

An intellectual at the service of the United States hegemony: Lincoln Gordon and the Alliance for Progress in Brazil – a case study

Pedro Carvalho Oliveira¹
Beatriz Machado Lima²

Abstract: This investigation aims to analyze the performance of Lincoln Gordon, Brazilian ambassador in the early 1960s and a key player in the Alliance for Progress, as an intellectual articulator of strategies to defend the international interests of the United States in Latin America, during the Cold War. Our research effort is to demonstrate how Gordon made use of the Alliance for Progress as a political instrument for the dissemination of the American political and economic culture and the consolidation of Washington's hegemony. For such a purpose, we follow the concepts of hegemony and organic intellectual proposed by Antonio Gramsci. Our main source of examination is the book "O Progresso pela Aliança", published by Gordon himself in 1962 targeting the Brazilian public and aimed at propaganda of the foreign aid program, suggesting the existence of mutual interests between Brazil and the USA, which would facilitate the Alliance's success in the country, hence the defense of the territory against Soviet socialism. Through a critical and detailed analysis of this material, we came to the important conclusion that Gordon played a crucial role in consolidating the Alliance for Progress in a modernization program linked to the need to create paternalistic relations between the US and Latin American countries, developing American liberal capitalist logic, the system of ideas that defines Gordon's class position.

Keywords: Alliance for Progress; Lincoln Gordon; organic intellectual; hegemony.

Um intelectual a serviço da hegemonia dos Estados Unidos: Lincoln Gordon e a Aliança para o Progresso no Brasil – um estudo de caso

Resumo: Esta investigação tem como objetivo analisar a atuação de Lincoln Gordon, embaixador estadunidense atuante no Brasil no início da década de 1960 e peça fundamental da Aliança para o Progresso, como articulador intelectual de estratégias de defesa dos interesses internacionais dos Estados Unidos na América Latina durante a Guerra Fria. Buscaremos demonstrar como Gordon fez uso da Aliança para o Progresso como instrumento político para a difusão da cultura política e econômica americana e para a consolidação da hegemonia de Washington. Nesse sentido, buscaremos apoio nos conceitos de hegemonia e intelectual orgânico propostos por Antonio Gramsci. Nosso exame terá como fonte principal o livro "O Progresso pela Aliança", publicado pelo próprio Gordon em 1962 e direcionado ao

¹ Doutor em História pela Universidade Estadual de Maringá. Professor do Departamento de História da Universidade Estadual de Maringá e da Universidade Estadual do Paraná – Campus de Paranavaí. E-mail: pedro.labtempo@gmail.com. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0393-4143>.

² Mestre em Ciências Sociais pela Universidade Estadual de Maringá. Professora da Unicesumar – Campus de Maringá. E-mail: biamuglia@hotmail.com. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4635-7415>.

público brasileiro, pretendendo fazer uma propaganda do programa de ajuda externa, sugerindo a existência de uma afinidade de interesses entre Brasil e EUA, o que facilitaria o sucesso da Aliança no país e, conseqüentemente, a defesa do território contra o socialismo soviético. Por meio de uma análise crítica e detalhada desse material, chegamos à importante conclusão de que Gordon desempenhou um papel crucial na consolidação da Aliança para o Progresso, um programa de modernização ligado à necessidade de se criarem relações paternalistas entre os EUA e os países latino-americanos em desenvolvimento

Palavras-chave: Aliança para o Progresso; Lincoln Gordon; intelectual orgânico.

Arquivo recebido em: 17/01/2024

Arquivo aprovado em: 06/06/2024

INTRODUCTION

“What is the essential purpose of the Alliance for Progress? In a single sentence, it is an effort of social progress throughout Latin America, operating through democratic institutions based on respect for the individual”.³ This is how Lincoln Gordon, then Ambassador of the United States in Brazil, defined the program created by John F. Kennedy’s government to provide foreign aid to Latin American countries interested in resources to modernize the region. Gordon was one of the main names of the task force responsible for planning and executing the ambitious project, through which about 20 billion dollars, between loans and donations, should arrive for the poor countries of the continent, thus collaborating with the integration of these nations to the international dynamics of modern capitalism over 10 years.

Gordon made an enormous effort to convince the ruling classes and the governments that represented them in Latin America to accept, without reservation, that North, Central, and South America needed to be united in building a fecund space for the flourishing of liberal democracies, in addition that, equipped with the basic conditions, the United States must help developing states. How? Through a joint effort for the proliferation of private companies that would act for the promotion of a modern liberal culture. Through traveling and public lectures, the diplomat made use of his position to persuade Brazilian leaders to adhere to the

³ GORDON, Lincoln. **O Progresso pela Aliança**. São Paulo: Record, 1962, p. 01.

Alliance for Progress, if possible, pressuring governments to set in motion the resources provided by the program.

The diplomat knew, like others within his purview, that conquering Brazil was decisive for the success of the Alliance: in case the giant of the South turned its back on the initiative, it would hardly reach other Latin American countries. Therefore, his speeches in defense of the program in Brazil had been more frequent, and the production of the book *O Progresso pela Aliança*, published in 1962, as aforementioned, resulted in a publication aimed at Brazilians. In the highlighted passage, we can see how Gordon articulates social progress, democracy, and individualism in the light of what Antonio Gramsci (2008) calls “Americanism”: the expansion of the socioeconomic culture necessary for the consolidation of American hegemony – that is, of the “American century” (MUNHOZ, 2020) – after the First World War.

Backed by the above-mentioned book, as well as other documents that record Gordon’s political profile, our examination seeks to understand the diplomat as what Antonio Gramsci (2008) calls an organic intellectual, someone imbued with discursive and practical intentions to preserve or solidify the hegemony of a social class – in his case, the American liberal bourgeoisie that benefited from Fordism. The organic intellectual has a connective-organizational character, being more than a formulator or influencer, but someone who acts to mediate relations between social classes to preserve the interests of a specific one, thus collaborating to developing political plots that guide the construction of a reality favorable to the class that they desire to protect. They are political subjects not only committed to spreading the ideas of a social class, which, in such case, must also be seen as ideas glimpsing an international hegemony, in which the US presents as a model of society, but also as participants in the realization of this process.

Furthermore, we can see how, synchronously, the Alliance for Progress was channeled by Gordon to serve this purpose, thus representing an instrumental program to the affirmation of the United States hegemony and its socioeconomic model in the Americas. For our examination, we focus on Gordon and the Alliance for Progress in Brazil, a country that is intended as a showcase for the program’s success and where particular conditions would point to the need for a more vigorous presence of the Alliance.

The Alliance for Progress in Brazil: modernization and combat against communism

The conquest of power by the Bolshevik revolutionaries in Russia, in 1917, triggered a warning signal that resounded across all continents: a new model of society, guided by communism, was emerging in practice. The fact coincided with something that, since the end of World War I, had been expected: the entrance of the U.S.A., after centuries of isolationism, in the dispute for international hegemony to fill the vacuum left for fallen European empires. This was because, far from the main stage of the conflict, the country inflated its economic potential as a result, on one hand of the provision of resources required by Europe during the war effort and, on another, of having become a creditor of nations in combat. Thus, the US government believed that it was possible to launch itself into the international scene by extending to the entire West what already existed in the Americas, that is, the hegemony of Washington (MUNHOZ, 2020).

However, since 1922, the newly founded Union of Soviet Socialist Republics became an obstacle to these plans. Not only for intending to consolidate itself as power in the European East but also for being the irradiator center of the revolutionary worldview that spread over a Europe taken over by the post-war crisis, a moment seen by many as opportune for the outbreak of uprisings supported by the Soviets, which would align with Moscow. At the end of World War II, with most of central Europe occupied by the Red Army, the feeling that a communist wave would sweep the West became more frequent among supporters of international capitalism. The friction between the US and the USSR grew as they both wished, each in their way, to export their ideologies, which resulted in the Cold War.

The United States' effort to expand its hegemony internationally was given, mainly, through what Antonio Gramsci (2008) called "Americanism". In general, it is the synthesis of economic and social models based on Fordism that would create new habits of consumption, supported by new cultural symbols, consistent with a new model of production that reshaped

the profile of liberal capitalism. More than that: “Americanism” sought to build a new social being, whose behavior would benefit the existence of this system. We understand Fordism as a system of mass production that changed industry in the 20th century. Designed by Henry Ford, it revolutionized automobile production in the U.S. and then spread to the entire world. Through this model, the assembly lines and standardization of products optimized the time and reduced manufacture length, enabling to produce more in less time. This led to an increase in product availability, which required an increase in demand, which, in turn, required to encourage a consumer culture that could enable the population to acquire those products quickly. The economic crisis that would result from the Stock Market Crash of 1929 resulted mainly from the high availability of products in contrast to lower demand.

To succeed and be assimilated by other industries, the Fordist model – in which there was a rationing of time aiming for bigger profit and the need to expand sales – needed that other countries also were open to accepting a model of society aligned with these interests. Among the European nations there was already a liberal and capitalist tradition that paved the way for the Fordist model consolidation. Plan Marshall’s resources and its entire technical and ideological structure would be widely accepted in Europe, which would get closer to the “Americanist” model. The US foreign aid program for the reconstruction of Europe after World War II had specific aspects and directions, since European economies were already sustained on solid liberal ground. The Alliance for Progress provided not only financial resources for the recovery of the economy and industry but also technical assistance for them. In Latin America, however, the situation of liberal economies was different.

Despite long processes of rupture with the former European colonies through independence movements and the rise of republican politicians, Latin American countries had coexisted with reminiscences of oligarchic structures and conservative social organizations, which opposed the existence of a social order based on modern liberalism and democratic appeals. It was not, by any means, a territory where the United States model would be easily accepted, as it would need to duel with political forces willing to make concessions, but not to have their privileges – based mainly on land property heritage – threatened.

The difficulty of penetrating “Americanism” in Latin America, to consolidate the United States hegemony in the region, appears in the performance of the Alliance for Progress

on the continent. The cooperation program aimed to subsidize modernization projects designed by local governments to encourage, through donations and loans in dollars and national currencies, the development of the region, considered backward regarding the Western international capitalist system. John F. Kennedy's government approved an investment of 20 billion dollars for the program, which was intended for infrastructure improvements, and agrarian, educational, and technical reforms to raise the levels of development in Latin America (RIBEIRO, 2008).

In 1962, Lincoln Gordon was at the University of Manaus, in Amazonas, to promote the program, until then, timidly accepted in Brazil. In front of students critical to the interests of the Alliance, holding posters against the United States imperialism, Gordon was interrogated incisively about the program's intentions in Brazil and Latin America. One of the students asked him why such large funding was only thought of after the success of the revolutionary movement led by Fidel Castro in 1959's Cuba when this type of foreign aid had been required long before.⁴ This questioning shed light on the main *raison d'être* of the Alliance for Progress: it was a political instrument of the fight against communism in the West.

The program's intention, therefore, was to invest in the modernization of Latin America since Washington believed that the Cuban situation until 1959 was common to the entire region. Latin American countries suffered from social structures considered outdated, problematic work relations, an alarming social inequality, and a mass of poor people in the agricultural zones, where relations analogous to slavery coexisted with a considered incomplete capitalist system. According to the analysis of US policymakers, the combination of these elements was an attraction for communist movements, of which Cuba was an example (FICO, 2008). At a certain point, the Alliance gave up its already fragile humanitarian intentions of equality expansion to assume a full political face, indiscriminately financing forces aligned with US politics without any concern about the destination of the investments, as long as they guaranteed the strengthening of the United States hegemony.

⁴ BRUBECK, W. H. Ambassador Gordon defends US against misconceptions in meeting with university students in Brazil's Amazon. *Opening the Archives: Documenting U.S.-Brazil Relations, 1960s-80s*. Brown Digital Repository. <https://repository.library.brown.edu/studio/item/bdr:669002/>.

For our debate, we should remember that the Alliance for Progress is part of an effort that has mobilized various intellectuals to think of methods for the expansion of “Americanism”, hence the hegemony of the United States. The so-called Theories of Modernization, whose greatest exponent was W. W. Rostow, argued that it must be created economic and social conditions in underdeveloped countries to make them “take off” in the direction of international capitalism. Any failure in this direction represented, according to these theories, an example of the inferiority of certain nations vis-à-vis the United States, which could justify more incisive actions of Washington to force the way toward modern capitalist liberalism, seen as a natural evolutionary outcome. To avoid frustration, it was important to think of ways to disseminate liberal ideas along with a culture in tune with the United States’ proposal. As a world power, the country had the pretension of leading this process, which would fatally bring other countries to its orbit and extend its hegemony. At the same time, this would reduce the Soviet perimeter of influence and thus be a weapon in the fight against international communism (LARA, 2019). For intending to apply what he called a “pacific revolution of liberal order”, Rostow became known as the anti-Marx (BELMONTE, 2010).

Gordon, as ambassador of the US in Brazil, had an important role in seeking to consolidate this strategy designed by Rostow and other modernization theorists. As we will see next, he was engaged in spreading the Alliance for Progress as a humanitarian project for development, articulating Latin American and United States cultures, and foreseeing the program’s actions as movements of a pacific revolutionary process. We will also see his impetus in defending a modernization system based on the active participation of private companies as the most appropriate way to accomplish this goal. His speeches were deeply based on a proposal of building the United States’ hegemony.

Lincoln Gordon: a brief biography of his political trajectory

Abraham Lincoln Gordon was a New Yorker born in 1913, the son of parents enthusiastic about the cultural atmosphere of the United States East Coast in the early twentieth century, where progressive ideas of the welfare state seeking to rescue primary

principles of liberalism, merged to the strong aristocratic presence still persistent in the region and set in the industrialist visceral capitalism. Since school, Gordon had a strong inclination to topics related to the liberal culture, which intensified after he entered Harvard, where he received his bachelor's degree in 1933. Afterward, he obtained a doctorate in economics from the University of Oxford, in England. His knowledge of the European economy would be central to the execution of the Marshall Plan at the end of World War II (SMITH, 2015).

The Marshall Plan's success led Gordon to join the group of diplomats invited by Kennedy to become part of the government. The then President, who authorized the Alliance for Progress in 1961, was determined to win the Cold War and lead the US to conquer a complete international hegemony by defeating Soviet communism. Surrounded by modernization theorists, JFK insisted that modern liberal principles paved the way for the program's transformative proposal which should be driven by capitalism. Gordon, who shared this thought, was not only one of the names called to put the Alliance into execution –to repeat the success of the Marshall Plan – but was also eventually appointed ambassador of the US in Brazil, where he would strive for the success of the program in the country (GIGLIO; RABE, 2003).

The experience as a Marshall planner moved Gordon, accompanied by other members of the Alliance for Progress force-task, to argue that Latin America had long deserved a modernization program. He emphasized the term modernization because, in contrast to what happened in Europe, Latin American countries had different problems. European nations needed the Marshall Plan to recover after World War II, but they were already industrially and economically developed countries under contemporary capitalism so that the resources invested by the US would fulfill the purpose of accelerating the economic recovery of the continent and driving it away from revolutionary communist threats. In Latin America, the situation would be much more complex, as the countries of the region did not have a modern liberal culture ingrained – at least not in the terms desired by Washington (LARA, 2019).

Gordon, as well as other cabinet colleagues, had studied Latin America closely throughout their academic careers. Imbued with a strong anticommunism, the diplomat centered the role of the Alliance for Progress in a process that foresaw the ascension of communist revolutionary movements caused by an irregular presence of liberalism in Latin

America. He noted that the program needed strong humanitarian content that could cover its political proposal (LARA, 2019). Therefore, the Alliance needed to be very well grounded theoretically, although he believed that foreign aid resources would attract the sympathy of Latin American political leaders quickly, which did not happen at such a fast pace. The impatience about this certainly resulted in more abrupt movements by the US, such as open support for military coups – Gordon was one of the great enthusiasts and articulators of the rupture in Brazil in 1964 (FICO, 2008).

Gordon's entire intellectual background was based on energetic liberal formulations, such as those of John Maynard Keynes, and an enthusiastic preference for the New Deal. He believed that economic intellectual action should merge incisive political actions on the part of governments with an allegedly efficient logic of private corporatism. Only in this way, he believed, would it be possible not only to resolve economic crises, but to do so from an expansion of the liberal and, above all, Fordist culture. He increasingly outlined the understanding that only the model of society presented by the US would save developing countries from communist attacks (SMITH, 2015).

Michael J. Hogan, a historian who dealt with the history of US international relations, shows that the Marshals-planners, including Gordon, believed that the vision of the New Deal as an instrument for economic growth raised the United States to a prominent position in the post-war global scenery. In this sense, economic growth was adjusted to social harmony, and both walked side by side to culminate in proposals of international development. Therefore, as a power nation, the US embodied its forces to intervene overseas through the Marshall Plan, already trying the potential of its instruments of hegemonic diffusion, which would later be put back to the test with the Alliance for Progress in Latin America (HOGAN, 1987).

In general terms, we can assume that Lincoln Gordon was a diplomat interested in the dissemination of “Americanist” liberal ideas, that is, ideas singular to the American model of capitalist liberalism that, by reaching new territories, would guarantee the prominence of American international hegemony. At the same time, this would consequently make the supposed Soviet expansion campaign unfeasible, complying with the yearnings of this “cold warrior” who believed to have the mission to save the West from communism. His idealism was in line with the United States' orthodox perspective, composed of intellectuals whose

arguments pointed to the USSR as responsible for the Cold War episodes of tension, while the U.S.A. only organized itself to contain this threat. At the same time, it had corporatist traces. There was room for the idea that the interest of domestic institutions (in this case, the liberal business community and the US private capital) drove and often governed the United States foreign policy against communism (MUNHOZ, 2020). Therefore, the international relations kept by the US government should not only preserve the country's national security, its economy, and its model of society: it should make it the rule, an exportation model that would ensure the flourishing of conditions to consolidate the international hegemony of the United States. The Alliance for Progress would be seen by many analysts as an effort to do so.

One of the means to accomplish this would be the exportation of a culture of consumption allied to a new growing production culture: Fordism. Therefore, the importance of insisting on the dissemination of private companies was essential. Gordon, coming to Latin America and Brazil to present the Alliance for Progress, and making a sort of lobby, is incisive when underlining the relevance of the role of private industry for the success of the program, hence for the modernization. His statements on the strategy designed for foreign aid often explain this, which provides us with indications about his role as an organic intellectual investing in the construction of the United States' international hegemony. Upon being nominated US Ambassador in Brazil, he became a key player in consolidating a channel of approach between Brasilia and Washington – at least at first – opened by the Alliance for Progress.

An intellectual at the service of “Americanism”: Lincoln Gordon and the Alliance for Progress in Brazil

The Sardinian revolutionary philosopher Antonio Gramsci (1999), when discussing the role of intellectuals in the class struggle, presents us with two important categories: traditional and organic intellectuals. The first ones are associated with long-established institutions in modern societies, such as the church, the army, academia, and legal institutions, among others, in which a few subjects participate. Organic intellectuals, on the other hand,

originate from a specific social class, which they defend through their discursive and political elaborations, becoming a kind of ideological spokesman for the interests of their class.

The ideology – here understood as the set of structures (symbolic, cultural, and mental) that govern social behavior, responsible for preserving an interesting social dynamic to the privileges of the ruling class, that is, a class hegemony – is one of the central elements for class struggles, according to Gramsci (1999). Through it, the dominant class organizes the collective and consolidates its power by making use of an established consensus on consumption, forms of production, and income distribution, among other elements fundamental to a particular type of society functional to this class. The organic intellectual has an essential role in this process.

They are crucial for the construction of hegemonic projects of class – which, in our case, extends to a sphere of greater domination, comprising the international level. The intellectual has the role of not only influencing but organizing society to preserve or ground the foundation where their social class and its interests (which they are tied to) will be based on. Their role is visible by acting as a mediator between social classes and the State (LIMA, 2021). It is, therefore, organizational, in the field of production, culture, in public and private administration, or politics. Thus, the intellectual not only thinks and creates formulations to collaborate with decisions or political actions that preserve the interests of a social class: but he is also an active agent, who organizes the necessary structures for this (GRAMSCI, 1999). They connect the interests of a class and the complex web of its relations with other classes and countries.

With that in mind, we must pay attention to the fact that:

The construction of consensus around one or another idea involves the performance of the intellectual, according to the interests of the worldview that he represents. Therefore, its connective-organizational role will “sew” these interests to foreign policy actions, giving it cohesion and amplitude. This sewing is made, not only before the civil society, in its dialogues with the population, but also before the political society itself, in the making of the general orientation that will be passed to new diplomats who will embody the Brazilian external politics (LIMA, 2020, p. 108).

Gramsci’s (1999) concept of hegemony is also of great importance for our study. By bringing this concept, we are alluding to the form of ideological domination of one

(dominant) class over another (subaltern) class that occurs through one or more channels of ideological diffusion (such as media, cultural productions, and symbolic references), until the whole society identifies the interests of the hegemonic class as the interests of all classes. At the national level, it is revealed in the way that, for example, the culture of the ruling class predominates in such a way that even the subaltern class recognizes it and its common denominators as examples to be followed. At the international level, it is the interests of a particular country (in this case, the United States) that spread over others (here, Brazil) searching to create a relationship of dominance and subordination. This was a common practice for the United States during the Cold War.

Lincoln Gordon is, from our point of view, an example of an intellectual because he is engaged in defending the interests of the United States to tune Brazilian aspirations to the ones of his country. With this, he adapts the dominant class-subaltern class relationship existing in his own country to an international dynamic, in which the US dominates, and Brazil is subject to its domination or is targeted by it. At the top of this relationship is the US ruling class, which would benefit greatly from the strengthening of US international hegemony.

As we have seen, all of Gordon's academic training was made under the aegis of liberal thought and the idea of combating communism through the diffusion of principles of liberalism. At the height of the Cold War, this was at the heart of Gordon's diplomatic profile and mobilized his efforts both in building the Alliance for Progress and in operating the program in Brazil, the country to which he had been appointed Ambassador. He was therefore a member of a dominant social class in the US that, in turn, wished to extend an ideological, social, and economic control beyond borders under the cloak of foreign aid for modernization purposes.

His book "The Progress Through the Alliance", published in Brazil in 1962, is a synthesis of his political thinking during the Cold War, of how foreign aid should support the consolidation of modern liberalism through the private capital of transnational companies, especially the ones from the US with interests in the country. The book is divided into eight chapters: Brazil and the Alliance for Progress; Benefits for the People; Spirit and Goals; The Philosophy of a Program; Development and the Democratic Revolution; Reconstruction of

the Educational Structures; and The Free Initiative and the Alliance for Progress and the productive tensions in the development of the Western Hemisphere. For our analysis, we will focus on four of them: chapters one, three, five, and seven.

In the first chapter, Brazil and the Alliance for Progress, Gordon reinforces that the program is one of the safest paths to Brazilian political stability, compromised since the resignation of Jânio Quadros, in 1961, and the inauguration of João Goulart in the same year. Suspecting Goulart, Gordon sheds light on the fact that radical reforms, such as those proposed by the then-Brazilian President, further threatened the security of fragile national democratic institutions, which could be properly repaired with foreign aid investments supported by the assistance of private industry and the development of liberal capital. While presenting the program, he fits it in a singular perspective through which the Brazilian culture would be associated with US culture, highlighting the similarities and forgetting the differences between the two countries. It is, in short, an appeal to the Brazilian ruling class to forget Goulart's reformism and embrace the moderate reformism of the "peaceful revolution" that the Alliance would bring.

In chapter three, "Spirit and goals", the diplomat underlines the humanitarian intention of the Alliance when arguing that the program would develop Brazil and it would lead it to overcome its oligarchical structures. According to him, this is one of the indispensable missions of the initiative and it should happen through the social changes promoted by modernization, which, in turn, should oversee international private industrial capital. He is categorical about this when stating that

Wherever this [the Alliance actions] is possible, I would like to see private foreign investments take the form of mixed enterprises with Latin American capital. This would not only reinforce the already strong principle of association of joint enterprises but would also help the faster diffusion of modern techniques.⁵

The diffusion of techniques capable of modernizing the economy, hence society, from Gordon's point of view, could be feasible because of private investments in Latin America. This would gradually lead to mixed companies – public-private capital – gaining a specific

⁵ GORDON, Lincoln. **O Progresso pela Aliança**. São Paulo: Record, 1962, p. 35.

way of acting, in tune with what Gordon and the US policymakers understood as modern behavior. This, as we will see, is summarized by the idea that private capital should be the hallmark of the Alliance for Progress's investments, and the diffusion of this type of company in Latin America should be its heritage.

Gordon points this out in chapter five, "Development and the Democratic Revolution" when saying that "with only a few remnants of European imperialism that are rapidly disappearing, Western Europe is today enjoying a new and appreciable phase of development" (1962, p. 59). That is, the new phase of development, which would guarantee the import of the American way of life, overlapped the old imperialist political model that had led the world to two wars. Therefore, the investments of the Marshall Plan had placed capitalist Europe on a new level of development; so why wouldn't this work in Brazil?

At the same time, he assures that the change towards a "democratic revolution" – permanent, liberal, capitalist, and supposedly peaceful, in opposition to the communist revolution – did not intend to allow drastic changes in the foundations of Brazilian society. Not coincidentally, Gordon appealed to what, in his view, Brazil and the United States shared culturally, saying that "throughout this process of social and economic transformation", a consequence of the investments of the Marshall Plan, "certain basic moral and political values remained intact. Moral values are those of Christian civilization and respect for the dignity of every human being".⁶ Important values not only to the United States Constitution but also its culture. Therefore, he sought an approach channel that could later be extended to create a greater bond that would allow Brazil to be closer to the US.

It is essential to understand that American diplomacy at the time, greatly influenced by the modernization theorists from which JFK surrounded himself, perceived the US as a power not only economically and politically, but culturally developed to the point of recognizing itself to other nations, especially American ones. The Alliance for Progress and its theoretical foundation were impregnated with the idea that any negative result for foreign aid could only be explained by particular conditions of each beneficiary country, inapt, for some reason, to adopt models of society considered by the United States as modern and developed (PACKENHAN, 1973). The potential to supply conditions for the full performance of the

⁶ GORDON, Lincoln. **O Progresso pela Aliança**. São Paulo: Record, 1962, p. 59.

private initiative was seen by these political agents as characteristics of an inclination to development, which, if did not exist, should be stimulated in some way.

In the chapter “The Free Initiative and the Alliance for Progress”, Gordon converges efforts to defend this thesis. For him, in summary, it was clear that the development and modernization of countries like Brazil could only be achieved through the expansion of the private business sector, which could develop a new productive and consumerist culture consistent with the reality of international capitalism – not coincidentally, the one based on the echoes of Fordism. Gordon insists that there is an excessive presence of “public affairs” in Brazil and that this was a problem that the Alliance would solve, once the action of private companies in solving problems not solved by the State became more common. In this sense, he states that “the modern point of view affirms that companies are an organization for a defined social purpose”, that is, they have a kind of modernizing mission. Thus, “this modern point of view places in high priority the productivity in constant increase”⁷, thus requiring creating space for new consumer markets imbued with new standards of consumption.

The book published by Gordon is the summary of his thinking around the purposes of the Alliance for Progress: a program that should work for the expansion of the United States hegemony, making the Western bloc cohesive, seeking the formal alignment of Brazil and Latin America. For this, the diplomat and the program sought to establish connections with Brazil aiming at the acceptance of the program, but in what way? Trying to bring cultural elements of Brazil and the United States closer to one another and then insisting that this would facilitate the promotion of “Americanism” in the region. The means to achieve this would be the diffusion of private companies, leveled to the absolute models of modernization of society, replacing the role of the State and guaranteeing the formation of cultural and economic ideas utilitarian to the US interests in the Cold War, while also guaranteeing an obstacle to any Soviet expansionist ambition.

Conclusions

⁷ GORDON, Lincoln. **O Progresso pela Aliança**. São Paulo: Record, 1962, p. 89.

Our purpose in this article was not, under any circumstances, to exhaust this study object. On the contrary: our goal was to open the way for new possibilities to understand the Brazil-United States relations during the Cold War. These are, therefore, partial and still precarious analyses and affirmations that require development. It is an invitation to analyze the relations between the two countries based on Antonio Gramsci's thought and its categories, especially the intellectual.

As we have seen, Lincoln Gordon, a United States diplomat and member of the task force that put the Alliance for Progress into practice, fits perfectly into this category. He is an intellectual acting on behalf of a social class and a model of society that should be implemented as a way of combating Soviet communism, a model organized by the ruling class. Therefore, the Alliance became an instrument to accomplish this under the veil of foreign humanitarian aid. Gordon unites all the time the interests of the private capital, intrinsic to his social class and the "Americanist" project and to modernization, supposedly the main end of the program, which in fact created conditions to enforce the United States' international hegemony.

We know that the concept of "Americanism" was coined by Gramsci at the time that Fordism gained force as an industrial model of production, so it can be pointed out as a dated explanatory key. However, we believe in a continuous effort for the dissemination of this model that the 1960s used the Alliance for Progress as a bridge to reach the least developed capitalist nations in Latin America, as the Marshall Plan had done with the countries of developed industrialization in Europe. Therefore, "Americanism" was one of the many instances that were used, in the long run, to raise the United States hegemony.

Since his early years as a US Ambassador to Brazil, Lincoln Gordon has behaved as a spokesman for his class, his country, and his peers, first when traveling throughout Brazil disseminating the ideals of the Alliance for Progress and then when writing the book analyzed throughout this work. In this book, he summarizes the purposes of the Alliance and associates them to expand the socioeconomic culture of the United States, something to be consolidated through the diffusion of private business systems that could broaden the scope of modern liberalism. All this, at the same time, under the justification of the fight against communism.

Through his book and efforts as an ambassador – such as having been one of the protagonists of the Brazilian 1964 coup on the United States side, that supported the rupture –, we can see his contribution to the search for the “American century”, that is, for the consolidation of the United States international hegemony that should be achieved with the importation of its liberal model into the world. We see more specifically how this happened concerning Brazil. The fight against Soviet communism, which was the backdrop to this process, explicit the projections of the Alliance for Progress in Brazil: to become a means to build structures interesting for Washington’s power.

References

- BELMONTE, L. A. **Selling the American way: U.S. propaganda and the Cold War.** Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.
- FICO, Carlos. **O Grande Irmão: da operação Brother Sam aos anos de chumbo – O governo dos Estados Unidos e a ditadura militar brasileira.** Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2008.
- GIGLIO, J. N.; RABE, S. G. **Debating the Kennedy Presidency.** New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003.
- GRAMSCI, Antonio. **Americanismo e fordismo.** São Paulo: Hedra, 2008.
- GRAMSCI, Antonio. **Cadernos do cárcere.** Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1999.
- HOGAN, Michael J. **The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- LARA, José V de. **Revolução às margens do capitalismo: a Aliança Para o Progresso no Nordeste do Brasil, 1961-1964.** Dissertação de Mestrado. Maringá: UEM, 2019.

LIMA, Beatriz M. (2021). O Ministro das Relações Exteriores como intelectual orgânico: formulação e direção. In: MATHIAS, Meire (Org.). **Nexos Latinos**. São Paulo: Lutas Anticapital, 2021, p. 293-326.

LIMA, Beatriz M. **O papel do intelectual orgânico na construção da política externa brasileira**: diferentes perspectivas para a América Latina (2001-2010). Dissertação de Mestrado. Maringá: UEM, 2020.

MUNHOZ, Sidnei J. **Guerra Fria**: história e historiografia. Curitiba: Editora Appris, 2020.

PACKENHAN, R. A. **Liberal America and the Third World**: political development ideas in foreign aid and Social Science. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

RIBEIRO, Ricardo A. As origens da Aliança Para o Progresso. In: SRAINE, A. (Org.). **Estado, desenvolvimento e políticas públicas**. São Paulo: Editora Unijuí, 2008, p. 319-362.

SMITH, B. L. R. **Lincoln Gordon**: Architect of Cold War Foreign Policy. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 2015.