
Global Circuits of Blackness

Interrogating the
African Diaspora

Edited by
**JEAN MUTEBA RAHIER,
PERCY C. HINTZEN,
AND FELIPE SMITH**

UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS PRESS
Urbana, Chicago,
and Springfield

2010

7

Amy Jacques Garvey, Theodore Bilbo, and the Paradoxes of Black Nationalism

REENA N. GOLDTHREE

Liberty is a synonym of independence and self-government. And only when we too have created states, built the nations and erected the governments comparable to those of other men, can we honestly hope to erase the stigma of inferiority.

—Amy Jacques Garvey, “The Language of Freedom”

Surveying the sociopolitical landscape from her home in Kingston, Jamaica, in 1944, Amy Jacques Garvey (1895–1973) assessed the fate of black people in a dynamic “world under demolition and re-construction” (1944b:5, 16). For Jacques Garvey, the widow of Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) cofounder Marcus Garvey and a seasoned journalist and activist in her own right, the world under demolition was shaped by the entangled histories of slavery, imperialism, and racial oppression. The nascent postwar world under reconstruction, however, was one that held much promise for Africans and the Afro-descended. Jacques Garvey believed the hardships, dislocations, and destruction engendered by the Second World War had fortuitously “set in motion a leveling process” (1944a:7) that offered unprecedented opportunities for black people in Africa and the Americas to secure political and economic freedom. “It is a historical fact that no matter how peoples are oppressed and held in subjection, providence always provides such events as wars to make opportunities for their emergence,” she surmised with characteristic aplomb (Jacques Garvey 1944m). Because black troops from Africa, the United States, and the Caribbean had fought to “liberate enslaved Europe and to break the Imperialistic might of Japan” (Jacques Garvey 1944a), the nations of Europe owed a tremendous debt to their black colonial subjects. Equally as important, the rhetoric of self-determination and democracy in the Allies’ wartime declarations—particularly the Atlantic Charter—provided a moral and political

space for Africans and the Afro-descended to critique colonialism and racial discrimination.

The Atlantic Charter and the (Re)Emergence of Transnational Black Activism

The Atlantic Charter, more than any other wartime declaration and perhaps more than any event, with the exception of Italy’s invasion of Ethiopia in 1935, galvanized African and Afro-descended opponents of colonialism and the color line. Issued jointly by Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill in August 1941, the Atlantic Charter simultaneously outlined the Allies’ strategic war aims and offered a lofty blueprint for a new liberal democratic order. In idealistic moral language reminiscent of Woodrow Wilson’s pronouncements during the First World War, Churchill and Roosevelt declared that the Atlantic Charter was a document in which all human beings could “base their hopes for a better future for the world” (Rosenman 1950:314). The concise 375-word declaration stressed that Britain and the United States would not pursue territorial aggrandizement, and emphasized that the two nations sought to establish a peaceful world in which all peoples could trade, travel, and live in “freedom from fear and want” (Rosenman 1950:314). The eight-point declaration also suggested that Britain and the United States would promote international disarmament and economic advancement for all nations of the world.

Though historians and political scientists have traditionally stressed the diplomatic significance of the Charter, noting that it functioned as a public expression of Anglo-American solidarity five months before the United States’ official entry into the Second World War and ultimately served as the basis for the United Nations Organization Charter in 1945 (Brinkley and Facey-Crowther 1994; Hatcho 2003), scholars of postwar anticolonial movements have examined the Charter’s impact on black and brown activists around the globe. As Immanuel Geiss argues in his seminal study of Pan-Africanism, the Atlantic Charter had a “particularly electrifying effect” (1974:365) on the resurgent Pan-African movement during the war years. It was the Charter’s third point that garnered sustained attention from Africans and the Afro-descended, as it raised crucial questions about the future of Britain’s colonies. Point three of the Charter affirmed the “right of all people to choose the form of government under which they live” and stated that Britain and the United States desired to restore “sovereign rights and self government . . . to those who have been forcibly deprived of them” (Rosenman 1950:314). Given Britain’s vast colonial empire in Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean, the third point of the Atlantic Charter stirred the hopes of nationalists from Nigeria to New Delhi. Seeking to quell burgeoning aspirations for self-determination among British colonials in Asia and Africa,

Churchill announced before Parliament in September 1941 that the Atlantic Charter was not "applicable to Coloured Races in colonial empire, and that the restoration of sovereignty, self government, and national life is applicable only to the States and Nations of Europe" (Louis 1978:121–30). Fourteen months later, in November 1942, he unequivocally declared his position on decolonization: "I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire" (Churchill 1943:268). Churchill's brazen refusal to extend the provisions of the Atlantic Charter beyond the continent of Europe provoked the ire of Africans and the Afro-descended and raised suspicions that their wartime sacrifices had been in vain (Cayton 1942; Ottley 1943; Reddick 1943).

Stirred by wartime pronouncements such as the Atlantic Charter and the unprecedented scale of the war effort (including the mobilization of millions of African and Afro-descended soldiers worldwide) during the Second World War, black activist-intellectuals forged dense transnational political networks and articulated a Pan-Africanist discourse that linked the subjugation of black colonials in Africa and the Caribbean to the plight of racially marginalized Afro-descendants in Latin America and the United States (Geiss 1974; Von Eschon 1997). Nurtured by a vibrant exchange of English- and French-language newspapers, manifestos, petitions, and letters from major printing centers in New York, Chicago, Paris, London, Lagos, Fort-de-France, and Kingston, these networks underscored the symbiotic relationship between national and international political struggles. Thus, as the Allied and Axis powers fought to determine which nations would dominate the modern landscape, Africans and the Afro-descended demanded that the Allies' promises of democracy and national sovereignty be extended to black people throughout the world. Heralding this period of militancy and anticolonial fervor, one commentator proclaimed: "All over the world the peoples of color are aroused . . . to the *Imperium* of the white nations. Once they were filled with terror at the white man's power; today they know that they themselves are power" (Tate 1943:521).

Encouraged by the fevered political mobilization sparked by World War II, Jacques Garvey challenged black activists in the Americas to move beyond "local palliatives" (1944n) and to refocus their efforts outward—toward the rehabilitation and redemption of Africa. Situating Africa at the "nerve center" of the black world, she contended that the "redemption of Africa" was the only way to ameliorate the "ills of all Africans and people of African descent everywhere" (1944n). Insisting that the redemption of Africa would need the support of "all peoples of African blood," Jacques Garvey solicited assistance from veteran leaders such as Nnamdi Azikiwe, George Padmore, W. E. B. Du Bois, A. Phillip Randolph, and Max Yergan. In a moment of such unprecedented opportunity for Africans and the Afro-descended, it was time to "sound the clarion call . . .

for Unity of Purpose, respect for each other's efforts, and co-operation in all undertakings" (Jacques Garvey 1944e).

But as Jacques Garvey reached out to the "Racial Stalwarts" of the black world, she also covertly reestablished contact with a powerful white ally—Theodore Bilbo. An unabashed white supremacist and Democratic senator from the state of Mississippi, Bilbo had once remarked that the "white race [had] founded all civilizations worthwhile" (U.S. Congressional Record 1938, vol. 83:84). Anathema to the civil rights establishment in the United States—the NAACP maintained a lengthy file on the senator throughout his career—Bilbo was denounced for opposing a federal antilynching bill and being a former member of the Ku Klux Klan. His racist rhetoric only increased during the Second World War, as he lobbied against the creation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission and urged his fellow Mississippians to "draw the color line tighter" (Smith 1983:132). Nevertheless, Bilbo and Jacques Garvey found common cause in the fight for "race integrity" (Jacques Garvey 1944o). Like Bilbo, Jacques Garvey opposed racial integration and believed that voluntary emigration to Africa would allow black Americans to help develop the continent while providing a better life for themselves. Thus, when Jacques Garvey learned that Bilbo was reintroducing the Greater Liberia Act, a piece of congressional legislation that called for the United States to allocate millions of dollars for the purpose of establishing an independent nation for blacks in West Africa, she immediately offered him her support. Encouraging Bilbo to publicize the bill as the "answer to the Negro soldier's prayer," Jacques Garvey (1944o) provided the senator with a detailed strategy for garnering black support. During the entire period of the war, she insisted that the Greater Liberia Act was "the best measure proposed in recent years to solve the vexed problem of Black and White in America" (1944o).

Even in the context of the remarkably fluid politics of the early 1940s, Jacques Garvey's willingness to collaborate simultaneously with men as different as Theodore Bilbo and W. E. B. Du Bois was unusual. Jacques Garvey, however, repeatedly explained her overtures to Bilbo and others as part of a comprehensive campaign for the "rehabilitation of Africa" (1944c; 1944e; 1944n). Yet, what did she mean when she lobbied for the "rehabilitation of Africa" and how could her plan to rehabilitate the continent incorporate such different political actors? In her vision of a "redeemed Africa," how did she imagine the plight of all peoples of African descent (both historically and in the postwar period)?

For the purpose of excavating Amy Jacques Garvey's vision of a rehabilitated Africa and to understand better her controversial political praxis, this essay offers a close reading of an array of anticolonial works she produced between 1944 and 1946. While studies of 1940s Pan-Africanism rarely acknowledge Jacques Garvey's numerous contributions, her political thought serves as an excellent window into the competing understandings of race and nation among black ac-

tivists during the World War II years. A rich body of social science and historical literature has analyzed the ways in which the Second World War prompted new understandings of race and nation among European and American intellectuals (Baker 1998; Jackson and Weidman 2005; R. King 2004; Smedley 1999). Yet, few scholars have probed the ways in which Africans and the Afro-descended grappled with new universalist conceptions of race during the 1940s or how these ideas impacted longstanding debates about integration versus separatism. This article suggests that unlike Du Bois and other Pan-African leaders, Amy Jacques Garvey held fast to a biological conception of race and campaigned for racial equality as well as racial autonomy. Indeed, Jacques Garvey's major contribution to the 1940s Pan-African movement was her insistence that racial liberation could, and should, be achieved without racial assimilation. For her, freedom not only meant political independence and full equality but racial autonomy as well. Fearful that interracial anticolonial alliances among Asian and African colonized peoples would promote the cause of Asian decolonization at the expense of the liberation of Africa, she disregarded the promise of interracial solidarity. Instead Jacques Garvey reasoned that interracial cooperation could only occur after each race had achieved an equal position in the global arena.

Jacques Garvey's political outlook fits most clearly within the black nationalist intellectual tradition (Moses 1996).¹ Specifically, she articulated a form of black nationalism closely associated with Marcus Garvey and the UNIA. As a particular manifestation of Pan-Africanist thought, New World black nationalism "emerges from and circulates in direct opposition to the racism of existing states" (Carr 2002:6). As Wahneema Lubiano suggests, black nationalism is "the activation of a narrative of identity and interests" that posits a common past, present, and future for all Africans and Afro-descendants. It can function as a "utopian narrative," a "narrative of political history," or a form of "ongoing, ever-renewed critique" of black exploitation at the hands of Europeans (Lubiano 1997:233). Manifestations of black nationalism in general, and the Garvey movement in particular, have traditionally emphasized black "racial solidarity, cultural specificity, religious, economic, and political separatism" (Lubiano 1997:234).

Lubiano's insights on black nationalism, although articulated in reference to black nationalism in the United States, can be employed profitably to understand black nationalism among Afro-descendants in the Americas more generally. As a lifelong black nationalist and Garveyite, Jacques Garvey not only advocated racial unity, but racial separatism—arguing that Africans and Afro-descendants should maintain their own cultural and economic institutions. Throughout World War II, she labored politically to construct a form of "African" racial identity that would emphasize the social, economic, and historical commonalities between black peoples in Africa and its diaspora. When Jacques Garvey repeatedly described all black people as "precious African links

of a mighty chain" (1944d; 1981), she made the case that blacks in all parts of the world were inextricably and irreversibly linked. For her, Africans and the Afro-descended were united because of their common oppression *and* connected through their "African blood." Articulating an essentialist conception of race rooted in biology and the North American "one-drop rule," she contended that "Africans (100% and 1%)" (1944d; 1981) were part of the same people. Yet, it was Jacques Garvey's acceptance of European notions of race as a biological category and the nation-state as a racially homogeneous entity that led her to challenge the Eurocentric focus of the Atlantic Charter by collaborating with an infamous white American racist.

Reassessing Jacques Garvey's Intellectual Legacy

As Robin Kelley perceptively notes, "The dream of African liberation comes to us largely as a male dream of armies liberating the motherland from their imperialist adversaries" (2002:136). Black women's "freedom dreams" have received insufficient attention in studies of radical black politics in general, or the Pan-African movement in particular. Thankfully, over the past three decades, revisionist historians and feminist scholars have increasingly explored Jacques Garvey's international work on behalf of Africans and the Afro-descended in order to shed new light on the role of black women in local and transnational politics (Martin 1991; McDuffie 2006; U. Taylor 2003). Moving beyond myopic Marcus Garvey-centered studies of the UNIA and Garveyism, scholars have documented women's extensive contributions to the movement (Martin 1991), fruitfully explored the gendered discourse and praxis of the UNIA (Bair 1992; U. Taylor 2002), and acknowledged Jacques Garvey as one of Garveyism's "key architects" (Adler 1992:346). The bulk of this important work concentrates on the pithy editorials Jacques Garvey penned in the women's page of the *Negro World* between 1924 and 1927 and highlights her scathing critique of the UNIA's male-dominated hierarchy (Adler 1992; Broussard 2004; James 1998; Matthews 1979; U. Taylor 2002). Yet, if she was a "community feminist" (U. Taylor 2000; U. Taylor 2002) in the 1920s, her trailblazing efforts to shed light on the plight of black women had largely dissipated by World War II. Indeed, as Jacques Garvey's biographer Ula Taylor concedes, "by 1940s, gender-specific discussions in Jacques Garvey's writings were minimal" (U. Taylor 2002:176).

Despite assertions that Jacques Garvey was a "lifelong advocate of social justice" (Adler 1992:346), there are few systematic studies of her writings during her three decades of political activism after Marcus Garvey's death in 1940. The dearth of scholarly interest in her voluminous writings and personal correspondences from the 1940s stands in sharp contrast to the numerous treatments of her *Negro World*

editorials (for example, Adler 1992; Broussard 2004; James 1998; Matthews 1979; U. Taylor 2000). Yet, the years during and immediately after the Second World War were some of Jacques Garvey's most prolific and were a key period in her political and intellectual development. Thus, it is essential that scholars also grapple with her many writings that followed her husband's death, because her efforts during the war reveal the evolution of Garveyism after the "golden age" of the UNIA.

The handful of scholars who have taken note of Jacques Garvey's participation in Pan-African efforts during the 1940s either focus on her role in convening the landmark 1945 Pan-African Congress—without tackling the complex question of her ideological stance in relation to the larger movement—or underestimate her unique intellectual contribution to the development of Pan-Africanism by failing to acknowledge her controversial racial views. Consequently, we know almost nothing about the ways in which Jacques Garvey's analysis of the postwar political milieu differed from that of her better-known contemporaries. For example, Imanuel Geiss (1974), David Levering Lewis (2000), and Rupert Lewis and Maureen Warner-Lewis (1987) all chronicle Jacques Garvey's political initiatives during the 1940s without providing a systematic analysis of her extensive published or private writings.

In contrast, historians Penny Von Eschon (1997) and Ula Taylor (2002) grapple with Jacques Garvey's political engagements during the 1940s and reconstruct her intellectual exchanges with fellow black activists. However, neither scholar thoroughly explores how Jacques Garvey's essentialist views of race and desire for an autonomous black nation peopled by Africans and the Afro-descended was at odds with both liberal and leftist visions of the postwar world. As a result, Von Eschon hastily insists that Jacques Garvey's political thought fits squarely within the tradition of liberal Pan-Africanism, that it was in line with that of Du Bois, and that it was ultimately "more accommodationist than anticolonial" (1997:45–46). Taylor (2002) paints a strikingly different, and much more nuanced, picture of Jacques Garvey than Von Eschon and makes the case that her political program fused nationalism and feminism. Discussing Jacques Garvey's political praxis in the 1940s over several chapters, Taylor stresses that they were a "decade of unity" (2002:143) in Jacques Garvey's political career. After Marcus Garvey's death, she suggests that Jacques Garvey became "a team player" (2002:149) within the Pan-African movement, transforming "from an isolated political woman into an organizational player" (2002:184). Thus, Taylor credits Jacques Garvey with elevating the postwar Pan-Africanist "discourse to new heights with her call for 'UNITY'" (2002:4). Problematically however, Taylor takes Jacques Garvey's calls for unity at face value, minimizing the ways in which her bold strategies for the redemption of Africa were often in tension with other Pan-African positions at the time.

Jacques Garvey's advocacy of the Greater Liberia Act, and black nationalism

more generally, often put her at odds with other Pan-African activists. Moreover, her willingness to partner with black rivals during the 1940s does not mean that her feuds with these leaders were no longer salient. Despite the unusually high spirit of cooperation among black activists during the 1940s, major ideological fissures existed within the Pan-African movement. The debate between Pan-Africanists who favored racially exclusive nationalist strategies and those who sought interracial solidarity is highlighted in the divergent responses to the Atlantic Charter.

The Memorandum Correlative: A Black Nationalist Blueprint for the Postwar World

It was nearly three years after the declaration of the Atlantic Charter—and following a desperate plea from Dr. Harold Moody, a prominent Jamaican-born physician and president of the London-based League of Coloured Peoples—when Amy Jacques Garvey began to cogitate a formal response to the pivotal wartime proclamation. Following the death of her husband in 1940, Jacques Garvey had largely receded from her life as an activist and political journalist to devote her full attention to her new role as a single mother of two young sons. Yet, 1944 would mark Jacques Garvey's ambitious return to the world of political journalism and reemergence in the thriving Pan-African movement. In the early months of 1944, she dispatched a series of letters to black leaders in the United States to garner support for her response to the Atlantic Charter—the *Memorandum Correlative*. Seeking support from men who had demonstrated their "interest in Africa and Africans at home and abroad" (1981), she contacted four of black America's most renowned leaders: Du Bois, Adam Clayton Powell Jr., A. Phillip Randolph, and Max Yergan (1944c; 1944e; 1944n; 1981). Realizing that the fate of the postwar world rested with the leaders of the United Nations, Jacques Garvey encouraged each activist to write a memorandum to the Allied powers demanding an African Freedom Council, comprised of both African and European representatives, to oversee the colonies in Africa. Like many other black intellectuals looking forward to the postwar period, Jacques Garvey believed that the service of African and Afro-descended troops in the war and the powerful rhetoric of freedom and democracy in the Atlantic Charter offered real opportunities for Africans and the Afro-descended to challenge European domination and gain political and economic freedom. Because Africans and the Afro-descended had made a material contribution to the war effort, she reasoned, they deserved to be compensated and covered by the Atlantic Charter: "Europe and America should feel constrained to make amends for the exploitation of our lands and labor and black leaders should be ready to demand that repayment come soon and in a tangible form" (1944e).

Jacques Garvey's overtures to Du Bois and Randolph, only four years after her husband's death, seem to underscore the remarkable cooperation of the World War II period and her estrangement from the leadership of the UNIA. Two decades earlier, both Du Bois and Randolph had launched vitriolic attacks against Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association, culminating in Garvey's deportation in 1927. Describing Garvey as a "little, fat black man" (Lewis 2000:78) who was "ugly, but with intelligent eyes and a big head" (Lewis 2000:81), Du Bois warned that Garvey was a dangerous demagogue who threatened to fan the flames of class hatred among black Americans. Although Du Bois was not officially a part of the "Garvey Must Go" campaign, opting not to sign a letter supporting Garvey's immediate deportation, Jacques Garvey believed throughout her life that Du Bois had been "Garvey's No. 1 Enemy" (1963:76) and the "intellectual leader" (1963:143) of anti-Garvey agitation. In contrast to Du Bois, who had always taken a cautious stand toward Garvey, Randolph had initially been a staunch supporter of Garvey and the UNIA. In time, however, he became disillusioned with Garvey's questionable business ventures, spectacular Harlem parades, dictatorial leadership methods, and denunciations of socialism. Declaring acidly that Garvey had "succeeded in making the Negro the laughingstock of the world" (2000:79), Randolph was one of the leaders of the 1922–1923 "Garvey Must Go" deportation campaign and chaired a heated anti-Garvey rally attended by more than two thousand people. Moreover, during the apex of the anti-Garvey effort, both Du Bois and Randolph had not only attacked Garvey's leadership of the UNIA but had also derided the association because of its large number of Caribbean members (James 1998). In the early 1920s, both Du Bois's *Crisis* and Randolph's *Messenger* published articles with a blatant bias against Caribbean immigrants (James 1998; Lewis 2000). Du Bois not only described Garvey as a "West Indian agitator" (2000:62) in a *Crisis* article but also remarked privately that Garvey was the leader of an organization comprised of "the lowest type of Negroes, mostly from the West Indies" (2000:80). Nevertheless, by 1944, Jacques Garvey insisted in a letter to Du Bois that petty "personal feelings must be forgotten in the Unity of effort that is being forged for Africa, and our people" (1981). Seemingly, as one scholar argued, the animosity between Du Bois and Jacques Garvey was "water under the bridge" (U. Taylor 2002:161).

Yet, Jacques Garvey's willingness to work with political rivals is best understood as a tactical decision—a (temporary) choice to subordinate personal animosities to the urgent task of racial advancement. Her repeated calls for unity did not mean that longstanding personal feuds and ideological disagreements were, as her biographer maintained, "water under the bridge" (U. Taylor 2002:161). Instead, she found that such disagreements and rivalries were counterproductive, and should therefore be minimized whenever possible. In a series of let-

ters to Benjamin Gibbons, the president of the Garvey Club of New York and a longtime confidant, Jacques Garvey carefully justified her overtures to foes inside and outside the Garvey movement. Encouraging Gibbons not to allow "personal feelings override the great good" that could be achieved through cooperation, she explained that "I am now working with my enemies in the Cause of the betterment of my race" (1944g). Realizing that divisions among Africans and the Afro-descended could be exploited by the Allied nations, she labored to conceal the ideological disputes and personal feuds that divided black activists. "We must show a united front to the United Nations," she wrote (1944g). "Personalities must be set aside while we are in the shaft pulling like. . . . towards the goal (her ellipses)" (1944g).

As she sought support for a collective protest against the selective application of the Atlantic Charter, Jacques Garvey stressed that political campaigns for a "free Africa" were inextricably linked to racial liberation efforts outside the African continent. In her journalistic writings during the 1940s, she often described the relationship between black people using romantic language or familial tropes, proposing that a transcendental racial spirit and shared history connected the "sons and daughters of Africa" (1945a:14). In her private correspondence, however, she recruited fellow black activists to mobilize on behalf of Africa through appeals to mutual self-interest. Cognizant of the fact that black leaders in the Caribbean and the United States were engaged in fevered grassroots struggles of their own, she emphasized that international organizing on behalf of Africans and Afro-descendants would not detract from domestic efforts. In a letter to Adam Clayton Powell Jr. she promised that, "Our international plan will not interfere with local efforts to relieve local conditions; but rather [will] strengthen all local efforts. . . ." African redemption would be of "two-fold benefit"—assisting those at home and abroad (1944c). Like Marcus Garvey (R. Lewis 1988; Martin 1976), she maintained that a "redeemed Africa will enhance the prestige of people of African descent in the Western Hemisphere" (1944c). In her estimation, the Afro-descended would only be treated justly in their countries of birth when there was an independent African nation-state that commanded the world's respect (economically and militarily). Thus, she asserted confidently, "Help Africa, and you help yourself" (1944n).

Published in 1944 and widely distributed by 1945, the *Memorandum Correlative* was one of the most extensive analyses of the Atlantic Charter and its consequences for Africans and the Afro-descended. With the *Memorandum Correlative*, Jacques Garvey sought to articulate the political desires of Africans and Afro-descendants throughout the world and formulate "a comprehensive, cover-all Security Plan for every person of color, no matter where they live or what passport they carry" (1944d). Reflecting the prominence of social science approaches to the study of racism, colonialism, and nationalism during the

period, the sixty-five-page document attempted to present an objective sketch of the social and economic condition of black people through an assortment of qualitative and quantitative data. Calling on the reader to review the Atlantic Charter "through African eyes," Jacques Garvey (1944p:7) began by reiterating what were by 1944 familiar criticisms of the declaration (for example, Azikiwe 1943; Cunard and Padmore 1942; Ottley 1943; Padmore 1943a, 1943b, 1943c). Despite its universal language and grand pronouncements of freedom and self-determination, she insisted, the Atlantic Charter was narrowly intended for the nations of Europe. The fourth point of the Atlantic Charter, which promised all nations "access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world" (Rosenman 1950:314), would allow the nations of Europe to resume their plunder of Africa unabated after the war. While the charter guaranteed that all nations, "great or small, victor or vanquished" (Rosenman 1950:314), would have access to the world's wealth, there were no protections in the document for indigenous peoples and their rights to raw materials. Thus she feared that once hostilities ceased, Africans would be "used as the instrument to provide, procure, and process for shipment the wealth of Africa to the marts of Europe" (1944p:5).

In contrast to her other writings during the period, the *Memorandum Correlative* was written explicitly for the political leaders of the postwar world—the small cadre of men Jacques Garvey acknowledged as the "architects of a world under reconstruction" (1944p:title page). While Jacques Garvey dedicated her trenchant editorials in *The African* to the role black women and men could play in redeeming Africa, the *Memorandum Correlative* focused on a radically different target audience: Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek, Stalin, and Roosevelt.² Because Jacques Garvey's primary concern was to articulate the role that the Allied nations should play in the creation of a new postwar political order, Africans and the Afro-descended at times appeared in the text as passive subjects, political wards of Europe and the United States. Despite the fact that Jacques Garvey closely monitored the progress of black liberation efforts in Africa and the Americas, there is strikingly little discussion of indigenous anticolonial campaigns in Africa, the budding nationalist movement in the British Caribbean, or struggles for social and political equality in the United States. Instead, addressing Britain as the dominant colonial power in Africa, Jacques Garvey called on the British government to fulfill its role as the guardian of its African possessions: "We agonizingly ask, will the Protector, protect the Protectorates? Will the Trustee discharge his trust?" (1944p:44).

However, as she was all too aware, the nations of Europe could serve as Africa's "protector" or its greatest foe. Although Jacques Garvey claimed that the purpose of the *Memorandum Correlative* was not "to recite in detail the methods employed by the European nations in contact with Africans in order to further

their selfish ends" (1944p:1), she narrated the tragic history of African exploitation at the hands of Europeans throughout the document. Yet, she skillfully anchored her demands for Africans and Afro-descendants in both the past and the present. Africans and the Afro-descended deserved to be protected by the Atlantic Charter not only because of their three centuries of uncompensated contributions to the nations of Europe, but also because of their sacrifices on behalf of the Allied war effort. Thus, she wrote: "But as civilization is in the throes of a globular war, in which all races are sharing in the pain and anguish of emergence in a New Era; we are basing our claims to share, as Partners, in the post-war Democracy, on our centuries of 'blood sweat and tears' contributions to humanity's comfort and happiness" [1944p:1].

Though Jacques Garvey stated that "all races" were affected by the dislocations and trauma of the Second World War, she opted not to link the plight of Africans and the Afro-descended with that of other colonial subjects, instead maintaining that racial nationalism was the most effective response to European imperialism. Justifying the *Memorandum Correlative's* exclusive discussion of the Atlantic Charter's relevance for black people, she maintained that the colonies in Asia would be "strong enough" (1944p:4) at the conclusion of the war to stave off European encroachment and exploitation. In her estimation, Africans and the Afro-descended would occupy a uniquely vulnerable place in the postwar world, and therefore, would require their own "African Freedom Charter." By limiting her analysis of the Atlantic Charter to its relevance to blacks, Jacques Garvey turned away from the widespread third world solidarity rhetoric espoused by fellow Pan-Africanists and instead embraced a position of black exceptionalism.³

The centerpiece of the *Memorandum Correlative* was Jacques Garvey's proposal for an African Freedom Charter, an "International Declaration of general policy . . . toward the continent of Africa, its people—Africans, and all people of African descent the world over" (1944p:7). In her plan, she espoused an ambitious vision for a rehabilitated Africa that emphasized the importance of sovereign black nation-states. While Roosevelt's call for all of humanity to enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want was commendable, these four freedoms would mean little for Africans and Afro-descendants without the foundation of political sovereignty. Without a nation to call their own, Jacques Garvey insisted, Roosevelt's celebrated four freedoms could not significantly alter the plight of Africans and the Afro-descended. Thus, she countered that Africans and the Afro-descended required six broad forms of freedom—economic, social, educational, political, spiritual, and moral freedom—to prepare themselves to be both self-sufficient and self-governing. . . . Peoples made 'backward' by oppression and repression, must be given the Six Freedoms, in order to remove the Bars, Bans, and Barriers that prevent them

from emerging to the point of Nationhood," she surmised (1944p:8). Once the United States and the nations of Europe granted Africans and the Afro-descended these six freedoms, they would "by their own initiative, industry, and moral intentions" (1944p:8) secure for themselves Roosevelt's four freedoms.

Predicting that political sovereignty would be a chimera without a viable economy, Jacques Garvey insisted that "one of the mainstays of independence is economics" (1944p:10). In her proposal for an African Freedom Charter, she argued that European exploitation of African land and labor had to cease before African nations could truly be self-supporting. The economic exploitation of Africa not only denied Africans access to indigenous sources of wealth, but also retarded the development of the continent's educational system. Denouncing European "companies, associations, and governments" (1944p:10) for extracting the wealth of Africa while denying African children the fundamental right to education, she recommended that all African children should be given "equal opportunities for education" (1944p:10). Moreover, she insisted that economic exploitation was inextricably linked to the moral condition of African society. "Men are forced to steal when denied the right to work decently for it. Women will sell their bodies to procure little comforts that their family [sic] needs; children will become waifs and strays when recreational centers and libraries are closed to them. Who is to blame?" (1944p:11).

Jacques Garvey's preoccupation with racial autonomy and support of racial nationalism—undoubtedly, the two most controversial aspects of her political thought—emerged most clearly in her call for social and spiritual freedom in the African Freedom Charter. Adamant that Africans and the Afro-descended should not be discriminated against in any fashion, she nevertheless dismissed the idea that racial discrimination should be eradicated through integration. Reiterating her belief in racial purity, she adamantly insisted that "all self-respecting races desired to retain their racial integrity" and that Africans and the Afro-descended had no intention of committing "race suicide" (1944p:10). In her call for spiritual freedom for Africans and the Afro-descended, she argued that they could never hope to "rise to the omniscience of their being" if they were not allowed to "develop along their own cultural and racial lines" (1944p:10). Thus, as Jacques Garvey envisioned it, the African Freedom Charter would guarantee racial integrity and cultural autonomy, while also affirming the right to self-government.

Central to Jacques Garvey's redemptive vision was the creation of a postwar independent West African nation stretching from Gambia to Nigeria and populated jointly by African Americans and indigenous Africans. While the proposed African Freedom Charter would prepare Africans and Afro-descendants for nationhood, the Greater Liberia Act was heralded as a welcome sign that the United States was willing to assist in the process of African decolonization. In

the *Memorandum Correlative*, Jacques Garvey presented the Greater Liberia Act as a way to further the cause of self-determination in Africa while promoting racial harmony in the United States. The sweeping Senate bill proposed that the United States government appropriate millions of dollars to purchase Britain's and France's West African colonies for the purpose of resettling two million black Americans (Hedlin 1974; U.S. Congressional Record 1944, vol. 90:6253). The purchased colonies would be annexed to Liberia and would form a single, autonomous, West African nation-state (Hedlin 1974:132). Jacques Garvey optimistically contended that the legislation would give blacks in the United States, who were stymied by Jim Crow policies and racial violence, a "new lease on life" (1944j): While African Americans faced job discrimination and social exclusion in the United States, they could put their professional skills to use in Africa. "The Aframerican with his surplus of industrious, skilled and professional men and women, should seek to find an outlet for his ability and industry in his mother country—Africa." Moreover, she reiterated the claim that all Africans and Afro-descendants would gain respect once there was a "scientific and modern" black nation in Africa (1963:64–65).

Jacques Garvey's support of the Greater Liberia Act prompted her to reestablish contact with the bill's sponsor, the unabashed white supremacist and United States senator, Theodore Bilbo. The Mississippi senator first introduced the Greater Liberia Act in 1939 in response to proposed federal antilynching legislation and hoped to reintroduce the measure in 1945 or 1946 (Fitzgerald 1997; Smith 1983). Moreover, despite his racist proclivities (or perhaps because of them), Bilbo had worked intensely in the late 1930s to convince the federal government to allow Marcus Garvey to return to the United States (Martin 1976). Viewing Garvey as "the most conspicuous of all the organizers of his race" (Martin 1976:348), Bilbo supposed that if Garvey returned to the United States to speak on behalf of the Greater Liberia Act, the measure would garner the support of the African American community. Bilbo not only worked (unsuccessfully) to secure Garvey's return to the United States, but also collaborated with Garveyites to collect fifty thousand additional signatures in support of the act (Hill 1991, vol. 7:883–84; Martin 1976:352). The senator proudly cited Garvey's support of the Greater Liberia Act throughout his speeches in 1938 and 1939, and in his infamous 1947 antiintegration tract, *Take Your Choice: Separation or Mongrelization*, Bilbo went so far as to credit Garvey for exposing African Americans' "desire" to live in their own nation. Garvey, he wrote, "definitely succeeded in establishing the fact that there is an overriding impulse, a divine afflatus among the masses of Negroes in the United States for a country of their own and a government administered by themselves" (Martin 1976:349).

Thus, oddly enough, Bilbo and Jacques Garvey found common cause in the fight for "race integrity" (Jacques Garvey 1994o) as well as their respect for

Marcus Garvey's leadership abilities. Like Bilbo, Jacques Garvey feared racial integration and believed that voluntary immigration to Africa would allow black Americans to spearhead development initiatives on the continent while providing a better life for themselves. Encouraging Bilbo to publicize the bill as the "answer to the Negro soldier's prayer" (19440), she provided the senator with a detailed strategy for garnering black support.

Not surprisingly, the inclusion of the Greater Liberia Act in the *Memorandum Correlative* was profoundly controversial. Although grassroots African colonization programs have a long history among the Afro-descended, these efforts have often been misunderstood and marginalized (Barnes 2004; Hahn 2003; Miller 1975; Moses 1996). Marcus Garvey's African Colonization Program in the 1920s, the most highly publicized attempt to establish an independent African republic peopled by the Afro-descended, was routinely belittled as an unrealistic and escapist "Back to Africa" effort. Adamantly rejecting this view of Garveyism, Jacques Garvey wrote: "Garveyism is neither an escapist programme, nor an abdication of Negroes' rights in America, as suggested by some of his Northern [U.S.] critics to slur Garvey and ridicule the real importance of the African colonization proposals as an outlet for the Race to develop and expand to the stature of men and women with national prestige and economic security . . ." [1963:252]. As this statement makes clear, Jacques Garvey believed that Afro-descendants could profit materially and socially by establishing an autonomous nation in Africa. As historian Rupert Lewis rightly cautions, the Garveys' support of African colonization by the Afro-descended should not be viewed as a form of "mass repatriation utopianism" (1988:72). In fact, neither Garvey nor Jacques Garvey ever suggested that all blacks should emigrate from the United States to Africa, and both emphasized that any emigration should be voluntary.

Jacques Garvey's enthusiastic support of the Greater Liberia Act was also unconscionable to many black men and women because it allied her with white racists such as Theodore Bilbo and Earnest Cox, a representative of the White American Society. Jacques Garvey fully realized that Bilbo was not sponsoring the Greater Liberia Act because of his interest in the welfare of Africans and the Afro-descended, conceding privately that the senator was "rabid and rude" and only "acting in the interest of his own Race" (1944g). Nevertheless, she believed that Bilbo, through his sponsorship of the Greater Liberia Act, could "inadvertently" aid Africans and the Afro-descended (1944g).

Jacques Garvey was not the first black nationalist to form a single-issue tactical alliance with a white supremacist; indeed, her partnership with Theodore Bilbo is part of the extensive and disquieting history of strategic collaboration between black nationalist leaders and white separatists.⁴ United by an essentialist view of race and fervent belief in racial separatism, black nationalist figures

such as Marcus Garvey, Elijah Muhammad, and Malcolm X also briefly met with prominent white racists to discuss black American resettlement and various other efforts to promote racial autonomy. In her study of Earnest Cox's campaign for black American resettlement in Africa, Ethel Wolfskill Hedlin (1974) found that Cox worked with numerous black allies during his forty-year effort. Hedlin noted that "white support [for black American resettlement in Africa] has most often come from racists who fear that the continued presence of blacks among the population will result in such an intermingling of racial bloodlines that the Aryan race will lose its purity, thereby losing its superiority" (1974:vi).

In some respects, Jacques Garvey's overtures to Senator Bilbo merely continued her deceased husband's ill-fated efforts to discuss racial autonomy with white supremacists and segregationists (Martin 1976; Stein 1986).⁵ In June 1922, Marcus Garvey met with Edward Young Clarke, acting imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, during a national tour stop in Atlanta to outline the aims of the UNIA (Martin 1976:344-46). Undeterred by the firestorm of criticism after his exchanges with Clarke, Garvey invited John Powell of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs of America to speak at Liberty Hall in Harlem after Powell visited him in jail in 1925 and introduced a resolution in the Richmond, Virginia, branch of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs protesting his imprisonment (Martin 1976:347-51). Garvey also supported farfetched colonization schemes by segregationist Senator Joseph I. France (R-Maryland) in addition to Senator Bilbo's initial effort in 1939 to introduce the Greater Liberia Act. In the decades following Jacques Garvey's alliance with Theodore Bilbo, Nation of Islam leader Elijah Muhammad reached out to George Lincoln Rockwell of the American Nazi Party and invited Rockwell to speak at the NOI national convention in June 1962 (members of the American Nazi Party, dressed in full Nazi regalia, also attended the 1961 national convention at Muhammad's request) (Perry 1991:358-59). Muhammad also arranged a covert meeting between Malcolm X and Ku Klux Klan representatives in Atlanta in December 1961 to discuss the Nation's desire to obtain land to establish a separate nation for black Americans (FBI 1961:88-89; Perry 1991:358).

Jacques Garvey acknowledged both publicly and privately that the Greater Liberia Act was highly unpopular among blacks in the United States. However she assumed that African Americans, suspicious of any bill sponsored by a southern senator, misinterpreted the measure as an effort to expel all blacks from the United States (1944p:64). If the bill was cosponsored by a liberal northern senator, she conjectured, they would realize that the measure was not "just a Southern push-out" (19440). Jacques Garvey severely underestimated the fervor and depth of black Americans' opposition to Bilbo and to the Greater Liberia Act. The Mississippi senator's unpopularity among African Americans reached its apogee during the last years of his political career (1944-1947), as groups of

black and Jewish activists protested daily outside his Washington, D.C., apartment and collected signatures for his impeachment (Smith 1983:152). Blasting Jacques Garvey for including the Greater Liberia Act in the *Memorandum Correlative* and for collaborating with Bilbo to garner support for the measure, one Garveyite exploded, "To ask the race in the United States to accept anything coming from Bilbo as having any possible good is sheer madness. . . . As a good Christian, would you accept a plan from the devil as to how to get to heaven?" (U. Taylor 2002:159). It is also unlikely that the African men and women of French and British West Africa would have welcomed Jacques Garvey's plan for a single West African state. While she contended that the plans for self-government outlined in Nnamdi Azikiwe's "The Atlantic Charter and British West Africa" (1943) coincided with the provisions of the Greater Liberia Act, Azikiwe's plan clearly called for the creation of several separate nations in West Africa and made no mention of black American immigration to Africa. Ultimately, the Greater Liberia Act was never reintroduced in Congress, as Theodore Bilbo died in August 1947. In her memoir, Jacques Garvey reiterated the dubious claim that "Coloured Arm-chair politicians" in the United States had recklessly and prematurely lobbied against the Greater Liberia Act: ". . . In their blind hate of Bilbo, of Garvey, and in their selfish disregard of the appalling conditions of the masses of intelligent, ambitious people, they abused Bilbo, and influenced Legislators who voted against the Bill" (1963:240-42).

From beginning to end, the *Memorandum Correlative* elaborated a conception of race that privileged similarity, not difference, among Africans and Afro-descendants. Jacques Garvey stressed that the bitter legacy of slavery, economic exploitation, racial terror, and political disfranchisement united Africans and the Afro-descended in a "one-ness of common suffering" (1944k). The Afro-descended, though living outside the African continent, "work and suffer under similar disabilities as are imposed on Africans in Africa," she argued (1944p:7). For her, the advancement of Africans and the progress of Afro-descendants were part and parcel of the same global struggle. While the "children of Ham" (1944d) spoke different languages, practiced various religions, and lived in disparate parts of the world, she stressed that the common desire to overcome racial oppression trumped such differences: "The ties of blood that bind us transcend all national boundaries. The difference of languages and dialects are being overcome as all of us are learning the language of freedom" (1945a:14). Further linking Africans and Afro-descendants because of their physical appearance and biological ancestry, she stated that the "color of our skin and the texture of our hair" highlights the common "source from which we sprung" (1944k). Africans and Afro-descendants, she suggested, were destined to dwell together in their "natural habitats—the tropical zones of the Earth" (1944p:10).

By emphasizing the centrality of nation-state building as a response to racial oppression, Jacques Garvey failed to consider the many ways in which politically sovereign black nation-states in Africa could still be marginalized by the West. Further, by calling for a black West African nation-state, controlled and inhabited solely by Africans and the Afro-descended, she did not contest European constructions of the nation as a racially and culturally homogenous polity. Hence, though she offered a sophisticated analysis of European exploitation of Africa and the centrality of Africans and the Afro-descended in the making of the modern world, she was ultimately unable to posit an alternative (and more equalitarian) model of the nation.

Jacques Garvey wrote the *Memorandum Correlative* to "focus the searchlight of public opinion on the ambitions and aspirations of Africans" (1944h). Over the course of 1944, she offered varying assessments of how the four major Allied powers would respond to her provocative blueprint for the postwar world. Throughout the spring of 1944, she insisted confidently that the "Big Four" would adopt the suggestions of the *Memorandum Correlative* and would soon propose an African Freedom Charter. Given that several of the Allied nations had vast colonial empires in Africa or records of discriminating against Africans and Afro-descendants, why would they put forward an African Freedom Charter? Appealing to the Allies' self-interest, Jacques Garvey suggested that an African Freedom Charter would protect millions of Africans and Afro-descendants and would also serve as a strategic piece of wartime propaganda for the Allies. If the Allied nations proposed an African Freedom Charter, it would "knock the wind out of the sail of German and Japanese propaganda," assuage the fears of Pacific Islanders who "view[ed] with distrust the prospects of American hegemony," and bolster the morale of black people throughout the world (1944:9). Jacques Garvey (1944d) hoped that China and the USSR would sympathize with the demands of Africans and Afro-descendants because of their progressive racial politics, while England and the United States would grudgingly enact an African Freedom Charter in order not to be outdone by Stalin. When conservative African American editor George Schuyler insisted that Africans and the Afro-descended could never force the Allies to uphold the tenets of an African Freedom Charter, she remained hopeful. Well aware that they lacked the "material might" to demand that the Allied nations issue (or abide by) an African Freedom Charter, Jacques Garvey instead suggested that they could use the righteous tone and grand democratic pronouncements of the Allies against them. If the Allied nations ratified the African Freedom Charter and then violated the agreement, black leaders could expose the Allies' hypocrisy by "continually turning on the searchlight on the breaches of faith" (1944i).

By October 1944, however, Jacques Garvey conceded privately that the *Memorandum Correlative* had little hope of changing the outlook or policy of the Al-

lies. Writing to Nnamdi Azikiwe, she remarked that she “never for a moment believed that our Memorandum of Demands, because of its rectitude, would bring moral adjustments” (U. Taylor 2002:158). Ultimately, the *Memorandum Correlative* received little attention from the leaders of China, England, the USSR, or the United States. Though the document was sent to each of the “Big Four” as well as all the delegates at the founding conference of the United Nations, we only have evidence that one ambassador replied to Jacques Garvey’s text—Ambassador Guillermo Belt of Cuba (U. Taylor 2002:164). The guarantees of the Atlantic Charter were never formally extended to Africans or the Afro-descended.

Conclusion

Amy Jacques Garvey left little evidence of her personal thoughts regarding the dismal response to the *Memorandum Correlative*, her “sacred document” (1944f) and most ambitious attempt to lobby the major powers on behalf of Africans and the Afro-descended. We can only speculate how she might have felt as the Allied nations rebuffed widespread calls to extend representative democracy to Africa, and Britain and the United States rejected China’s 1945 proposal to include a declaration on racial equality in the United Nations Charter.⁶ It is telling, however, that all of Jacques Garvey’s political initiatives following the *Memorandum Correlative* were geared toward mobilizing Africans and the Afro-descended to “strike the blow for their own freedom” (1946a:13). In an editorial published in *The African* in May 1946, she angrily denounced the Atlantic Charter as the Allies’ “brazen attempt to woo the Axis nations by promising equal access to raw materials” (1946a:13). Referring to Britain and the United States as the “double-dealing nations,” she suggested that the Atlantic Charter had been a cunning attempt to “appease subject peoples” at the height of wartime hostilities (1946a:13).

Commenting on the militancy of Africans and Afro-descendants during the period of World War II, Jacques Garvey once remarked triumphantly that the “spirit of freedom is pregnant in the breasts of black men and women” (1944l). For her, this was a period of remarkable promise for black colonial subjects as well as disenfranchised African Americans. The calamities of the Second World War, seemingly ordained by God, had provided an opening for blacks to emerge from centuries of oppression and exploitation. In a period of such heightened promise and opportunity, Jacques Garvey claimed that the proper response to European imperialism was racial nationalism. Black nationalism, however, remained marginal among the Afro-descended throughout World War II, even among those who expressed Pan-African sentiments and lobbied for the decolonization of Africa and the Caribbean. Indeed, Jacques Garvey

soon learned that the anticolonial militancy of the 1940s did not mean Afro-descendants had eschewed integrationism. Moreover, the Allied nations’ commitment to democracy proved to be fleeting, at best. Frustrated by the limited political and economic reforms in much of Africa and the Caribbean at the end of the war, she concluded that the “spirit of democracy has taken no peacetime form” (1946b:11).

It is tempting to view Jacques Garvey’s support of the Greater Liberia Act and collaboration with Theodore Bilbo as an aberration in her distinguished activist career. Yet, she vigorously supported efforts to settle Afro-descended peoples on the African continent throughout her life. Indeed, in her 1963 memoir, *Garvey and Garveyism*, she spent a chapter recounting the “African colonization” efforts of Afro-descendants in the United States and British West Indies and bemoaned their great (unrealized) potential. Fundamentally, Jacques Garvey’s nationalist response to the Atlantic Charter was based on her acceptance of the Western idea that sovereign nation-states were the locus of power and identity in the modern world, as well as an essentialist view of race. As scholars such as Paul Gilroy (1993) and Michelle Wright (2004) have demonstrated, Afro-descended intellectuals in the West have engaged continuously in counter-discourses that critiqued the exclusion of blacks from the nation by either demanding full incorporation into the nation or by insisting that Africans and Afro-descendants deserved to be recognized as their own nation.⁷ Operating in a world in which “modernity implies a conjoining of the nation and the civilized” (Hintzen 2004: 295), Jacques Garvey insisted that Africans and Afro-descendants possessed a shared racial consciousness, and therefore, deserved their own nation-state. She repeatedly insisted that a politically independent black nation in Africa would lend both protection and prestige to Africans and Afro-descendants throughout the world.

An indefatigable activist and prolific writer, Amy Jacques Garvey is an ideal figure for exploring the tenuous place of black nationalism in the 1940s Pan-African movement. Although she was welcomed into the male-dominated, transnational network of Pan-African activists because of her connections to grassroots political organizations in West Africa and the British Caribbean and her status as the widow of Marcus Garvey, her work remained marginal in the movement because of her views on race and steadfast nationalist vision. Her willingness to collaborate simultaneously with men as different as Theodore Bilbo and W. E. B. Du Bois, even in the context of the remarkably fluid politics of the early 1940s, transgressed the boundaries of coalition politics.

While many of the central themes in her political thought resonated with ideas initially articulated by Marcus Garvey, Jacques Garvey rejected his claim that a single transnational organization should attempt to express the yearnings of all Africans and Afro-descendants. Instead, she proposed a more democratic and

decentralized model of black nationalist praxis that affirmed the powers of ordinary men and women, instead of a single charismatic leader, to form autonomous, grassroots associations to work toward the shared goal of racial liberation.

Until recently, students of 1940s black radicalism have overlooked the work of Amy Jacques Garvey, instead focusing exclusively on the contributions of black male activists. Scholars' failure to include Jacques Garvey in treatments of World War II Pan-Africanism highlights a troubling lacuna in the historiographies of both Pan-Africanism and radical black politics (Boyce Davies 2009). Yet African and Afro-descended women such as Amy Ashwood Garvey, Claudia Jones, and Eslanda Good Robeson also articulated visions of a liberated Africa in the 1940s and fought tirelessly to make their visions a reality. The pivotal role of black women in radical politics during the 1940s is an important story that is yet to be fully told.

Notes

I wish to thank John D. French, David Barry Gaspar, Jocelyn Olcott, Andrea Queeley, Janet Ewald, Pete Sigal, Lola Young, and the editors of this collection for their thought-provoking comments on, and careful readings of, several versions of this article. I am also extremely grateful for the encouragement, insightful comments, and suggestions for revisions that I received from the participants at the Interrogating the African Diaspora International Summer Graduate Seminar (2005), Latin Americanist graduate students at Duke University, and members of the African and African American Studies Dissertation Writing Group (2007). A Mellon Mays Pre-Doctoral Research Grant (Social Science Research Council), Provost's Pre-Dissertation International Field Research Grant (Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies at Duke University), Race and Gender Research Award (Women's Studies, Duke University), and Travel Grant (Institute for Critical U.S. Studies, Duke University) funded the research necessary to complete this project.

1. For an analysis of the origins and evolution of black nationalist thought in the Americas, see Wilson Jeremiah Moses, ed., *Classical Black Nationalism: From the American Revolution to Marcus Garvey* (1996; esp. 1–42). While Wilson offers a useful history of black nationalist ideology from the eighteenth to early twentieth centuries, he problematically dismisses the continuing significance of black nationalism after the decline of the UNIA in the mid-1920s.

2. In several letters, Jacques Garvey identified these four leaders as the intended audience for the *Memorandum Correlative*, see Jacques Garvey to John B. Shaw, February 28, 1944, box 3, file 3, Marcus Garvey Memorial Collection Papers; Jacques Garvey to C. W. Downes Thomas, April 14, 1944, box 3, file 7, Marcus Garvey Memorial Collection Papers; Jacques Garvey to Max Yergan, February 8, 1944, box 3, file 11, Marcus Garvey Memorial Collection. The *Memorandum Correlative* was ultimately distributed to numerous other foreign ambassadors in the United States as well as to Chiang Kai-shek, Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin. All in Marcus Garvey Memorial Collection Papers, Special Collections Library, Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee.

3. For example, stating the Council of Africa Affairs' position on racial nationalism, Max Yergan argued that "Nationalism in the racial sense is insufficient. There must be the closest bonds of cooperation between the peoples of Africa and the peoples of the rest of the world. This is our perspective. This concept is bigger than any concept of race." For a further discussion of black Americans' efforts to link the decolonization of Africa to other anticolonial struggles see, Michael T. Martin and Lamont H. Leakey, "Pan-American Asian Solidarity: A Central Theme in Du Bois' Conception of Racial Stratification and Struggle," *Phylon* 43, no. 3 (1982): 202–17; Von Eschon, *Race Against Empire*, 22–23.

4. For a provocative interpretation of the history of collaboration between black nationalists and white supremacists, see Gilroy 2000b:231–37.

5. For an overview of Marcus Garvey's connection with white supremacists, see Martin 1976:chapter 12.

6. For a discussion of the debates over the colonial question and the drafting of the UN Charter, see Sherwood 1996.

7. In their works, both Gilroy (1993) and Wright (2004) examine the ways in which Afro-descended intellectuals have critiqued racially exclusive notions of the nation. Gilroy highlights the scholarship of W. E. B. Du Bois and Richard Wright (among others), while Wright focuses on the writings of Aimé Césaire, Fanon, and Du Bois.