, according to this view, the United States was one of the very few countries where a revolution succeeded, would affirm America's leading role in the world.[26]

The views of both Hunt and Mead then offer an interesting insight into the framing of American foreign policy. The four schools of thought as detailed by Mead offer interesting insights into various ways of thinking about foreign policy. Though various schools of thought were dominant at various points in history, which can be seen in the foreign policy pursued by the United States at that particular time, the four schools influenced each other and the leading school often used elements from the other three schools and combine them into an effective policy. Over the course of the Cold War, Wilsonianism and Hamiltonianism were both dominant, as aspects of both of these schools of thought can be seen in policies implemented by the United States at that time, including the Point IV Program, as this thesis will show further on.

Furthermore, various aspects of these schools of thought, such as freedom of the seas and promoting democracy abroad, can also be seen in Hunt's view. Though Hunt does not classify American foreign policy into four schools of thought, his views do overlap with those of Mead. It is in this overlap, that seems to combine the realist approach of the Hamiltonians with the idealism of the Wilsonians, a new approach to international relations becomes visible. In essence, both Hunt's and

---

[25] Michael Hunt, "Traditions of American Diplomacy: From Colony to Great Power", in *American Foreign Relations Reconsidered, 1890-1993*, ed. Gordon Martel, 14.
[26] Ibid., 14-15.

Mead's perspective can be seen as constructivist. The constructivist approach to international relations is fairly new and warrants further investigation.

Though both realism and liberalism can explain a state's action up to a certain degree, neither of these ideas took into account that norms and ideas might define a nation's interest. Two factors led to the rise of the constructivist approach in the years following the Cold War. First off, constructivism realized that the realist notion of a world without norms and values did not make sense. Including these factors was only logical as it could explain the behaviour of political actors, both state and non-state. The second factor that led to the rise of constructivism was the end of Cold War, as neither realism nor liberalism could have predicted this ending to a defining period in history.[27] Constructivism entails that "meaningful behavior, or action, is possible only within an intersubjective social context."[28] The social context thus shapes the actions of the actor, be it a nation or an individual. It is norms and ideas that give actions meaning. Without norms, actions would be devoid of any meaning. This is also the way states understand each other. "The identity of a state implies its preference and consequent actions. A state understands others according to the identity it attributes to them, while simultaneously reproducing its own identity through daily social practice."[29] This entails that countries do not directly choose how they are perceived around the globe. The perception of a country is created by the perceiving country by attributing certain characteristics to it. This means that the characteristics that are acted upon are the attributes bestowed upon it by the acting country, and thus actions could become a self-fulfilling prophecy. If a state thus perceives a threat, it is that perception the state as an actor will react to, whether this threat is real or perceived does not matter.

Douglas Little, historian of American diplomatic history, acknowledges Hunt's interpretations and follows the same reasoning. During the 20th century, the people who promoted American foreign interests, such as oil magnates, diplomats and soldiers, used cultural shorthands to deal with the

---

[27] Michael Barnett, "Constructivism", in *The Globalisation of World Politics*, eds. John Baylis and Steve Smith (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008), 156-157.
[28] Ted Hopf, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", *International Security*, vol. 23, No. 1 (Summer 1998), 173.
[29] Ibid., 175.

people living the region. In doing so, the Muslims living in the Middle East were seen as backwards, while the Jews of Israel were headstrong. These perceptions support Hunt's view on the belief in a racial hierarchy, which is perceived through a constructivist reality. Little digs deeper, though, and tries to explain why Jews and Arabs were considered low on the racial ladder, rather than nearer the top.[30] In explaining the reasons behind this racial hierarchy in the Middle East, Little refers to Columbia University professor Edward Said's interpretation of Orientalism.

By Orientalism, Said means two distinct, though interwoven, concepts. The first concept is that of an academic discourse. Anyone who teaches, researches, or is to another extent involved in the Orient, is what Said calls an Orientalist. Related to this meaning of the world Orientalism is the imaginative meaning. It is based upon the distinction made between the Western world, or the Occident, and the Orient. Between the two concepts there is a constant exchange of information. Orientalism, then, can be seen as the leading institution in dealing with the Orient. By teaching about it, writing about it, and researching it, Orientalism became the way the west started to dominate the Orient and gaining authority over it. In his book, Said demonstrates that Orientalism allowed the western world to become stronger by making this clear distinction between the Occident and the Orient.[31]

Constructivist International Relations discourse states that the more an entity or group of people are represented with certain distinction or commonalities, the more those commonalities will be acted upon. In this sense, orientalism becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. If a region is perceived to be incapable of self-governing, the more the colonizer will act as if it needs to be governed. As Said explains: Orientalism is a "Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient."[32] The Orient, then, was Orientalized by western discourse. There is a strong relationship between the Orient and the Occident. One that is characterized by domination and a complex

---

[30] Douglas Little, *American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945* (Chapel Hill; University of North Carolina Press; 2004), 10.
[31] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London; Routledge & Kegan Paul; 1978), 3.
[32] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York; Vintage Books; 1979), 3.

hegemony.[33] Therefore, Said argues that Orientalism is not chiefly about the Orient as an academic discourse, but rather is more valuable as a sign of western power over the non-western powers. It is used to create a distinction between westerners and 'the others', in which the European-Atlantic culture is dominant.[34]

To rationalize its own imperialistic ambitions in the Middle East and Asia, the British government used the concept of Orientalism in the 18th century to paint a picture of decadent, alien, and above all, inferior view of the people living there. With British power diminishing especially in the Middle East, and American power on the rise in the region, it seems this way of thinking has been ingrained in American views as well. These views acquired their position through popular culture. Pictures of the people of the Middle East in magazines such as *National Geographic* had embedded in them subliminal messages that affirm these views. Because these people are backwards, they need American guidance to become successful.[35]

Though not necessarily perceived to be incapable of self-governing, the Orient was often perceived to lack technology and modernity in the eyes of the United States. While Americans and other Westerners were capable of developing and applying technology through science, the people of the Orient, who were lower in racial hierarchy, were not. They were often perceived as children, incapable of effectively utilizing technological advancements. Americans believed that if traditional practices and institutions were removed, these people could be elevated to more modern standards. It was the goal of the Americans to teach them how. When war broke out with Spain in 1898, and American troops were sent to the Philippines, reconstructing that society in a more modern, technologically advancement manner became an American mission.[36]

Interestingly, following this argument, it is not so that these cultures will remain decadent and inferior forever. There is room for improvement. Yet, according to American popular culture, and also

---

[33] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London; Routledge & Kegan Paul; 1978), 5.
[34] Ibid., 6-7.
[35] Ibid., 10-11.
[36] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 19-20.

foreign policy, from Truman to Bush, this is unattainable for the people of the Middle East if they go by it on their own. American help is the key aspect in becoming more modern and becoming less inferior. Arab self-determination has often been regarded as ideologically absurd by American foreign policy makers. American help is the key aspect to achieving modernization.[37]

Modernization was to be achieved through development programs, such as the Point IV Program. The question this thesis will answer then, is twofold. First off, what was the historical background of the Point IV Program? A plan as ambitious as this had a long history that would need to be detailed to understand it. Furthermore, the United States could not conceive such a bold program on its own, so how did it relate to other aid programs put in place by multilateral organizations such as the United Nations? Second, using primary sources accessed at the Truman Library, this thesis will examine historical sources related to the Point IV Program. How was the program announced? What were the arguments used in setting up the program? How does this relate to Edward Said's view on the Orient? This thesis will argue that, in essence, the Point IV Program is based on both Wilsonian and Hamiltonian ideas infused with the racial thinking mentioned by Hunt which is visible in Said's Orientalism.

---

[37] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 11.

American Policy of Economic Development

There is a long history of American foreign development programs and the Point IV program was not the first, nor the last, in a string of policies, some more succesful than others. In Hunt's view, we can assess that the United States was concerned with foreign involvement even before the 20th century. The 19th century's Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door policy affirm the United States' interest in Latin America and Asia respectively. Whereas the Monroe Doctrine can be seen as primarily political and military involvement, the Open Door policy contained an economic component. Though this policy, and that of the Freedom of the Seas, are economic, they are based on trade, rather than economic aid. The Point IV program as imagined by Truman is the first policy that was based on economic aid for developing countries. An interesting work on the history of American foreign economic development is David Ekbladh's *The Great American Mission*. In this book, Ekbladh, who is a professor of history at Tufts University, examines American development programs in the 20th century. Ekbladh argues that the Point IV had many precursors and came out of a long development of various programs. Though a complete history would be too extensive, this chapter will detail three important predecessors of the Point IV Program. The first one is the reconstruction of the Phillipines after the Spanish War at the end of the 19th century. The second one is the international famine relief programs set up in China in the 1920s. Finally, the third one is the Tennessee Valley Authority, set up by President Roosevelt as part of his New Deal policy to combat the Great Depression. Each of these programs detailed here will contain a key feature that can also be found in the Point IV Program and is therefore of importance in understanding the program.

In the view of American Republicanists, modernization is a key element of development. It is modernization that can bring order and speed up development. However, as technology is a leading aspect of modernization, people had to be taught how to harness it. In the 19th century, as industrialization picked up pace, it was engineers and scientists that became symbols of American

capability. They were therefore seen as the agents of change in solving social and political problems. During the latter half of the 19th century, what is now called development was called reconstruction.[38]

Though often times 'reconstruction' refers to a specific time in America's history when the country was healing itself after the Civil War. With this period coming to an end in 1877, reconstruction became to mean something different in the field of international politics. It no longer was the model of social transformation, but rather it became to entail the efforts to effect social change through rationality and science. A key aspect in this is bringing together the modern world and society as a whole. Reconstruction was thus closely tied to reform in the Progressive Era.

Looking at the Progressive Era, we can see that Said's vision on Orientalism was not only found in European thought. America's own reverend Josiah Strong held similar views. In *Our Country* he expresses similar views to those mentioned by Said. Strong views the Anglo-Saxons as the dominant race. The United States was ordained by the Almighty of civilizing the rest of the world. It was therefore the goal of the United States to strife for the "extinction of the inferior races." This does not mean that these people had to wiped out, but rather had to be elevated to a higher level of development.[39] There was thus a sense of divine providence.

The belief that Americans were bestowed by God in bringing civilization to less civilized people included Filipinos. However, it was not just due to the Filipinos that the region was considered backwards. Their previous colonial exploiters, the Spanish, were partially to blame. It was now up to the Americans to bring prosperity to the region. This is also where America's colonial rule differed from their European colonial counterparts, or at least the rhetoric. Whereas European colonial rulers exploited the region to their own benefit, the Americans framed their colonial rule in a framework of tutelage. They were to teach the Filipinos how to modernize and would ready them for eventual self-government. [40]

---

[38] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 14-16.
[39] Josiah Strong, *Our Country* (Reprint 1885; Cambridge; Belknap Press; 1963), 213-217.
[40] Ibid.

This view is underscored by Susan Harris, a professor of American Literature and Culture at the University of Kansas, in *God's Arbiters.* A sense of Christian duty was incorporated in the American mission of educating and Christianizing the people of the Philippines. This was used as a justification for the annexation of the Philippines. Around the same time of the annexation, the British poet Rudyard Kipling published "the White Man's Burden", in which he called for the United States to annex the Philippines. The poem affirms the idea of the superior Anglo-Saxon to take up the burden of educating the racially inferior people. Harris uses this poem to detail the racial sentiment present in the Anglo-Saxons of both Great Britain, as Kipling was British, and the United States.[41]

Educating the people of the Philippines was then not only done by private organizations and the military, but due to the fact that education was seen as a mission from the Almighty, also missionaries swarmed to the islands to teach in newly established Catholic and Protestant schools. The American governor of the region, W. Cameron Forbes, focussed not only on Christian education, but also on improvement of infrastructure and public health. Infrastructure in his eyes was necessary to construct a working society and was therefore at the core of civilization. Teaching people how to build roads and maintain them would surely bring them civilization and propel them towards self-government.[42]

Though his best-laid plans seemed to be working for a while, two aspects refrained the United States from achieving its goal in the Philippines. Firstly, after Woodrow Wilson's re-election in 1912, Forbes was replaced by a new governor-general, Burton Harrison. With his replacement, the era of social-engineering in the Philippines came to an end. Furthermore, the early modernization efforts in the Philippines lacked several aspects that would play a large role in later modernization projects. The most important of these aspects was the investment capital of large private funds. Several families that made their fortune during the industrial age in the nineteenth century created large foundations

---

[41] Susan K. Harris, *God's Arbiters: Americans and the Philippines, 1898-1902* (New York; Oxford University Press; 2011), 15-16, 131-153.
[42] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 21-22.

that would invest in these modernization efforts. Foundations include, but were not limited to, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Though these foundations were often linked to evangelical Protestantism, they were also heavily influenced by the developing field of social sciences. These foundations, financially well-endowed, were capable of spreading American modernization efforts around the globe, even when the United States government had virtually given up its mission.[43] It was these foundations that were to play a large role in providing relief for famines in China.

Following World War I, the United States held on to its foreign policies of the Monroe Doctrine, isolationism towards Europe and the Open Door policy. While American involvement in the Philippines could be justified through the Monroe Doctrine, its counterpart aimed at China also saw American modernization efforts, though these were orchestrated less through formal channels, but more through dollar diplomacy and informal relationships. Hoover did see Latin America as an important trade partner. At this time, economic growth and economic development was not yet differentiated between as this would not happen until the anticolonial paradigm took shape after the Second World War.[44] As a result, Herbert Hoovers presidency in the 1920s never saw an official program aimed at providing aid and assistance in underdeveloped regions.[45]

While the United States government refrained from setting up extensive economic foreign aid programs, the wealthy foundations and other private groups were active during this period. An important region for these foundations during this period was Asia, with China receiving the bulk of the attention. To many westerners and their governments, China was seen as old fashioned as it had failed to come to grips with the ever changing modern world. Therefore, China seemed like an

---

[43] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 22-23.
[44] William O. Walker III, "Crucible for Peace: Herbert Hoover, Modernization, and Economic Growth in Latin America", *Diplomatic History*, 30, 1 (January 2006), 90-91.
[45] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 25.

opportune target for Americans to demonstrate the effectiveness of modernization in civilizing a backwards people and non-governmental organizations took the lead.[46]

After the Qing dynasty collapsed in 1911, American influence in China increased, but it was not until the famine of 1920-1921 that American involvement took flight. American observers of the famine noted that while natural disaster may have been in play for some famines, the regularity of famines in China indicated that a structural cause seemed more likely. It did not take long before the structure of Chinese society was blamed. Not just roaming warlords and fractured politics were to blame, but a deeper seeded societal problem was the cause. Old traditions that favored male offspring and the binding of the feet in women which lowered their productivity on the land all contributed to mass starvation, which was a symptom of underdevelopment.[47]

Both national and international famine relief societies combined their efforts and created the Peking United International Famine Relief Committee. While many countries donated to the relief efforts, the largest share came from the United States. This organization effectively helped the Chinese government in providing relief for millions of Chinese people. This led, in 1921, to establishment of the permanent China International Famine Relief Commission. Rather than providing direct famine relief to the population of China, the CIFRC committed itself to finding solutions to the structural problems leading to the repeated famines. By spending time and money on public works projects, such as the building of roads and dikes, and educating the Chinese people, the committee effectively reformed some structural aspects of Chinese rural society. The Chief Engineer of the CIFRC, O.J. Todd, deemed the Chinese to be "hardworking and easy to teach; traditional Chinese methods, he felt, needed only the extra benefit that they could be provided by Western technology and good leadership."[48]

---

[46] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 26.
[47] Ibid., 28.
[48] Lillian M. Li, *Fighting Famine in North China: State, Market, and Environmental Decline, 1690s-1990s* (Stanford; Stanford University Press; 2007), 295-303.

What these development programs had in common was not just their focus on reconstruction and reform, they were also not based directly on previous programs, but rather set up by either various private organizations (in the case of China) or were part of a reconstruction program following a war (the Philippines) and all had varying degrees of success. What they lacked was a certain model on which they could be based. It was not until President Roosevelt's New Deal politics came into swing in the 1930s, combatting the Great Depression, that a model for economic development programs was found in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

While the Great Depression had already set in by the time Franklin Delano Roosevelt became president in 1933, his predecessor had failed to make any sizeable recoveries happen. Roosevelt promised change and inspired massive optimism. Through federal assistance through programs that were part of his "New Deal for the American People"[49], he pledged to get the economy back on track. The first wave of his new program, the First New Deal, created new connections between the American government and local communities. Though his program drew much criticism, the scope and size of his policies led to millions of Americans returning to work.[50]

A dam in the Tennessee river in Muscle Shoals, Alabama, had been intended to facilitate the production of explosives during the First World War. However, the dam was not completed until the 1920s and thus played no part in the conflict. In the 1920s, the industrialist Henry Ford considered buying the dam to use its power supply to facilitate a commercial plan in the Mississippi Valley. However, this plan was repeatedly blocked by private utilities. It was Roosevelt's First New Deal that broke this status quo. His plan went further than just the dam in Muscle Shoals, though. His New Deal would use the already dam in place and build many more dams to develop and modernize the

---

[49] Franklin Delana Roosevelt, "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Democratic Convention in Chicago" (July 2, 1932), speech. Web. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=75174 (Retrieved September 27, 2016).

[50] Aaron D. Purcell, "Historical Interpretations of the New Deal and the Great Depression", in *The New Deal and the Great Depression*, ed. by Aaron D. Purcell (Kent, Kent State University Press; 2014), 4-6.

American South around the Tennessee Valley. This enterprise was to overseen by a new public corporation called the Tennessee Valley Authority.[51]

While the dams and hydroelectric plants were the mechanical part of the modernization effort by the TVA, social change was also pursued. This social change was led by its first chairman, Arthur E. Morgan. He advocated educational reform in the region to get rid of the feudal image of the local communities and effect changes of social norms. In doing so, the TVA made its way into almost every aspect of daily life in the Tennessee Valley. It affected agriculture, industry and electric power, but also less obvious aspects such as malaria control and other public health issues, and emancipation of women.[52]

It did not take long for the private foundations operating internationally to notice the TVA and its potential. The CIFRC's engineer Todd travelled to the Tennessee valley in 1935 to see the development programs at work first hand. Nationally, the TVA was welcomed by progressives and New Dealers as it effectively combined reform ideas, from social engineering to scientific planning. This combination of aspects is also what drew the international foundations towards to Tennessee Valley. The Rockefeller foundation believed the TVA was the very best of Roosevelt Democracy and this approach would help tremendously in developing China. [53]

Ekbladh attributes much of this interest to the enthusiasm of one of the directors of the TVA, David Lilienthal, and it was his ideas that seemed to make the TVA revolutionary. Lilienthal proclaimed in 1939 that because the United States was such a large and diverse country, having federal power centralized in Washington could be a threat to democracy, as Washington will be out of touch with what the local communities need. Lilienthal therefore argued for decentralized federal administration

---

[51] David Ekbladh, ""Mr. TVA": Grass-Roots Development, David Lilienthal, and the Rise and Fall of the Tennessee Valley Authority as a Symbol of U.S. Overseas Development, 1933-1937", *Diplomatic History*, 26, 3 (Summer 2002), 338-339.

[52] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 48-63.

[53] David Ekbladh, ""Mr. TVA": Grass-Roots Development, David Lilienthal, and the Rise and Fall of the Tennessee Valley Authority as a Symbol of U.S. Overseas Development, 1933-1937", *Diplomatic History*, 26, 3 (Summer 2002), 340.

and agencies which would overcome this issue. Key in this approach would be the TVA which would serve as an example of the best and boldest of these agencies. Through these decentralized agencies technology and expertise could be distributed among the people and communities where it was needed with such speed, unattainable by a heavily centralized government. The TVA thus became a model that could be copied to any other region, in the United States or internationally, and be equally successful.[54]

The TVA became a rallying point for liberals as an example of effective modernization. While government led development for the TVA's critics seemed like totalitarianism, such as fascism and communism, the enemies of American liberal ideology, the TVA showed that modernization based on science and technology and liberalism went hand in hand.[55] More so, the development ideologies that led to the TVA could effectively compete with totalitarianism. Central to this thought was American economist Eugene Staley. He proposed a comprehensive program based on international economic development. To guide social and economic change, the program had to intervene systematically in the poorer regions of the world. To do so, governments and non-governmental organizations had to work together. International development would then be juxtaposed by its totalitarian rivals. It is Staley who has been credited with loading the term 'international development' with its current interpretation.[56] The Point IV, then, was the culmination of these developments. It combined the thought on development and reconstruction as seen after the Spanish War, which focussed on eventual self-government, the private investments of several funds as seen in China during the many famine relief programs, and the New Deal model of the TVA which would allow for an implementation of such program across the globe.

---

[54] David Ekbladh, ""Mr. TVA": Grass-Roots Development, David Lilienthal, and the Rise and Fall of the Tennessee Valley Authority as a Symbol of U.S. Overseas Development, 1933-1937", *Diplomatic History*, 26, 3 (Summer 2002), 340.341.
[55] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 41.
[56] Ibid., 63-71.

However, before the model of the TVA could be implemented around the globe where American influence was present, a new crisis loomed. Even before Lilienthal had set out his ideology, Todd took Roosevelt Democracy back to China and was ready to implement the New Deal policy in China. The war that broke out between 1937 between Japan and China refrained the CIFRC from actually working on reconstruction and economic development, but forced them to focus on relief for the victims of the war. The same went for the Rockefeller Foundation and by 1938 both these relief and reconstruction organizations had been rendered impotent.[57]

The Second World War offered both an obstacle to international economic development, as well as an opportunity. Though it rendered national and private institutions, as mentioned above, incapable of providing aid or development, it gave rise to an even larger organization that could, the United Nations. This organization, tasked with much more than just peace and security around the globe, became one of the leaders of economic development after the Second World War. Even though the United Nations was a result of the war itself, the idea of such an organization was not new. The next chapter will examine the history of the United Nations and where it came from. Following that, the chapter will detail the creation of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. These organizations were designed specifically to foster support for and help develop monetary stability and economic and social development for poorer regions of the world. These organizations, together with the United Nations, would cooperate with the United States in implementing the Point IV Program. It is the ideals that shaped these organizations that are an important aspect to research and understand their influence on the United States and other economic developmental efforts.

---

[57] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010), 38.

United States and the Post-War World

United Nations

The first part of this chapter will detail the emergence of the United Nations. The Wilsonian ideals that inspired the inception of this organization were not new and will be detailed in this chapter. Combined with the emergence of the Bretton Woods institutions which were based on Hamiltonian ideals, detailed later on in this chapter, it will become clear how these institutions, together with the history of American development programs as detailed in the previous chapter, have led to the creation of the Point IV Program and how all these aspects became infused in it.

When World War Two came to a close, the major powers realized a new organization had to be established that could prevent such a war from ever happening again. With the Atlantic Charter, which would later become the United Nations, such an organization was created. However, this was not a novel idea, and the United Nations was not the first international organization that was created to the end of preventing major wars. Rather, the organization was partly the result of the development of an idea that originated after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815. As a result, the 19th century created a legacy which led to the creation of the United Nations.

Following the argument of Margaret Karns, Karen Mingst and Kendall Stiles there are three traditions that served as a precursor to the United Nations. The first one is the Concert of Europe, established in 1815. The Concert of Europe pioneered multilateral meetings, though it was not yet institutionalized. Though it was not an actual organization, the Concert operated as a forum for the major powers of Europe to discuss pressing political matters with the goal of keeping peace in Europe while ensuring that neither France nor any other power would become too powerful. Thus, the maintaining the balance of power in Europe was its main goal.[58]

---

[58] Margaret Karns, Karen Mingst and Kendall Stiles, *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance* (Boulder; Lynne Rienner Publishers; 2015), 77-80.

The second international organization that proved innovative was the Hague System. While in many respects the system was similar to the Concert of Europe, for example the lack of institutionalization, there were some major differences that proved promising for future developments. Firstly, the multilateral meetings were no longer solely accessible to the major powers of Europe. Rather, both major and minor powers had access to the meetings. Secondly, the scope of the organization increased not merely through allowing minor powers to join the meetings, but also powers from outside Europe were included. This increased its effective sphere. Thirdly and lastly, the organization's effectiveness was further increased over the Concert of Europe due to an increase in the amount of meetings.[59]

The third legacy is one that is perhaps better known throughout the world. Not only as an American idea at the end of the First World War, but probably more so because it turned out to be a failure. This organization, the League of Nations, can be seen as the predecessor to the United Nations. Not only can we see a similar organizational structure, the ideas that created and controlled it also seem similar.

When World War One came to a close it was the ideological conviction and political tenacity of one man that saw the establishment of an institutionalized international organization that would have to maintain an international peace. It was American president Woodrow Wilson that fought to create an international organization while, ironically, he did not want his presidency to be about foreign policy.

Trying to stay true to the tradition in American foreign policy of isolationism towards European political affairs, president Wilson kept the United States out of the First World War for as long as he could. However, internationalists within the United States believed that America's way of life could be preserved only through involvement in geopolitics. While the discussion between the isolationists, whose views became stronger now that they were opposed, and the internationalists raged, Wilson prepared for new elections in 1916 and moved towards a more internationalist

---

[59] Margaret Karns, Karen Mingst and Kendall Stiles, *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance* (Boulder; Lynne Rienner Publishers; 2015), 77-80.

perspective. It was in early days of the election campaign that Wilson first expressed his views on the creation of an association of nations.[60]

After securing re-election, Wilson set about ending the struggle in Europe, fearful of being dragged into a war no one wanted. When he addressed the senate in January of 1917, Wilson outlined his revolutionary ideas on a new world order and a just peace. After securing what Wilson called "peace without victory", the balance of power and the old militarism must be replaced by a community of nations. One that recognizes the equality of all powers, major and minor. This new world order should guarantee principles such as Freedom of the Seas. He thought it inconceivable that the United States would play no part in this. To convince the sceptical American public, Wilson declared his ideas adhered to the principles of American foreign policy. Most importantly, they adhered to the Monroe Doctrine.

> "These are American principles, American policies. We could stand for no others. And they are also the principles and policies of forward looking men and women everywhere, of every modern nation, of every enlightened community. They are the principles of mankind and must prevail."[61]

In the end though, the United States was forced to participate in the war. During the peace talks that followed the war, Wilson travelled to Europe to lead the American delegation in these talks. Though he advocated a just peace, the European victors had their sights set on revenge, while Germany awaited their fate. Above all, Wilson was committed to establishing the League of Nations, his brainchild and interpretation of the community of nations. In the intended structural organization of the League of Nations some organizational bodies of the United Nations can already be discerned. During the peace talks in Europe, he secured Allied agreement to an Assembly that would be made up out of every member, and a Council consisting out of the five victorious nations and four other nations

---

[60] George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776* (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008), 398-407.
[61] Woodrow Wilson, "Peace without Victory" (United States Congress, Washington DC., January 22, 1917.) Web. http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/peacewithoutvictory.htm (Retrieved September 27, 2016).

to be elected by the Assembly. Not only would this organization arbitrate and adjudicate in disputed between countries, it would also employ economic and military sanctions against aggressors to protect the peace.[62] In the light of the recent war, creating such an organization was no mean feat. However, it would not prove to be lasting. The League of Nations, the first institutionalized international organization to maintain a lasting peace, failed.

The League failed due to several reasons. One of its biggest failings came to the forefront rather quickly, though, in a manner that was rather ironic. After the League was established, the United States debated about its role in the world. The debate did not center on internationalists versus isolationists, as isolationism was no longer a real option. Rather, the question was what form internationalism should take. By the time Wilson returned to the United States from his talks in Europe, he found that the progressive internationalists that had supported him during his 1916 re-election, were disillusioned by his actions in Europe. They were appalled by Wilson's abandonment of his Fourteen Points, but even more so by the fact that the League of Nations seemed to uphold rather than change the old world order.[63] Others feared Wilson had paved the way for the United States to give up their sovereignty to an international organization. However, it was the Senate that would decide whether or not the United States would join this organization its president had strived to create.

Support for the League in the Senate was mixed. Various Republicans were in favor of a League of Nations, though they had reservations and would only ratify it when certain amendments were made. Not only would the League of Nations not have any jurisdiction on American domestic issues, including the Monroe Doctrine, the amendment minimalized American obligations towards Article X, which demanded the collective defense of a member's territorial integrity or political independence. Wilson would not agree to this, as he saw Article X as the key provision in his League of Nations. His stubborn adamancy proved to be the final nail in the coffin of American participation in the League of

---

[62] George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower* (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008),423-427.
[63] Ibid., 428.

Nations. In the final vote, American ratification of the League of Nations was rejected.[64] The organization would have to fulfil its role without the leadership of its creator.

Even though the United States ended up not participating in the League of Nations as one of its council members, the other four victors, France, Great Britain, Japan and the Soviet Union, did participate and formed a four member council. However, the council, and indeed the League, proved to be unable to prevent future wars as it failed to react accordingly to defend territorial integrity and political independence of its members. When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, the League failed to react and it allowed Japan to occupy Chinese territory. When Italy invaded Abyssinia, or present day Ethiopia, the League failed again.[65] While it can be argued that these failures were due to the fact that both the aggressors in these cases were members of the Council, other members of the Council could have stepped up. Furthermore, Germany was not part of the Council. Yet, its move into the demilitarized Rhineland, its annexation of Czechoslovakia, and its invasion of Poland went unanswered. Though the League existed until 1946, by the time World War Two broke out, the League was effectively dead.[66] Still, the idea of an international organization to maintain an international peace was very much alive. Mark Mazower argues that the traditional story of American isolationism after the rejection of the League of Nations was exaggerated. Over two hundred Americans worked for the League of Nations and the Rockefeller Foundation supported the organization throughout the 1930s. This goes to show that, while the United States was not a member of the League, it was still supported. There were even plans to get the United States to join the League of Nations after the Second World War, had it not failed.[67]

For policy makers working on the Atlantic Charter in the early 1940s, it was clear that lessons had to be drawn from the failure of the League of Nations. In general, four of these lessons were drawn that would prevent a new post-war boondoggle. Firstly, the Treaty of Versailles was riddled

[64] George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower* (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008), 427-435.
[65] Paul Kennedy, *The Parliament of Man: The Past, Present, and Future of the United Nations* (New York; Random House; 2006), 21-26.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea* (London; Penguin Books; 2012), 192.

with vengeance on the part of the victors, as mentioned before. Germany was not part of the peace talks as it had to wait what punishment it would receive. The lesson here is that not only victors, but all belligerents had to be brought into the post-war planning process as early as possible. Secondly, the administration had to start planning for peace while the war was still raging. The reasoning behind this is that once an armistice is in place, negotiations harden as nations turn inwards to deal with neglected domestic issues. The third lesson was that security does not merely mean military security. What must be strived towards is a more integrated perspective on collective security that will also include economy, trade, and labor standards. This lesson was based on the perceived success of some League of Nations affiliates, such as the International Labor Organization. Finally, the last lesson was not to divulge in too much idealistic language, but rather promise progress that speaks to the common man, such as technical assistance.[68]

This does not mean that the inception of the United Nations was free of ideological language, quite the contrary. In January 1941, in memory of Wilson's Fourteen Points, American President Franklin Roosevelt delivered the annual State of the Union in which he promulgated what he had dubbed the Four Freedoms. Roosevelt proclaimed that everyone in the world should have freedom of expression, freedom of religion and worship, freedom from want – which translates into economic prosperity, and freedom from fear – which would encapsulate an worldwide arms reduction.[69]

Roosevelt realized these freedoms could not be achieved by the United States on its own. In the early stages of the war, a close alliance between the United States and Great Britain was realized. Both President Roosevelt and Prime-Minister Churchill actively supported not only a wartime alliance, but also shared ideas on creating a post-war world, and how to achieve a lasting peace. When Churchill and Roosevelt met in August of 1941, the British government was presented with a set of principles that would form the basis of the Atlantic Charter. Still, Roosevelt was weary of committing himself to

---

[68] Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press; 2005), 14-15.
[69] Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, "State of the Union Address, 1941" (Washington DC, January 6, 1941), Speech. Web. http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/speech-3320. (Retrieved September 27, 2016).

a peace-time alliance and making the same mistake as Wilson of overselling an international organization, which led to the fact that nothing concrete was established. Churchill, however, was convinced that the United States would join them in creating an international organization that would prevent future wars.[70] Furthermore, Churchill firmly believed that no organization would work if not all participants of the wartime Big three alliance were included. This meant including Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union. What this meant was not so much a return to the League of Nations, but rather, as Mazower puts it, to the balance of power found in the Concert of Europe, established after the fall of Napoleon.[71]

In January 1942, roughly a month after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the Big Three and twenty-six other states, including governments in exile, signed the Declaration of the United Nations. Rather than being a peace-time international organization, it was a wartime alliance pledged to defeat the axis powers and uphold the values asserted in the Atlantic Charter.[72] The wartime alliance would work together in freeing the world from subjugation and uphold human rights. The term human rights was not new, however, it was new in this declaration. Declaring human rights as a goal brought this declaration more in line with Roosevelt's Four Freedoms and underscored the ideological content.[73] Only in victory would an evolution into a peacetime organization to maintain international peace and security be attainable.

Tasked with outlining such an organization was Cordell Hull, United States' Secretary of State. As Churchill and Stalin shared interests in a system based on the balance of power and thus did not thoroughly believe in a global system of security, creating such as system was an American preoccupation.[74] Hull successfully managed to steer clear of Wilsonian errors and managed to build consensus on an organization that could achieve what it set out to do. In August 1943, Hull got British

[70] Anthony Gaglione, *The United Nations under Trygve Lie, 1945-1953* (London; The Scarecrow Press; 2001), 3.

[71] Mark Mazower, *Governing the World* (London; Penguin Books; 2012), 195-196.

[72] Anthony Gaglione, *The United Nations under Trygve Lie* (London; The Scarecrow Press; 2001)*, 3-4. Mark Mazower, *Governing the World* (London; Penguin Books; 2012), 197-198.

[73] Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World* (Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press; 2005), 55.

[74] Mark Mazower, *Governing the World* (London; Penguin Books; 2012), 199.

Foreign Secretary Sir Anthony Eden to agree to a joint allied declaration, to be signed at an upcoming conference in Moscow, that would support an organization to uphold the Atlantic Charter and maintain international peace and security.[75] This was once again affirmed by the national leaders of the Big Three in Tehran in December of the same year.

In February 1945, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin met for the last time in Yalta. Unexpectedly, the Soviet Union made several concession to the United States that would diminish their influence in the United Nations and shifted the weight of the organization to the western powers. Following these concessions and this shift, the final conference on the United Nations was to be held in San Francisco later in 1945. At the conference, the smaller nations, led by delegations from Australia and New Zealand, pressed for linking friendly relations among UN members to the observance of human rights and the solution of social problems.[76]

Human rights came to play an important role in winning over support for the organization, both internationally and domestically. Domestically, Roosevelt believed that New Deal rhetoric based on human rights and humanitarian aid would be sure to win over domestic public approval of such an organization. From 1943 onwards, Roosevelt focussed on planning the post-war international economy. In unison with this planning, the war had made the struggle against hunger and poverty more severe and acute. Combining these two aspects led to preparations made for the humanitarian crisis that was sure to follow the defeat of the axis powers by the coalition of the United Nations. With this, the new alliance gained a humanitarian aspect. Though the American perspective was first met with mockery from their British counterparts, Sir Eden soon realized it was in Great Britain's interest to follow along in its humanitarian aspect, as it would ensure American post-war cooperation.[77]

The New Deal not only provided rhetoric of human rights that would ensure public support for a new international organization. Rather, it was the whole idiom of New Deal politics and policy that provided the foundations for creating such an organization. As Borgwardt explains, New Deal

---

[75] Anthony Gaglione, *The United Nations under Trygve Lie* (London; The Scarecrow Press; 2001)*,* 4.
[76] Ibid., 9.
[77] Mark Mazower, *Governing the World* (London; Penguin Books; 2012), 199-200

politics were characterized by large-scale institutional solutions to social problems. In their pragmatic approach to global problems, Roosevelt and his administration attempted to incorporate domestic New Deal policies on geopolitical issues. The activist regulatory state was translated from the domestic sphere to the world sphere.[78]

Sadly, even before the conference in San Francisco, the architect of the United Nations, president Roosevelt, passed away. Succeeded by Harry S. Truman, the conference took place. At this conference, as mentioned before, smaller nations pressed for including issues besides security in the UN Charter. Relatedly, these smaller nations feared a strong block was being formed by the great powers and that the UN was actually a step backwards from the League of Nations. It was feared that a new world order was created under the guise of internationalism and that it was a turn back towards the systems of the 19th century. In July of 1945, US Congress voted in favour of the new organization and ratified the charter. However, the power block the small powers were so fearful over never truly emerged. The Big Three alliance, held intact by the wartime UN alliance, fell apart before the war ended.[79]

As Mazower explains, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin effectively created an organization that "combined the scientific technocracy of the New Deal with the flexibility and power-political reach of the nineteenth-century European alliance system."[80] The United Nations, transforming from a wartime alliance into a peacetime organization, focussed heavily on hard security issues, yet these security issues would not address all the Four Freedoms promulgated by Roosevelt. While security aspects of the United Nations will focus on the Freedom from Fear, the United States would still have to fight the battle to assert a Freedom from Want, which in essence was both a social and an economic battle to rid the world of poverty. This battle was first fought at Bretton Woods, in 1944, where a new economic world order was to be created, following the same New Deal policies that helped shape the United Nations.

---

[78] Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World* (Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press; 2005), 70-71
[79] Mark Mazower, *Governing the World* (London; Penguin Books; 2012), 210-213.
[80] Ibid., 213.

Bretton Woods

When it was clear to the Big Three and its allies that they would defeat the Axis powers by late 1943 and early 1944, the development of the United Nations took flight, as has been illustrated previously. Though the United Nations would mainly focus on international security issues through a Security Council and prevent a new world war from breaking out, the talks at Bretton Woods were focussed on creating a system that would work in conjunction with the United Nations to prevent a worldwide depression as had happened in the 1930s from happening again.[81] It was believed that a monetary order could oversee global expansion of markets without having to revert to the old gold standard.[82] These ideas are in line with the New Deal for the World and creating a governing body for this monetary order.

The Bretton Woods conference led to the creation of two international organizations that together would help bring order to the macroeconomic world. Led by the renowned British economist John Maynard Keynes and American economist Harry Dexter White, the 1944 conference would lead to the creation of both the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. While both the IMF and World Bank were based on ideas conceived by Keynes in 1942, White pushed to create these institutions the way the United States envisioned them. While the British, represented by Keynes were more interested in the IMF, Keynes was in charge of the commission that would develop the World Bank. At the same time, the American delegation was more interested in developing the World Bank, though White was in charge of the commission developing the IMF.[83]

Though Keynes' plan consisted of four pillars, the first two pillars led to the creation of the post-war international economic order. According to Keynes, the first pillar should be based on macroeconomic management. This would be a system to stabilize international markets by proving

---

[81] Mahbub ul Haq, *UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions: New Challenges for the 21st Century* (Basingstoke; Macmillan; 1995), 17.

[82] Graham Bird, "A Suitable Case for Treatment: Understanding the Ongoing Debate about the IMF", *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 5, (Oct 2001), 824.

[83] Mahbub ul Haq, *UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions* (Basingstoke; Macmillan; 1995), 17-20.

monetary flows to create an equilibrium in the balance of payments of its members. Today, traces of these vision can be found in the IMF, the International Monetary Fund. As it was set up, the IMF would have four distinct functions that would help create order. First, it would be an adjustment institution and focus on advising states on how to adjust macroeconomic policies. Second, to support changes in macroeconomic policies approved by the IMF, it would provide loans to implement those policy changes whenever necessary. Third, on an international basis it would coordinate macroeconomic policy. Lastly, it would operate as a forum for international monetary debates.[84]

In theory then, the IMF was the organization that would control the international macroeconomic order. The organization was not without its controversies, though. Strikingly, Keynes had already given thought to what is today one of the most controversial aspects of the IMF, namely conditionality. Conditionality states that a country can only get a loan if they change a certain aspect of their economic policies as instructed by the IMF. Though today's conditionality is strict and yet the fund is very small, Keynes envisaged a much larger fund with a smaller focus on conditionality.[85] In the end, conditionality was not introduced until the 1950s, when the United States feared that it would be asked to underwrite the Fund's lending operations and thus de facto be paying for the IMF and its loans to other countries.[86]

The second pillar was what is now the World Bank, or more officially, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Economists Michael Gavin and Dani Rodrik explain why this pillar of the new economic world order requires the most imagination. The World Bank addressed the need of channelling funds from areas where it was plentiful to areas where it was needed most. Though, because this had long been done by private funds and institutions, the need for a governmental organization dedicated to doing just that was difficult to justify. These private channels often worked on a bilateral basis, and they seemed to operate just fine. The early stages of the talks

---

[84] Mahbub ul Haq, *UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions* (Basingstoke; Macmillan; 1995), 825.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Graham Bird, "A Suitable Case for Treatment: Understanding the Ongoing Debate about the IMF", *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 5, (Oct 2001), 825.

on the World Bank then focussed on the extent of its operations, thus what it should do, rather than just how it should go about doing it. According to Gavin and Rodrik, the World Bank ended up performing two different roles, one intended and one unintended role. The intended role was the operate as a multilateral institution that would direct funds to developing economies. Its unintended role was the World Bank became a source of ideas on both social and economic development issues.[87]

The development issues soon outweighed the reconstruction part of the World Bank. Due to both the emergence of the Marshall Plan by the end of the war that aided in reconstructing Europe and part of the World Bank's reconstruction roles were taken over by the newly formed United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or UNRRA, the reconstructive aspects of the World Bank were minimized. At the same time, development issues at the World Bank grew due to the heavy presence of developing countries, many of them Latin-American.[88]

Though White was in charge of the commission that developed the IMF, he had much influence over the development of the World Bank as this was where America's focus was. White wanted to create an international organization where not one country would preside over others, but where all countries had an equal share in the decision-making process of the World Bank. This multilateral character was not without its opponents. One of the opponents to this vision was the United States. After the war, the United States was one of the biggest, if not the biggest, economy in the world. It was obvious that it was the United States who would be providing the first funds to the World Bank. Therefore, it was questioned why any other country would have any say in the Bank's lending decisions. Furthermore, European countries, all heavily affected by war, questioned why they should invest their scarce resources into an organization that was to fight scarcity. White's argument for this vision, however, centered on the fact that both debtor and creditors countries would feel

---

[87] Michael Gavin and Dani Rodrik, "The World Bank in Historical Perspective", *The American Economic Review*, vol. 85, no. 2 (May 1995), 329.
[88] Mahbub ul Haq, *UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions* (Basingstoke; Macmillan; 1995), 19-20. Michele Alacevich, *The Political Economy of the World Bank: The Early Years* (Palo Alto; Stanford University Press; 2007), 2-3.

responsible for their investment if they had influence in the decision-making process. White's vision prevailed and the World Bank was created as a truly multilateral organization.[89]

While Keynes and White agreed on the multilateral aspect of the World Bank, their opinions were different when it came to the operational aspect of the World Bank. Keynes believed that the Bank should not actually give out funds, but rather participate in and guarantee private loans. White, on the other hand, argued that the Bank should give out loans from its own capital and borrowed resources. Quite understandably, Keynes was backed by the European delegations, as they wanted to minimalize capital investment during a period of scarcity. Furthermore, Keynes argued against debtor countries being solely responsible for international investment. After the inauguration of the World Bank, however, it soon became the Bank emphasized direct lending.[90] The question then remains: who does the Bank lend to?

Unlike many other international organizations, the World Bank was created without a fixed mandate. Contrary to the IMF, the World Bank was not fixated on conditionality or changing the recipient country's macroeconomic policies in any way. However, through its focus on rates of return from its project based lending, government policies were affected, as the World Bank would not lend money for a project that was doomed to fail due to faulty government policies. According to development economist Hans Singer, it was assumed that in developing countries, that lacked capital for development, there was an abundance of development projects just waiting to be financed. The rate of return would be incredible, as all these countries lacked was investment capital. As it turned out, this was not the case and fairly soon the World Bank did implement a form of conditionality.[91]

Four reasons underscored this shift towards conditionality. First off, supporting the loans to the debtors by sending staff to provide assistance proved more expensive than anticipated. Second, if the project support by the World Bank was a high-yielding one, it would supported by the local

---

[89] Michael Gavin and Dani Rodrik, "The World Bank in Historical Perspective", *The American Economic Review*, vol. 85, no. 2 (May 1995), 329-330.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Mahbub ul Haq, *UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions* (Basingstoke; Macmillan; 1995), 18-20.

government. The loan offered by the Bank would free up national financial assets while the Bank's loan would be invested in low-yielding project that had not been researched by the Bank. Third, the success of individual projects was heavily influenced by policies of national governments and institutions. Lastly, the local government were no longer seen as incorruptible, while perception of the World Bank improved since its creation.[92]

What becomes clear when the creation of the IMF and World Bank is examined, is that the organizations are the result of a sense of euphoria that overflowed the western world in the last years of the Second World War. The New Deal politicians utilized the Zeitgeist of 1944 and 1945 to mobilize support for a new international world order. Keynes saw the conference at Bretton Woods as the opportunity for his generation to get it right, after its failure following World War I. The goals of global economic stability and local individual security of the American negotiators mixed well with Keynes' perception. These goals were, according to Borgwardt, a logical extension of New Deal politics which argues that stability of capital is firstly a domestic issue. Extending this to a global order with using the IMF and the World Bank as its agents then is logical.[93]

These economic institutions, together with the United Nations, were reshaped at the start of the Cold War by the United States to fit their struggle against communism and promote the growth of capitalism around the world. The World Bank and the IMF became important actors in the Third World in the fight against communism. The loans and credits the World Bank and the IMF handed out preferred open-market economies. As a result, countries that chose for a closed, communist market, did not receive the benefits from the new global economic order. The United States effectively controlled these institutions and thus could control who would receive economic aid through these institutions.[94]

The Point IV Program was the culmination of the developments outlined in the previous chapter, which were development programs in the Philippines after the Spanish War, private

---

[92] Mahbub ul Haq, *UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions* (Basingstoke; Macmillan; 1995), 20.
[93] Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World* (Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press; 2005), 92-93.
[94] Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War*, (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press; 2007), 152-154.

investment funds in China and the TVA as a model for federal backed development programs, the ideals that led to the creation of the United Nations and the monetary institutions, such as the Wilsonian ideal of spreading democracy, Hamiltonian ideals of an economic world order, Roosevelt's Four Freedoms, and the security threats that emerged out of the ending of the Second World War and the start of the Cold War. It combines foreign aid, economic development and modernization and political stability.[95] The question then remains is how was this achieved. How did the United States think it could best develop the world and what were the arguments used by the politicians and other people in charge to justify American involvement in the rest of the world?

---

[95] Douglas Little, *American Orientalism* (Chapel Hill; University of North Carolina Press; 2004), 195.

Point IV

Having examined the history of American development programs and the emergence of the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions in the previous chapters, this chapter will deal with the Point IV Program itself. Using primary sources from the Truman Library and Museum in Independence, Missouri, the hometown of President Truman, the rhetoric of the Point IV Program will be examined. The Point IV Program played an important role in the early years of the Cold War, as it tried to connect the First World, or the United States, to the Third World, or the non-aligned developing countries, with the goal of making sure the Second World, or the Soviet-Union, could not spread communism further than it already had. If the Point IV Program was such an important factor in the struggle between democracy and communism, how can Edward Said's Orientalism be seen in its rhetoric?

Announcing the Point IV Program

When the war was over in 1945, the United Nations transformed from a wartime alliance to a peacetime organization. Mazower argues that the re-election of Truman in 1948 was significant not just to the United States, but also to the United Nations as Truman turned towards the United Nations to reach out to the Soviet Union. However, whereas the wartime United Nations saw reluctant cooperation between the United States and the USSR, Truman wanted to utilize the organization to combat the influence of communism. It was up to capitalism to show it was the way forwards and that it was capitalism that could help other countries.[96] In Truman's inaugural address on January 20th, 1949, Truman brought forward his ideas in stern rhetoric.

In Truman's view, the time of his re-election marks a schism. The Second World War is over and now the world looks at the United States to take the lead to build a peace for the second half of the 20th century. In the beginning of his speech, he proclaims the values and principles the people of

---

[96] Mark Mazower, *Governing the World* (London; Penguin Books; 2012), 273-274.

the United States live by. The manner in which he does this, is reminiscent of the Four Freedoms proclaimed by Roosevelt in 1941. Freedom of Speech and Freedom of Worship are the first freedoms addressed by Truman, though formulated differently.

> ''*The American people stand firm in the faith which has inspired this Nation from the beginning. We believe that all men have a right to equal justice under law and equal opportunity to share in the common good. We believe that all men have a right to freedom of thought and expression. We believe that all men are created equal because they are created in the image of God. From this faith we will not be moved. The American people desire, and are determined to work for, a world in which all nations and all peoples are free to govern themselves as they see fit, and to achieve a decent and satisfying life. Above all else, our people desire, and are determined to work for, peace on earth-a just and lasting peace-based on genuine agreement freely arrived at by equals.*''[97]

His rhetoric is clear. It is up to America to take a leading role in the world, to further the development of less privileged people and fight for self-determination, an underscoring of the anti-colonialist ideal. Furthermore, religion is an important factor as men are created equal in the image of God. It is by following this ideal that it has become the duty of the United States to pursue these goals. Within this thought, there is room for racial hierarchy, as explained by Michael Hunt. Though people are created equal, they are not yet equal. Hierarchal advancement is possible in this thought, however, and that is what is indicated here as well. This advancement can only be achieved with the help from the United States and other western countries. Strikingly, there is no room for the Soviet Union, though they are also part of the United Nations. Rather, in the years following the Second World War, as mentioned before, the USSR has become the rival of the United States. This is illustrated well by Truman, and this part of the address is reminiscent of the Freedom from Fear as promulgated by Roosevelt.

---

[97] Harry S. Truman, "Inaugural Address" (Washington DC., January 20th, 1949), Speech. Web. https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm (Retrieved September 27, 2016).

What is created, then, is a bipolar world where there seems to be no room for Orientalism and an actively participating Third World. The American people are prepared to work for a lasting peace on earth based on agreements arrived at by equals. This can only be achieved when people can govern themselves as they see fit. In the American view, this means that they should be free to choose democracy over a totalitarian regime, but it does not take into account the possible desire of some countries to turn communist. These people, that have to make a decision between democracy or communism, are represented by the Third World. Orientalism, then, comes into play as it defines the way they are regarded by, in this case, the United States. The United States cannot perceive the idea that the Third World might choose Communism over democracy. The perceived threat is Soviet imperialist incursion into the developing world, rather than the Third World actively choosing a Communist way of life. Western dominance is ingrained in United States rhetoric up to the degree that there is no room for the other side of the bipolar world. Democracy is the only way forward and therefore the Third World must choose democracy and capitalism. This sense of control and improvement is manifested throughout the Point IV Program.

By highlighting differences between communism and democracy, Truman tries to indicate that capitalism is the way forward, while communism holds back the development of the world.

"Communism is based on the belief that man is so weak and inadequate that he is unable to govern himself, and therefore requires the rule of strong masters. Democracy is based on the conviction that man has the moral and intellectual capacity, as well as the inalienable right, to govern himself with reason and justice. Communism subjects the individual to arrest without lawful cause, punishment without trial, and forced labor as the chattel of the state. It decrees what information he shall receive, what art he shall produce, what leaders he shall follow, and what thoughts he shall think. Democracy maintains that government is established for the benefit of the individual, and is charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights of the individual and his freedom in the exercise of those abilities of his. Communism maintains that social wrongs can be corrected only by violence. Democracy has proved that social justice can

be achieved through peaceful change. Communism holds that the world is so widely divided into opposing classes that war is inevitable. Democracy holds that free nations can settle differences justly and maintain a lasting peace."[98]

With fascism defeated, communism became the new ideological adversary of the United States. Communism relies on oppression and unjustified violence and war will be inevitable and is represented as 'evil'. On the other hand, democracy is represented as 'good'. There is morality, reason, and justice. There is no oppression but rather rights are protected by a government that rules by the power vested in it by the people. Democracy presides over the Freedom from Fear. People living in a democracy do not need to fear oppression or violence, or being subjected to unlawful imprisonment. Instead of adjusting social wrongs by violence, democracy will adjust social wrongs through social change in a peaceful manner. Economic development then is the way forward as this maintains the final freedom, the Freedom from Want. It is this freedom that is the fourth point Truman addresses in his speech.

Truman refers to the Marshall Plan, or the Economic Recovery Program, and how this program not only strengthened the post-war European economy, but it ensured a firmer support for democracy. Democracy, of course, seen as the vessel that would bring peace to the world. Truman calls for a seizure of this momentum in his inaugural address and details his plan for freedom and peace consisting of four points. First, the United States will continue to support the United Nations in any way it can. Second, economic aid program, such as the Economic Recovery Program, will be continued around the globe. Third, Truman proclaims to protect freedom loving countries against aggression, and in doing so, hints at the establishment of a new military alliance which will become known as NATO, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

His fourth point, however, is the crux of his speech. "We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the

---

[98] Harry S. Truman, "Inaugural Address" (Washington DC., January 20th, 1949), Speech. Web. https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm (Retrieved September 27, 2016).

improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."[99] This new program is what will become known

as the Point Four Program. To fight poverty and hunger in underdeveloped areas of the world, the

United States is to provide technical assistance in developing these areas so they may become more

than just self-sustaining, but that they may show economic growth and prosperity. Truman goes on to

state:

> *"We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their*
>
> *contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all*
>
> *nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies whenever*
>
> *practicable. It must be a worldwide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom.*
>
> *With the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture, and labor in this country, this*
>
> *program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially*
>
> *their standards of living."[100]*

Clearly, the effort should not be unilaterally American, but rather a cooperative effort of the United

States, the United Nations, and private investors, as we have seen before in areas such as China that

was stricken by famines on a regular basis. However, the rhetoric shows that the United States is to

take up the leading role and that other nations that wish to join in should follow them, as their

"contributions will be warmly welcomed." By basing this program on democratic principles, Truman

wants to avoid imperialistic tendencies which could lead to the exploitation of the developing regions

in a for-profit structure. Democracy is to lead the way to personal freedom and happiness. Truman

believes totalitarianism regimes will flourish where poverty remains and where the people have no

hope for a better future.[101] By bringing development to the Third World, those nations will choose

---

[99] Harry S. Truman, "Inaugural Address" (Washington DC., January 20th, 1949), Speech. Web.
https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm (Retrieved September 27, 2016).
[100] Ibid.
[101] Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs: Volume Two: Years of Trial and Hope* (New York; The New American Library; 1956), 265-266.

democracy over communism. The four points proclaimed by Truman will finally then safeguard the Four Freedoms promulgated by President Roosevelt some eight years before.

The Point Four Program was a new program, but came out of a long tradition of economic aid programs, as illustrated in the chapters before. However, in the few years since the conclusion of the Second World War, the United States had initiated two other economic aid programs. One of which, the Marshall Plan, is well known, as it provided aid to western European countries for a number of economic and geopolitical reasons, one of which was stopping the spread of communism. The second program, that aided Greece and Turkey in 1947, is less well known. Truman uses this program to illustrate the effectiveness of economic and technical assistance as a means of developing a country so it can stand up to the threat of communism. The key difference between the Marshall Plan and the Greek-Turkish program and the new Point Four program, was that first two programs were emergency aid programs, and were never intended to last for a significant amount of time. The Point Four program on the other hand was intended as a long-term aid program, in line with Truman's anti-communist policy of containment.[102]

The announcement of the Point IV Program shows the public intentions of the program. The key aspect is aiding in developing underdeveloped regions of the world so those countries can withstand the pressure of communism. A cultural superiority is created as the democratic countries, under American leadership, can prevent the spread of communism while the developing countries cannot. A perceived cultural inferiority on their part is acted upon. However, an announcement like this has to have a detailed history. While the publicly announced intentions seem very benevolent, an examination of what went on behind the inaugural address might offer an interesting insight into the intentions of the program.

---

[102] Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs: Volume Two: Years of Trial and Hope* (New York; The New American Library; 1956), 266, 269.

Conceiving the Point IV Program

The concept of Point IV was actually one that had already been in the minds of policy makers long before the inaugural address of 1949. According to Stanley Andrews, who would become director of the Point IV program in 1952, the Institute for Inter-American Affairs preceded the program. This institute, led by Nelson Rockefeller, was tasked with educating Latin America so they could aide in the war effort by supplying resources to the allies. At the same time, the Department of Agriculture, where Andrews worked at the time, provided technical assistance in food production in the same region.[103] Though the programs preceding the Point IV Program were clear, it was unclear who actually conceived the Point IV Program and proposed it to President Truman and his staff.

In November of 1948, Benjamin Hardy, who would become the TCA's chief Public Affairs Officer at its establishment, wrote to the director of the State Department's Public Affairs Office Francis Russell and engaged criticism of United States foreign policy. According to Hardy, the public was critical of America's struggle with communism as it was approached to negatively. Therefore, Hardy suggested a positive approach to the struggle with communism. Technical assistance could be the answer if a new program was fashioned.

> *"We need only to take full advantage of the opportunity and convert this instrument into a dramatic, large-scale program that would capture the imagination of the peoples of other countries and harness their enthusiasm for social and economic improvement to the democratic campaign to repulse communism and create a decent life of the earth's millions."*[104]

No longer the bipolar view that tainted Truman's inaugural address, this perspective behind the address shows that democracy and capitalism, led by the United States, should capture the imagination countries around the world to get them to join America's cause in spreading democracy and capitalism around the world to halt the spread of communism. The Point IV Program was not

---

[103] Richard D. McKinzie, "Oral History Interview with Stanley Andrews" (October 31, 1970), Web. https://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/andrewss.htm (Retrieved September 27, 2016).
[104] Benjamin Hardy; November 23, 1948; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

solely intended as a development program for the Third World then, but also as a program that would harness the enthusiasm of other democratic countries, and countries that want to become democratic, in furthering the campaign against communism. The Orient became the new battleground in the fight against communism.

This idea was not foreign to him. Hardy had seen first-hand what the effects of technical assistance program could be when he was located as a press officer in Brazil from 1944 to 1946. In 1947, he became employed as a speech writer. In that capacity, he got involved in the Marshall Plan and once again saw the benefits of an economic development program. It was not until 1948 that the remembered the lessons he learned in Brazil which resulted in the memorandum that lead to the Point IV Program.[105] The memorandum details what kind of technical assistance should be provided and that it could be based on the model of the TVA. Furthermore, Hardy stresses that, should such a program be developed in successive steps, it should be announced by the President in his State of the Union address, or another major speech.[106]

The draft prepared by Hardy, however, was rewritten in such a manner that hardly any of his ideas remained. His idea for a technical assistance program was removed altogether. At this time, though, Hardy was convinced such a program was needed and he was determined to make it happen. After being informed by Francis Russell that the new draft was not satisfactory either, Hardy set about drafting a new address, one that would contain the four points. This draft underwent further changes and led to various differences between Hardy's memorandum and the final inaugural address. The most significant of the changes was the inclusion of capital investment. Furthermore, Hardy intended the program to be worldwide, and would be focused on modernizing industry in western countries,

---

[105] Benjamin H. Hardy to Mr. Daniels, November 19, 1950; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [3 of 3], Truman Library.
[106] Benjamin H. Hardy to Mr. Russell, November 23, 1948; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

rather than only developing underdeveloped areas.[107] This interpretation of the origins of the Point IV Program are supported by Francis Russell.[108]

Paradoxically, the papers of David D. Lloyd provide a different perspective. According to these papers, the two staff members that seemed most influential in drafting the speech were David D. Lloyd, a member of the White House Staff, and Walter Salant, staff member at the Council of Economic Advisors. Not only did they play a key role in drafting Truman's inaugural address, they also helped create the Point IV Program itself. In a memorandum sent to Lloyd and George Elsey, who was an assistant to the President, and later to the director of the Point IV Program, in 1950, Salant outlines a basic plan of how the Point IV Program, or the Technical Cooperation Administration, as it was known by then, was to be managed.[109] It is unclear who actually first came up with the idea of the Point IV Program. What is clear, however, is how to program was to be implemented.

Shortly after Truman's inaugural address, the office of public affairs sent out a memorandum to its staff that outlined Truman's Point IV Program. It briefly sums up the goals of the program, to offer technical assistance, and details that it is indeed not new, as Stanley Andrews mentioned, but based on other assistance programs through, for example, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. It emphasizes the novelty of the program, though, as it highlights its expansive scale and its intended longevity. Most importantly, the goal of the program is to bring technical knowledge to underdeveloped areas to help develop them, rather than economically exploit them in imperialistic fashion. Furthermore, the memorandum, like Truman's inaugural address, makes clear the United States cannot do this on its own. The program favors multilateral cooperation through the United Nations and the involvement of private investors.[110]

---

[107] Benjamin H. Hardy to Mr. Daniels, November 19, 1950; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [3 of 3], Truman Library.
[108] Francis Russell, Date Unknown; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [3 of 3], Truman Library.
[109] Walter Salant to David Lloyd and George Elsey, February 20, 1950; SMOF: David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.
[110] Office of Public Affairs, Information Memorandum no. 36; February 4, 1949; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

This brief look at the conception of Truman's inaugural address and the announcement of the Point IV Program shows the extent to which the Point IV Program was embedded in Cold War perceptions. According to the sources, the Truman administration was perceived as fighting communism in a negative manner. Some positivity was needed, which meant promoting democracy rather than fighting communism. Though as benevolent as the announcement of the Point IV Program in the address may seem, the United States clearly saw that it had a lot to gain from it. Aiding in development would further the American cause of fighting communism. Contrary to the Economic Recovery Program implemented in Europe, the Point IV Program was Truman's attempt a long term program to promote democracy and capitalism and fight communism by preventing it from spreading to the Third World.

Selling the Point IV Program

The outline of the program and its goals were clear. However, between the inaugural address and the effective establishment of the TCA, the program had to sold both to the public and to Congress. This would not be an easy feat, as the public was weary of the program at first, which can be seen in the way the program was represented in the media.

On February 8, following the inaugural address, a memorandum by Benjamin Hardy details criticism Truman's program received by the public. Ferdinand Kuhn of the Washington Post sceptically remarked that the program will require a rare kind of leadership if such a program is actually to be developed. The Denver Post called it "no more than a Kernel of an idea.". Most of all, the program is perceived to be hazy and unclear and no more than mere rhetoric.[111] To change the public's opinion and secure funding, both through private investment and Congress, the Truman administration had its work cut out in selling this program. What followed was a year of addresses and speeches to obtain

---

[111] Benjamin Hardy to Mr. Russell and Mr. Jones, February 8, 1949; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [2 of 3], Truman Library.

the support that was needed. These addresses were not only made by the president himself. To maximize exposure, various other people within the administration addressed executives and associations with the goal of encouraging private investment. One of such addresses was held by the Assistant to the President John R. Steelman on May 27th, 1949.

Before the Joint Luncheon of the Executives Club of Chicago and the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Steelman outlines the administration's views on the Point IV program. This address is interesting as it details arguments made by the Truman administration to win over private investors for their new program. It highlights the fact that the Point IV Program evolved out of several other programs, both governmental and privately funded. Furthermore, it is highlighted that it is not a reconstruction program, but truly a developmental program. There is a focus on the economic benefits of the program, both for the affected areas as for the United States. Aspects of development are highlighted, and the involvement of the United Nations and its various bodies, including the Economic and Social Council is discussed in favourable light. What is striking though, is that there is no mention of idealism, democracy or communism anywhere. Whereas Truman's inaugural address and further speeches as will be highlighted later on, refer to the idealistic struggle between democracy and communism as a raison d'etre for the Point IV Program, such remarks are lacking in Steelman's address. The only reference he makes is "Beyond the material rewards derived from this program, lies the broad vista which it opens – a better civilization whose motive force is no longer fear, but hope".

Though a reference to fear, which can be linked to communism as was done in Truman's inaugural address, it hardly invokes images of an ideological struggle. Rather, the speech puts emphasis on economic aspects. Selling this idea to possible investors then does not seem to feasible with ideological arguments, which seem to be reserved for the public and convincing Congress.[112]

What this speech does illustrate, though, is that economic development is needed to bring hope to the Third World. As the Cold War rages, the Third World is unaligned with either democracy of communism. According to the Truman administration, personified by Steelman in this case, the

---

[112] John. R. Steelman, May 27, 1949; SMOF: David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

prime motive force for the Third World is fear. Fear of communism. By bringing development the Point IV Program can bring them hope. Once more, American dominance over the Third World and their aspirations to control and improve those regions become clear. It seems utterly inconceivable that some people of the Third World may prefer communism over capitalism.

On June 24, 1949, some six months after his inaugural address, President Truman addressed Congress. In this address, Truman asked Congress to help under-developed areas by enacting legislation "to authorize an expanded program of technical assistance for such areas, and an experimental program for encouraging the outflow of private investment beneficial to their economic development."[113] Truman goes on to reason that these countries lack an economic basis to develop democracy, and so are under threat from communism. American assistance of these areas hold great promise. "It is not only a promise that new and stronger nations will be associated with us in the cause of human freedom, it also a promise of new economic strength and growth for ourselves."[114] Truman's reasoning is that developing these countries will not only lead to more productive trade, it will also steer these developing countries clear from totalitarian regimes.

In reference to his inaugural address, Truman argues that aiding developing countries is one of the pillars of the Charter of the United Nations. "Under Article 56 of the Charter, we have promised to take separate action and to act jointly with other nations "to promote higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development.""[115] As Truman pledged continued support for the United Nations in his inaugural address, Congress had to follow suit and allow for this continued support in the form of this new economic aid program.

In this address to Congress, Truman specifies more clearly than in his inaugural address what kind of aid he wishes to employ to develop the regions affected by the program and classifies the aid into two categories. The first categories focusses on technical assistance. This aid, delivered by experts

---

[113] Harry S. Truman, Address to Congress, June 24, 1949; SMOF: David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Ibid.

from the United States and other participating countries, would focus not just on education and infrastructure, but more importantly, Truman envisioned technical assistance to aid in the planning of long-term economic development. Long-term economic development would lead to high productivity and the chance for long-term trade deals. The second category is related to this as it focusses on the production of goods and financial assistance so the people of the region receiving the aid can set up successful enterprises of their own. Much of the capital required for these projects must come from abroad, both governments and private investors.[116]

Truman continues: "Much of the aid that is needed can be provided most efficiently through the United Nations."[117] On March 4, 1949, two months after the inaugural address, and some 3 months before Truman's address to Congress, the plan for a Point IV Program was brought before the Economic and Social Council, the body of the United Nations dealing with economic and social development.[118]

The United Nations completed a survey of possible projects, after a request to do so by the United States. The total costs of a United Nations effort would not exceed 35 million dollars. Aside from investing in this joint effort with the United Nations, Truman believed there was an opportunity for the United States to fund their own program as well. Therefore, Truman requests appropriations of no more than 45 million dollars in the year of the program's inauguration. He asserts that the neither the United States nor the United Nations will bear the full burden of the program's costs. As the program is intended to develop underdeveloped countries, these countries are required to "bear a substantive portion of the expense."[119]

Furthermore, Truman recommends that the authority of over the program is vested in the administration of the president, as a variety of federal agencies will be involved in developing the

---

[116] Harry S. Truman, Address to Congress, June 24, 1949; SMOF: David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.
[117] Ibid.
[118] Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs: Volume Two: Years of Trial and Hope* (New York; The New American Library; 1956), 271.
[119] Harry S. Truman, Address to Congress, June 24, 1949; SMOF: David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

program and implementing it. Also, investment capital needs to be acquired to develop the program. This should be done both through private investment and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In short then, in his address to congress, president Truman requests the enactment of two proposals. The first proposal will set up a program of technical assistance whereas the second enactment will encourage foreign investment. These measures complement American foreign interests as these underdeveloped areas house "new creative energies. [...] Unless we aid in the newly awakened spirit in these peoples to find the course of fruitful development, they may fall under the control of those whose philosophy is hostile to human freedom, thereby prolonging the unsettled state of the world and postponing the achievement of permanent peace."[120]

What becomes visible in Truman's perspective on the Point IV program is that it not merely focussed on developing Third World countries to reap economic benefits, although at times it seemed like it was framed that way. Rather, the program fits within his larger policy of containing the spread of communism. Point IV, thus, is very ideological in many ways. Yet, the way it is done, seems to be very realistic in its approach. Democracy and communism are locked in an anarchic struggle for power and the Third World is up for grabs. When these countries are bound to one of the ideologies, the balance of power will shift. Point IV is an attempt to connect the United States to several Third World countries and prevent the balance of power to shift in favor of the communist Soviet Union. Orientalism comes into play when the rhetoric towards the Third World is examined. There is constant need of the United States to dominate the Third World by making decision for them, as they are incapable of doing so themselves. Though in his inaugural address Truman announced countries should be able to govern themselves and have freedom of expression, this only seems applicable if they favour capitalism and democracy over communism. The United States attempts to dominate and control the developing regions, though their rhetoric is one of benevolence. By helping these countries

---

[120] Harry S. Truman, Address to Congress, June 24, 1949; SMOF: David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

develop and achieve modernity, the people of the developing countries will be elevated on the racial ladder and be ready to govern themselves. At this point, these people will favour democracy over communism, as it was democracy and capitalism that aided them in achieving modernity, prosperity, and self-governance. The two objectives set out for the Point IV Program support this view.

Roughly, the Truman administration saw two types of objectives for the new program. The first kind of objectives were of an economic nature. The reasoning is that increasing productivity in underdeveloped areas will lead to an array of economic effects. Not only will it stabilize the American domestic market as their manufactures commodities are now traded with new untapped markets, it will stimulate growth of the global economy as well. Not only the United States, but all developed regions can now sell their goods and commodities to new markets, which in turn will lead to an increase of capital flow and productivity in the underdeveloped regions. Overall, the world economy will be strengthened.

Secondly, according to the Truman administration, the program will not only strengthen the economy, it will stabilize the world order. Point IV is important for American national security, is the administration's reasoning. By using Point IV to build good-will across the world, the United States will eventually reap those benefits. This is particularly important "in areas of strategic economic or military significance."[121] Furthermore, the program will strengthen the United Nations and its relations with the United States. Point IV will support international economic development, one of the key objectives of the United Nations. Also, working together with the United Nations will make sure that Point IV cannot be framed as imperialistic.

The grand goal of these two types of objectives though, is to promote peace. By developing trade and industries, strengthening democracy and the United Nations will show that world development can be peaceful. "If international tensions are eased in this way, defense expenditures

---

[121] Author Unknown, Objectives and Nature of the Point IV Program; Date Unknown; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [2 of 3], Truman Library.

should decrease, and both current living standards and further economic development would then be able to benefit from the additional resources thus made available."[122]

It thus is clear that the Point IV program is intended to do more than just offer technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. The objectives mentioned above indicate that developing these regions is to the benefit of the United States. The program then seems to be a rather selfish act covered by altruistic motives. Binding these regions to the United States and Europe will shift the balance of power drastically in the West's favor. Truman underscores this in a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives Sam Rayburn on August 25th, 1950. "The importance of the Point IV appropriation in the struggle against communism cannot be overemphasized."[123]

In the year after the inaugural address, there are two main aspects of the Point IV program that come forward repeatedly. The first is the economic benefits that the program will entail. Not only for the regions where the program will be implemented, but also for the domestic markets. There will be an increase in exports and an outwards flow of capital which will result in increased productivity and jobs. These economic benefits are highlighted when the program is pitched to possible investors, as can be seen during the address by the President's Assistant John Steelman. However, when the administration is trying to garner support from the United States Congress or the public, different rhetoric is used. Though Roosevelt promulgated a Freedom from Fear, the rhetoric illustrates a fear from communism. To make sure communism does not spread, the democratic United States have fallen into an ideological struggle with communism. Point IV is one of the positive results of the struggle with communism, and as such, it should be regarded in that perspective. Aiding the underdeveloped regions of the world will spread not only wealth, but also a democratic ideal, that through economic superiority and growth can suppress the spread of communism. The regions

---

[122] Author Unknown, Objectives and Nature of the Point IV Program; Date Unknown; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [2 of 3], Truman Library.
[123] Harry S. Truman to Sam Rayburn, August 25, 1950; SMOF David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [2 of 3], Truman Library.

receiving the aid will then be bound, through good will and economic ties, to the United States and the rest of the western world.

Though anti-imperialistic in its rhetoric, there is a certain notion of colonialist thought embedded in the Point IV Program. The perception of the Third World is that the people living there are underdeveloped. Acting on this perception, the United States conceives a program that will develop these regions to modernize them, elevate them, and get them ready for self-governance. A new dominance over the Third World, or the Orient, is established. No longer is the goal economic exploitation and subjugation, but trade, spreading democracy and halting the spread of communism. By modernizing the Third World, the developing regions will choose democracy and capitalism over communism, or, as Steelman would put it, hope over fear.

Implementing the Point IV Program

Point IV became a reality on June 5th, 1950, when President Truman signed the "Act for International Development", passed by Congress. Not much later, on September 8th, 1950, President Truman signed an executive order delegating carrying out the Point IV Program to the Secretary of State. In doing so, the executive order established the International Advisory Board, led by Nelson Rockefeller, with the purpose of considering plans for the newly established program. The technical staff assembled by the Secretary of State become known as the Technical Assistance Cooperation, or the TCA, of which Henry Bennett became the first administrator.[124] However, before the TCA was created and could act out the program, both Congress and the agricultural sector, which would provide most of the specialists for technical assistance, had to be convinced.

---

[124] Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs: Volume Two: Years of Trial and Hope* (New York; The New American Library; 1956), 271-272. George M. Elsey, General Plan for Operation of the Technical Cooperation (Point IV) Program under the Proposed Executive Order; August 17, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Point IV Executive Order, Truman Library.

President Truman's statement accompanying the new executive order focusses on the juxtaposition between the free western world and the communist world. He highlights how the Point IV Program will prove communist propaganda wrong. "Communist propaganda holds that the free nations are incapable of providing a decent standard of living for the millions of people in the under-developed areas of the earth. The Point Four Program will be one of our principal ways of demonstrating the complete falsity of that charge."[125] He goes on to detail that the financial appropriation of roughly thirty-five million dollars is not a large one compared to the need of the program. Furthermore, in the ideological struggle against communism, this is a rather small sum of money with high expectations, as illustrated by a satirical image by the Washington Post on July 7, 1950. The picture shows President Truman requesting appropriations for the Point IV Program of 35 million dollars only to be rebuffed with "Nah! Let's wait until they go communist, then spend a few billions fighting them." Congress then, was not yet set on appropriating money for the Point IV Program.[126]

Around that time (exact date unknown) a confidential memorandum circulated in the offices of the Truman administration. While Truman requested an appropriation of thirty-five million dollars, several Republican Senators tried to decrease this amount first to fifteen million, then thirteen million and eventually ten million dollars. A call to completely eliminate the appropriation did not pass.[127] President Truman then called upon Congressional leaders and drew a parallel between the war in Korea and the Point IV Program. Truman asserted that no matter how quickly the fight in Korea was won, Point IV was to spearhead a psychological front against communism without which the grand

---

[125] Harry S. Truman, Statement by the President, September 8, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Executive Order), Truman Library.

[126] Author Unknown, Cartoon in Washington Post, July 7, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.

[127] Author Unknown; Date Unknown; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.

struggle against this ideology could not be won. For a rather "insignificant outlay" this program will "give the long-exploited masses of the orient hope for a better life in a non-communist world."[128]

Blair Moody of the Washington Post continues this parallel by stating that if the Senate Appropriations Committee succeeds in slashing the budget for the Point IV Program, the soldiers that lost their lives in Korea may have died in vain. If the anti-Soviet effort on the psychological front does not match the intensity of the struggle on the battlefield, this would be the case. Moody goes on to assert that if there was no threat of communism and no war in Korea, Point IV would be good for the United States as it would help build self-sufficient states with which the United States could trade. However, with the Soviet threat and the Korean war posing a serious issue, sending America's allies in Asia mere armament shipments rather than hope in form of economic development, "would make an eventual Russian victory in that area, military or otherwise, certain."[129]

Not just the media supported Truman's requested appropriations. On July 11th, Warren Austin, who at that time was the United States ambassador to the United Nations, prepared a statement in which he emphasized the importance of the Point IV Program. Ambassador Austin regards the Point IV Program as the ideal counter against Soviet destructive technical assistance. "The Communists are using technical assistance for destructive purposes. The answer of the free world must be to pursue with greater vigor than ever before our goal of using technical assistance for constructive purposes. He also draws a parallel between the Point IV Program and Korea. Korea was one such area where the communists pushed through, according the ambassador. Point IV will succeed in eliminating such areas of weakness and, in doing so, combat the spread of communism so that "people can choose the way of life they wish to lead with calm and reason rather than in terror and desperation."[130]

---

[128] Blair Moody; July 11, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.
[129] Ibid.
[130] Warren Austin, Statement by Ambassador Austin, July 11, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.

In Truman's letter to Speaker of the House Rayburn of August 25th, in which he underscores the importance of Point IV in the struggle against communism, Truman's conclusions are similar to those of Blair Moody. The appropriation amount is fairly small compared to other efforts in the struggle against communism. The effects of this small amount of money, however, could tip the "scales toward the way of freedom" in areas where communist totalitarianism clashes with the free way of life. Point IV can demonstrate that democracy offers them economic prosperity, a promise that communism cannot fulfil. "If the reduction made by the conference committee in the amount appropriated by the Senate for Point IV is allowed to stand, it will largely destroy the program's effectiveness." Moreover, the United States might then no longer be regarded as the better alternative to communism as the areas that need their help the most cannot count upon them. Or as President Truman put it eloquently and sharply: "This attempt to save some ten million dollars will do more for the communists in their attack on the free world that hundreds of millions of dollars of their own propaganda. At a time when we are calling upon our young men to go into battle in the cause of freedom, I can conceive of no more tragic blunder than to throw away this opportunity of doing so much to strengthen the cause of freedom at such little cost."[131]

Seemingly, the pressure from both the media [132] and the President and other officials had an effect. The Senate Appropriations Committee agreed on the budget, which meant that the TCA could be created. The next step was getting the agricultural sector on board, as this sector had to provide the majority of the specialists needed to implement the developmental projects.

Part of the funds appropriated by Congress are not to be invested in the program directly. Rather, funds will also be devoted to multilateral development programs through the United Nations. The bilateral development agreements between the United States and developing countries will

---

[131] Harry S. Truman to Sam Rayburn; August 25, 1950; SMOF David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [2 of 3], Truman Library.
[132] Author Unknown, New York Times, July 1, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.

therefore be supplemented by these multilateral agreements.[133] Underscoring this mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and the United Nations was Stanley Andrews. In an address to the North Carolina State Grange in Lumbarton on October 24, 1950, stresses the importance of working in conjunction with agencies affiliated with the United Nations, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labor Office, the World Heatlh Organization and the International Bank and Monetary Fund. Andrews underscores the role of the agricultural sector in this new undertaking. He clearly defines a relationship between the farmers, their obligation towards the United Nations and the multilateral and bilateral undertakings. International trade leads to the farmers' crops being spread all around the globe. To improve the situation of underdeveloped regions, the farmers have an obligation to produce high quality products with high nutritional value that adhere to the high standards set by the Food and Agricultural Organization.[134]

By relating the American agricultural sector to the improvement of underdeveloped areas, he stresses the importance of efforts made by this sector in the struggle against communism. The struggle against communism, and the Iron Curtain being erected across Europe has led to an increase of demand of American agricultural deficits. Whereas before World War II, countries such as Romania and the Ukraine exported agricultural products to Western Europe, the countries in Westen Europe were now dependent on American products. [135]

Andrews made similar remarks a month later, on November 13, when he addressed the Annual Convention of the Land Grant College Association. The need of foreign countries for American men trained in agriculture is detailed. Historically, American agricultural attachés to foreign countries act as scientists developing new methods of production or report on living standards of the country in which they serve. As of 1950, the Department of Agriculture had 65 men stationed in seventeen

---

[133] Harry S. Truman, Statement by the President, September 8, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Executive Order), Truman Library.
[134] Stanley Andrews, The Farmer in World Affairs, October 24, 1950; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 3; Government Service File, 1942-53; 1950 Personal, Truman Library.
[135] Ibid.

countries serving international development. Andrews calls these "our Point IV men."[136] He believes

this amount will increase of the next few years and the program will therefore need specialists trained

in extension and agronometrics and a large number of technical researchers, scientists and specialists

in farming machinery. Generally, in Andrews view, "may we say that the needs for agriculturally

trained personnel falls into about two broad categories – for those who represent agriculture and its

various interests abroad with our diplomatic missions; second, for those who will become the

operating crews of the Foreign Development Programs which will be undertaken in cooperation with

other nations under the popular conception of Point IV."[137] Both speeches stress the importance of

the American agricultural sector in making the Point IV Program a success. In conjunction with both

bilateral and multilateral agreements, the agricultural sector of the United States will be needed if

Point IV is to succeed. Furthermore, as Fred Bailey and Jay Richter of the *Washington News* report,

the agricultural sector feared cuts in the budget of the Marshall Plan, which at this time financed half

of American farm exports, would be cut in the next fiscal year. By securing the Point IV Program, the

agricultural sector gains a new export market where they may be able to sell their surpluses.[138] By

drawing relationships between these aspects, the critical support of the American agricultural sector

is secured, which will secure specialists for the Technical Cooperation Administration and will lead to

the growth of the Point IV Program.

By the end of 1950 then, the outline of the Point IV Program had become clear. Legislation

had been put in place by the Act for International development by the 81st Congress. This act declares

that it is official United States policy to aid in the development efforts of economically underdeveloped

areas. To do so, the resources of the United States, both public and private are to be utilized most

effectively. the Secretary of State is authorized to oversee the effective utilization of these resources,

as mandated by the Executive Order of September 8, 1950. The most important instrument under the

---

[136] Stanley Andrews, Needs of Foreign Countries for U.S. Men Trained in Agriculture, November 13, 1950; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 3; Government Service File, 1942-53; 1950 Personal, Truman Library.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Fred Bailey and Jay Richter, Washington News, Date Unknown; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 3; Government Service File, 1942-53; 1950 General Folder 2, Truman Library.

Secretary of State in achieving American foreign policy goals of this nature is the Technical Cooperation Administration. Together with the heads of other relevant agencies, as specified in the Executive Order, this administration will plan and execute programs authorized by the Act for International Development.[139]

However, even though the Secretary of State is at the top of the program, he will delegate the authority and responsibilities received through the Executive Order to an administrator. The first one, as mentioned before, was Henry Bennett. Three divisions, separated on a basis of subject matter, will fall under him. These groups will not only work together within the TCA, but also with other agencies such as the Department of Agriculture, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and the United Nations. The administrator will be advised is to be advised by a Council on Technical Cooperation. The agencies participating in projects administered by the TCA are subject to the direction of the local American ambassador. [140]

Despite the initial objections of the Senate Appropriations Committee, thirty-five million dollars was appropriated, of which twelve million dollars. was allocated to the United Nations and their projects. Another nineteen million dollars was allocated to bilateral, rather than multilateral, projects. While initially, these appropriations would be sufficient, the Point IV Program was expected to grow significantly. Whereas in 1950 there were 126 technical assistance positions, by 1951 it was projected this would have grown to over 350.[141] Less than two years after Truman's inaugural address, during which he mentioned his intentions for a bold, new program to aid the underdeveloped regions of the world for the first time, his idea had been put into action. The Point IV Program, administered through the TCA, was now in full effect and over the course of the next few years was only projected to grow.

---

[139] OFAR – USDA, Status of Point IV Program; October 2, 1950; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 3; Government Service File, 1942-53; 1950 Point IV Program, Truman Library.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.

The Point IV Program Thrives

In the State of the Union Address of 1951, Truman expresses his belief that the democratic countries of the world want nothing but peace and have to bind together to face the common threat of communism. He further expresses regret of Soviet imperialistic tendencies around the world as he had hoped that the Soviet Union would "live and let live" as they too were part of the United Nations. The Soviet-Union goes about their destruction in two ways. The first and most obvious way is external aggression. The second way is that of subversion and propaganda. Truman stresses that both these aspects of Soviet imperialism have to be counteracted and neglecting one of the two is not an option as it will result in a defeat. Truman underscores the leading role the United States must fulfil in binding the western nations together in the struggle against communism. One of the key elements in taking up this role, according to Truman, will be extending American economic assistance to countries who need it. The Marshall Plan has proven successful at keeping communism at bay as it has not spread further across Europe. In other parts of the world, such as the Near East and Asia, economic assistance is to be based more on economic development. This is a direct reference to the Point IV Program. Without specifically mentioning the program or the TCA, Truman once again emphasizes the importance of the Point IV Program in developing underdeveloped economies in the struggle against communism.[142]

Three months after the State of the Union Address, by March of 1951, over 350 technicians were working on a hundred projects in twenty-seven countries across the globe. No less than thirty-five governments of underdeveloped countries requested American developmental aid through the Point IV Program. Not only did American technicians go abroad, local technicians were to be trained in the United States. Around the same time, 236 trainees from thirty-four countries were being educated in the United States.[143] On April 18, 1951, President Truman released a statement regarding

---

[142] Harry S. Truman, "State of the Union Address, 1951" (Washington DC, January 8, 1951), Speech. Web. https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/tap/1851.htm (Retrieved September 27, 2016).

[143] Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs: Volume Two: Years of Trial and Hope* (New York; The New American Library; 1956), 272-273.

an informal report on Point IV and mentions similar numbers. Once again, the President reiterates the importance of the Point IV Program in combatting communism. "The Point Four Program is part of the defense of the free world. It is the best answer to the false promises of communism. It offers the plain people of the world a way to do what they want most to do – improve their conditions of life by their own efforts. [...] But this is only the beginning."[144] By the end of 1951, the Point IV Program had spread to thirty-three countries.[145]

The State of the Union Address of 1952 further underscores the importance of the Point IV Program. Following the success of Korea, where American military forces, under the flag of the United Nations, pushed back the communist forces, the United States must increase their assistance to the people of Asia to keep them free from communism. "In Asia the new Communist empire is a daily threat to millions of people. The peoples of Asia want to be free to follow their own way of life." To guarantee these people they are indeed free to choose their own way of life, the United States must increase their aid. According to President Truman, this does not merely entail military aid, but also economic aid, both capital investment and sharing technical knowledge. Truman illustrates the success of Point IV by detailing the increase in production by Indian farmers after receiving technical assistance through the program. It shows an increase of productivity of roughly 500%. To maintain these successes, Truman pleads for more funding. "We need more funds to speed their efforts, because there is nothing of greater importance in all our foreign policy. There is nothing that shows more clearly what we stand for, and what we want to achieve." Once again, Truman highlights the fact that the amounts of money he asks for are not immense in regards to what the Point IV Program is intended to do, and what they are up against. "My friends of the Congress, less than one-third of the expenditure for the cost of World War II would have created the developments necessary to feed

---

[144] Harry S. Truman, Statement by the President, April 18, 1951; SMOF David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [3 of 3], Truman Library.
[145] Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs: Volume Two: Years of Trial and Hope* (New York; The New American Library; 1956), 273.

the whole world so we wouldn't have to stomach communism. That is what we have got to fight, and unless we fight that battle and win it, we can't win the cold war or a hot one either."[146]

Roughly one year later, though, in June 1953, Truman's successor President Eisenhower takes administrative action. In his view, the organization of foreign policy programs and foreign aid programs are too scattered. Eisenhower proposes centralization under the new Foreign Operations Administrations. The Points IV Program in the guise of the TCA is transferred from the State Department to the new Administration. "The technical cooperation program will be carried out solely in furtherance of the purposes of the Act for International Development."[147] Though the technical aid programs in conjunction with the United Nations continue, it marks the end for the Point IV Program as intended by President Truman.

The Point IV Program, Constructivism and Orientalism

In January 1952, a few weeks after the State of the Union address, the first annual report on the Act for International Development was presented by the TCA. One of the main question this report addresses is what the American people expect to get out of Point IV. In the answer it is stated that the Point IV Program serves "America's own welfare and interests," something that has not been stated before in any of the other sources as plainly as in this report. "We want conditions of life in which we can be free and prosperous by honest work. We know these conditions cannot endure while half the world is struggling with poverty and ignorance."[148] The report continues:

"We have undertaken the Point IV Program so that, as they acquire modern techniques, these

people can create decent lives for themselves. That is what they want most to do. Out of the

---

[146] Harry S. Truman, "State of the Union Address,, 1952" (Washington DC, January 9, 1952), Speech. Web. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=14418 (Retrieved September 27, 2016).
[147] Dwight D. Eisenhower, Address to Congress, June 1, 1953; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 10; government Service Files, 1942-53; 1953 Point IV & Technical Coop Admin [Folder 1], Truman Library.
[148] Harry S. Truman, First Annual Report on the Act for International Development, January 29, 1952; SMOF David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV Report 1952, Truman Library.

Point IV Program, then, we expect nothing less than a community of self-governing, self-sustaining nations. A community of nations living peacefully together, trading freely and profitably with our country and others, having no need of help from us or anyone else."

The early view that though the rhetoric of the Point IV Program is altruistic, the motives behind the program most certainly are not, is supported by this report. The ideological rhetoric of providing aid to underdeveloped areas so they can resist the evil totalitarian communist advances is backed by the motive of providing a continuous high standard of living for the American people. Furthermore, before these nations can trade freely and be self-governing, the modernization efforts led by the United States need to be accepted and continued. To implement the Point IV Program, which was intended to do just that, two different types of arguments have been used.

First and foremost, the Point IV Program was to provide a positive approach to the struggle with communism. Where often times propaganda was used to demonize the enemy, the Point IV Program would provide an opportunity for the United States to show to the world that they were sincere in aiding underdeveloped areas, that they could be relied upon by the nations around the world who needed it most. The belief that all men have the right to equal justice under law and a satisfying life is acted upon by the Point IV Program. It is to provide self-reliance to the underdeveloped areas of the world. If this to be achieved through American support, these countries will not only be able to resist communist encroachment, they will also be allied to the United States and the rest of the Western world. Democracy, according to Truman is based on this idea of self-reliance, contrary to communism which relies on subjugation. Providing in self-reliance will only enforce the global position of democracy.

A key aspect in achieving this is a reliance on bilateral and multilateral agreements. These multilateral agreements will operate mainly through the United Nations and its various bodies, such as the Social and Economic Council, but also the World Bank. These institutions have been created after World War Two and will play an important role in American economic development programs. A significant part of the funding appropriated by Congress was to go to the United Nations to support

these multilateral programs. These bilateral and multilateral agreements have the same goals, however, and the TCA is involved in both of these agreements.

The second line of argument focussed on a different aspect of the Point IV Program. The positive approach to the ideological struggle was mostly intended to win over the public. As the Point IV Program not only relied on Congressional appropriations, but also on private capital investments, these possible investors had to be convinced of the effectiveness of the program as well. However, whether it was effective in the struggle against communism seemed not as important. Rather, a positive effect on the economic situation was highlighted in addresses to possible investors. By increasing the size of the tradeable market, the United States would reap the benefits. Similar views were made in an article on Stanley Andrews as it underscored the view that economic benefits were a reason for the United States to implement the Point IV Program at a time when the Marshall Plan was reduced in size.

Economic benefits were not the only argument used to win over possible investors and the agricultural sector, for it was this sector that was to provide most of the technicians and scientists who would actually perform the program. In several addresses, Stanley Andrews and others, secured the support of the agricultural sector by highlighting the fact that it would increase the number of jobs and thus the need to train additional agricultural technicians.

Winning over Congress, and especially the Senate Appropriations Committee, seemed more difficult. The arguments to convince this committee of the need for a new development program were a combination of the two lines of argument highlighted above. The emphasis on the ideological struggle with communism was combined with a focus on the budgetary arguments. Fighting communism was necessary, especially while the United States, and indeed the United Nations, were heavily involved in a war in Korea trying to prevent communism from spreading across the peninsula. Point IV would offer the United States the possibility to fight communism ideologically for a fraction of the cost of what a war would cost. This is best highlighted by the satiric image mentioned before. Rather than fighting the underdeveloped regions once they have fallen to communism, it was

advisable to spend significantly less to develop these areas and prevent them from accepting a communist regime in the first place.

These arguments, especially the ideological ones, do have a slight negative connotation to the use of the term 'underdeveloped'. As Said wrote about orientalism that it defines otherness, so does this term. The self-fulfilling prophecy Said wrote about seemed to have come true with the Point IV Program. By regarding certain areas around the globe as underdeveloped constantly, it became imperative for a country such as the United States to actually develop them. However, rather than governing the areas themselves as classic imperialists would have done, the United States assumed the rhetoric of economic development to ready these regions for self-governance. Before this could be achieved, though, these areas had to be restructured to be able to be developed. Said explains this tendency of the west to restructure and dominate the orient, or the underdeveloped areas, as Orientalism.

Furthermore, the term 'underdeveloped' reinforces the belief in a racial hierarchy, as indicated by Hunt to be one of the core aspects of American foreign policy. It infers an Anglo-Saxon superiority, as the regions traditionally inhabited by these people are regarded as the developed regions. Paradoxically, in the context of the Point IV Program, the term 'underdeveloped' is not meant to have a negative connotation and thus need not offend anyone, according to the First Annual Report. The reason that various regions across the globe have become underdeveloped is not merely foreign imperialistic exploitation by the developed nations, including the United States. Another factor is ignorance. According to the report, "only in the past few decades have scientists and technicians found answers to the kinds of problems that have plagued the people of the less developed regions until now."[149]

However, this seems short-sighted. The aspect of ignorance as explained in the report, is strongly connected to imperialistic exploitation. The underdeveloped regions are often colonies, or

---

[149] Harry S. Truman, First Annual Report on the Act for International Development, January 29, 1952; SMOF David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV Report 1952, Truman Library.

former colonies of western powers. These countries have been exploited, but, as a means of producing valuable products, they were successful. Therefore, the technology and know-how to make them more self-reliant was available, but it seemed like a well-considered decision by the imperialist exploiting nations to not implement this knowledge. This further affirms Said's views on Orientalism and the racial hierarchy. These regions could not implement the technological know-how themselves, which led to further reliance on the Western powers. Therefore, these countries would have been readily acceptive of a development program, such as Point IV, that, at least rhetorically, moved away from classic imperialism.

What these arguments show, then, is that the Point IV Program was Wilsonian and Hamiltonian idealism infused with racial thinking as seen in Said's Orientalism. The Wilsonian ideals that led to the creation of the United Nations and the Hamiltonian ideals that inspired the creation of the Bretton Woods institutions created an atmosphere in which the Point IV Program could thrive. Orientalism explains these ideals as asserting a western dominance over the Third World. This dominance and control over the Third World is based on perceptions. It is these perceptions that are a leading factor in Constructivist discourse. Constructivism states that a state's behaviour is based on a intersubjective social context. A state, such as the United States, understand another state's identity according to the perceptions of that state. If the state is regarded as inferior, this inferiority will be acted upon, whether it was true or not. The Point IV Program, then, acted on two perceptions.

The first thing it acted upon was the perceived threat of communism. Whether this threat was real or not, is not the point of this thesis. However, because it communism was perceived as a credible threat to the democratic alliance of the United States, this was acted upon by containing its spread. This containment brings us to the second perception that was acted upon. To contain communism, the United States not only wanted to fight communism on the battlefield, as it did in Korea, but some officials in Truman's administration conceived of an idea that would also fight communism on a positive note, by reinforcing the spread of democracy rather than halting the spread of communism. The Third World became a battleground as, in the perception of the United States government,

communism and democracy fought over the allegiance of these countries. The perception that was acted upon here was the racial inferiority of the underdeveloped regions of the world. Without the help of democracy loving nations such as the United States, these countries would sooner or later bow down to the totalitarian regimes of communism, or at least this was the American perception.

Using Edward Said's views on Orientalism, this behaviour can be explained. The perception of the region, that was reinforced by the media and cultural shorthands that had been used for decades by both the British and the French and now the Americans, contributed to a self-fulfilling prophecy. The Third World was perceived by the American as being unable to withstand the pressure of communism on their own, therefore they needed help from the United States and the western powers. By including them in the new economic order, a democratic peace could be orchestrated in the Third World. Following the Hamiltonian idea that capitalism was the bringer of peace, big businesses, in the form of private investors and the agricultural sector, cooperated with the American government in spreading capitalism to those regions that appeared to need it the most. These ideas are reinforced by the Wilsonian idea of a democratic peace, which holds that democratic nations do not go to war with each other. By bringing capitalism to the Third World, that battleground would be won over to adhere to democratic principles and thus communism would not be able to get a hold of the Orient.

The perception, then, that the United States was superior to the Third World, and should therefore take on a leading role, is constructivist in itself. Said explains that Orientalism is not only a means of defining 'the other', but in doing so, the country also defines itself, as it produces its own identity through daily social practice. The West, then, affirms their superiority over the Orient, as that is the way they perceive the racial hierarchy. By controlling the Orient and aiding them in modernization efforts, the people of the Third World can climb higher on the racial ladder and ultimately achieve self-reliance and self-governance without any further involvement needed from the United States or any other power from that moment on.

The Point IV Program can therefore be seen the answer to both these perceptions. The rhetoric of developing the underdeveloped countries, then, becomes less negative. This explains the views as detailed in the report that the term 'underdeveloped' does not have a negative connotation. The Point IV Program truly was intended to help those racial inferior people. The goal was not to oppress them, but rather to elevate them. The motives, in part, were benevolent, rather than selfish on the part of the United States. Obviously, by combining big business and government development programs there had to a margin for profit and the motives then were not completely benevolent. However, as it shows in the arguments used in setting up the Point IV Program, the Truman administration believed that they could provide development for racially inferior people to combat the threat of communism. A small appropriation was needed to put this program into effect, and, if the sources are to believed, the program was incredibly effective in developing these areas. The effectiveness of the program in stopping communism, then, calls for a whole new thesis.

Conclusion

The Point IV Program was one of the answers the Truman administration provided in their struggle against communism. As the Cold War turned the Third World, which was underdeveloped in the eyes of the United States, into a battleground, the Point IV Program was intended to win over these areas. The interventions, of which Point IV was one aspect, underscored Western, and in this case primarily American, dominance in the region with the intent of control and improvement. Developing these regions would offer the Third World with a viable defense against communist incursions, or even total communist totalitarian dominance.

The Point IV Program, then, combined aspects of both the Wilsonian and Hamiltonian schools of thought, as outlined by Walter Russell Mead. The belief that spreading democracy would lead to peace, as believed by the Wilsonians, combined with the peaceful effects of the spread of capitalism, as believed by the Hamiltonians, led to the creation of the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions after the Second World War. This newly formed world order, then, formed a bastion against communism dominated by the Americans.

The Point IV Program developed from a long history of foreign development programs. Three aspects of the Point IV Program can be seen in its historical background. The combination of development programs aiding the Philippines in preparing them for eventual self-governance after the annexation of these islands by the United States following the victory over Spain in the late nineteenth century, private investors and funds setting up development programs in famine stricken areas in China, and the Tennessee Valley Authority as an example of the New Deal policy that was to develop certain underdeveloped domestic areas, provided a foundation on which the Point IV Program could be based. This foundation, together with the development of the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions led to a program that could combine the aforementioned factors, yet increase its scope drastically. It allowed the United States to implement a foreign aid program that had a global reach.

The Program, then, became an effective tool during the Cold War. In the struggle between capitalism and Communism, the Point IV Program was intended to offer a positive outlook on capitalism. By showing underdeveloped regions of the world what capitalism had to offer, these regions would choose capitalism over Communism, and thus the spread of Communism would be contained. The Third World, thus, effectively became an ideological battleground of the Cold War. In many ways the Third World was marginalized by the United States. These regions were inferior to the white Anglo-Saxon ruled West. Therefore, the west, embodied by the United States was to take up a leading role while the Third World was reduced to an object.

This objectifying of a region is important in Edward Said's view on Orientalism. The discourse of Orientalism is used as a way for the west to gain control and hegemony over the Orient. It creates a distinction between the western world and 'the others'. The Orient was in perceived to be racially inferior to the West. It is these perceptions that are acted upon. As Constructivism teaches us, it is perception, whether true or false, that are acted upon. Characteristics of a region are bestowed upon that region by the acting country. By objectifying the Third World as incapable of resisting Communism on their own terms and preparing themselves to self-governance, the United States acted upon these perceptions. In American Orientalism, the Orient was extended to cover not merely the Near East and the Far East, but all developing areas. These developing areas, or the Third World, was 'otherized' and objectified in its entirety. For these regions to be capable of self-governance and self-reliance, they had to be developed with the aid of the United States and other western powers. The key factor to achieve this was modernization. The Point IV Program would offer a way of modernizing the underdeveloped areas. By offering technical assistance, the United States would educate and restructure societies in the developing regions of the world. By doing so, it would construct a complex hegemonic relation with these areas.

What this thesis set out to achieve was to examine the Orientalist discourse in Point IV rhetoric by examining primary sources of the top officials of the program. While the Orientalist discourse can be discerned in these sources, it would be interesting to examine this program in other ways. One

aspect this thesis has not been concerned with was the extent to which the Third World countries requested American foreign aid. Did these regions actively seek out American help, or did they have no say in it at all? Also, did the Soviet Union have a similar program to win over the Third World and prevent them from falling to capitalism? Furthermore, how effective was the Point IV Program in containing the spread of Communism? Did democracy and capitalism prevail in the regions that received aid through the Point IV Program? These question, and many more, could offer various avenues of research into this topic that would be worth examining.

Bibliography

Secondary Sources:

Alacevich, Michele, *The Political Economy of the World Bank: The Early Years* (Palo Alto; Stanford University Press; 2007)

Barnett, Michael, "Constructivism", in *The Globalisation of World Politics*, eds. John Baylis and Steve Smith (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008).

Bird, Graham, "A Suitable Case for Treatment: Understanding the Ongoing Debate about the IMF"*, Third World Quarterly*, 22, 5, (Oct 2001), 823-848.

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

Dunne, Tim, "Liberalism", in *The Globalisation of World Politics*, eds. John Baylis and Steve Smith (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008).

Dunne, Tim, and Schmidt, Brian C., "Realism", in *The Globalisation of World Politics*, eds. John Baylis and Steve Smith (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008).

Ekbladh, David, ""Mr. TVA": Grass-Roots Development, David Lilienthal, and the Rise and Fall of the Tennessee Valley Authority as a Symbol of U.S. Overseas Development, 1933-1937", *Diplomatic History*, 26, 3 (Summer 2002), 335-374.

Ekbladh, David, *The Great American Mission: Modernization & the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton; Princeton University Press; 2010).

Gaglione, Anthony, *The United Nations under Trygve Lie, 1945-1953* (London; The Scarecrow Press; 2001).

Michael Gavin and Dani Rodrik, "The World Bank in Historical Perspective", *The American Economic Review*, 85, 2 (May 1995), 329-334.

Go, Julian, "The Provinciality of American Empire: 'Liberal Exceptionalism' and U.S. Colonial Rule, 1898-1912, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 49, No. 1 (January 2007), 74-108.

ul Haq, Mahbub, *UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions: New Challenges for the 21st Century* (Basingstoke; Macmillan; 1995).

Harris, Susan K., *God's Arbiters: Americans and the Philippines, 1898-1902* (New York; Oxford University Press; 2011).

Herring, George C., *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776* (Oxford; Oxford University Press; 2008).

Hopf, Ted, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", *International Security*, vol. 23, No. 1 (Summer 1998), 171-200.

Hunt, Michael, "Traditions of American Diplomacy: From Colony to Great Power", in *American Foreign Relations Reconsidered, 1890-1993,* ed. Gordon Martel (London; Routledge; 1994).

Karns, Margaret, Mingst, Karen, and Stiles, Kendall, *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance* (Boulder; Lynne Rienner Publishers; 2015).

Kennedy, Paul, *The Parliament of Man: The Past, Present, and Future of the United Nations* (New York; Random House; 2006).

Li, Lillian M., *Fighting Famine in North China: State, Market, and Environmental Decline, 1690s-1990s* (Stanford; Stanford University Press; 2007)

Little, Douglas, *American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945* (Chapel Hill; University of North Carolina Press; 2004).

Mazower, Mark, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea* (London; Penguin Books; 2012).

Mead, Walter Russell, "American Grand Strategy in a World at Risk", *Orbis*, vol. 49, no. 4 (Fall 2005), 589-598.

Mead, Walter Russell, *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How it Changed the World* (New York; Routledge; 2002).

Petras, James, and Morley, Morris, *The United States and Chile: Imperialism and the Overthrow of the Allende Government* (New York; Monthly Review Press; 1975).

Purcell, Aaron D., "Historical Interpretations of the New Deal and the Great Depression", in *The New Deal and the Great Depression*, ed. Aaron D. Purcell (Kent, Kent State University Press; 2014).

Ritchie, Nick, and Rogers, Paul, *The Political Road to War with Iraq: Bush, 9/11 and the Drive to Overthrow Saddam* (New York; Routledge; 2007).

Said, Edward W., *Orientalism* (London; Routledge & Kegan Paul; 1978).

Said, Edward W., *Orientalism* (New York; Vintage Books; 1979)

Thompson, Alexander, *Channels of Power: The UN Security Council and U.S. Statecraft in Iraq* (New York; Cornell University Press; 2009).

Walker III, William O., "Crucible for Peace: Herbert Hoover, Modernization, and Economic Growth in Latin America", *Diplomatic History*, 30, 1 (January 2006), 83-117.

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

Primary Sources:

These primary sources are annotated in accordance with guidelines found on the website of the archive of the Truman Library and Museum.

Andrews, Stanley, Needs of Foreign Countries for U.S. Men Trained in Agriculture, November 13, 1950; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 3; Government Service File, 1942-53; 1950 Personal, Truman Library.

Andrews, Stanley, The Farmer in World Affairs, October 24, 1950; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 3; Government Service File, 1942-53; 1950 Personal, Truman Library.

Austin, Warren, Statement by Ambassador Austin, July 11, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.

Author Unknown; Date Unknown; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.

Author Unknown, Cartoon in Washington Post, July 7, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.

Author Unknown, New York Times, July 1, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.

Author Unknown, Objectives and Nature of the Point IV Program; Date Unknown; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [2 of 3], Truman Library.

Bailey, Fred, and Richter, Jay, Washington News, Date Unknown; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 3; Government Service File, 1942-53; 1950 General Folder 2, Truman Library.

Elsey, George M., General Plan for Operation of the Technical Cooperation (Point IV) Program under the Proposed Executive Order; August 17, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Point IV Executive Order, Truman Library.

Eisenhower, Dwight D., Address to Congress, June 1, 1953; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 10; government Service Files, 1942-53; 1953 Point IV & Technical Coop Admin [Folder 1], Truman Library.

Hardy, Benjamin H.; November 23, 1948; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

Hardy, Benjamin H. to Mr. Daniels, November 19, 1950; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [3 of 3], Truman Library.

Hardy, Benjamin H. to Mr. Russell, November 23, 1948; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

Hardy, Benjamin H. to Mr. Russell and Mr. Jones, February 8, 1949; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [2 of 3], Truman Library.

McKinzie, Richard D., "Oral History Interview with Stanley Andrews" (October 31, 1970), Web. https://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/andrewss.htm

Moody, Blair, July 11, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Appropriations), Truman Library.

OFAR – USDA, Status of Point IV Program; October 2, 1950; Stanley Andrews Papers; Box 3; Government Service File, 1942-53; 1950 Point IV Program, Truman Library.

Office of Public Affairs, Information Memorandum no. 36; February 4, 1949; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

Strong, Josiah, *Our Country* (Reprint 1885; Cambridge; Belknap Press; 1963)

Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Democratic Convention in Chicago" (July 2, 1932), Speech. Web.

http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=75174

Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, "State of the Union Address, 1941" (Washington DC, January 6, 1941), Speech. Web.

 http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/speech-3320.

Russell, Francis, Date Unknown; Benjamin H. Hardy Papers; Box 1; Point IV [3 of 3], Truman Library.

Salant, Walter to David Lloyd and George Elsey, February 20, 1950; SMOF: David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

Steelman, John. R., May 27, 1949; SMOF: David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

Truman, Harry S., Address to Congress, June 24, 1949; SMOF: David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [1 of 3], Truman Library.

Truman, Harry S., First Annual Report on the Act for International Development, January 29, 1952; SMOF David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV Report 1952, Truman Library.

Truman, Harry S., *Memoirs: Volume Two: Years of Trial and Hope* (New York; The New American Library; 1956).

Truman, Harry S., "Inaugural Address" (Washington DC., January 20th, 1949), Speech. Web.

https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm

Truman, Harry S. to Sam Rayburn, August 25, 1950; SMOF David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [2 of 3], Truman Library.

Truman, Harry S., Statement by the President, September 8, 1950; George M. Elsey Papers; Box 61; Foreign Relations - Point IV (Executive Order), Truman Library.

Truman, Harry S., Statement by the President, April 18, 1951; SMOF David D. Lloyd Papers; Box 20; Point IV [3 of 3], Truman Library.

Truman, Harry S., "State of the Union Address, 1951" (Washington DC, January 8, 1951), Speech. Web.

https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/tap/1851.htm

Truman, Harry S., "State of the Union Address,, 1952" (Washington DC, January 9, 1952), Speech. Web.

http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=14418

Washington, George, "Farewell Address" (September 19, 1796). Web.

http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp

Wilson, Woodrow, "Peace without Victory" (United States Congress, Washington DC., January 22, 1917.) Web.

http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/peacewithoutvictory.htm