

Brandan P. Buck  
Dissertation Prospectus

**Partisans of the Old Republic:  
Right-Wing Opposition to U.S. Foreign Policy, 1934-1992**

“9/11 was a direct consequence of the United States meddling in an area of the world where we do not belong and where we are not wanted.” These provocative comments were delivered on MSNBC’s *Hardball* on September 30, 2002, by conservative commentator, Patrick J. Buchanan.<sup>i</sup> Buchanan’s intellectual and political heritage was far from that of a stereotypical dove. Before the fall of the Berlin Wall, Buchanan was a proud cold warrior and his political career involved service in the Nixon and Reagan administrations and several presidential runs in the Republican and Reform parties. Upon the end of the Cold War, Buchanan did an about-face on the necessity of American global power and became a vocal opponent of U.S. belligerence on the world stage. For him, the appalling terrorist attack upon the United States was an inevitable outcome of an unjust and unwise American imperial project. In the wake of 9/11, after a decade of critique and political campaigns, he became the de facto leader of a small but dedicated cadre of antiwar conservatives.

He was joined in the public eye by another unorthodox Republican, the libertarian-leaning congressional representative from Texas, Ron Paul. In 2008 and 2012, Paul sought the Republican Party nomination for president. A key facet of his campaigns was his opposition to the America’s wars in the Middle East and the foreign policy logics which animated them. As with Buchanan, Paul argued that 9/11 was blowback for decades of violent American interventionism in the Middle East. He also advocated for the elimination of foreign aid, U.S. withdrawal from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the removal of U.S. troops from Western Europe and East Asia. While Paul failed to secure the Republican nomination, his political heterodoxy

coupled with a burgeoning social media, breathed new life into a small but strident political subculture of rightwing antimilitarists and noninterventionists.

The sentiments espoused by figures such as Buchanan and Paul challenged the very core of a bipartisan foreign policy status quo which had for decades remained largely unquestioned. Since the end of the Second World War, the Republican and Democratic parties, backed by a web of think tanks, nonprofits, and corporations, shared a rough consensus about U.S. action on the world stage. Despite minor disagreements over scale and method, the two parties agreed that global security and prosperity required an assertive America to buttress a capitalist, liberal, and democratic world order.

Buchanan and Paul represented the vanguard of an escalating grassroots and right-wing disdain for U.S. government foreign policy. After the scale and cost of American interventions mounted, they were joined at the congressional level by a cohort of Tea Party-backed Representatives and Senators. This new generation of Republicans opposed facets of American foreign policy, particularly military and clandestine interventions in Libya<sup>ii</sup> and Syria<sup>iii</sup>. This growing rift within the GOP set the stage for a political outsider, Donald J. Trump to make foreign policy criticism a central plank of his populist campaign.<sup>iv</sup> The seemingly sudden normalization of rightwing foreign policy dissent threatened to scuttle Republican political orthodoxy and resurrect an all but extinct flavor of conservative, the “America First” isolationist.

What are the origins of this discontent with America’s role in the world? Some academics and commentators have posited that this turmoil possesses shallow roots which span only to Pat Buchanan’s presential runs in the 1990s. Others have contended that the modern Republican party’s recent dalliance with “isolationism” is an attempt to resurrect a political tradition plowed

under by American entry into World War II. What are the origins of the dissent which animated heterodox political figures like Buchanan and Paul? Are their foreign policy challenges merely a reaction to events or rather a visible manifestation of an ideology with a history? This dissertation will challenge the claim that right-wing noninterventionism is a new phenomenon or a mere reanimation of a long dormant conservative worldview.

### **Research Question, Background and Argument:**

This dissertation asks a simple question. What happened to rightwing noninterventionist thought between its political heyday in the mid-1930s and its modest political reanimation during the 1990s?

During the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a political faction later known as the Old Right held on to a vision of a restrained America on the world stage. Based largely within the rural Midwest, the Old Right was a hodgepodge of fervent anti-New Dealers, trade protectionists, nativists, and noninterventionists. They were opposed, at least in theory, to everything big: big government; big labor; big business; and big banks. They embraced romantic notions of American exceptionalism and scorned Europe as a land of iniquity. To them, the Old World represented the worst of all political and cultural outcomes: monarchism; imperialism; corporatism; and socialism. These core beliefs translated into foreign policy positions which opposed entangling alliances, government directed foreign investment, and large standing armies. Additionally, they advocated for restraining U.S. political influence to the Western Hemisphere.

The current scholarly consensus among historian and political scientists is that right-wing noninterventionism effectively died during the middle of the 1950s. The conventional thinking from national security and foreign policy scholars such as Michael Hogan, Justus Doenecke,

Joseph R. Stromberg, and Aaron Friedberg, was that the Eisenhower administration plotted a center course with his New Look<sup>v</sup> defense policy which placated the Old Right's concerns and thereby undercut their resistance. Intellectual historians and political scientists of the postwar Republican party, such as Colin Dueck, Paul E. Gottfried, George H. Nash, and David Farber have advanced a similar thesis. Their view is that Republican noninterventionism was marginalized in the mid-1950s by Republican political moderation and an embrace of Cold War internationalism. Insider accounts from activists, politicians, and journalists sympathetic to the Old Right tell a similar story. Individuals such as Murray Rothbard, Justin Raimondo, Joseph Scotchie, and Bill Kauffman tinge their accounts with a narrative of betrayal. For them, the death of right-wing noninterventionism was caused by intraparty intrigue, interparty collusion, and other pernicious forces.

This dissertation will advance the argument that, despite the views of other scholars, right-wing noninterventionism was not decisively vanquished during the Eisenhower administration. Old Right ideas about foreign policy and national security survived politically well into the early 1970s. Throughout the first half of the Cold War, Old Right holdouts in congress continued to agitate for their worldview. They successfully spearheaded congressional efforts to slash foreign aid spending and contributed to the elimination of the draft. Even after the last of the rightwing noninterventionists departed government service, their ideology survived in network of conservative and libertarian thinktanks. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, their critiques seeped their way through the cracks of a burgeoning post-Cold War order and foreshadowed the current era of American political turmoil.

**Historiography and Contributions:**

An exhaustive examination of the noninterventionist right will add new dimensions to our understanding of three historiographical problems in 20<sup>th</sup> century American history: the development of modern conservatism, antiimperialist politics, and the domestic politics of American Cold War foreign policy. As a study of continuity rather than change, my work promises to reveal new dynamics in political history that are often obscured by a literature marked by abrupt ruptures and divisions – at the start and of the Cold War or focused on the polarizing divisions of New Left and the New Right in the 1960s. Recentering our focus on the Old Right will provide a different narrative of postwar conservative politics and the domestic politics of U.S. foreign policy.

Scholarly and journalistic inquiries into noninterventionism have traditionally centered around political and cultural activity of the so-called interwar “isolationists” and their most visible manifestation, the America First Committee. Accounts of noninterventionism in the immediate aftermath of Allied victory often treated those who opposed U.S. entry into the war as at best dupes and at worst pro-fascist agents of the Nazi regime.<sup>vi</sup> Their political defeat is often treated as analogous to the defeat of fascism, both of which ushered in a new liberal internationalist age shepherded by a benevolent behemoth in the form of the United States government. Historian Brooke Blower has observed that this first draft of noninterventionist history created a false, but usable account of U.S. foreign policy in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Blower contends that this popular narrative was utilized to legitimate American global power by casting the U.S. “reluctant heroes” on the international stage.<sup>vii</sup>

The historiographic tide shifted significantly in the wake of the Vietnam War. Historians who came of age during a period of disillusionment with American global power started to rethink the noninterventionists of yesteryear. This new crop of historians aimed to add complexity to orthodox accounts of noninterventionism and differentiate its mainstream adherents from illiberal actors like the fascist German American Bund and fellow travelers such as the Silver Legion of America. Blower asserts that these scholars sought to rehabilitate the interwar noninterventionists “as populist underdogs or well-meaning anti-imperialists, whose reservations had come to seem reasonable, even prescient in light of the protracted military campaigns of the late twentieth century.”<sup>viii</sup> Seminal works include Justus Doenecke’s *Storm on the Horizon: The Challenge to American Intervention, 1939-1941*, *From Isolation to War, 1931-1941*, and *The Battle Against Intervention, 1939-1941* are examples of such scholarship. Doenecke’s contemporaries and fellow experts on interwar noninterventionism, Wayne S. Cole, and Joseph R. Stromberg, have similar corpora centered around U.S. entry into the Second World War. More recent works in this vein include Christopher McKnight Nichols’ *Promise and Peril: American at the Dawn of a Global Age*. These works tended to periodize a crescendo of noninterventionism during the waning days of American neutrality followed by an abrupt collapse brought on by the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. The scholarly agreement of this corpus is that any opportunity for a *majority* consensus on U.S. neutrality in international politics sunk along the vessels of the Pacific Fleet on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 1941.

In addition to this body of research on interwar noninterventionism, a small collection of scholars have studied the postwar longevity of the ideology into the nascent Cold War. This body of work asserts that noninterventionism hobbled into the postwar period but was ultimately extinguished by the escalation of U.S. tensions with the Soviet Union and the Korean War.

Published in 1979, Justus Doenecke's *Not to the Swift: The Old Isolationists in the Cold War Era* is the authoritative account of noninterventionism's political decline in the mid-1950s. Doenecke coined the phrase "Old Isolationist" to refer to those political and ideological actors who formed their noninterventionist worldview during the interwar period (between the first and second World Wars) and maintained it during the burgeoning Cold War.<sup>ix</sup> He offers a multicausal explanation for isolationism's political deterioration during the early Cold War. Among his reasons proposed is sheer attrition due to the relative advanced age of isolationists in elected office,<sup>x</sup> a splitting of the cohort via McCarthyism,<sup>xi</sup> and the U.S. government's China policy.<sup>xii</sup> He also cites Eisenhower's ability to neutralize isolationist opposition through his Korean War ceasefire and New Look defense policy which sought to reduce defense spending and rely on nuclear deterrence.<sup>xiii</sup> In *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State*, historian Michael J. Hogan offers his take on the death of the Old Isolationists. Hogan argues that the Korean War constituted the beginning of the end of isolationist resistance, as the conflict drove a wedge in their opposition and made possible a suite of legislative compromises. Hogan further asserts that Eisenhower's New Look placated the rightwing of the GOP but still accelerated U.S. defense spending and obligations aboard.<sup>xiv</sup>

Campbell Craig and Fredrik Logevall argue in *America's Cold War: The Politics of Insecurity*, that throughout the Cold War, American action was guided and narrowed by an anticommunist and internationalist political consensus. They further argue that this relationship meant that American politicians were pushed into belligerence with the Soviet Union due to both material and political concerns. This relationship described by the authors as "intermestic" (a portmanteau of international and domestic) narrowed the acceptable range of political thought *vis-a-vis* the Soviet Union and the Cold War generally. The presence and political agency of the Old Right is

largely absent from Craig's and Logevall's work. The political resistance of figures Sen. Robert Taft and Sen. John Bricker are present but not central to their analysis. Craig and Logevall generally ignore rightwing voices of opposition to Cold War orthodoxy and instead highlight the impact of right-wing hawks like the GOP's China Lobby and unilateralists such as Sen. Barry Goldwater. The impact of their oversight is the presentation of Cold War hawkishness as associated intrinsically with the right. Indeed, in the authors' introduction they contend that *any* possibility for thawing the Cold War was lost "as those on the left and center-left [...] lost cultural and political approval."<sup>xv</sup> These works, while valuable have focused their analysis primarily on defense spending and a few prominent pieces of legislation and treated the decline of the Old Right as a mere political outcome. These works do not account for the broader cultural or intellectual trends which inform politics, nor do they analyze the full suite of Cold War policy, particularly foreign aid.

The study of American conservatism was once widely neglected by political historians. Since the mid-1990s however, the historical profession has corrected this oversight and produced a multitude of works on the postwar right.<sup>xvi</sup> Written in the wake of the Reagan era, most histories of the American postwar right focused on the New Right and its ascendance within the Republican party. Authoritative scholarship has tended to focus on the solidification of neoliberalism within the GOP, domestic issues, and on the political economy of the Cold War. Such works include Lisa McGirr's *Suburban Warriors*, Kim Phillips-Fein's *Invisible Hands*, and Elizabeth Tandy Shermer's *Sunbelt Capitalism*. On the issue of right-wing resistance to Cold War foreign policy and militarism, these works are of limited utility. Their analyses tend to focus on successful influence of military Keynesianism and Cold War paranoia in creating the modern Republican party. These scholars have often periodized their accounts around the nomination of



Barry Goldwater and election of Ronald Reagan. Historian Matthew Lassiter critiqued this analytical framework as a “telescoping strategy” which presents an “all-roads-lead- to-Reagan transformation” of the American right.<sup>xvii</sup> The historiographic impact of this strategy buried a once ideologically dominant presence of noninterventionism and antimilitarism within the Republican party.

There are several authoritative intellectual histories of the American conservatism which touch on the noninterventionism of the Old Right. While these works offer the most comprehensive account of right-wing noninterventionism available, they treat the tradition as something which was overcome by the ascendance of the New Right. This corpus contains works such as Paul Gottfried’s *Conservatism in America* and *The Conservative Movement*, David Farber’s *The Rise and Fall of Modern American Conservatism*, George H. Nash’s *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America*, and Colin Dueck’s *Hard Line*. Written through the lens of intellectual or political history, these books concern the victory of the postwar Republican realignment away from the Old Right. Like scholars of the early national security state, these works comprise a consensus that by the middle of the 1950s the Republican party had shed its historic predilection towards noninterventionism.

Historian George H. Nash’s *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America* is emblematic of this consensus. Nash argues that America’s postwar right grew from the combination of disparate voices from three separate cohorts which enjoyed a renaissance in the postwar world. First was a faction of “classical liberals” or “libertarians” who sought to resist “the threat of the ever expanding State to liberty, private enterprise and individualism.”<sup>xviii</sup> Next, was a clique of “new conservatives” who were shocked “by totalitarianism, total war, and the development of secular, rootless, mass society during the 1930s and 1940s.”<sup>xix</sup> Lastly, the third cohort was a band

of “militant, evangelical” anticommunists staffed largely by ex-radicals and former communists who experienced a transformation to the political right. Such figures included Whittaker Chambers, James Burnham, and Frank Meyer, among others.<sup>xx</sup> The demands of this tripartite political fusion demanded that the party shed its interwar prediction towards noninterventionism, particularly its detachment from European politics. The formation of the modern Republican party culminated in the exile of Old Right figures who clung to a pre-Cold War vision of American foreign policy and its implications for American society.

Intellectual historian Paul E. Gottfried expands on Nash’s thesis. He argues that upon its inception, postwar American conservatism was of a completely artificial elite construction with no grassroots support. He further argues that in the mid-1950s the Republican party became a bastion of elite thinkers in journalism and think tanks that largely made their peace with the New Deal state and used anticommunism to paper over the movement’s inconsistencies. In Gottfried’s view, “the Buckleyites” saw rolling back the welfare state as a task “less urgent than fighting communism.”<sup>xxi</sup> In order to thwart the Soviet Union, the New Right sought to shed some of its nativist and parochial tendencies and welcomed American Catholics and Jews into their political fold. He argues that new conservative thinkers such as Waldemar Gurian, Eric Voegelin, and Hannah Arendt contended that the Second World War was part of a larger struggle between liberty and tyranny. Many of these thinkers were recent refugees from Europe and suffered persecution from either Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, or both. Given their experience, they argued that America’s victory in World War II was righteous, one which set up another moral struggle against Soviet totalitarianism.

Gottfried asserts that this injection of liberal universalism into American conservatism meant that the New Right embraced a view that the United States was part of the larger “Christian West.”<sup>xxii</sup>

The conservative elite's embrace of Atlanticism brought them firmly in line with their Democratic political opponents and forged an elite consensus on a new American orientation towards Europe. He notes that this shift was diametrically opposed to the Republican right's historic provincialism and embrace of Anglophobia. These works, while immensely valuable provide a limited, elite narrative and present the political decline of the Old Right as one of catastrophic rupture.

Several political and ideological insiders have written accounts on the end of right-wing noninterventionism. These accounts should be approached with caution as their authors possess a clear ideological bias and rooting interest. Some of these authors lived through or participated in the events that they describe. As such, many of these works blur the lines between primary and secondary sources. Books which fit into this category are Pat Buchanan's *A Republic Not an Empire*, Bill Kauffman's *Ain't My America* and *America First!*, Justin Raimondo's *Reclaiming the American Right*, Joseph Scotchie's *Revolt from the Heartland*, and Murray Rothbard's *Betrayal of the American Right*. As with scholars of the early national security state and postwar conservatism, these writers assert that right-wing noninterventionism suffered a series of quick legislative and electoral losses during the mid-1950s and that these losses condemned noninterventionism to exile. As the titles of these works indicate, they are written by individuals who have an axe to grind. They are the heirs of those who were exiled from the mainstream of the American right – they provided important primary sources for this study but cannot be taken uncritically as historical accounts of the subject.

Despite these issues, the works provide valuable insights into an understudied facet of American political history: the role of Republican party infighting as the reason for isolationism's decline. In *The Betrayal of the American Right*, economist, political theorist, and libertarian activist

Murray Rothbard argued that throughout the 1940s and into the mid-1950s, the GOP experienced an ideological split between “the Old Right” and an interventionist and domestically moderate political cohort, later to be known as “the New Right.” This split was often encapsulated by the Robert Taft v. Thomas Dewey primary fight of 1948. Dewey was victorious in securing the Republican nomination but was soundly defeated by the incumbent Democrat, President Harry Truman. Although Dewey lost the election of 1948, the authors of these works deem his ideology as ultimately triumphant within the GOP. Dewey narrowed the range of acceptable political thought on the right, particularly on issues of foreign policy and the national security state. Examples cited are the departure of isolationist journalist Frank Chodorov from *Human Events* and later from the *Freeman*<sup>xxiii</sup>, the influence of William F. Buckley and his *National Review*<sup>xxiv</sup>, and elite designs of GOP party leadership from Eisenhower onward.

There are however a small number of works which present a more complicated picture of postwar conservatism and its relationship with Cold War foreign policy. While none of these works are exhaustive accounts of the political decline of the Old Right or the continuation of noninterventionist worldview outside of government, they do offer a valuable relief on elite analyses of American conservatism. The work of Heather Hendershot, David Mills, and Sandra Scanlon suggest that a significant gap remained between the foreign policy positions of Republican party elites and the party’s voting base. Their work also suggests that conservative anticommunism did not automatically result in an aggressive vision for U.S. foreign policy.

In *Cold War in a Cold Land*, historian David Mills contends that the people of the northern Great Plains states (defined by him as the Dakotas and Montana) cultivated a particular regional relationship with the U.S. government’s Cold War effort from 1945 to 1973. Mills argues that Dakotans and Montanans embraced some aspects of the government’s Cold War, such as the

construction of military facilities in their states, while rejecting some the paranoia of the Second Red Scare and the excesses of McCarthyism.<sup>xxv</sup>

Media scholar Heather Hendershot covers the first generation of conservative talk radio in *What's Fair on the Air: Cold War Right-Wing Broadcasting and the Public Interest*. Hendershot offers a content analysis of “ultraright” political figures active during the late 1950s and through the 1960s. Hendershot provides invaluable insights into the foreign policy thinking of American conservatives outside the confines of the Republican party’s intellectual and political elite. Her work illustrates that right-wing noninterventionism had a longer shelf life than the accounts of political and intellectual historians. She highlights individuals and programs within the orbit of oil magnate and political booster H.L. Hunt. Beginning in 1951, Hunt owned and operated the popular conservative television and radio programs *Life Line* and *Facts Forum*. Hunt’s *Life Line* program was proliferated via radio, television and in print publications. *Life Line* even rivaled elite conservative print publications in terms of its scope and income.<sup>xxvi</sup> Unlike these elite media outlets, programming on H.L. Hunt’s shows included critical coverage of U.S. foreign aid and diplomatic programs. Hendershot asserts that *Life Line* “had always been isolationist in orientation” and pointed “to Korea and Vietnam [as] mistakes and a waste of taxpayers’ money.”<sup>xxvii</sup>

In *The Pro-war Movement* historian Sandra Scanlon incorporates into her study the relationship of grassroots conservatives (whom she calls social conservatives) and elite conservatism. Scanlon’s thesis is deceptively simple: the Vietnam War made modern conservatism. Scanlon argues that prior to the Reagan Revolution, the rank and file of the conservative movement held lukewarm opinions on the Vietnam War and the larger American mission against the Soviet Union. She cites that grassroots conservatives were more likely than their elite counterparts to

advocate withdrawal from the conflict and a suspension of aid to South Vietnam.<sup>xxviii</sup>

Conservative intellectual elites however embraced the war as a righteous struggle against communism and an indispensable facet of the Cold War. Scanlon quotes heavily from outlets such as *National Review* and *Human Events*, both of which asserted that the war was a virtuous extension of America's struggle against communism. Scanlon contends that these disparate factions came together as the result of two forces: a grassroots response to the excesses of a largely left-wing antiwar movement and the political guile of the Reagan campaign.

The presence of the right-wing noninterventionism is largely absent in current scholarship on American antiwar activism and anti-imperialism. There is a robust body of scholarship written about American antimilitarism and peace activism which emanated from the New Left, particularly in response to the Vietnam War. Such works include Jemeri Suri's *Power and Protest*, Bryan Burrough's *Days of Rage*, Kelly Moore's *Disrupting Science*, Landon R. Y. Storrs' in *The Second Red Scare*, and Charles DeBenedetti's *An American Ordeal*, to name a few. Leftwing antiwar activism and the street protests that they produced are integral to American metanarratives of recent history. Their critiques of a rapacious American foreign policy dictated by capitalist machinations endures in American discourse. This focus on the New Left has in effect masked the earlier antimilitarist and noninterventionist agitation which emanated from the right and created a false political binary around American attitudes towards foreign intervention. In common or academic parlance "right wing" has become synonymous with belligerence and militarism.<sup>xxix</sup> An exhaustive incorporation of Old Right critiques into this historiography challenges this conception and presents a political spectrum of foreign policy best described as "in v. out", not "left v. right."

Despite this wealth of scholarship, there remains no authoritative history of right-wing noninterventionism which covers the entirety of America's rise as a global power and treats the topic as a continuous tradition worthy of historical inquiry.<sup>xxx</sup> Current studies on the subject focus on its political decline and as such they neglect the examples of intellectual continuity on the noninterventionist right. I am interested its political decline and hope that a longer account of right-wing noninterventionism will provide a more rigorous understanding of its marginalization, not death, which has been overstated by previous scholarship. While this dissertation will be primarily concerned with the intellectual continuity of the noninterventionist right, I am interested in its mechanisms of political deterioration. I intend for this dissertation to be in dialogue with the scholars and pundits who have attributed this transformation to intraparty infighting or political compromise. However, my primary goal is to illustrate the examples of intellectual and cultural sustainment of the rightwing noninterventionism.

To do so I intend to approach this topic with the methods of the intellectual and cultural historian, using political sources to test the change or continuity of rightwing noninterventionism's worldview. As such I intend to approach my sources with an eye to the ideologies and cultural attitudes which undergirded the foreign policy perspectives and positions of the American right.

This study will draw upon two source bases, the words and actions of U.S. congressional members and media production of rightwing noninterventionists. I intend to use congressional sources and data as a proxy for the larger cultural and intellectual mood within the American right. Given congress' scale, electoral regularity, and procedural business, they are closer to the pulse of American political life than the quadrennial and elite nature of presidential politics. My

analysis of political materials will rely on a conventional close reading of traditional primary sources and computational analysis of congressional voting records.

Work on political sources will be paired with analysis of conservative media production. I will analyze my sources to develop the networks and intellectual continuities of the noninterventionist right. Hendershot, Scanlon, and Mills have provided glimpses as to the cultural longevity of the Old Right's worldview. However, they have not determined how these cultural attitudes persisted despite an elite Republican consensus and the political supremacy of the Old Left prior the trauma of the Vietnam War. This project is not intended to be a work of social history. However, the persistence of Old Right political and media figures suggests that a political base remained for right-wing noninterventionism existed well into the 1960s, if not beyond. An exhaustive social history of the noninterventionist right is a project for future scholars; my hope is that a successful project will help them do so.

### **Sources and Methodology**

I have identified a suite of primary sources from each of my source bases. My conservative media sources are intentionally middlebrow. Most scholars of American conservatism tend to focus their media analysis on print publications aimed at the conservative elite. Publications such as *National Review* and *Human Events* towed the consensus line on Cold War foreign policy. However, I intend to focus my efforts on three bodies of literature outside of this elite circle. First is a web of television, radio, newsletters, and lobbying materials which targeted grassroots conservatives and congressional politicians. My second media source base are local newspapers. Third, is a body of academic journals published by figures within the libertarian movement.



These combined corpuses present a robust picture of a right-wing noninterventionist political culture which existed well beyond the periodization commonly held by most scholars.

I have identified several online sources which host conservative/libertarian newspapers, periodicals, lobbying materials, and other artifacts of political culture. The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Jr. Presidential Library and Museum hosts a wealth of material related to right-wing noninterventionism. The library has 195 digitized items from the collection's "Right-wing movement" folder. The collection contains documents concerning the Kennedy Administration's surveillance of conservative individuals and organizations. The collection contains assessments of conservative organizations, their finances, ideologies, and network connections. The JFK Library also hosts digitized copies of *The Dan Smoot Report*, a newsletter of conservative noninterventionist Dan Smoot. An eclectic mix of websites, message boards, and even YouTube also host copies of *The Dan Smoot Report* and its accompanying television program.

Presidential collections will also provide primary sources. Online collections hosted by several presidential libraries contain materials on isolationism as a political issue, both real and imagined. Similarly, *The American Presidency Project*, hosted by the University of Southern California contains similar sources to include party platforms and campaign materials. While this is not a study centered on presidential politics, speeches, press conferences, and other materials will provide useful atmospherics for the dissertation.

I will also use conventional newspapers as a means of researching the political careers of noninterventionist representatives and senators. Of special interest are local newspapers available through Newspapers.com. My preliminary research has determined that many small-town papers actively covered the foreign policy stances of their local representatives. Local newspapers also

hosted op-eds from congressional members not published in national papers. Additionally, they often printed campaign ads, recaps of debates, and other election materials which can shed light on the foreign policy views of congressional members and their constituents.

There are also several libertarian and conservative organizations which provide digitized copies of historic newsletters, internal documents, and other institutional materials. The Ludwig von Mises Institute for Austrian Economics offers a trove of digitized materials concerning American libertarianism. Among such materials are seminal journals within the movement to include *Left and Right*, *The Freeman*, *The Libertarian Forum*, and others. The Mises Institute also offers free to the public numerous digitized books, many of which concern war, interventionism, corporatism, and U.S. empire. The libertarian think tank, the Foundation for Economic Education also makes available to the public assorted materials related to its educational and institutional mission. Such materials include publications, correspondence, and founder Leonard Reed's personal journal. *Reason*, a libertarian monthly publication, offers to the public an archive of historic articles which date to the magazine's inception in 1968.

I have identified several archives of interest. First is the JFK Library which contains an assortment of materials related on the American right. Brown University hosts a compendium called the Hall-Hoag Collection of Dissenting and Extremist Printed Propaganda. This collection contains materials from *The Dan Smoot Report* as well as the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, a noninterventionist lobbying group. The University of Virginia library special collection contains several volumes of *The Dan Smoot Report* and Smoot's earlier journal, *Dan Smoot Speaks*. The Mises Institute host several collections integral to the inner workings of the libertarian movements. Among them are the papers of Ludwig von Mises and Murray Rothbard. Similarly, Foundation for Economic Education in Irvington, New York contains the papers of founder and

libertarian activist, Leonard Reed. The Library of Congress Manuscripts Division host several collections of interest, chief among them are the papers of Sen. Robert A. Taft. The Manuscripts Division also hosts an oral history collection of former congressional members that has oral histories from several prominent noninterventionist representatives and senators. Finally, the Hoover Presidential Library hosts numerous collections from prominent right-wing noninterventionists from both the political world and literary circles.

This study will marshal congressional sources using both conventional and digital methods. It will be supported throughout with original computational analysis of congressional voting records. I have compiled a digital corpus of 3,680 congressional roll call votes between 1935 – 1992 related to foreign aid spending, diplomatic initiatives, or defense policy. The data was collected from VoteView.com, a website hosted by the University of California’s Political Science Department. When combined with their voting and member data it yielded a database of 936,940 voting observations and a secondary dataset of 2,966 congressional members, their voting trends, and biographical information. My initial analysis has revealed that right-wing noninterventionism enjoyed a considerably longer political life within Congress than the trajectory identified by scholars who have hitherto focused on the presidency or intraparty politics. This dataset will be used to identify fissures in the Cold War consensus and thereby reperiodize the political staying power of the noninterventionist right. It will also be used to identify congressional voting trends, generational shifts, and serve as a tool for conventional research.

Computational analysis of roll call votes will be supported by additional analysis of congressional data. The Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) hosts a corpus of congressional data entitled the “Database of [United States] Congressional

Historical Statistics, 1789-1989.” This dataset affords a wealth of biographical, demographic, occupational, and electoral information on members of Congress until 1989. The ICPSR data will provide additional data on members of Congress which can be used to frame historic inquiries into noninterventionist political figures, their political careers and lived experiences which may have framed their worldviews.

On the traditional front, I have identified a bevy of digitized congressional sources for this project. The *ProQuest Congressional* database provides an ample source base on congressional hearings, debates, and a sundry of items entered into the *Congressional Record*. *Hathi Trust* also hosts a wealth of material related to congressional action of foreign policy and items from public interest groups related thereto.

I intend to analyze these sources attuned to four overlapping analytical frames: populism, libertarianism, conspiracism, and race.<sup>xxxi</sup> Throughout my research I intend to determine how these discourses persisted, transformed, or conflicted with each other. These frameworks informed how noninterventionists interpreted current events and the kinds of political action they advocated. These frameworks influenced their conceptions of recent history. Members of the Old Right adhered to divergent and revisionist narratives of American foreign policy, particularly with U.S. entry into the Second World War, its conduct, and its conclusion. As such, I plan to determine how their discourses were utilized in historical revisionism and how that revisionism informed their contemporary politics. Similarly, I intend to see how such discourses survived during the immediate postwar era, when the triumphalist “good war” narrative of World War II was at its zenith.

## Chapters Summaries:

### Chapter 1: Heyday of the Old Isolationists, 1934 – 1952

Chapter 1 poses the following questions. How did U.S. intervention in World War II inform the intellectual evolution of the noninterventionist right? How did these individuals think about and react to U.S. policy during the Second World War? What was their stance on unconditional surrender and postwar planning? Lastly, how did the Old Right view America's role in the world following the war and how did they perceive U.S. involvement on the Korean peninsula prior to and during the conflict? To answer these questions, I will examine congressional activity and media production around these political inflection points. Chapter 1 will largely serve as a synthesis of secondary sources which will initiate the reader into the world of noninterventionism. However, I intend to analyze this material with an eye towards continuity, whereas previous scholars periodized their work around these events and argued that they contributed to the decline of right-wing noninterventionism.

American noninterventionism reached its political and cultural zenith during the interwar period. American casualties during the Great War, infringements on civil liberties, duplicitous use of propaganda, and distrust of big business galvanized Americans across the political spectrum to stay out of future European wars. Authors H. C. Engelbrecht and Frank Hanighen encapsulated this distrust with their polemical book, *Merchants of Death*. Engelbrecht and Hanighen charged that the United States was hoodwinked into entering WWI due to the treachery of the banking and arms industries. Their book became a best seller and helped to galvanize interwar noninterventionism and served as an intellectual forerunner of the "military industrial complex."<sup>xxxii</sup> The book and the public sentiment it encapsulated helped to form the Nye

Committee, a Senate investigation into the private sector industries which supported the U.S. war effort during World War I.

The Nye Committee failed to prove an illicit conspiracy between the government and business, but it did find that the economic interdependence between the United States and Great Britain meant that the U.S. was a “pseudo-belligerent” and greatly informed Washington’s decision to enter the conflict on the side of the Allies.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Sen. Nye furthered gained notoriety when he charged that the foreign born and Europhile directors within Hollywood actively propagandized through their films on the part of the Allies. Nye’s comments were widely criticized as antisemitic and damaged the credibility of the America First Committee and the interwar isolationists.<sup>xxxiv</sup> The America First Committee, the leading noninterventionist movement in the United States, was routinely hampered by charges of antisemitism either due to the public statements of prominent members like Charles Lindbergh<sup>xxxv</sup>, or from the uninvited (and publicly refuted) endorsement of antisemitic figures such as Father Charles Coughlin, and fascist organizations such as the Silver Legion of America.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

Despite these radical associations (either real or alleged), the lines of left and right noninterventionism were blurred during the interwar period as former New Deal liberals and progressives drifted into conservatism. Examples include figures such as Garet Garrett, John T. Flynn, General Robert E. Wood, and Oswald Garrison Villard. These former liberals wandered to the political right as they grew disillusioned with the New Deal and the erosion of American neutrality. Their newfound skepticism of economic interventionism at home fused with a stance toward noninterventionism abroad. The Old Right hyperbolically cast FDR as a budding authoritarian and fretted that “Democratic Militarism” would usher in fascism at home to defeat it abroad.<sup>xxxvii</sup> Similarly, some left-wing political figures were ostracized by their peers due to

their antiwar sentiments and their association with conservatives. Progressive historian Charles A. Beard serves as an example of such individuals. Beard's views on war and militarism were embraced by Old Right figures<sup>xxxviii</sup>, especially as his antiwar views alienated him from his progressive colleagues.<sup>xxxix</sup>

Noninterventionist ideas persisted on the right even during the Second World War.

Congressional conservatives attempted to limit the postwar plans of the FDR administration to involve the U.S. in the United Nations, questioned the necessity of unconditional surrender, and a vigorous postwar recovery program. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Old Right viewed the war through the lens of tragic necessity, and not as a mission to establish a liberal world order or as an opportunity to install a permanent security arrangement with Europe. As such, they advocated for limited American involvement in Europe's politics and reconstruction upon the war's end.

After the cessation of hostilities, the Republican right successfully pushed the Truman administration towards rapid demobilization and blunted the excesses of the early national security state.<sup>xi</sup> Within the House, postwar Republican opposition to U.S. foreign policy reached its zenith during the 81st and 82nd Congresses (1949-1953). U.S. involvement in the Korean War resurrected the political impact of the noninterventionist right. Right-wing Republicans were the conflict's loudest detractors in Congress and the conflict would elicit the staunchest Republican opposition to the Cold War. Old Right stalwart, Rep. Howard Buffet (NE-2) went so far as to publicly blame the U.S. government for instigating the conflict and picking a side in what amount to a Korean civil war.<sup>xii</sup>

## Chapter 2: The Old Right and the New Look, 1953 – 1959

Chapter 2 will ask; how did the Old Right operate within in Congress as a political and intellectual minority? How did their worldview transform (if at all) under Eisenhower's New Look policy? Lastly, how did a right-wing noninterventionist media adapt to a Cold War now in full swing? I will address these inquiries with a computational analysis of congressional voting records and an assessment of the right-wing media landscape aimed at grassroots conservatives. I will study these sources to assess what fissures remained between the Old Right and the intraparty consensus. Chapter 2 will directly challenge the assertions of earlier scholars that noninterventionism politically died during the Eisenhower administration. It will also illustrate that the political contours of U.S. foreign policy were a live political issue during the supposed height of the Cold War consensus.

Despite ideological changes within the Republican leadership, the right wing of the party maintained significant opposition on foreign aid and diplomatic policy more generally. Even though the Old Right accepted that confrontation with the Soviet Union was necessary, they remained opposed to key components of the Truman Doctrine<sup>xlii</sup> and advocated for a distinct, nationalist vision of America's struggle against the Soviets.

The vestiges of the Old Right did not shy away from initiating intraparty politics over foreign policy issues. They publicly criticized Republican party leadership when they believed that the United States government acted against their narrow conception of the American interest. They voted in accordance with their rhetoric. Throughout the Eisenhower Administration, approximately 40% of the party's right flank voted in opposition at least half of the time to U.S. foreign aid and foreign policy measures. The House of Representatives, in particular its



Midwestern Republican contingent remained a redoubt of the Old Right in elected office. Figures such as Iowa Congressman H.R. Gross publicly criticized the foreign policy Eisenhower administration on fiscal *and* moral grounds.

Old Right officeholders were joined by lobbying firms that advocated for similar foreign policy goals. These views were represented by organizations such as the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. The committee served as nexus between public and political advocacy and drew its intellectual heritage directly from the Old Isolationists and the America First Committee.<sup>xliii</sup> The Citizens Foreign Aid Committee represented a small but persistent public opposition to foreign aid and sought to convey those views to Congress. Polling data between 1955 and 1961 suggested that between 25% and 30% of Americans opposed U.S. foreign aid policy.<sup>xliv</sup> The Committee also advocated for starker changes in U.S. Cold War policy. Among them was the withdrawal of American troops from Europe and East Asia and the elimination of defense subsidies provided to NATO's European members.<sup>xlv</sup> The Committee did however support elevated defense spending and a large nuclear arsenal for deterring the Soviet Union. This commonality aside, the Committee represented an "America First" vision of the Cold War directly at odds with the consensus of New Deal liberals within the Democratic Party and the GOP's New Right.

### Chapter 3: The Old Right v. The New Frontier, 1960 – 1964

Chapter 3 poses the following questions. How did the Old Right operate during the Democratic administration of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson? What compromises did the Old Right make and under what circumstance? Lastly, how did these rightwing dissidents react to the presidential candidacy and defeat of Arizona senator Barry Goldwater? To answer these

questions, I will continue my analysis of congressional voting records and other material. This chapter will continue to challenge the periodization of previous scholars by illustrating that the holdouts of the Old Right remained politically active. It will also demonstrate that noninterventionism was strongly represented in grassroots conservative media throughout the first half of the decade despite the machinations of the Republican party leadership. Chapter 3 will also investigate how the political and media strains of right-wing noninterventionism interacted with each other and created a network which challenged the Cold War consensus.

The political vestiges of the Old Right were supported by a robust middlebrow conservative media landscape which echoed their vision of Cold War foreign policy. Programs included *Life Line*, *The Dan Smoot Report*, *Facts Forum*, and the *Manion Forum*. These media figures and programs advocated for an explicitly nationalist conception for America's struggle against communism, which contrasted sharply with a consensus centered on liberal internationalism. These media figures used foreign aid as the primary means to attack the postwar foreign policy consensus. They, coupled with figures in Old Right holdouts in Congress assailed foreign aid through the lens of classical economics and national self-interest. They believed that state planning was incapable of delivering on its promise of modernity, damaged emerging economies, created dependence, and destabilized regional relations. Additionally, many within the cohort tinged their critiques with racist views of postcolonial peoples and their inability to rapidly modernize.

These conservative critiques were paralleled by an ideological offshoot of the Old Right, the libertarian movement. This motley crew of heterodox thinkers shared conservative critiques on foreign aid and alliances but rejected the Cold War framework in its entirety. Unlike their conservative counterparts who had access to the airwaves, these libertarians used the medium of

academic journals and niche magazines to propagate their message. Periodicals included *The Freeman* and *The New Individualist Review*. Their criticisms of the Cold War status quo were intertwined within deeper criticisms of the corporatist state. This band of thinkers saw Cold War political expansionism and militarism as innately involved with technocracy, taxation, and inflationary monetary policy.

The Old Right fought against more than just the inertia of the interparty foreign policy consensus. They were also caught in the middle of the GOP's intraparty political evolution encapsulated by the presidential nomination of Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater. Goldwater's foreign policy vision was a unique amalgamation of Old Right's tendency towards nationalism and unilateralism coupled with the consensus desire to confront communism internationally. His aggressive Cold War policy platform coupled with a conservative domestic agenda put the remnants of the Old Right in a moral and political bind. While Goldwater's campaign ended in defeat it initiated a geographic transformation which would change the GOP for decades to come. By 1965 the South outpaced the Midwest as the largest regional cohort within the Republican right, a trend which would continue into the 1990s. This new, southern Republican conservative was considerably more supportive of the Cold War paradigm than their Midwestern, Old Right predecessors.<sup>xlvi</sup>

#### Chapter 4: Confronting Vietnam, 1965-1975

Chapter 4 will be guided by the following questions. How did the noninterventionist right confront the growing war in Vietnam? How did noninterventionism interact with Nixonian realism, American rapprochement with communist China, and detente with the Soviet Union? Finally, what relationship, if any, did the Old Right's noninterventionism have with the New

Left's opposition to the Vietnam War? To address these questions, I will analyze my compiled dataset to see what influence the Old Right had on the foreign aid cuts of the late 1960s.

Additionally, I will consult with my conventional sources to see what influence Old Right political figures had upon the end of the draft. I will also examine the print culture of the radical libertarian right to determine the level and impact of intellectual exchange with the New Left.

Chapter 4 will primarily serve as a bridge which illustrates the transformation of right-wing noninterventionism from a political force, however marginal, to an exclusively intellectual one.

Through the latter half of the 1960s, the Old Right would continue their campaign of parliamentary sabotage meant to derail foreign policies which clashed with their worldview. These holdouts were able to turn foreign aid into a live political issue. Bolstered by a larger partisan Republican revolt over the Vietnam War and domestic spending, Congress slashed foreign aid expenditures through the last half of the 1960s.

Right-wing noninterventionists contributed to another important political milestone: the elimination of the draft. University of Chicago professor, free market economist, and former editorial advisor at *The New Individualist Review*, Milton Friedman, was an instrumental figure in the ending of compulsory military service and the establishment of an all-volunteer military. Friedman, along with fellow academics Walter Oi and Alan Greenspan served on the Gates Commission, an investigative panel enacted by President Nixon charged with studying the end of conscription. While Friedman and company's primary thrust was economic,<sup>xlvii</sup> moral argumentation which compared the draft to slavery was integral to their position.

This chapter will also examine the ideological cross pollination between the Old Right and the New Left. Progressive and conservative dialogue on issues of foreign policy and the national security state was not a phenomenon new to the late 1960s. However, libertarian figures such as

Murray Rothbard, Karl Hess, and Leonard Liggio made a concerted effort during the turmoil of the 1960s to build a popular front with radical leftwing activists on issues of war and peace. To facilitate this political project, Rothbard and Liggio founded the radical academic journals *Left and Right*, and later the *Libertarian Forum*. These journals also hosted revisionist narratives of recent history, particularly on the Second World War, and served as a medium to maintain Old Right criticisms of the warfare state and executive authority. These niche libertarian journals served as an intellectual space to work out these heretical theories of recent history.

#### Chapter 5: Midnight in the Republic, 1976 – 1988

Chapter 5 asks, how did right-wing noninterventionism survive its political nadir during the Reagan era? How did it perceive the end of detente and escalation of tensions with the Soviet Union? And what forces propelled it back into political relevance during the 1992 presidential election and how was that resurgence informed by the intellectual continuities outlined in Chapter 4? To resolve these questions, I will examine the intellectual trajectory of noninterventionist discourse throughout the period.

Between the end of the Vietnam War and the conclusion of the Cold War, libertarians, and the conservative inheritors of the Old Right political tradition, now referred to as paleoconservatives, would create counter-institutions to maintain and proliferate their worldviews. Key organizations included: Rockford Institute/Chronicles magazine (paleoconservative, founded 1976), the Cato Institute (libertarian, founded 1977), the Mises Institute (libertarian, founded 1982) and the Independent Institute (libertarian, founded 1986). These outlets joined the libertarian Reason Foundation and its publication, *Reason* magazine which was established in 1968. While none of these think tanks were created exclusively to address issues of national security and international

affairs, opposition to U.S. foreign policy was an essential component of their intellectual endeavors.

These intellectual figures were bolstered by a lone but notable voice in Congress when Texas Representative Ron Paul entered office in 1977. Paul represented right-wing noninterventionism on the national political stage during the latter half of the 1970s and into the 1980s. Rep. Paul would become a cult hero for libertarians due to his idealism, oratorical bravery, and consistent voting record. He served as a conduit for their ideas in Congress and reliable “no” vote on interventionist foreign policy and bloated defense spending.<sup>xlviii</sup>

#### Chapter 6: The Return of the Old Right? 1989- 1992

Upon the fall of the Berlin Wall, American political and intellectual elites gleefully advocated for the United States to take its seemingly rightful place as the leader of a new, liberal, and corporatist world order. The transition from bipolarity of the Cold War to the unipolarity of the 1990s era was encapsulated by the now famous (or infamous) “New World Order” neologism proliferated by President George H.W. Bush. The first test for this new unfettered America occurred during Operation Desert Storm. The use of U.S. military force in the Persian Gulf signaled to the world that the United States would use its power to maintain regional stability, global energy supplies, and international norms.

Bush’s foreign policy vision and the war it precipitated was met by a small but vociferous resistance from the American right. Pat Buchanan vocally opposed military action to liberate Kuwait. According to his biographer, Timothy Stanley, Buchanan viewed the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait as “a spat between a dictator and a king that posed no threat to U.S. interests.”<sup>xlix</sup>

Pat Buchanan's entrance into the conservative political conscience would herald a sizeable right-wing revolt over the issue of U.S. foreign policy. The threat of the Soviet Union had previously convinced many conservatives, to include Pat Buchanan, to suppress their disdain for big government to defeat communism. With the Soviet Union vanquished, many conservatives advocated for the U.S. to voluntarily renounce its role as "leader of the free world" and thereby restore "the Old Republic."

Buchanan's political presence resurrected some of the darker elements from right-wing noninterventionism. During his political campaigns and in many of his writings, Buchanan made numerous controversial comments regarding the influence of Israeli-U.S. relations upon America's military role in the Middle East. He also insinuated that many of America's foreign policy intellectuals and security officials of Jewish heritage, particularly those within the neoconservative right, callously sent working class gentiles, white, Black, and Hispanic to their deaths. He claimed that the fighting in the Gulf would be done by "kids with names like McAllister, Murphy, Gonzales, and Leroy Brown" and not by the children of elites.<sup>1</sup> Buchanan's other policy planks would similarly cast a pall over his antiwar message: trade and immigration restrictionism

Buchanan would roll his opposition to the Gulf War into a Republican presidential primary run in 1992. His campaign was supported by writer, intellectual, and influential figure in the conservative movement, Russell Kirk. The traditionalist Kirk criticized U.S. involvement in the Gulf War and would serve as Buchanan's Michigan state chair. Buchanan's campaign was also endorsed by libertarian activists Murray Rothbard, Justin Raimondo, and Lew Rockwell. The three libertarians agreed with Buchanan's foreign policy views and saw his right-wing populism as a battering ram with which they could destroy the military-industrial complex, the national

security state, and the foreign policy consensus. For Rothbard and his fellow anarcho-libertarians, war was the most depraved of all state activities.<sup>li</sup> Therefore, despite qualms over economic and domestic issues, they viewed an alliance with Buchanan's populists as an opportunity to dismantle the American empire. This marriage of convenience between libertarians and populists bore a passing resemblance to the Old Right and would foreshadow the fractured political landscape a quarter century over the horizon.



<sup>i</sup> Quoted in Frum, David. “Unpatriotic Conservatives,” *National Review*, March 25, 2003, <https://www.nationalreview.com/2003/03/unpatriotic-conservatives-david-frum/>

<sup>ii</sup> 87 House Republicans joined progressive Democratic Congressman Dennis Kucinich and 60 other Democrats in a failed vote to end U.S. intervention in Libya. While the vote failed it demonstrated that the old foreign policy consensus was on the decline and that progressive – populist/libertarian cooperation on foreign policy restraint was possible. It is also worth noting that almost the entire Republican delegations from Wisconsin and Michigan voted in favor of the measure, Rep. Paul Ryan (WI-1) and Mike Rogers (MI-8), notwithstanding.

H.Con.Res. 51 — 112th Congress: Directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the ...” [www.GovTrack.us](http://www.GovTrack.us). 2011. November 17, 2020

<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/hconres51>, *VoteView*, <https://voteview.com/rollcall/RH1120410>

<sup>iii</sup> S. 3576 — 112th Congress: A bill to provide limitations on United States assistance, and for other purposes.” [www.GovTrack.us](http://www.GovTrack.us). 2012. November 17, 2020 <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/s3576>

McLaughlin, Seth “Tea party-linked lawmakers shun strike on Syria,” *Washington Times*, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2013

<https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/sep/10/tea-party-linked-lawmakers-shun-strike-on-syria/>

Pecquet, Julian “Tea Party takes lead on Syria,” *The Hill*, August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2013

<https://thehill.com/policy/international/319765--tea-party-takes-lead-on-syria>

<sup>iv</sup> A study conducted by Boston University political science professor Douglas Krinera and University of Minnesota Law professor Francis Shen “concluded that regions that had seen high concentrations in casualties over the past 15 years of warfare saw a swing in support towards Trump.” The study also found that military casualties in Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin motivated voters to back Trump over Clinton in the 2016 general election. White and rural constituencies have suffered a disproportionate number of casualties during wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Kriner, Douglas L. and Shen, Francis X., *Battlefield Casualties and Ballot Box Defeat: Did the Bush-Obama Wars Cost Clinton the White House?* (June 19, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2989040> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2989040>

According to congressional and survey data, 82% of U.S. casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan were white, despite comprising approximately only 57% of the U.S. military and 60% of the U.S. population. “American War and Military Operations Casualties: Lists and Statistics” *Congressional Research Service*, July 2020,

<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL32492.pdf>

“Small Towns Absorb the Toll of War” *NPR*, February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2007,

<https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=7492231>

Vance, J D, “Why Trump’s Antiwar Message Resonates with White America,” *New York Times* (Online), New York: New York Times Company. Apr 4, 2016.

Jilani, Zaid “SANDERS AND TRUMP VOTERS ARE MORE SKEPTICAL OF WAR THAN CLINTON, CRUZ VOTERS” *The Intercept*, April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2016 <https://theintercept.com/2016/04/02/sanders-and-trump-voters-are-more-skeptical-of-war-than-clinton-cruz-voters/>

For a view from the left, see Grandin, Greg, “Why Trump Now? It’s the Empire, Stupid,” *The Nation*, June, 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016, <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/why-trump-now-its-the-empire-stupid/> and Jilani, Zaid “STUDY FINDS RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIGH MILITARY CASUALTIES AND VOTES FOR TRUMP OVER CLINTON” *The Intercept*, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017

<https://theintercept.com/2017/07/10/study-finds-relationship-between-high-military-casualties-and-votes-for-trump-over-clinton/>

For a view from the right, see Trifkovic, Srdja, “Dismantling the Empire,” *Chronicles*, January 2017,

<https://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/dismantling-the-empire/>

<sup>v</sup> The New Look was a national security policy implemented by the Eisenhower administration. It was centered on deterrence via strategic, theatre, tactical nuclear weapons. The policy was designed to deter the Soviet Union from invading Western Europe and to do so on the cheap.

<sup>vi</sup> Such accounts were buttressed by the political and cultural fights which occurred during the waning days of American neutrality and the domestic fear of an Axis “fifth column” in the U.S. See: MacDonnell, Francis. *Insidious Foes: The Axis Fifth Column and the American Home Front*. Cary: Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 1995 and Charles, Douglas M. J. *Edgar Hoover and the Anti-Interventionists: FBI Political Surveillance and the Rise of the Domestic Security State, 1939-1945*. The Ohio State University Press, 2007. Historian Leo Ribuffo coined the phrase “Brown Scare” to describe a cultural climate of intense fear surrounding the presence rightwing extremism and

domestic fascism. See: Ribuffo, Leo. *The Old Christian Right: The Protestant Far Right from the Great Depression to the Cold War*. Temple UP, 1983,

<sup>vii</sup>Blower, Brooke L. "From Isolationism to Neutrality: A New Framework for Understanding American Political Culture, 1919–1941." *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 2 (2014): 345–376.

<sup>viii</sup> Blower, "From Isolationism to Neutrality: A New Framework for Understanding American Political Culture, 1919–1941"

<sup>ix</sup> Doenecke, Justus D. *Not to the Swift: The Old Isolationists in the Cold War Era* (Cranbury, Associated University Presses, Inc, 1979), p.11

Other scholars have noted that this political tradition had antecedents in American resistance to the Spanish-American War and the subsequent occupation of the Philippines. See: Lemelin, Bernard. "A Fiery and Unbated Supported of Post-War Isolationism: Journalist John T. Flynn and "American Foreign Policy, 1945-60," *Canadian Review of American Studies*, Volume 49, Number 3, Winter 2019, pp. 271-301 and Nichols, Christopher McKnight, *Promise and Peril: American at the Dawn of a Global Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011)

<sup>x</sup>Doenecke p. 242. My own analysis as determined that congressional members with noninterventionist voting records during the early Cold War died in office at twice the rate of their interventionist peers.

<sup>xi</sup> Doenecke p.212

<sup>xii</sup> Doenecke p. 189-196

<sup>xiii</sup> Doenecke p. 231, 232

<sup>xiv</sup> Hogan, Michael *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State, 1945-1954* (Cambridge University Press, 1998) p. 319

<sup>xv</sup> Craig, Campbell, and Fredrik Logevall. *America's Cold War the Politics of Insecurity* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009), p.9

<sup>xvi</sup> For more on this historiographic turn around see Phillips-Fein, Kim. "Conservatism: A State of the Field." *The Journal of American history* (Bloomington, Ind.) 98, no. 3 (2011): 723–743 and Lassiter, Matthew. "Political History Beyond the Red-Blue Divide." *The Journal of American History* 98, no. 3 (December 1, 2011): 760–764.

<sup>xvii</sup> Lassiter, Matthew. "Political History Beyond the Red-Blue Divide." *The Journal of American History* 98, no. 3 (December 1, 2011): 760–764. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/912857535/> p. 762

<sup>xviii</sup> Nash, George H. *Conservative Intellectual Movement in America Since 1945*. Wilmington: ISI Books, 2006, p.xv

<sup>xix</sup> Nash, p.xv

<sup>xx</sup> Nash, p. xvi, for more on the communist to conservative conversion pipeline, see Diggins, John *Up From Communism: Conservative Odysseys in American Intellectual Development* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994)

<sup>xxixxi</sup> Gottfried, Paul *Conservatism in America: Making Sense of the American Right* (PALGRAVE: New York, 2007) p.9

<sup>xxii</sup> Gottfried, p.11

<sup>xxiii</sup> Raimondo, Justin. *Reclaiming the American Right: The Lost Legacy of the Conservative Movement* (Wilmington: ISI Books, 2008) p. 147, Rothbard, Murray N. edited with an Introduction by Thomas E. Woods, Jr., *The Betrayal of the American Right* (Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2007), p 137

<sup>xxiv</sup> Kaufman, Bill *Ain't my America* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2008), p 132, Raimondo, p.14, Rothbard, 123

<sup>xxv</sup> Mills, David W. *Cold War in a Cold Land* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015) p. 21. The Dakotan political landscape of the early Cold War was overwhelmingly Republican. It would not be until the 92<sup>nd</sup> Congress (1971-1973), that the Dakotas would send more Democrats to Washington than Republicans. A notable exception being critic of the Vietnam War, and 1972 Democratic Presidential nominee, Senator George McGovern. Sen. McGovern's 1972 running mate was Robert "Sargent" Shriver, a founding member of the America First Committee.

<sup>xxvi</sup> By 1962, Hunt's Life Line program outpaced *Human Events* in terms of income generated, by 1963 his shows beat out conservative flagship publication, *National Review*. Hendershot, Heather *What's Fair on the Air? Cold War Rightwing Broadcasting and the Public Interest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).p. 11

<sup>xxvii</sup> Hendershot, p.55. Hendershot's use of "isolationist" is itself telling of the words staying power despite its politically motivated construction. *Life Line*, like other conservative outlets would come to support the war as a means of opposing a largely leftwing protest movement.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Scanlon, Sandra. *The Pro-War Movement: Domestic Support for the Vietnam War and the Making of Modern American Conservatism*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013, p.35

<sup>xxix</sup> Historian Paul A. C. Koistinen has asserted that the staying power of the military-industrial complex can be explained, in part, by “the conservative turn the nation as taken,” Koistinen, Paul A.C. *State of War: The Political Economy of American Warfare* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2012). A common account of the early Cold War asserts that President Truman was “pushed to the right” by his political rivals within the Republican party, particularly those in the so called “China Lobby.” These accounts ignore the significant disorder within the GOP on U.S. foreign policy during the early Cold War and that the strongest political resistance to the early national security in fact emanated from the Republican right. For more conventional accounts see: C. William Walldorf Jr. *To Shape Our World for Good: Master Narratives and Regime Change in U.S. Foreign Policy*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), Craig, Campbell, and Fredrik Logevall. *America’s Cold War the Politics of Insecurity* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009). For a dissenting view, read Joseph R. Stromberg. “Imperialism, Noninterventionism, and Revolution: Opponents of the Modern American Empire.” *The Independent Review* (Oakland, Calif.) 11, no. 1 (2006): 79–113 and Rothbard, Murray N *The Betrayal of the American Right*

<sup>xxx</sup> Historian Kim Phillips-Fein has contended that “[l]ittle work has been done on ideas about war, nationalism, and patriotism and the rise of the Right.” Phillips-Fein, Kim. “Conservatism: A State of the Field.” Similarly, Historian Alan Brinkley made a similar observation about the relative lack of scholarship on right-wing noninterventionism despite “ample evidence for distinctive conservative arguments about America’s role in the world.” Alan Brinkley. “Conservatism as a Growing Field of Scholarship.” *The Journal of American history* (Bloomington, Ind.) 98, no. 3 (2011): 748–751. Matthew Lassiter has argued that the current historiography of American politics mirrors “the red-blue binaries of journalism and punditry” and has called on historians to challenge that binary. My research seeks to meet both of those challenges. Lassiter, Matthew. “Political History Beyond the Red-Blue Divide.”

<sup>xxxi</sup> The Old Right was compromised of two ideological factions which we would now call populists or libertarians. Their political worldviews could be described as either small r republican, classically liberal, or libertarian. In the realm of foreign affairs these tendencies manifested themselves as opposition to spending, executive power, federal authority, or the draft. A smaller but noticeable subset adhered to beliefs which could be referred to as conspiratorial. These views ranged from the defensible to the manifestly ridiculous. Examples of the former were general critiques of the U.S. foreign policy establishment as intentionally antidemocratic, opaque, and self-serving. The latter were encapsulated by absurd notions such as the presence of a socialist shadow state in the U.S., a sundry of fever dreams about the United Nations as a secret one world government, and water fluoridation as a communist plot...to name a few. A still smaller but noticeable cohort grounded their foreign policy views in racist assumptions of foreign peoples and/or anti-Semitic views of their fellow Americans. It is up for debate as to the centrality of such views within the noninterventionist right. Justus D. Doenecke asserted that such xenophobes were in fact a “small minority within isolationist ranks.” Doenecke, *Not to the Swift: The Old Isolationists in the Cold War Era*, p.21. Wayne Cole made similar assertions in *America First – The Battle Against Intervention 1940-1941* For more on the impact of race and identity on U.S. foreign relations and the American right, see: Borstelmann, Thomas. *The Cold War and the Color Line American Race Relations in the Global Arena* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001 and Burke, Kyle *Revolutionaries for the Right: Anticommunist Internationalism and Paramilitary Warfare in the Cold War* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018 For more on the politics of conspiracism in post-war America, see Bratich, *Conspiracy Panics: Political Rationality and Popular Culture* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008).

<sup>xxxii</sup> Ledbetter, James *Unwarranted Influence: Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Military Industrial Complex* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011) p.22-25. The publication of *Merchants of Death* was one of many instances of left-right cooperation on the issue of militarism and interventionism during the interwar period as it was co-authored by individuals from two distinct political traditions. Hanighen was firmly a man of the right and occasional columnist for the libertarian monthly, *The Freeman*. He would go on to establish the conservative magazine, *Human Events* and became an active member of the America First Committee. Engelbrecht was a Christian internationalist and frequent writer for the Christian Socialist magazine, *The World Tomorrow*. See: Thompson, Michael G. *For God and Globe: Christian Internationalism in the United States Between the Great War and the Cold War*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015).

<sup>xxxiii</sup> Wiltz, John Edward. “The Nye Committee Revisited.” *The Historian* (Kingston) 23, no. 2 (1961): 211–233.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> Cole, Wayne S. *America First : the Battle Against Intervention, 1940-1941* New York: Octagon Books, 1971. See also Kauffman, Bill. *America First! : It’s History, Culture, and Politics* Amherst, N.Y: Prometheus Books, 1995.

<sup>xxxv</sup> Cole, p.141 - 142

<sup>xxxvi</sup> Olson, Lynne. *Those Angry Days : Roosevelt, Lindbergh, and America's Fight over World War II, 1939-1941* 1st ed. New York: Random House, 2013, and Cole p.139

<sup>xxxvii</sup> See Flynn, John Thomas. *As We Go Marching* New York: Free Life Editions, 1973.

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Even though Beard was never officially a member of the America First Committee, the group promoted his work and included *A Foreign Policy for America*, and *Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels* on its "America First Book List." Doenecke, Justus D. *In Danger Undaunted: The Anti-Interventionist Movement of 1940-1941 as Revealed in the Papers of the American First Committee* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press), 1990, p. 121

<sup>xxxix</sup> Bacevich, Andrew J, "Charles Beard: Punished for Seeking Peace," *The American Conservative*, March 21, 2019, <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/charles-beard-punished-for-seeking-peace/>

<sup>xl</sup> See, Friedberg, Aaron L. *In the Shadow of the Garrison State : America's Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000)

<sup>xli</sup> Rothbard, p.93

<sup>xlii</sup> The Cold War consensus is best encapsulated by the precepts of the Truman Doctrine, a U.S. government policy meant to establish global economic, diplomatic, and military dominance for the purpose of containing the Soviet Union and establishing a liberal international order. In practical terms, the consensus was operationalized with entangling alliances (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and similar defense pacts), the copious issuance of foreign aid to both the developed and postcolonial worlds, and the acceptance of massive military budgets.

<sup>xliii</sup> General Robert E. Wood help to establish the America First Committee, served as its first president and was a principle financial backer. Gen. Wood also provided financial support to the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. The two organizations shared a vision for an American neutrality in world affairs coupled with hegemonic control in the Western Hemisphere. Justus D. Doenecke. "General Robert E. Wood: The Evolution of a Conservative." *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 71, no. 3 (1978): 162–175.

<sup>xliv</sup> Lemelin, Bernard. "A Fiery and Unbated Supported of Post-War Isolationism: Journalist John T. Flynn and American Foreign Policy, 1945-60", Norris, John, "Special feature: A history of American public opinion on foreign aid." (Washington, D.C., DEVEX) August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017

<sup>xlv</sup> The Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, *Foreign Aid and You*, April 27<sup>th</sup>, 1959, p. 3

<sup>xlvi</sup> Right-wing Southern Republicans who began their congressional careers during the 89th Congress (1965-1967) or later opposed Cold War policy an average of 32% during their stints in office. Their Midwestern predecessors who ended their careers before 89<sup>th</sup> voted in opposition nearly twice as often, opposing Cold War policy 60% throughout their careers. For more on southern support for U.S. foreign policy see: Katznelson, Ira *Fear Itself* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2013) and Trubowitz, Peter *Defining the National Interest: Conflict and Change in American Foreign Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1998)

<sup>xlvii</sup> "they worked from two major assumptions: individual liberty is the most essential American value, and the free market is the best means to preserve it." Beth, Bailey *America's Army: Making the All-Volunteer Force* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 2009) p. 33, see also Doherty, Brian. *Radicals for Capitalism: A Freewheeling History of the Modern American Libertarian Movement* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2007) p.372.

<sup>xlviii</sup> According to my dataset, Rep. Ron Paul boasts the 23<sup>rd</sup> most oppositional Republican (80<sup>th</sup> overall) voting record on issues of military and foreign policy. For Senators and Representatives who began their careers after 1975, he is the number one, from all parties.

<sup>xlix</sup> Stanley, Timothy *The Crusader: The Life And Tumultuous Times of Pat Buchanan* (New York: Thomas Dunn Books, 2012) p.136

<sup>l</sup> Stanley, p.136

<sup>li</sup> "It is in war that the State really comes into its own: swelling in power, in number, in pride, in absolute dominion over the economy and the society." Murry Rothard, quoted in Malice, Michael *The New Right: A Journey to the Fringe of American Politics* (New York: All Points Books, 2019) p.40

"Vietnam should remind all conservatives that whenever you put your faith in big government for any reason, sooner or later you wind up as an apologist for mass murder," Karl Hess, quoted in Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America*, p.326 Hess was a former speech writer for Senator Barry Goldwater. Hess became disillusioned with politics after Goldwater's defeat, drifted briefly into the New Left, and eventually found an ideological home within the anarchist right.

---

**Primary Sources:****Selected Newspapers:**

*The Akron Beacon Journal*, Akron, Ohio, 1950 – 1968

*Boston Globe*, 1934 – 1992

*Chicago Tribune*, 1934 – 1992

*The Courier*, Waterloo, Iowa, 1949-1973

*The Courier-Journal*, Louisville, Kentucky, 1952-1968

*The Daily Chronicle*, De Kalb, Illinois, 1937-1963

*The Kansas City Times*, 1947 - 1961

*The New York Times*, 1934-1992

*The Paducah Sun*, Paducah, Kentucky, 1955 - 1968

*Washington Post*, 1934 – 1992

*The Sacramento Bee*, Sacramento Bee, 1953-1970

**Specialty Publications:**

*Chronicles*, 1977 – 1992

*QC Almanac*, 1945 – 1992

*The Dan Smoot Report*, 1957 – 1971

*The Freeman*, 1950 – 1992

*Left and Right*, 1965 – 1968

*The Libertarian Forum*, 1969–1984

*National Review*, 1955 – 1992

*The New Individualist Review*, 1961 – 1968

*New Libertarian Weekly* 1975-1977

*Modern Age*, 1957 - 1992

*Reason*, 1969 – 1992

---

**Congressional Materials:**

*Congressional Record*, 1934 – 1992

Lewis, Jeffrey B., Keith Poole, Howard Rosenthal, Adam Boche, Aaron Rudkin, and Luke Sonnet (2019). *Voteview: Congressional Roll-Call Votes Database*. <https://voteview.com/>

Scott, Adler, E. “Congressional District Data File.” University of Colorado, Boulder, CO.

Swift, Elaine K., Brookshire, Robert G., Canon, David T., Fink, Evelyn C., Hibbing, John R., Humes, Brian D., ... Martis, Kenneth C. *Database of [United States] Congressional Historical Statistics, 1789-1989*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2009-02-03. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR03371.v2>

**Essays, Books, and Published Collections:**

Buchanan, Patrick J. *A Republic, Not an Empire: Reclaiming America's Destiny* (Washington, DC: Regnery Pub., 1999)

Chamberlin, William Henry. *The Evolution of a Conservative*. (Chicago: Regnery, 1959)

Chodorov, Frank. *Out of Step: The Autobiography of an Individualist*. (New York: The Devin-Adair Company, 1962)

Selected sources contained within: Doenecke, Justus D. *In Danger Undaunted: The Anti-Interventionist Movement of 1940-1941 as Revealed in the Papers of the American First Committee* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press 1990)

Engelbrecht, H. C. (Helmuth Carol), and Frank Cleary Hanighen. *Merchants of Death; a Study of the International Armament Industry*. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1934)

Flynn, John Thomas. *As We Go Marching New York*: (Free Life Editions, 1973)

Garret, Garett *Ex America: The 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the People's Pottage* (Caldwell: Caxton Press, 2004)

Lane, Rose Wilder *Give Me Liberty* (Caldwell: Caxton Press, 1954)

Selected sources contained within: Polner, Murray and Woods, Thomas *We Who Dared to Say No to War: American Antiwar Writing from 1812 to Now* (New York: Basic Books, 2008)

Redman, Eric. *The Dance of Legislation: An Insider's Account of the Workings of the United States Senate*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011)

Smoot, Dan. *The Invisible Government*. Project Gutenberg, n.d.

Taft, Robert A. *A Foreign Policy for Americans* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1951)

---

**Selected Public Laws:**

*An Act Making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes*” P.L. 87-329, September 30, 1961.

*An Act To consolidate and revise foreign assistance legislation relating to reimbursable military exports*, 90 P.L. 629

*Joint Resolution to Promote the Maintenance of International Peace and Security in Southeast Asia*, PL88-408, August 10<sup>th</sup>, 1964

*Formosa and Pescadores Defense Act*, PL84-4, January 29<sup>th</sup>, 1955

*Middle East Peace and Stability Act*, PL85-7, March 9<sup>th</sup>, 1957

**Miscellaneous:**

The Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, *Foreign Aid and You*, April 27<sup>th</sup>, 1959

Leonard Read Journal, *Foundation for Economic Education*, 1949 – 1979,  
<https://history.fee.org/leonard-read-journal/>

McMahon, Robert *Christian Evangelicals and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Washington, D.C., The Council on Foreign Relations) August 22, 2006

Norris, John, “Special feature: A history of American public opinion on foreign aid.” (Washington, D.C., DEVEX) August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017

Schroyer, Liz *The Politics of Foreign Aid* (Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution) July 31, 2017

Utt, James B “THE U.N. BARBARIANS ARE HERE IN THE UNITED STATES,” *The Tribune*, March 15, 1963

**Archives:**

Library of Congress Manuscripts Division:

Clare Booth Luce Papers

Herbert A. Philbrick Papers

Former Members of Congress, Inc. Oral History Interviews

Robert A. Taft Papers

John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum

Right Wing Movement Folder

The Ludwig von Mises Institute for Austrian Economics

Murray Rothbard Papers

Ludwig von Mises Papers

Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington, New York

Leonard Read Papers

Hoag Collection of Dissenting and Extremist Printed Propaganda:

Citizens Foreign Aid Committee Collection

Dan Smoot Collection

John Birch Society Collection

Hoover Presidential Library and Museum:

Bricker Amendment Collection

Herbert Hoover Papers

Felix (M) Morley Papers

Charles C. Tansill Papers

Isabel M. Paterson Papers

Harold Royce [H.R.] Gross Papers

Rose Wilder Lane Papers

Robert E. Wood Papers



---

### Secondary Sources:

- Anderson, Perry *American Foreign Policy and Its Thinkers* (London: Verso, 2015)
- Bacevich, Andrew J. *American Empire the Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002)
- Bacevich, Andrew J. *The Age of Illusions: How America Squandered Its Cold War Victory* First edition. (New York, NY: Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company, LLC, 2020)
- Beth, Bailey *America's Army: Making the All-Volunteer Force* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 2009)
- Blower, Brooke L. "From Isolationism to Neutrality: A New Framework for Understanding American Political Culture, 1919–1941." *Diplomatic History* 38, no. 2 (2014): 345–376.
- Borstelmann, Thomas. *The Cold War and the Color Line American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001)
- Bratich, *Conspiracy Panics: Political Rationality and Popular Culture* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008)
- Burke, Kyle *Revolutionaries for the Right: Anticommunist Internationalism and Paramilitary Warfare in the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018)
- Craig, Campbell, and Fredrik Logevall. *America's Cold War the Politics of Insecurity* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009)
- Charles, Douglas M. *J. Edgar Hoover and the Anti-Interventionists: FBI Political Surveillance and the Rise of the Domestic Security State, 1939-1945.* (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2007)
- Cole, Wayne S. *America First: The Battle Against Intervention, 1940-1941* (New York: Octagon Books, 1971)
- Diggins, John *Up From Communism: Conservative Odysseys in American Intellectual Development* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994)
- Doenecke, Justus D. "General Robert E. Wood: The Evolution of a Conservative." *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 71, no. 3 (1978): 162–175.
- *Not to the Swift: The Old Isolationists in the Cold War Era* (Cranbury, Associated University Presses, Inc, 1979)
- *Storm on the Horizon: The Challenge to American Intervention, 1939-1941* (Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2000)
- Doenecke, Justus D and Wilz, John E. *From Isolation to War 1931 – 1941* (Wheeling: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2003)

- 
- Doherty, Brian. *Radicals for Capitalism: A Freewheeling History of the Modern American Libertarian Movement* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2007)
- Dueck, Colin. *Hard Line : the Republican Party and U.S. Foreign Policy Since World War II* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2010)
- Elghossainm, Anthony, “The Enduring Power of Neoconservatism,” *The New Republic*, April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2019
- Friedberg, Aaron L. *In the Shadow of the Garrison State : America’s Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2000)
- Gilman, Nils *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*. (Johns Hopkins University Press. 2003)
- Gottfried, Paul *Conservatism in America: Making Sense of the American Right* (PALGRAVE: New York, 2007)
- *The Conservative Movement* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993)
- Hawley, George *Right-Wing Critics of American Conservatism* (University Press of Kansas, 2016)
- Hendershot, Heather *What’s Fair on the Air? Cold War Rightwing Broadcasting and the Public Interest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011)
- Hemmer, Nicole “How Conservative Media Learned to Play Politics,” *Politico*, August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2016
- Hawley, George. *Right-Wing Critics of American Conservatism* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2016)
- Hogan, Michael J. *A Cross of Iron : Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State, 1945-1954* (Cambridge, UK ;: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- Kauffman, Bill *Ain’t My America* (New York, Metropolitan Books, 2008)
- *America First! : It’s History, Culture, and Politics* (Amherst, N.Y: Prometheus Books, 1995)
- Katznelson, Ira *Fear Itself* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2013)
- Koistinen, Paul A.C. *State of War: The Political Economy of American Warfare* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2012).
- Latham, Robert, *The Liberal Moment: Modernity, Security, and the Making of Postwar International Order* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997)
- Lassiter, Matthew. “Political History Beyond the Red-Blue Divide.” *The Journal of American History* 98, no. 3 (December 1, 2011): 760–764

- 
- Ledbetter, James *Unwarranted Influence: Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Military Industrial Complex* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011)
- Lemelin, Bernard. "A Fiery and Unbated Supported of Post-War Isolationism: Journalist John T. Flynn and American Foreign Policy, 1945-60," *Canadian Review of American Studies*, Volume 49, Number 3, Winter 2019, pp. 271-301
- MacDonnell, Francis. *Insidious Foes: The Axis Fifth Column and the American Home Front*. (Cary: Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 1995)
- Malice, Michael *The New Right: A Journey to the Fringe of American Politics* (New York: All Points Books, 2019)
- McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors the Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2001)
- Mills, David W. *Cold War in a Cold Land* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015)
- Mulloy, D.J, *The World of the John Birch Society: Conspiracy, Conservatism, and the Cold War* (Nashville, Vanderbilt, 2014)
- Nash, George H. *Conservative Intellectual Movement in America Since 1945*. (Wilmington: ISI Books, 2006)
- Nichols, Christopher McKnight, *Promise and Peril: American at the Dawn of a Global Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011)
- Nordlinger, Eric A. *Isolationism Reconfigured: American Foreign Policy for a New Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995)
- Patterson, James I. *Mr. Republican: A Biography of Robert A. Taft* (Boson: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972)
- Perlstein, Rick. *Before the Storm: Barry Goldwater and the Unmaking of the American Consensus* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001)
- Radosh, Ronald *Prophets on the Right: Profiles of Conservative Critics of American Globalism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975)
- Ramsey, Bruce *Unsanctioned Voice: Garet Garrett, Journalist of the Old Right* (Caldwell: Caxton Press, 2008)
- Offenbach, Seth *The Conservative Movement and the Vietnam War: The Other Side of Vietnam* (New York: Routledge, 2019)
- Rothbard, Murray N. *The Betrayal of the American Right* (Auburn: Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2007)
- Raimondo, Justin. *Reclaiming the American Right: The Lost Legacy of the Conservative Movement* (Wilmington, Del: ISI Books, 2008)

- 
- Scanlon, Sandra. *The Pro-War Movement: Domestic Support for the Vietnam War and the Making of Modern American Conservatism*. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013)
- Schwieder, David W. and Schwieder, Dorothy “The Power of Prickliness: Iowa's H. R. Gross in the U. S. House of Representatives,” *The Annals of Iowa*, Volume 65 Number 4 (Fall 2006)
- Scotchie, Joseph. *Revolt from the Heartland: The Struggle for Authentic Conservatism* (Milton Park, Routledge, 2017)
- Stanley, Timothy *The Crusader: The Life And Tumultuous Times of Pat Buchanan* (New York: Thomas Dunn Books, 2012)
- Stromberg. “Imperialism, Noninterventionism, and Revolution: Opponents of the Modern American Empire.” *The Independent Review* (Oakland, Calif.) 11, no. 1 (2006): 79–113
- Thompson, Michael G. *For God and Globe: Christian Internationalism in the United States Between the Great War and the Cold War*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015)
- Trubowitz, Peter *Defining the National Interest: Conflict and Change in American Foreign Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1998)
- Walldorf, C. William Jr. *To Shape Our World for Good: Master Narratives and Regime Change in U.S. Foreign Policy*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019)

### **Schedule for Completion**

Summer 2021

Continue computational analysis

Fall 2021

Draft Chapter 2

Continue computational analysis

Winter 2021

Draft Chapter 3

---

Research Trip to the Mises Institute

Spring 2022

Research Trip to Hoover Library

Draft Chapter 1

Revise Chapters 2

Summer 2022

Draft Chapter 4

Revise Chapter 1

Fall 2022

Draft Chapter 5

Revise Chapter 4

Winter 2022

Draft Chapter 6

Revise Chapter 5

Spring 2023

Draft Introduction and Conclusion

Revise Chapter 6

Revise and Defend