

White, 'Female Slaves: Sex Roles and Status in the Antebellum Plantation South' in Kathryn K. Sklar and Thomas Dublin (eds), *Women and Power in American History* (2 Vols) Vol 1 to 1880 (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1991), 158-171.

42. Higman, 'African and Creole Slave Family Patterns', 52.
43. White, 'Female Slaves', 164.
44. White, 'Female Slaves', 166.
45. Elizabeth Fenwick, an Englishwoman who lived in Barbados during the 1820s, was on the receiving end of such encounters with her female hired slaves. She complained, 'They will positively do nothing but what they please . . . & they laugh in their owner's face when reproved for not doing their duty.' See A.F. Wedd, ed, and comp., *The Fate of the Fenwicks* (London: Methuen Pub., 1927), 167, 168.
46. This point is made in a discussion of the role of households and household work in the structure of gender relations in India by Ursula Sharma, *Women's Work, Class and the Urban Household* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1986), 1-9. I have borrowed the phrasing used here since it seems to me equally applicable to my discussion of the role of the urban household in the structuring of gender and wide relations in the urban slave society.
47. Beckles, *Natural Rebels*, 68.
48. See William Dickson, *Letters on Slavery* (1789; Westport, Connecticut: Negro Universities Press, 1970), 6, 38, 39; also, *The Fate of the Fenwicks*, 163; Sir William Young, 'A Tour Through the Several Islands, Barbados, St. Lucia, Antigua, Tobago in the Years 1791 and 1792', qtd. in Bryan Edwards, *The History, Civil and Commercial of the British Colonies in the West Indies* (1793; New York: AMS Press Inc., 1966), 244, 245.

## The United Nations: Caribbean and African-American Attempts to Influence the Founding Conference in San Francisco in 1945

MARIKA SHERWOOD

### INTRODUCTION

There are innumerable books on the founding of the United Nations at San Francisco in 1945. Not one mentions the efforts made by colonised peoples and African-Americans to have their voices heard and to have the freeing of colonies put on the UN's agenda. Yet, at the end of the war, the majority of the world's population lived in subjection to imperial (mainly European) powers.<sup>1</sup>

Colonies had long been a contentious issue between the war-time leaders of the major powers among the allies, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. W.E.B. Du Bois claimed that there was 'sharp disagreement' between FDR and Churchill over the inclusion of the colonial issue in the many discussions that preceded the San Francisco conference: 'Roosevelt insisted that the problem ought to be faced, and Churchill replied with a slur on the status of American Negroes.'<sup>2</sup> As the U.S. edged closer to participating in what was then a European conflict, one thing FDR was positive about was that the U.S. would not help Britain 'simply so that she will be able to continue to ride roughshod over colonial peoples.' Roosevelt had been shocked at what he saw of colonialism in Bathurst, Gambia.<sup>3</sup> However, the president was interested in the British Empire not only for altruistic reasons: the U.S. had been excluded from their empires' trade and raw materials by all the imperial powers. Thus the U.S. continued to press Britain over the issue of colonial emancipation, especially India, throughout the war.<sup>4</sup>

When Roosevelt and Churchill met aboard the *Augusta* in August 1941 to discuss what came to be known as the Atlantic Charter, Churchill remarked, 'Mr. President, I believe you are trying to do away with the British Empire.'<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, Churchill had to appear to acquiesce to the terms of the Charter, one of which stated that they (Roosevelt and Churchill) 'respect the right of all peoples to choose the

forms of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.'

It is probable that at least some U.S. officials as well as Roosevelt intended this section of the Charter to apply to colonies as well as to those European countries then under Axis domination.<sup>6</sup> The British government feared that the Charter would lead to demands for self-government, if not independence, by the colonies and India. To squash any such notions and to refute a statement to the contrary by the Deputy Prime Minister, Churchill declared in Parliament on September 9 that the Charter applied to Europe only.<sup>7</sup>

Various aspects of the colonial issue were raised at all the meetings of the major Powers (the 'united nations') except the final one before San Francisco, held at Dunbarton Oaks in Washington, DC in October 1944. The four governments represented there, the U.S.A., the U.K., the U.S.S.R. and China reached tentative agreements, and drew up discussion documents for the forthcoming conference on everything but colonies.<sup>8</sup> This was, of course, very much Britain's desire, but it appears to contradict the previous stance of the U.S. on colonies. What had happened? The Joint Chiefs of Staff had convinced their political masters that there would be a clash of interests over trusteeship between those at the meeting; with the Axis powers, and especially Japan, still undefeated, such a clash between the allies had to be avoided.<sup>9</sup> Roosevelt was said to be opposed to such a perspective, partly on the grounds that it was contrary to the Atlantic Charter.<sup>10</sup> However, the military perspective prevailed throughout the San Francisco conference. President Truman (FDR had died a few days before the opening session) had apparently no qualms in concurring with the argument that the U.S.A. had to acquire new bases in the Pacific. This perceived need (by the Joint Chiefs and now by the new president) for the acquisition of new colonies naturally toned down the anti-colonial stance of the U.S.<sup>11</sup> The U.S. also felt that the U.S.S.R. had to be kept out of the colonies, and this new policy led it into closer alliance with the imperial powers. Thus the *Christian Science Monitor*, for example, could report on its front page on May 5 that the 'United Kingdom and the United States are united on objectives' regarding trusteeships.<sup>12</sup>

The exigencies of the situation demanded that Non-Self-Governing Territories (colonies, in UN jargon) be discussed, and, according to most analysts, the chapters within the UN's Charter on colonies proved most contentious; it is likely that agreement was only made possible by the ambiguities and loopholes written into the Charter.<sup>13</sup>

The issue of colonies was only allowed to surface in the most

general terms; what was discussed in great detail, and in the absence of any representatives of the colonised people themselves, was the issue of trusteeship territories. The agreement on trusteeships was reached in the absence 'of nearly all the Arab-Asian and a few Latin-American members.'<sup>14</sup> A Declaration regarding NSGTs was issued after much wrangling between pro- and anti-colonialists. The compromise eventually reached was high in sentiment and completely void of power to enforce any of the stated aims. That it was a 'sacred trust' for colonial powers to promote 'the well-being of the colonies' inhabitants' would not have impressed the millions of colonised peoples.<sup>15</sup>

This article will detail the efforts of Caribbean peoples and some African-American organisations to prepare for the meeting of the united nations, and to influence the discussions at the United Nations Conference on International Organisation (UNCIO) which met in San Francisco on 25 April 1945. It will also indicate the British responses to these efforts and how those minor powers who supported colonial independence were silenced. What I have no answer for is the process whereby the Soviets were muzzled: their representative Molotov stated in May that 'international security (depends on) dependent countries (being) enabled as soon as possible to take the path of national independence,' but this was apparently forgotten by June. Why?

## PREPARING FOR THE CONGRESS

Two African-American organisations, the Council of African Affairs and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and three organisations of colonials, the African Students Association, the West Indies National Council and the Jamaican Progressive League poured considerable effort into preparing for the conference. This article will look at the attempts made by the CAA, the NAACP and the WINC and other Caribbean groups to influence the founding conference.

The Council on African Affairs (CAA) was set up by Dr. Max Yergan in 1937. It was 'radical, black-led and inter-racial.' In 1939, on his return to the U.S.A., Paul Robeson became its chairman. When it became suspected as a 'communist front,' many well-known supporters left the CAA. Both the Council offices and its leaders were under FBI surveillance at least from the early 1940s.<sup>16</sup>

Early in 1944 Yergan, Robeson and Alphaeus Hunton, the CAA's education director, addressed a number of meetings in Canada on the future of African and other colonies, and the objectives of the allies – the united nations. There were also at least two public meetings in New York: on March 8 the meeting was 'Toward Democracy for Africa'; on April 8, 'What About Africa? – Africa in the World-Wide War'.<sup>17</sup> It may

have been this meeting which resulted in the publication of a leaflet, *What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World?*, which called for 'speedy economic and political development within the framework of the United Nations and within the spirit and intent of the Atlantic Charter.'<sup>18</sup> Robeson also gave a radio lecture on the upcoming conference, and intended to involve Nigerian publicist/politician Nnamdi Azikiwe and T.A. Bankole, the president of the Nigerian Trade Unions Congress, in the broadcast, but not enough money was raised.<sup>19</sup> The Council also met with the State Department's newly formed Division of African Affairs, urging 'a more aggressive pro-African policy.'<sup>20</sup>

On 14 April 1944 the CAA held a large conference on 'Africa - New Perspectives'. Among the 127 delegates from 60 organisations invited were the representatives of the African Students Association, the Indian organisations in the U.S.A. and the West Indies National Council. The British Ambassador informed the Foreign Office that between eight and nine thousand people attended the conference. Paul Robeson urged that the terms of the Atlantic Charter should be observed and demanded guarantees for self-government to be granted to all colonies within definite time limits. The Resolutions passed by the conference, which were sent to Secretary of State Hull and President Roosevelt, repeated those in the leaflet mentioned above, and called upon 'the United States to take the leadership in promoting these policies . . . as a guarantee that the fruits of victory shall be shared equally by all peoples.' Further, the conference demanded the end of forced labour, equal wages and 'fair prices' for 'African producers.' Max Yergan announced that he had received assurance from the U.S. State Department that the Atlantic Charter applied to all, including African countries.<sup>21</sup>

The British government, or at least the Colonial Office, became quite worried about the allegations and demands of the CAA Conference, though it took some months to decide what to do about it. In September it sent a copy of the *Proceedings*, which it had received from Paul Robeson, to the Ministry of Information, and suggested that the MOI could prepare a commentary on it. The MOI replied that maybe too long a period of time had elapsed for a commentary to serve a useful purpose; but it would ask for advice from its office in New York. The reply from New York was inconclusive.<sup>22</sup>

At the end of the year, on December 15, the Council sent a comprehensive memorandum signed by 170 'outstanding citizens' to the President and the Secretary of State. The signatories asked the U.S. government to ensure the 'rapid advancement of the economic and social well-being of the African people'; the achievement of 'self-government . . . within a specified time limit'; the abolition of all forms of 'discrimination based on race, creed or color'; the promotion of 'the

industrialization and mechanization of the African economy'; and 'that all nations shall share equitably with this country in the advantages of increased trade with Africa.' The letter was also published as a leaflet.<sup>23</sup>

On the same day the Council sent a copy of the above letter to Henry S. Villard, chief of the Division of African Affairs, State Department, and emphasised to him that the principles in their letter were applicable to 'all the areas where similar problems exist.' In his reply Villard assured Robeson that the Council's 'communication will receive the most careful consideration.'<sup>24</sup>

In March 1945 the CAA briefed the State Department's Archibald Macleish on the Council's views on Africa. The excerpt from Macleish's reply published by the CAA was as noncommittal as Villard's response a few months previously: the State Department assumed that 'certain aspects' of the colonial question would be considered at San Francisco; the charter of the United Nations would 'protect the security and well-being of all peoples.'<sup>25</sup>

To enhance its effectiveness, the Council now published another pamphlet, *The San Francisco Conference and the Colonial Issue*, intended for distribution to all the delegates to the Conference. The demands in the pamphlet included that discussions at the conference should not be limited to the trusteeship question, but should embrace all colonies; responsibility for the 'advancement of colonial peoples' should be assumed by an International Colonial Commission, responsible to the General Assembly. The Commission's membership should include representatives of colonial peoples. All colonies, except those 'for which there is the immediate prospect of self-government' should be placed under the Commission's supervision. The Commission would decide when each colony was ready for self-determination.<sup>26</sup>

The pamphlet was also sent to the media and to organisations which were asked to base resolutions upon its points and to send these to Max Yergan or Eslanda Goode Robeson, the Council's representatives in San Francisco. According to the FBI, during the conference the CAA planned to attempt to influence delegates and to establish close relations with labour representatives.<sup>27</sup>

The British government received a copy from a member of the Colonial Office's staff in San Francisco. A.H. Poynton forwarded it to the U.K. with the comment, 'I must confess we have not taken it very seriously.'<sup>28</sup>

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) grew out of the amalgamation of two groups: the one convened by W.E.B. Du Bois in 1905 at Niagara Falls, Canada and the other convened by white reformers in 1908. It soon grew into the foremost nation-wide civil rights organisation in the U.S. Du Bois

became the editor of its journal, *The Crisis*, in 1910. However, Du Bois' relationship with the NAACP was somewhat stormy; he left it for many years, but returned as its director of research in June 1944 and immediately informed the director that he saw as his first and most urgent task the preparation of 'the case of Africans and persons of Negro descent for the peace conferences and post-war planning authorities.' Further, he would organise 'these and other colored groups so as to clarify their ideas, plans and demands.'<sup>29</sup>

Du Bois drafted the resolution sent by the NAACP to the Department of State on 11 September 1944, in which the Association asked that the U.S. should not be 'party to the perpetuation of colonial exploitation of any nation.' The State Department's response pointed to the statement by Secretary of State Cordell Hull on 23 July 1942, which stated that the U.S. sought 'to encourage and aid all who aspire to freedom to establish their right to it by preparing themselves to assume its obligations.' Two years later the Secretary announced that it was 'the duty of nations having political ties with (dependent) peoples . . . to help the aspiring peoples . . . to prepare themselves for the duties and responsibilities of self-government, and to attain liberty.'<sup>30</sup>

Du Bois tried again at the conference of Americans United for World Organization called by the State Department in Washington on October 16 to consider the published proposals of the Dunbarton Oaks conference. Du Bois pointed out to the large audience that colonial peoples were deliberately excluded from the proposed terms which all referred to nations, thus excluding peoples who were not recognised as such; moreover, colonial disputes were stated to be beyond the jurisdiction of the new international organisation. Though Mary McLeod Bethune and Judge William H. Hastie were also at the meeting, it seems that Du Bois was the only African-American asked to speak.<sup>31</sup>

In February 1945 Du Bois was asked to attend yet another conference called in Washington, to discuss the Bretton Woods proposals for what became the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). He again pointed out that there was no reference to colonies in the published proposals.<sup>32</sup>

Not surprisingly, Du Bois was not reassured by his correspondence with the State Department or his experiences at the conferences. In March 1945 he asked the Secretary of State three specific questions:

- Will the question of colonies be considered at San Francisco?
- Will anyone represent colonial peoples?
- Will anyone represent Negroes?<sup>33</sup>

The final question referred to an NAACP Resolution sent to the

Secretary in September 1944, in which the NAACP directors had urged the State Department that 'qualified Negroes be appointed to serve as representatives of the United States Government at conferences . . . which are called to determine war and post-war policies.'<sup>34</sup> Presumably the reply to this had been negative as here Du Bois raised the issue again.

In the same month the NAACP Board of Directors adopted resolutions submitted by Du Bois, and published them as *The Prevention of War*. This proposed racial equality; that imperialists set dates for independence for their colonial possessions, or alternately 'integrate (colonial) peoples into the policy of the mother country with full rights of citizenship'; that the exploitation of natural resources and industrialisation should only be for the benefit of the inhabitants; that an International Mandates Commission should supervise World War I mandates and 'enemy territories' acquired in the present war.<sup>35</sup>

Having received no response to his letter to the Secretary of State, Du Bois wrote to Benjamin Gerig, chief of the State Department's new Division of Dependent Area Affairs, asking whether the Division covered all dependent areas, and what facilities could be offered to him (Du Bois) in San Francisco as a representative of the NAACP. He also enclosed a copy of the September Resolution and asked for Gerig's response.

It took Gerig one month to reply – a month during which the Administration announced that the NAACP was to be one of the organisations invited to serve as consultants to the U.S. delegation to San Francisco. Gerig informed Du Bois that his Division undertook the 'formulation of recommended policies' for all dependent areas. Unofficials could not participate in the conference; he was glad that Du Bois and White were among the representatives of the national organisations who would be consultants.<sup>36</sup>

The NAACP was the only African-American organisation among the 42 asked to serve as consultants. After some lobbying Mary McLeod Bethune, in her capacity as an NAACP vice-president, was added to the delegation.<sup>37</sup> The British were less than pleased by the U.S.' seeming democracy in appointing consultants. 'I'm afraid . . . these people will know precisely what is happening in sub-committees . . . and will not hesitate to use this knowledge . . . for the purpose of grinding particular axes,' one Foreign Office official commented on receiving the news from the British Ambassador in Washington. Another official, less circumspect than his colleague, scrawled on the telegram: 'This is the craziest yet. I hope we shall deny these bands of lunatics any part in the conference on pain of ourselves going home.'<sup>38</sup>

Organising to bring pressure on the U.S. delegates to San Francisco, Du Bois contacted other black activists while simultaneously

those with similar ideas got in touch with him. Among those contacted by Du Bois was Norman Manley, the leader of the Jamaican People's National Party; Du Bois asked Manley if he knew of any plans 'to secure greater powers post war,' and for the names of other anti-colonialist organisations.<sup>39</sup>

Du Bois discussed the necessity for holding a conference with many activists including Amy Ashwood Garvey, H.P. Osborne of the West Indies National Council, and Trinidadian Dr. Eric Williams, then teaching at Howard University.<sup>40</sup> These discussions resulted in a CAA/NAACP conference held in New York on April 6 at the 135th Street branch of the New York Public Library. Attended by some 60 invitees, the conference was chaired by Du Bois. Among the delegates were Akiki Nyabongo of Uganda and Francis Nkrumah from the Gold Coast; Rev. Ethelred Brown and A.M. Wendell Malliet of the Jamaican Progressive League; Richard B. Moore and Charles A. Petioni of the West Indies National Council; Julio Pinto Gandia of Puerto Rico; Kumar Goshal, D. Panth and Ramkrishna S. Modak of India; representatives from Indonesia and Burma; and the African-Americans Rayford Logan, Alphaeus Hunton and Lawrence Reddick. Though not mentioned in any of the newspaper articles, Amy Ashwood Garvey, the ex-wife of Marcus Garvey, is in the group photo which appeared in the New York edition of the *Pittsburgh Courier*.

Richard B. Moore presented the seven-point programme which the WINC intended submitting to the San Francisco conference (see below). Kumar Goshal warned that as the European powers' economic position was dire, they would need more markets, cheap labour and a large supply of raw materials; this did not augur well for the already impoverished colonies. Nkrumah 'demanded the end of British rule in Africa as the only means by which the welfare of colonial peoples could be advanced.'<sup>41</sup>

The resolutions committee, consisting of Du Bois, Hunton, Logan, Reddick, Akiki, Nkrumah, Goshal, Gandia, Petioni, John R. Andu of the Netherlands East Indies, and Maung Saw Tung representing Burma, drafted the statement which was discussed, signed, sent to African-American and white newspapers and ultimately presented to the conference at San Francisco. The four points were:

- colonialism must go
- an international body should oversee the transition from colonial status to autonomy
- colonial people should have 'effective representation' on this body
- the prime object of this body would be to improve the social and economic conditions of colonial peoples.<sup>42</sup>

To follow up the April 6 conference and to bring the issues before a wider public, Du Bois, Yergan, Petioni and George Harris called a Town Meeting on April 18. Attended by some 300 people, the meeting was chaired by the CAA's Alphaeus Hunton, who stressed 'the importance of promoting wide discussion and dissemination of information about the conference.' The resolution passed contained three demands:

- the unqualified adoption of the Dunbarton Oaks proposals for international cooperation
- participating governments should grant 'the same economic, social, cultural, legal and political rights' to everybody
- the establishment of machinery within the international organisation to speedily bring about social and economic advancement and self-government by all non-self-governing peoples.<sup>43</sup>

While the conferences were being held, the NAACP was becoming much distressed by the apparent omission of the colonial issue and the definite omission of colonial spokesmen from San Francisco. The Board of Directors sent a new resolution both to the President and the Secretary of State, expressing 'the deep concern of the Negro population over these omissions.' Their attitude towards the eventual peace treaty 'will be conditioned, in an important degree,' the NAACP warned, by the provisions 'toward the improvement in the status and welfare of colonial peoples . . . and programs for their eventual independence.' The Board urged the Administration to make it clear that the U.S. was not fighting a war for the perpetuation of colonial empires and that it was opposed to imperialism, 'particularly that based on race.'<sup>44</sup>

As the delegation was leaving for San Francisco, Walter White issued a statement expressing its hope 'to induce the Conference to face what is one of the most serious problems of the 20th century – the question of race and color.' The NAACP would press for the adoption of a bill of rights which would affirm the 'equality of all peoples and races.' White stated that it was being reported that the U.S. would be willing to condone the perpetuation of European empires in exchange for holding on to the Pacific islands taken from the Japanese. He hoped this allegation would prove unfounded.<sup>45</sup>

A few days previously, in his report to the NAACP on his four-month tour of the Pacific theatre-of-war, White had emphasised that 'the rights of native peoples . . . are completely unthought of, except by the natives themselves. . . . They (the peoples in British, Dutch and French colonies) are bewildered and dismayed that winning a war for "freedom" means no change in their status. . . . Failure to act on colonial policy now will aid Japanese propaganda that white people's only purpose was

the enslavement of colored peoples throughout the world.<sup>46</sup>

The West Indies National Council was the linear descendant of the West Indies National Emergency Committee, which had been formed in 1940 by prominent and politically active West Indians residing in the U.S., in order to present a declaration of rights to the Inter-American conference held in Havana.<sup>47</sup> The Emergency Committee itself had grown out of the West Indies Defense Committee which had organised aid to those injured in the 'riots' which took place throughout the Caribbean in 1937 and 1938.<sup>48</sup> The Council's president was Dr. Charles A. Petioni of Trinidad, a physician; the leading members were political activists Richard B. Moore of Barbados, W.A. Domingo of Jamaica, H.P. Osborne of Trinidad and attorney Hope Stevens of Nevis/St. Kitts. Among the WINC's advisory committee in 1945 were Congressman Rev. Adam Clayton Powell and Nigerian student and future politician, Kingsley Ozuomba Mbadiwe.

The WINC took up a variety of issues regarding the Caribbean: for example, it demanded that a West Indian should be appointed to the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission, and that the promises of the Atlantic Charter to free all oppressed people should apply to colonial peoples.<sup>49</sup> In August 1944 the WINC organised a public meeting at the Abyssinia Baptist Church in Harlem (Adam Clayton Powell's church) to celebrate the 110th anniversary of West Indian emancipation. The meeting, addressed by Richard B. Moore and Amy Ashwood Garvey, demanded the release of 'leaders of the West Indian peoples and political prisoners' such as Uriah Butler and W.A. Domingo, who had recently been arrested. The resolution passed claimed 'the right to self-determination and self-government for the peoples of Africa'; the participants pledged their 'unqualified support to the struggles of the African peoples for complete liberation.' The WINC sent a copy to the British Ambassador, with a request to forward it to the government in London. The assiduous Lord Halifax sent copies not only to the Foreign and Colonial Offices but also to the India Office.<sup>50</sup>

Naturally, the WINC participated in anti-colonial activities initiated by other organisations. Thus Richard B. Moore, the Council's usual spokesperson, addressed the April 6 NAACP colonial conference. He pointed out that West Indians had not been consulted over the establishment of U.S. bases in the Caribbean. 'The wealth of the Caribbean peoples had been drained to make lavish fortunes for European investors while the people starve.' Any commission set up to deal with the Caribbean must have West Indian representatives, Moore emphasised.<sup>51</sup>

As noted above, the WINC was among the sponsors of the Town Meeting held in Harlem on April 28. Some days earlier the WINC's

Conference Committee announced that it had nominated five representatives to travel to San Francisco to present the Council's seven-point program. The Council intended to seek ratification of both the program and the nominees at a mass meeting on April 16, when the speakers would include Adam Clayton Powell, New York Councilman Benjamin Davis and West Indian activists Moore, Petioni, Hope R. Stevens, Reginald Pierrepointe, and Ethelred Brown. A flyer was circulated asking for donations to cover the delegates' costs, which were estimated at \$2,500. The seven points were:

- representation at the conference
- self-government
- Caribbean participation in planning for post-war rehabilitation
- support for West Indian federation
- abolition of all discrimination
- equal rights
- integration, as equals, in any regional organisation of American nations.<sup>52</sup>

These activities of the WINC were reported both in the Caribbean and Nigeria. Jamaica's radical *Public Opinion* gave the details of the Council's programme, and in an accompanying article W.A. Domingo noted that under pressure from the Colonial Office the U.S. State Department had put WINC leaders on a 'blacklist.' The *West African Pilot* reported that Moore and Barbara Watson were to be delegates and that they would demand self-determination and self-government.<sup>53</sup>

It is not yet clear what the relationship was between the Jamaica Progressive League (JPL) and the WINC. The JPL had been formed in 1936 at the instigation of W. Adolphe Roberts 'in order to work for self-government and development' in Jamaica. Roberts, a historian, novelist and journalist, became the JPL's president and Ethelred Brown the vice-president. Brown, who had been a member of the Jamaica League, and had assisted a longshoremen's strike in Jamaica c.1918, migrated to New York, where by 1921 he was speaking on socialist platforms (or ladders, to be more precise, on Harlem street corners). The JPL was actively involved in Jamaica: for example, Brown was sent to the island to give evidence to the Moyne Commission and both he and Roberts attended the first annual conference of the PNP.<sup>54</sup> The U.S. government believed that it was influential in the British West Indies and that it was under communist influence.<sup>55</sup>

In February 1944 the JPL wrote to the chairperson of the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission, forwarding a resolution passed at a recent meeting, demanding that a 'full fledged Jamaican and not a Jamaican adopted expediency, should represent us at the AACC.' The

PNP had made a similar request, as had the WINC the previous month. It is not known how Roosevelt replied; the AACC asked for the advice of its own British Section, which in turn asked the Colonial Office, who consulted the Dominions Office and the U.S. government: in June 1945 it was announced that a West Indian could be appointed.<sup>56</sup>

Probably early in 1944 Eric Williams addressed what he describes as a 'Jamaican Conference' in Boston. This had been called by the Jamaican Associates Inc. and was chaired by William Harrison, an African-American who had been an associate of Padmore and James in London in the 1930s. The theme of the conference was 'The Four Freedoms For Jamaica'. W. Adolphe Roberts led the discussion. Williams, sharing the platform with Ethelred Brown and Judge James S. Watson, also of Jamaica, stated that the freedom from want was the first essential; freedom from fear and freedom of speech could only be attained when people had political freedom; religious freedom would result from political freedom. These 'will only become real if the people of Jamaica forge them into actuality,' he said.<sup>57</sup>

#### WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS, LONDON 1945

Colonial trade unionists in Britain for the founding meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) seized these new platforms offered them to broaden the WFTU agenda. Ken Hill of Jamaica declared that 'imperial powers should be asked to give a definite pledge that colonial peoples should be given self-determination as soon as possible, and that colonies should not be transferred between the imperial powers without the people's consent.' Hubert Critchlow claimed that in the 'Post-War Reconstruction, the terms of the Atlantic Charter should apply to Colonial and subject peoples as much as to the white-skinned nations of the world.' It was Ken Hill who signed on behalf of the 'British Commonwealth - Caribbean Zone' the *Call to All the Peoples*, issued by the conference, which invoked the Atlantic Charter in expressing 'the view that it is necessary to bring to an end the system of Colonies, Dependencies and subject countries.'<sup>58</sup>

Hill and Hubert Critchlow were among the colonial delegates who attended a meeting in March called by the Pan-African Federation, which was headed by Trinidad-born George Padmore, the foremost black political activist in Britain since the late 1930s. The delegates reported on the WFTU to an audience of some 300 in Manchester. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: to begin discussing the convening of a pan-African conference and to work on a statement to be presented to the United Nations. A draft manifesto was presented to the audience for ratification. It was intended to send the demands to San Francisco

and also to the NAACP, in order 'to aid it in calling a committee, one of whose tasks would be seeking representation at the forthcoming peace conference.' The manifesto's demands of UNCIO included equal rights; the eradication of illiteracy; economic development in the interests of Africans; and full self-government within definite time limits.<sup>59</sup> When it was published, as *Manifesto on Africa in the Post-War World*, the cover page stated that it was endorsed by the following trade union leaders on behalf of their unions: J.S. Annan (Gold Coast Trade Unions), T.A. Bankole (president, Nigerian TUC), H.N. Critchlow (British Guiana Trade Unions) and J.A. Garba-Jahumpa (secretary, Gambia TUC).<sup>60</sup>

Ken Hill also addressed a meeting in Liverpool, probably called by Dudley Burke, who described himself in the article he wrote about the visit as 'a Jamaican war worker in Liverpool'; he was also the chair of the PNP Supporters' Committee among the 'West Indian technicians.' Burke found it 'comforting that Hill found it necessary and possible to associate himself with George Padmore.' Hill spoke for over two hours, explaining the situation in Jamaica.<sup>61</sup>

#### IN THE CARIBBEAN

Thus far little evidence has come to light regarding agitation for representation or for colonial issues to be on the UN's agenda.<sup>62</sup> An article by George Padmore in the *Georgetown Daily Chronicle* of 2 February 1944, formed the substance of a meeting of the city's African Welfare Convention. Padmore reported that General de Gaulle had recently announced that he would 'extend certain of the principles outlined in the Atlantic Charter to the coloured races in the French Colonial Empire' at the end of the war (p.1). The Convention 'looked forward to an early application of the Charter in word and deed to these parts.'<sup>63</sup> The Caribbean Labour Congress held in British Guiana in February 1944 demanded 'that a definite declaration be made by the British Government and the Allies on the rights of the Colonial peoples under the Atlantic Charter, and the degree to which this was applicable to them.' According to the *Daily Chronicle*, another resolution demanded that 'there should be representation by native West Indians at the Peace Conference.'<sup>64</sup>

At the following year's Labour Congress, held in Barbados in September, it was noted that the resolution passed at the previous year's conference asking for 'representation by West Indians in the UNCIO structure' had been forwarded to the British government, 'but no reply had been received and no action taken.' Vivian Henry advocated that West Indians 'should join in whatever discussion takes place to settle the structure of the post-war world.' Hubert Critchlow called on the

Congress to 'reaffirm the resolution passed' in 1944. Richard Hart suggested that 'the Conference should ask for representation on the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission and similar bodies, not merely for West Indians but more widely for all Colonial peoples.' Albert Gomes agreed with Hart's last point, but suggested that a conference of colonial peoples should be called to ascertain 'the opinion of the colonies as to the administration in the post-war world.'<sup>65</sup>

Richard Hart in a letter to the author dated 13 February 1995 wrote that he did not 'know of any PNP representations to the United Nations.'

#### AT SAN FRANCISCO

Though the war was not yet over, for two months from April 25, the attention of the 'free' world was on the meeting of the United Nations Conference of International Organization in San Francisco. Besides the 282 official delegates of the 51 countries represented, every person and organisation which sought to have its wrongs redressed sent lobbyists to the city. In the disparaging words of the *Washington Post*, a 'little army of independistas (were) lobbying the press and the delegates.'<sup>66</sup> However, as already indicated, the agenda was fairly firmly set and controlled by the major powers, the most influential of which was the United States. The new U.S. President and his Secretary of State were not nearly as supportive of independence for colonies as Roosevelt and Hull had been. According to C.W. Taussig, an adviser to President Roosevelt on Caribbean affairs, Hull's memoranda on the question served as 'the veritable Bible of the advisers to the United States Delegation to San Francisco who were advocating strong colonial provisions in the Charter. . . . The fight for these was carried on against an indifferent and sometimes an antagonist delegation.' According to another observer, 'determined pressure to "humanize" the Charter was brought to bear on the U.S. delegation by the consultants.' A black writer believed that the consultants 'came to form some kind of "conscience" for the drafters of the Charter.'<sup>67</sup>

The *independistas* in San Francisco had to work through lobbying either the NAACP official consultants to the U.S. delegation or those delegations presumed to be sympathetic to their interests, such as those representing the Arab nations, Egypt, Haiti, Liberia or Ethiopia. Other tactics used were press conferences, telegramming delegates, and holding public meetings at which resolutions were passed for forwarding to the delegations, and which, it was hoped, would be reported in the newspapers.

From the beginning African-Americans questioned the possible

inefficacy of the official consultants, Bethune, Du Bois and White. For example, the *California Eagle* noted that the role of these consultants was unclear; was their appointment just an empty gesture, the paper queried. The *Pittsburgh Courier* commented a couple of weeks later that the 'Negro consultants do not even get a chance to see the delegates . . . (neither) do the observers. . . . Doubtless nobody ever thought of using them . . . (they) are sprinkled around to lie in the dust.'<sup>68</sup>

Despite some differences among themselves, the African-American organisations' representatives realised that the situation called for united action and a meeting was called under the leadership of Rev. J.L. Horace of the National Baptist Convention, Rev. G. Cooper Fountleroy, Dr. J. Finley Wilson and Judge Hobson R. Reynolds, the president of the Civil Liberties Commission.<sup>69</sup> Two weeks later the *Pittsburgh Courier* reported the formation of the Federated Organization of Colored Peoples of the World.<sup>70</sup> This group was presumably synonymous with that written up as the League of Races by the *California Eagle* on May 25. The League, whose secretary was Maneck Anklesaria of Calcutta, sent a proposal to the UN demanding equality, human and civil rights, self-government for all and a reduction in the power of the 'Major Powers'. Curiously, none of the colonial organisations appear to have been members.

The African-American consultants met formally twice a week with the Federated Organization to discuss progress.<sup>71</sup> The Organization worked hard: it visited national delegations, held press conferences and organised a banquet where seven nations were represented, in order to press its aim of having the UN Charter include guarantees of the 'rights and security of the colored peoples of the world.' It wanted a 'universal bill of rights, the abolition of the colonial system and equality for all races.' At both the banquet and at meetings with individual delegates the Organization emphasised 'how their interest and our interest tied together.' Realising that the Conference was not going to deal with these issues, the Organization decided it had to raise funds to send a deputation to the forthcoming peace conference.<sup>72</sup>

At a public meeting Dr. William Holmes Borders, chair of the National Baptist Convention, many of whose members became officials of the Federated Organization, gave an interim analysis of the Conference. 'National problems' could only be discussed if they were 'related to world problems.' If they were eventually included they could be used to strengthen the 'Negro's argument for justice in the south.' Dr. Ernest B. Kalibala, a Ugandan teaching at Morris Brown College, also addressed the meeting. He explained the history and European rationale for colonies and advocated 'an International Commission whose membership should include the colonial peoples in order to arrive at a

satisfactory conclusion.<sup>73</sup>

Well-known figures from the African-American world also attempted to intervene in the proceedings. Congressman Adam Clayton Powell had written to the Secretary of State regarding the colonial independence issue; Stettinius replied that there had been no 'modification in the historical and traditional attitude of the U.S. towards the right of all peoples to aspire to liberty and to attain it.'<sup>74</sup> James B. Cashin, the chairman of the board of the largest black weekly, the *Chicago Defender*, was not content with reporting the news – or with the progress of the Conference. He called a press conference at which he explained that the 'colonial system (was) abominable because it denied the opportunity for free and unhampered self-government and cultural growth.' What was needed was a colonial commission 'to hasten self-government and economic freedom.'<sup>75</sup>

Colonised peoples formed themselves into the Provisional World Council of Dominated Nations in April under the presidency of Ramkrishna S. Modak of India; the secretary was Julio Pinto Gandia, the secretary-general of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party; the treasurer was Mithrapuram K. Alexander. The Council issued a ten-point Resolution which included demands for the release of all political prisoners in the British and American colonies; the abolition of imperialism, independence for all dominated nations and representation at the Conference.<sup>76</sup>

On May 17 the Council held a meeting to protest against the Conference's decision not to allow their representative to speak at plenary sessions. According to one report, some UNCIO delegates were in attendance. Dr. Modak, described as a former Bombay jurist and legislator, stated that the Council's object was 'the liquidation of the fundamental cause of war, imperialism.'<sup>77</sup> Three days later the Council held a forum at which Gandia stated that the U.S. had ruined the economy of Puerto Rico and Dr. Modak spoke about India. Richard B. Moore of the WINC 'eloquently voiced the challenge of colonial conditions' and pointed out that the 'Anglo-American bloc resisted an attempt to write in a statement describing the objective of the trusteeship program as the eventual "self-government and independence" of the subjected people.' Other speakers were Kilsoo K. Haan of the Sino-Korean People's League and Radonegoes Daroesman, the president of the San Francisco Indonesian Association. The forum called for a unity of all the peoples of the world.<sup>78</sup>

The United Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), though a member of the Federated Organization, attempted to make its own interventions in San Francisco. Amy Jacques Garvey's *Memorandum Correlative of Africa, West Indies and the Americas*, a 66-page booklet, was sent to the UN delegates by B. Gibbons, president of the Garvey Club of

the UNIA in New York. The *Correlative Memorandum* asked the UN 'to prevent any regrouping of territories in Africa on the basis of European exploitation, either directly or through White Settlers in Africa' (p.44). The UN should declare the Six Freedoms for all peoples of African descent: an African Freedom Charter which would ensure economic, social, educational, political, spiritual and moral progress (p.60). An African Freedom Council should have oversight for the administration of this Charter.<sup>79</sup>

William L. Sherrill of the UNIA distributed to all Conference delegates a seven-point programme, which called for a trusteeship system to replace colonial exploitation, equal rights, the right to self-determination and representation at the Conference for all nations. Other demands were for 'equitable pay . . . preparation for free and independent life . . . human rights . . . (and) markets of raw materials which should be available to all who need them.'<sup>80</sup>

On June 1, by which the UN's neglect of the issue of the colonies had become manifest, the Garvey Club sent a telegram to the UNCIO. This expressed disappointment at the failure to adopt Mrs. Garvey's Freedom Charter and to 'guarantee full and complete independence to colonies, protectorates and trusteeship areas.'<sup>81</sup>

Lester Taylor, the UNIA representative in San Francisco, presented a memorandum to the UN's Trusteeship Commission and its Committee of Jurists, which included the UNIA's 1943 'Objectives of Peoples of African Blood and Descent', originally sent to President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin. An attached resolution asked the Security Council to create a special secretariat to receive and consider petitions for independence; within twelve months of receiving a petition, the Secretariat would have to hold a plebiscite and if the vote was affirmative, declare the nation free.<sup>82</sup>

The West Indies National Council, as noted above, also sent representatives to San Francisco. We have to presume that sometime early in May the WINC had called a meeting, as on May 14 the British Embassy in Washington forwarded to the Colonial Office the texts of speeches 'delivered by three leading members' of the WINC. Unfortunately, the Colonial Office has destroyed the file and I have not been able to find other accounts of this meeting. On May 25, as Dr. Petioni had been unable to secure a hearing at the Conference, Richard B. Moore wrote to Alger Hiss, secretary-general of the UNCIO, enclosing a copy of the Council's *Appeal to the World Security Conference of the United Nations on Behalf of the Caribbean Peoples*, and advising Hiss that it had been sent to every official delegate. Moore wrote that 'Freedom for the Caribbean peoples, as well as for the other 750,000,000 colonial peoples of America, Africa, Asia, is a prime requisite for world security

and peace.' He asked for immediate consideration of the demands for independence, economic development and the fulfillment of the terms of the Atlantic Charter. Hiss replied that it was 'not intended that the matter you mention will be a subject of action.'<sup>83</sup>

The WINC issued a press release outlining Moore's letter to Hiss (the reply had not yet been received) and the points in the *Appeal*. Articles based on this release appeared in the black press. The *Appeal* was also launched at a public meeting under the auspices of the Provisional World Council, where Richard B. Moore explained that it had been issued on behalf of British, French and Dutch West Indians. He emphasised the need for measures for economic development and the elimination of prejudice.<sup>84</sup> The *Appeal* as well as the press release were also sent to the Colonial Office.<sup>85</sup>

Besides working with the Provisional World Council, Moore also cooperated with others seeking independence. Thus, for example, he spoke at a Free India meeting towards the end of May, addressed by Mrs. Vijaya L. Pandit, sister of Jawaharlal Nehru. He thanked the Indian National Congress for having unequivocally condemned the invasion of Ethiopia by Italy in 1935, and asked the conference to reaffirm the principles of the Atlantic Charter and apply them to colonial peoples.<sup>86</sup>

Simultaneously, Dr. Petioni, having had to return to his medical practice in New York, expressed his disappointment that the U.S. had not taken a stand advocating independence for colonies. Those 'who had learned to look to America as a champion of freedom for all peoples,' he said, were disillusioned. This feeling was echoed by many commentators in the black press.<sup>87</sup>

As further discouraging reports appeared on the progress of the discussions, Moore tried again. On June 11 he sent a letter to all delegates requesting that the Charter of the United Nations Organisation should include independence as the goal and inalienable right of colonised peoples; he also asked for direct representation of the colonial peoples on the UN's commissions and agencies, and for the affirmation that the provisions of the Atlantic Charter applied to the peoples of colonial and dependent areas.<sup>88</sup>

In its press release the WINC pointed out that Moore's letter was in support of General Carlos P. Romulo's attempts to get 'independence' written into the Charter.<sup>89</sup> Romulo, the head of the Filipino delegation, had said at a press conference that he was speaking on behalf of the 600 million people not represented at the Conference, 'though it is a thankless task and it may be a lost cause.' As the General later recalled, he had decried colonialism in the General Assembly and had not been surprised to have the colonial powers 'lined up' against him; what had taken him aback was the 'non-committal attitude of Commander Henry

Stassen of the U.S. delegation.'<sup>90</sup> Romulo was soon silenced: Lord Cranborne noted in his diary entry for June 14 that the 'U.S. delegation had squared General Romulo about "independence".'<sup>91</sup> (Presumably a similar fate met the Ecuadorean delegation's proposal on May 1 that independence should be granted by the vote of two-thirds of the members, and the Egyptian delegate's plea that the UNCIO's aims should conform to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.<sup>92</sup>)

The Council's press release also welcomed the telegram which Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes had sent to the U.S. delegation, urging them to 'come out strongly for independence. . . . If this country fails to do so, it might well be regarded as a reversal of our traditional policy.'<sup>93</sup>

Moore clearly also continued to press his case with the UNCIO administration as a letter of the Acting Information Officer, Bryant Mumford, refers to Moore's letter of June 11 and 'previous correspondence.' Moore must have raised questions regarding the provisions in the chapter on trusteeship as Mumford wrote him that the UNCIO promoted the advancement and development of trust territories towards self-government 'in accordance with their (dependent peoples') capabilities.'<sup>94</sup> Unfortunately we have no record of Moore's reaction to this expression of a UN official's perceptions of colonised peoples.

According to the *Chicago Defender*, on two occasions Moore 'stirred huge audiences to new awareness of the potentiality of public opinion, declaring, "There is a power requisite to compel the statesmen to carry out the provision of human rights. That power is you and me. Peace like freedom is indivisible. It will come only at humanity's insistence. If a nation cannot endure half slave and half free, the world cannot endure half slave and half free".'<sup>95</sup>

The West Indies were also represented at San Francisco by Attorney Bindley C. Cyrus, who submitted to the UN a proposal for the establishment of a United States of the West Indies, incorporating all the Caribbean colonies and the Guianas. Social, educational and economic development should be financed by a joint British-American fund of about \$240 million, part interest-free loan and part outright gift.<sup>96</sup>

Dr. Max Yergan and Eslanda Goode Robeson were the representatives of the Council on African Affairs in San Francisco.<sup>97</sup> As soon as the Conference opened, the CAA submitted a memorandum to all the delegates demanding, *inter alia*, the establishment of an international colonial commission which would oversee the movement to self-government and self-determination.<sup>98</sup>

As the Conference discussions continued to omit the issue of colonial independence Paul Robeson sent a telegram to President Truman requesting 'forthright affirmation of the traditional American

principle of freedom for colonial peoples.' Why had this principle been omitted from the U.S. proposals, Robeson asked.<sup>99</sup> Probably a few days later, Robeson spoke on the theme of 'San Francisco and the Negro' at a meeting in Chicago, while in San Francisco Essie Robeson made an 'eloquent appeal for the independence of subject peoples everywhere to the (UN) session taking up the issue of trusteeships.'<sup>100</sup>

Yergan took a more analytical line in the statement he issued which maintained that the emphasis in the discussions on the protection of national interests, both military and economic, was not only dangerous, but 'obscured' the American proposals for international trusteeships. Trusteeship Councils should have jurisdiction over all colonial territories; the Councils' powers should be clearly defined and they should have colonial representation.<sup>101</sup> To bring added pressure on the U.S. government, the CAA contacted its supporters, asking them to send telegrams to the President and the U.S. delegation, urging the support of 'the traditional American policy of independence within a specified time.'<sup>102</sup>

These efforts were unsuccessful. In the editorial of the June issue of its journal *New Africa*, the CAA declared that there was only a moral commitment in the tentative agreements reached so far for some political and other advancement for colonial peoples. This 'inadequacy . . . must be attributed as much to the pressure of forces right here in America, as to the influence of imperialist interests abroad,' the editorial emphasised.

The CAA did not give up. The FBI agent keeping it under surveillance reported that Yergan had met with the Liberian, Haitian and Ethiopian delegates a number of times. He had also 'called a conference of Negro observers to attempt to unify their support for the CAA programme on the colonial question.' The agent also recorded that Yergan had been in 'close contact with - (name obliterated) of the Division of Dependent Area Affairs, who had facilitated Yergan meeting delegates.'<sup>103</sup> Presumably the official named was one-time CAA member Ralph Bunche. On returning to New York Yergan sent telegrams to the Soviet, British, French, American and Chinese delegates, and subsequently to all other delegates, pressing for the inclusion of independence and self-determination for colonial peoples in the UN's objectives.<sup>104</sup>

Having failed at San Francisco the CAA produced a leaflet, *Text and Analysis of the Colonial Provisions of the United Nations Charter*, which offered a stringent clause-by-clause critique of the relevant Articles of the UN Charter. It was disseminated widely as its aim was 'to assist in developing a clear public understanding of the responsibility of the American people for securing the maximum effort by the United

Nations Organization on behalf of the freedom and well-being of all colonial peoples.' Interestingly, there is a typescript of the *Text*, date stamped 1945, in the files of the British Trades Union Congress. A Foreign Office official's comment on reading the *Text* reveals as much about the imminence of the Cold War as about the FO's attitude to colonies: he described the leaflet as 'a captious summary, which applauds permanent membership of Russia and China on the Trusteeship Council.' The Colonial Office received a copy of the *Text* in August, but its response will remain forever unknown as the file has been destroyed.<sup>105</sup>

The NAACP consultants, Mary McLeod Bethune, W.E.B. Du Bois and Walter White (replaced by Roy Wilkins on May 24), having conferred with the major African-American organisations in the U.S., announced that they were not just speaking for themselves - they represented all these groups.<sup>106</sup> The consultants met, wrote Mrs Bethune, 'constantly with the representatives of the national (Negro) organizations who have banded themselves together in one united group. We advise them and they advise us.' They also met with the U.S. delegation 'as often as necessary,' and were also in constant touch with 'the consultants of other nations. . . . Through this Conference the Negro becomes more closely allied with the darker races of the world. . . . To the Negro people the Conference has but one meaning, that is how far democratic practices shall be stretched to embrace the rights of their brothers in the colonies as well as the American Negro's own security at home.'<sup>107</sup>

In his report to the NAACP, White outlined the initial problems the consultants faced: the U.S. delegates had not intended to 'actively work for a human rights commission or for action on colonial trusteeship.' The consultants had had to be 'almost brutally frank in serving notice that they expected and insisted that the Americans take an unequivocal stand.'<sup>108</sup> In a private letter to his friend attorney Arthur B. Spingarn, Du Bois was quite forthright in his criticism of the American delegates: 'as consultants we could do little, although we exercised some little influence. . . . Not a whisper against colonialism could be heard. . . . They would not take a stand for any race equality, or for colonies, but did back some contradictory statement on human rights.'<sup>109</sup>

The three NAACP consultants did what they could. Du Bois and White held 'numerous conferences with members of foreign delegations, including those of France, Haiti, Liberia, the Philippines, Australia and some of the South American ones.' They also expected to meet with Lord Halifax (U.K. Ambassador), Anthony Eden and Mr. Molotov, and 'the representatives of as many other powers as is possible.' Mrs. Bethune also met with delegates and found Mrs. Pandit especially impressive. She also held two successful press conferences.<sup>110</sup> The trio

also addressed numerous public meetings: for example, Walter White speaking at the St. Matthews AME Church criticised the U.S. delegates for not taking 'the high moral ground taken by the U.S.S.R. and China' (see below).<sup>111</sup> Du Bois, at a meeting in mid May, emphasised that the 'causes of war will remain if the colonial question is not addressed.'<sup>112</sup>

The NAACP representatives raised specific issues with the U.S. delegation and sought publicity for their perspective on these. On May 2 White reported to New York headquarters that they had presented a proposal affirming the equality of all peoples and arguing for an international colonial commission to bring about self-government for all colonial peoples. NAACP branches were subsequently asked to send telegrams along these lines to Secretary of State Stettinius.<sup>113</sup>

On May 7 the African-American consultants sent a telegram to Stettinius pointing out that as colonies had been declared to be within the metropolises' 'domestic jurisdiction,' the UN would be unable to intervene to safeguard colonised peoples' rights, despite the agreed declaration against discrimination and for fundamental freedoms. Moreover, there were no 'provisions for Native representation' in the proposed trusteeship administration. In its report of this telegram, the *Christian Science Monitor* noted that the consultants had pointed out that the 725 million colonised peoples had no official representation at San Francisco; they had also demanded concrete provisions for transition to autonomy.<sup>114</sup> Before leaving San Francisco White met with Stettinius specifically over the all-important issue of domestic jurisdiction.<sup>115</sup> The statement apparently reached the Colonial Office shortly after it was issued.<sup>116</sup>

However, all the efforts proved fruitless. In mid-May Du Bois had to point out to the U.S. delegates and Stettinius that the proposed Bill of Rights omitted specific mention of colonised peoples. He again asked for equality and a colonial commission.<sup>117</sup>

When it was reported in the media that it was the U.S. and Britain that had blocked the proposal by China and the U.S.S.R. to include the promise of independence in the UN Charter, the NAACP consultants wired Stettinius and Stassen warning that if the reports were correct, 'such a stand would be interpreted as a negation of all our statements that this is a war being fought for the freedom of all people. . . . Coloured peoples will interpret this as the determination of whites of the world to deny freedom to coloured peoples.' NAACP branches were asked to send similar telegrams.<sup>118</sup>

On his way back to New York, White stopped in Washington to talk with President Truman, urging him to include in his closing address to the Conference the affirmation of 'America's position for freedom and independence by calling another world conference dealing with

dependent peoples, trusteeship and human rights.'<sup>119</sup> Early in June Du Bois also returned to New York. At a press conference in the office of his publishers he stated that the UN, 'by deciding that the international organization cannot interfere with domestic matters such as colonies, has disenfranchised 750 million persons living in colonies and made no provision for their representation in the new world order.'<sup>120</sup> A few days later Du Bois sent copies of his new book, *Color and Democracy*, to all the U.S. delegates.<sup>121</sup>

## ASSESSMENTS OF THE CONFERENCE

According to Charles K. Webster, on the staff of the British delegation, Britain had 'allowed our mandates to go under the new control (the Trusteeship Commission), but for the rest the matter remains exactly as before except that there is machinery if states desire to put their colonial territories under it. We have no such intention, and I'm sure no other power has.'<sup>122</sup>

African-Americans were of the same opinion. Some of the editorial comments in their press were:

The goal of independence got the brush-off. (*Philadelphia Tribune*, 30/6/1945)

The Charter is scarcely a resounding victory for dependent peoples. . . . There is no compulsion to act upon noble ideals. . . . Independence is not included. (*New York Age*, 20/6/1945)

The conference is a waste of time and money and a cruel buoying of the hopes of the subjugated and oppressed people. . . . Just words, words, words. There is no real power in the Charter to apply any of the enunciated principles. (*Pittsburgh Courier*, 26/5/1945, 2/6/1945)

The lights have gone on again for the coloured people nowhere in the world. Whites only and only for whites is the foundation of the peace structure being built. . . . Coloured folk are still in the Jim Crow car of world affairs. (Earl Brown in *The New York Amsterdam News*, 26/5/1945)

It is more clear than ever that colonial peoples will never have freedom given to them – they will have to take it. (George Schuyler in *The African*, vol.3, no.3, July/August 1945)

The colonial press was like-minded:

It is obvious that UNCIO will not even try to tackle the colonial problem. . . . It leaves you disheartened. . . . The design is to bolster British imperialism. (*Jamaican Public Opinion*, 21/5/1945)

We the unrepresented millions have sat and watched the 'power politics' of the plutocrats. An almost subconscious revival of a litany of diplomatic platitudes . . . have featured the discussions. . . . We cannot help but express our disappointment. (*West African Pilot*, 4/6/1945, 12/6/1945)

San Francisco and the world has once more returned to terrific scramble for colonial territories and spheres of influence. . . . New life has been infused into predatory imperialism. (*Nigerian Daily Service*, 26/5/1945<sup>123</sup>)

And the activists? Dr. Mordecai Johnson expressed 'grievous disappointment with the moral calibre of the leadership of the official American delegation.' W.E.B. Du Bois asked the U.S. Senate to amend the Charter by adding the establishment of a colonial commission and a statement on equality. Kumar Goshal wrote that colonial peoples were dismayed and 'bewildered by the lack of any vigorous support at San Francisco.' Roy Wilkins 'in a blistering editorial (in the *Crisis*) declared that by voting against the proposal for colonial freedom, the U.S. had renounced its own revolutionary heritage.' The CAA wrote that the 'World Charter, while quite lengthy and filled with unctuous rhetoric, has failed to establish the means for the UN to insure the effective and rapid economic, social and political advancement of colonial peoples.' Padmore was brief: '*plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.*'<sup>124</sup>

## NOTES

1. See, for example, H.V. Evatt, *The United Nations*, O.U.P., Melbourne 1948; Leland M. Goodrich, *The United Nations*, Stevens & Son, London 1960; Huntington Gilchrist, 'The Colonial Question at San Francisco', *American Political Science Review*, 34/5, October 1945, pp. 982-992; Evan Luard, *The History of the United Nations* (vol. 1, 1945-1955), Macmillan, London 1982; Ruth B. Russell, *A History of the United Nations*, Brookings Institute, Washington D.C. 1958. Harold Stassen, *Where I Stand*, Doubleday & Co, New York 1947; Escott Reid, *On Duty*, Kent State University Press 1983; Paul Hasluck, *Diplomatic Witness*, Melbourne University Press 1980; *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg*, Gollancz, London 1953. See also P.A. Reynolds and E.J. Hughes, *The Historian as Diplomat*, Martin Robertson, London 1976; W.J. Hudson, *Australia and the New World*, Australian National University 1993 and also his *Australia and the Colonial Question at the U.N.*, Sydney University Press 1970.
2. W.E.B. Du Bois, 'The Colonies at San Francisco', *Trek*, 5/4/1945. On FDR's attitudes, see also Clark Eichelberger, *Organizing for Peace*, Harper & Row, New

- York 1977, p.247; Foster Rhea Dulles and Gerald E. Ridinger, 'The Anti-Colonial Policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt', *Political Science Quarterly*, 70/1, March 1955. Secretary of State Cordell Hull was, according to C.W. Taussig, strongly interested in the 'problems and well-being of dependent peoples' and had pressed British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden to declare not only for the independence of colonies, but to put a timetable to its achievement. Taussig believed that Hull had under-reported his struggles on behalf of dependent peoples in his *Memoirs*. C.W. Taussig to Colonel Berding 23/10/1947, Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park: Taussig Papers, Box 43.
3. Elliott Roosevelt, *As He Saw It*, Duell, Sloan & Pearce, New York 1946, pp.25, 74-5.
  4. See Ernest B. Haas, 'Trusteeship and Colonialism', *International Organization*, 7/1, February 1953, pp.1-21; Wm. Roger Louis, 'American Anti-colonialism and the British Empire', *International Affairs*, 61/3, Summer 1965, pp.397-420. The Soviets understood this: for example, E. Zhukov in 'The Colonial Question at the Present Stage' (*The War and the Working Class*, no.6, 15/3/1945) wrote that 'The Americans would like a change in the colonies' status so as to allow unhindered investment of American capital and a free market for U.S. goods . . . (America) wants to use India's resources in the war against Japan.'
  5. Roosevelt, p.41. For a journalist's eyewitness account see H.V. Morton, *Atlantic Meeting*, Methuen & Co, London 1943; for a political eyewitness, see Robert E. Sherwood, *The White House Papers of Harry L. Hopkins*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London 1948, vol.1, chapter 16.
  6. Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, believed that 'our position (was) that the Atlantic Charter applies to all peoples alike...(The) entire government believed in this.' *Memoirs of Cordell Hull*, Hodder & Stoughton, London 1948, p.1484.
  7. See Wm. Roger Louis, *Imperialism at Bay*, OUP 1978, pp.121-130. This excellent book traces the trajectory of the colonial question at the various Big Power meetings from 1941 to 1945.
  8. It is important to note that the major power attempted to control, if not preempt discussion by the 51 nations at the Conference by drawing up these discussion documents, thus setting the agenda. Not that discussion was 'free': Sir Alexander Cadogan, a member of the U.K. delegation, wrote in his diary that 'the Americans did what they could with their Latin American protegés and we got to work on ours. (I put in some work . . . intimidating Saudi Arabians, Turks and others.)' D. Dilks (ed), *The Diaries of Sir Alexander Cadogan 1935-1945*, Alexander, London 1971, p.738. Senator Tom Connally, a U.S. delegate, wrote in his autobiography that 'several times, on close issues we told him (Nelson Rockefeller), "Look, get your people lined up right away".' Rockefeller, the head of the Office of Inter-American Affairs and 'a powerful figure in the Latin economy, was acting as liaison with Latin American delegates.' Gabriel Kolko, *The Politics of War* (1968), Pantheon Books, New York 1990, p.475.
  9. Judge William Hastie warned Walter White of the NAACP on 11 April of the Army and Navy's demands for bases and that military's advice was for the U.S. to tell the imperial powers that what they did in their colonies was of no concern to the U.S. White to Wilkins 11/4/1945 regarding an urgent phone call from Hastie, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II box 639. See also, for example, Werner Levi, 'The United States and the Pacific Bases', *The Fortnightly*, September 1946, pp.165-171. Trusteeship referred to the issue of

- mandated territories – ie, colonies taken from the loser and mandated to the victor at the end of WWI; and also to colonies seized from the Axis powers in the present conflict.
10. Louis 1978, pp.374–377; Russell, p.510. For a trenchant critique of the Dunbarton Oaks proposals see W.E.B. Du Bois, 'Imperialism, United Nations, Colonial People', *New Leader* 30/12/1944, p.5.
  11. The British delegates would have breathed a sigh of relief had they known this. In a Top Secret telegram from San Francisco Lord Cranborne advised the Secretary of State for Colonies that 'our difficulty is political. We cannot count on carrying any point which may be pressed to a vote in Committee unless the U.S. supports us. We are therefore in a dilemma that if we feel so strongly on any point that we cannot meet U.S. views and must force the issue, the almost certain result will be that we lose altogether.' PRO: FO371/50809/U3665/191/70.
  12. See, for example, H.K. Jacobson, 'The U.N. and Colonialism' in L.M. Goodrich and D.A. Kay (eds), *International Organization: Politics and Processes*, University of Wisconsin Press 1973, p.289; *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg*, Gollancz, London 1953, notes for 17 April 1945. See also H.S. Challenor, 'The Contribution of Ralph Bunche to Trusteeship and Decolonization' in B. Rivlin (ed), *Ralph Bunche*, Holmes & Meier, New York 1990, esp. p.137. Yet, as late as January there were serious areas of disagreement between the U.K. and the U.S.A.. See Secretary of State's report to President Roosevelt on the British Colonial Secretary's visit to the U.S. 31/1/1945, Hyde Park: Roosevelt Papers, OF4630.
  13. Vernon McKay, 'The Impact of the United Nations on Africa' in C. Grove Haines (ed) *Africa Today*, Johns Hopkins, Baltimore 1955, p.368.
  14. Kenneth J. Twitchett, 'The Colonial Powers and the United Nations', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 4/1, Jan. 1969, p.180.
  15. See, for example, Julius W. Pratt, 'Anti-colonialism in U.S. Policy' in R. Strausz-Hupe and H.W. Hazard (eds), *The Idea of Colonialism*, Atlantic Books, London 1948; Yassin E. Ayouty, *The UN and Decolonisation*, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague 1971; S. Hasan Ahmed, *The UN and the Colonies*, Asia Publishing House, New York 1974; Emil J. Sady, *The UN and Dependent Peoples*, Brookings Institute, Washington DC 1956. Jacobson (p.306) noted the 'deep dichotomy between Lord Cranborne and Fadhil al-Jamali of Iraq, Carlos Romulo of Philippines and Professor Amad of Egypt.'
  16. See Hollis R. Lynch, *Black American Radicals and the Liberation of Africa: the Council on African Affairs 1937-1955*, Cornell University 1978, p.17. See also Dorothy Hunton, *Alphaeus Hunton: The Unsung Valiant*, Eca Associates, Virginia n.d. (c.1986); Martin B. Duberman, *Paul Robeson*, Knopf, New York 1988. The FBI files on Yergan show that he became an FBI informant from about October 1948. Report by New York agent 4/10/1948, FBI Archives: file 100–210026 vol.12, serials 225–270.
  17. Flyers in Schomburg Center Scrapbooks; the year is not given. On Robeson in Canada, see Duberman, p.669, n. 1.
  18. Leaflet *What of Africa's place in tomorrow's world?*, National Council of Negro Women's archives, series 5, box 10, folder 171.
  19. Duberman, p.669, n.2.
  20. Lynch, p.28.
  21. *For a New Africa – Proceedings of the Conference on Africa*, National Archives:

- RG59:880.50/6–2344; *Summary of Conference Discussion*, Hunton Papers: Schomburg Center MG237, folder 2/6; *New Africa*, 3/5, May 1944, pp.13. There are copies of the *Proceedings* in the NAACP Papers, Group 2, box A4; also in the Ghana National Archives, Nkrumah Papers, SC21/1/64 and in PRO: FO371/38639/AN2791/397/45. There is also an FBI report, dated 29/4/1944, file 100–692 66, in the Du Bois Papers, University of Massachusetts: Box 378, file 43, group 312 series 23. The British Embassy's reports of 26/4/1944 and 1/5/1944, are in PRO: FO371/38639/AN1768/397/45 and AN1837/397/45.
22. Correspondence between CO and MOI 6/9/1944, 11/9/1944 and 20/9/1944, PRO: FO371/38639/AN3432/397/45 and AN3498/397/45.
  23. CAA's letters to President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, 15/12/1944, Schomburg Center: Hunton Papers, MG237.
  24. Paul Robeson and Max Yergan to Henry S. Villard 15/12/1944 and Villard to Robeson 4/1/1945, National Archives, RG59:500.00/12–1544 and FW500. CC12–1544.
  25. Editorial, *New Africa*, 4/4, 1945.
  26. *The San Francisco Conference and the Colonial Issue* is in both the NAACP and the Hunton Papers.
  27. CAA to National Negro Congress 17/4/1945, Schomburg Center: NNC Papers, reel 1208, 'UN'; 'Council Sends Colonial Plan to 'Frisco Delegates', *The Richmond Afro-American* 21/4/1945, p.9 and also in the (Baltimore) *Afro-American* on the same day; *Pittsburgh Courier* 28/4/1945; FBI report for 5/2/1945, FBI Archives: file 100–692 66.
  28. Note by Poynton 5/6/1944, PRO: CO968/160/4.
  29. NAACP to Du Bois 17/5/1944, Du Bois Papers, reel 56, frames 404, 412; Du Bois quoted by Herbert Aptheker in his introduction to W.E.B. Du Bois, *Color & Democracy: Colonies & Peace* (1945), Kraus Thomson, Millwood, New York 1975, p.10.
  30. Du Bois 1975, pp.128–130; Denton L. Watson, 'The NAACP and Africa: An Historical Profile', *Crisis*, April 1977, pp.131–138, esp. p.136.
  31. NAACP Press Release, 'Du Bois Hits Colonial Issues at State Department Conference', National Council of Negro Women Archives, series 5, box 22, folder 336; 'Colonial Question Ignored at Dunbarton Oaks Peace Session', *Pittsburgh Courier* 28/10/1944, p.4. Reporters were not allowed into the meeting.
  32. Denton L. Watson, 'The NAACP and Africa: An Historical Profile', *Crisis*, April 1977, pp.133–4.
  33. Du Bois Papers, reel 58, frames 0012/3.
  34. Du Bois 1975, pp.128–9.
  35. Watson, p.134.
  36. Du Bois to Secretary of State Stettinius 10/3/1945 and to Benjamin Gerig 21/3/1945; Gerig to Du Bois 21/4/1945, Du Bois Papers, reel 58, frames 0012–3, 0016. That Du Bois had not received a reply is stated by Herbert Aptheker in his *The Correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois*, vol.3, University of Massachusetts Press 1978, p. 8. Mordecai Johnson, the president of Howard University, had requested the State Department in November 1944 to permit Du Bois to attend the UN sessions as an 'unofficial and informed observer'. J. Byrnes, State Department to U.S. Embassy, London, 5/11/1944, National Archives, RG59: 501.PA/11– 545.

37. On the appointment of Bethune, see Harris 1991, pp.135–6.
38. Lord Halifax to Foreign Office 11/4/1945, PRO: F0371/50698/U2673/1270. The second comment appears to be signed by Alex Cadogan, who was part of the British delegation.
39. Du Bois to Norman Manley 10/10/1944, Aptheker (1978), vol.3, pp.1–2.
40. All the correspondence is in Du Bois Papers, reel 56, frames 1248–9, 1254–6, 1265, 1386; reel 57, frames 0203–4, 0208–0210, 0228, 0240–2, 0386–0394, 0565–68, 0740, 1079, 1082–3, 1086–7, 1096–7, 1147, 1150, 1169, 1171–4, 1264; reel 58, frames 0012, 0015, 0208, 0244. Du Bois to Roy Wilkins 26/2/1945, and Wilkins accepting invitation 2/3/1945, NAACP Papers Group II Box A197. See also Harris 1991, p.132.
41. Report of conference in *New York Amsterdam News* 14/4/1945.
42. *New York Amsterdam News* 14/4/1945, p.1; *Richmond Afro-American* 21/4/1945, p.7; *Pittsburgh Courier*, 14/4/1945; 'Instant Freedom Planned at NAACP Colonial Parley', (Baltimore) *Afro-American* 21/4/1945. The conference was reported in London in the *League of Coloured People's Newsletter*, June 1945. The full list of the resolutions committee members is in Du Bois' Report of the Department of Special Research, March 12 – April 9, 1945, National Council of Negro Women Archives, series 5, box 22, folder 337.
43. 'Conference Observers to Request Equality for All', *The Afro-American*, 28/4/1945 p.15; 'Harlem Rally Supports San Francisco', *Chicago Defender* 28/4/1945. Anson Phelps-Stokes of the Phelps Stokes Fund, a white philanthropic organisation much concerned with Africans and the colonies in general, was less than pleased with some of the statements at the conference. He wrote to White, with a copy to Du Bois objecting, *inter alia*, to Goshal's claim that India's poverty was attributable to imperialism, and to another speaker's claim that 'colonialism has caused poverty, illiteracy and disease.' Anson Phelps-Stokes to Walter White 19/4/1945, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box 169.
44. NAACP resolution dated 9/4/1945, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box A639; even the *New York Times* reported this missive to the President on 12/4/1945, p.25.
45. 'NAACP Will Seek Bill of Rights, Race Equality', *League of Coloured People's Newsletter*, June 1945, p.54; *Afro-American* 28/4/1945.
46. 'White Warns Against Colonial Policy in East', *Afro-American* 21/4/1945, p.5.
47. On the Havana Conference see *The Memoirs of Cordell Hull*, pp.791–2, 821–8; John S. Young, *Lest We Forget*, Insider Books, New York n.d. (c.1992), pp.213–6. In about 1941 the WINC and another organisation, the West Indian Association for Caribbean Affairs (WIA) had tried to persuade President Roosevelt to appoint West Indians to his Caribbean Advisory Committee. Jamaican-born journalist A.M. Wendell Malliet had been a member of the WIA but is said to have resigned when it decided to cooperate with the WINC. Ethelred Brown was said to be on the WIA's Board of Directors. 'Social and Political Forces in the Dependent Areas of the Caribbean', Dec. 1944, U.S. National Archives: RG59: 844.00/3–945.
48. W. Burghardt Turner and Joyce Moore Turner (eds), *Richard B. Moore*, Pluto Press, London 1992, pp.73–76. On events in Jamaica during these years, see, for example, Richard Hart, *Rise and Organise*, Karia Press, London 1989; on Trinidad, see W. Richard Jacobs (ed), *Butler Versus the King*, Key Caribbean

- Publications, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad 1976 and Selwyn Ryan, *Race and Nationalism in Trinidad and Tobago*, University of Toronto Press 1974.
49. Osborne of the WINC to President Roosevelt 17/1/1944; Osborn sent a copy of his letter to the British Ambassador with a request that it should be forwarded to the FO and the CO, 26/1/1944. The letter was forwarded on 4/2/1944. PRO: CO318/462/2. The Anglo-American Caribbean Commission had been set up in 1942 to aid cooperation on social and economic development. On some facets of Domingo's and Richard B Moore's early years in the U.S., see Harold Cruse, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, New York 1967.
50. PRO: F0371/38369/AN3745/3976/45; U.S. National Archives, RG59: 844.00/3–945.
51. Report of Moore's speech sent to the Colonial Office, PRO: CO28/336/7. Roosevelt and Churchill agreed to swop 50 mothballed U.S. destroyers for military bases in Newfoundland, the Bahamas, Bermuda and the Caribbean. It apparently did not occur to Roosevelt's anticolonial sentiments that the peoples of the islands should have been consulted. The story is told in full in Philip Goodhart, *Fifty Ships that Saved the World*, Heinemann, London 1965.
52. Reginald Pierrepointe of Barbados was a journalist. 'West Indians Seek Seat at Frisco Confab', *New York Amsterdam News* 7/4/1945, p.5A; 'West Indians Ask Voice at World Security Meet', (Baltimore) *Afro-American* 14/4/1945; 'West Indians Nominate Five Delegates to San Francisco', *New York Amsterdam News* 14/4/1945, p.8A; *New York Age* 14/4/1945; *Chicago Defender* 28/4/1945; fundraising circular, Schomburg Center: National Negro Congress Papers, reel 1208, 'UN'.
53. *Public Opinion* 9/4/1945; *West African Pilot* 28/4/1945, p.1. According to James Spady's *Marcus Garvey, Africa and the UNIA* (Marcus Garvey Memorial Foundation, New York 1985, p.94), Barbara Watson, Mabel Staupers and Vivienne Parker were co-chairs of the WINC. He does not give a date.
54. For the history and activities of the Jamaica Progressive League see John S. Young, *Lest We Forget*.
55. U.S. National Archives, RG59:844.00/3–945.
56. This whole paragraph is from PRO: CO318/462/2 and 318/462/3. The resolution also appeared in *Public Opinion*, 4/3/1944, p.3. In June 1948 Dr. Eric Williams, who had done some part-time research for the AACC in Washington, was appointed as deputy chairman of the AACC's Research Council. Unfortunately in his autobiography, *Inward Hunger* (University of Chicago Press, 1969), Eric Williams says nothing about his association with Caribbean activists in the U.S.
57. Williams (n.56), p.82; 'The Four Freedoms For Jamaica', *Public Opinion*, 17 & 18/2/1944; 25/3/1944, pp.3, 6–8. On Ethelred Brown, see Mark D. Morrison-Reed, *Black Pioneers in a White Denomination*, Beacon Press, Boston 1984.
58. *New York Times*, 13/1/1945, p.7; also quoted in African Transcripts, no.2, March 1945, p.44. WFTU, *A Call to All the Peoples*, London 1945; text of Critchlow's speech in Modern Records Centre, Warwick University: TUC 910.11. Ken Hill was among the colonial WFTU delegates who attended a special meeting called by the Fabian Colonial Bureau on February 19; he noted there that he had tried to 'establish relations with the British TUC but without success.' ILO Archives, Geneva: NL 1/25/6, FBC. See also George Padmore (ed), *The Voice of Coloured Labour*, London 1946. En route home after the conference Critchlow was not

- allowed to land in Port-of-Spain; according to Padmore's article in the *Chicago Defender* (16/6/1945), this was because after a visit to Moscow he was seen as a "dangerous" black leader.'
59. George Padmore, 'Call for Pan-African Parley Drafted by British Colonial Leaders', *Chicago Defender* 17/3/1945; 'Pan-African Confab'; *West African Pilot* 30/4/1945, pp.1, 2; *Chicago Defender* 10 & 17/3/1945. On Padmore see James R. Hooker, *Black Revolutionary*, Pall Mall Press, London 1967, and Padmore's own books. The Hooker book does not do justice to Padmore.
  60. Ibrahim Garba-Jahumpa has been given a variety of initials by authors; I am guided by the appreciation of him in *West Africa*, 12–18 September 1994, p.1581.
  61. 'Our Proudest Night in West Indies House', *Public Opinion*, 23/3/1945, p.2. An immediate outcome of Hill's visit was an offer by the National Council of Labour Colleges to run classes at the hostel.
  62. This may be due to the paucity of Caribbean papers in the British Library.
  63. *Daily Chronicle*, 22/2/1944, p.6. Interestingly, the main speaker on this issue was J.A. Barbour-James, a retired civil servant who had lived in Britain for many years and had been active in various U.K.-based black organisations, including the League of Coloured People.
  64. *Empire*, 7/1, May 1944, pp.5–6; *Daily Chronicle*, 28/2/1944, p.5, 3/3/1944, pp.1, 4; *The Sunday Chronicle*, 27/2/1944, p.1; *The Barbados Advocate*, 31/3/1944.
  65. Caribbean Labour Congress, *Official Report, Conference in Barbados September 17–27, 1945*, p.11.
  66. The number of lobbyists is not known. There were 2,636 media representatives, and 2,262 military, 400 Red Cross and 800 Boy Scout helpers. G. Ferrari-Bravo, p.76; E. Meyer, *Report on San Francisco*, *The Washington Post* 1945, p.12. This is a reprint of the *Post's* editorials on UNCIO; the comment is from the editorial published on 3/5/1945.
  67. C.W. Taussig to Colonel Berding 23/10/1947, Hyde Park: Roosevelt Library, Taussig Papers, Box 43; Vera Micheles Dean, 'The San Francisco Conference', *Foreign Policy Reports*, July 15, 1945, pp.110–125. (Dean represented the Foreign Policy Association at San Francisco.) Sue Thurman writing in the *Chicago Defender*, 26/5/1945 (Thurman was the wife of Dr. Howard Thurman, former professor of religious studies at Howard University and inter-racial church leader in San Francisco at the time of the Conference). On how the U.S. planned administratively, see Eugen P. Chase, *The United Nations in Action*, McGraw-Hill, New York 1950.
  68. 'UN Security Confab Poses Questions for Consultants', *California Eagle* 3/5/1945, p.1; *Pittsburgh Courier* 19/5/1945.
  69. Either this founding meeting or another called a few days later was addressed by Edgar G. Brown of the National Negro Congress, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, Mary McLeod Bethune and Judge Reynolds. Harris 1991, pp.138–8; *California Eagle* 3/5/1945; *Pittsburgh Courier* 5/5/1945; *San Francisco Chronicle* 4/5/1945, p.10.
  70. The members included The Baptists, Elks, the Film and Radio Guild, the National Bar Association, the National Council of Colored Women, The National Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, the National Medical Association, the NNC, the UNIA and the National Teachers' Association.
  71. *Pittsburgh Courier* 19/5/1945; 'Race Group form World Federation', *Pittsburgh Courier* 2/6/1945, p.2.
  72. *Pittsburgh Courier* 2/6/1945.
  73. 'Borders Speaks at Frisco Meet', *Atlanta Daily World* 15/5/1945, pp.1,5.
  74. Edward R. Stettinius to Adam Clayton Powell 7/6/1945, Schomburg Center: NNC Papers, reel 1208.
  75. *Chicago Defender* 12/5/1945.
  76. Modak and Gandia had attended the April 6 colonial conference in New York, as reported above. Flyer in UN Archives PAG 5-1.2, Box 5; *The Statesman* 20/5/1945, p.5.
  77. *West African Pilot* 19/5/1945, p.1. Two excellent, if aged, books on U.S. imperialism in Puerto Rico are Manuel Maldonado-Denis, *Puerto Rico: A Socio-historic Interpretation*, Vintage Books, New York 1972; Gordon K. Lewis, *Notes on the Puerto Rican Revolution*, Monthly Review Press, New York 1974. See also Sidney Lens, *The Forging of the American Empire*, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York 1974.
  78. *San Francisco Chronicle* 21/5/1945, p.5; *San Francisco Reporter* 25/5/1945; WINC Press Release 26/5/1945, PRO: CO968/160/4. It is not quite clear from these reports which meeting was attended by the UNCIO delegates. There is also some discrepancy in the literature over the spelling of Daroesman's first name as well as over the name of this organisation.
  79. Amy Jacques Garvey, *Memorandum Correlative of Africa, West Indies and the Americas*, Jamaica 1944; T.T. McCoskey to B. Gibbons, Garvey Club, 8/5/1945, both in UN Archives; PAG5-2.2.3, Box 22. The Memorandum was duly sent to the Colonial Office. PRO: C0968/160/4.
  80. 'Democratic Colonial Administration Asked', *California Eagle* 3/5/1945, p.1.
  81. Garvey Club Press Release 1/6/1945, Schomburg Center: Vertical File FSN Sc 005,365–1.
  82. Lester E. Howard Taylor to UN 14/6/1945; Bryant Mumford to Taylor thanking him, UN Archives: PAG5-2.2.3, Box 22; Petition from UNIA, n.d., UN Archives: PAG5-1.2, Box 2.
  83. Richard B. Moore to Alger Hiss 25/5/19–5; Hiss to Moore 1/6/1945, UN Archives: PAG5-1.2, Box 4; 'Self Government for Caribbean Peoples', *Public Opinion* (Jamaica) 15/6/1945, p.2.
  84. Press release 26/5/1945, PRO: CO968/160/4; 'West Indians Plead for Eventual Independence', *California Eagle* 31/5/1945; 'West Indians Seek Full Independence', *Chicago Defender* 2/6/1945; *Philadelphia Tribune* 2/6/1945; *Richmond Afro-American* 30/6/1945, p.24. See also Turner and Turner (1992), pp.80–81.
  85. Page for file 14814/11/11 in Register of Correspondence PRO: CO974/22. The file itself has been destroyed.
  86. *San Francisco Chronicle* 26/5/1945, p.3; *The Statesman* 30/5/1945, p.6; Richard B. Moore's speech, 'The Fate and Future of the Colonial Peoples', NYPL: XFT pv10 vol.1, pt.2; *Public Opinion* 25/6/1945 p.3; 26/6/1945, p.3.
  87. 'West Indies Seek Full Independence', *Chicago Defender* 2/6/1945.
  88. Richard B. Moore to the Honorable Delegates of the UNCIO, 11/6/1945, UN Archives: PAG5-1.2, Box 4.
  89. WINC press release 13/6/1945, UN Archives PAG5-1.2, Box 4; 'Push Colonial Freedom Drive', *Chicago Defender* 23/6/1945.
  90. 'Romulo Champions Inserting Independence in Objectives Preamble', *New York Times* 2/6/1945, p.10; *Jamaican Gleaner* 10/6/1945; *San Francisco Chronicle*

- 2/6/1945, p.4; *Star of India* 28/5/1945, p.6; Carlos P. Romulo, *Forty Years*, Greenwood Press, New York 1986, pp.38–45. Romulo notes with apparent pride that he had been nominated by African states for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1982 'because of my fight to include that phrase (independence) in the Charter'.
91. Minute by Cranborne 14/6/1945, PRO: CO968/162/3. Lord Cranborne, though listed among the U.K. delegates as Secretary of State for the Dominions, was in fact the Leader of the House of Lords; he had been Secretary in the Foreign Office (1935–38), the Dominions (1940) and the Colonies (1942). P.H. Gore Booth, in San Francisco as adviser in the U.K. delegation, a few days earlier had described General Romulo as 'that shallow mountebank'. Gore Booth to Foreign Office, 4/6/1945, PRO: FO371/50723/U4885/12/70.
  92. The Ecuadorean delegation's proposal is among the papers in CO968/160/4; on Egypt, see Egyptian Society of International Law, *Egypt and the United Nations*, Manhattan Publishing Co, New York 1957; Ferrari-Bravo, p.81.
  93. Ickes' telegram text in NYPL: XFT pv10 vol. 1 pt. 2; *New York Times* 11/6/1945, p.10. Ickes' telegram is not mentioned in T.H. Watkins, *Righteous Pilgrim – Life and Times of Harold L. Ickes 1874–1952*, Henry Gold & Co, New York 1990. Ickes had been president of the Chicago branch of the NAACP in 1922; in 1930 he banned segregation and hiring discrimination in the Ministry of Interior.
  94. Bryant Mumford to Richard B. Moore, 23/6/1945, UN Archives: PAG5–1.2, Box 4.
  95. 'Dress Circle Affairs Highlighted Parley', *Chicago Defender* 16/6/1945.
  96. 'United States of West Indies Plan Suggested', *New York Amsterdam News* 9/6/1945, p.2A. Cyrus had been 'sent to the West Indies to conduct a survey for the *Chicago Defender*' according to that paper's edition of 5 May 1945, p.18.
  97. Essie Robeson, wife of Paul, then chairman of the CAA, had joined the CAA staff in 1945. Later she became a correspondent at the UN. Freedomways (eds) *Paul Robeson, the Great Forerunner*, (1965) Dodd Mead, New York 1985, p.305.
  98. *Pittsburgh Courier* 28/4/1945; *West African Pilot* 9/6/1945, pp.1–2; *New Africa*, May 1945. James B. Cashin, the chairperson of the *Defender's* Board, echoed the CAA's demands. *Chicago Defender* 12/5/1945.
  99. Telegram from Paul Robeson to President Truman, *Pittsburgh Courier* 19/5/1945, p.19. See also Lynch, pp.28–9; Duberman, pp.297–8, 670.
  100. Report on Paul Robeson, 6/7/1945, FBI Archives: file 100–12304, sect. 1; 'Dress Circle Affairs Highlighted Parley', *Chicago Defender* 16/6/1945.
  101. 'Colonial Issues Need Clarity', *Pittsburgh Courier* 19/5/1945, sect.2, p.13; *The New York Age* 19/5/1945; *California Eagle* 17/5/1945, pp.1, 2.
  102. Telegram from CAA 21/5/1945, Howard University: E. Franklin Frazier Papers, Box 131–306
  103. Reports by San Francisco agent 26/9/1945 and 4/5/1945, FBI file 100–69266, in University of Massachusetts: Du Bois Papers, box 378, file 43, group 312. Another FBI agent, reporting on Yergan himself, reported that his quarry was 'dissatisfied with the NAACP . . . not living up to heavy responsibility'. Yergan, he wrote, was trying to arrange a large press conference which – (name obliterated) trying to sabotage . . . CAA sends material to the 2,000 in the press corps.' Report by agent 14/8/1945, FBI Archives: file 100–210026, serials 183–205. It is difficult to determine how much credence to give to reports by FBI agents.
  104. 'Proposal of Regional Colonial Commissions', *Public Opinion* 13/6/1945, p.2 and 19/6/1945, p.1.

105. CAA, 'Text and Analysis of the Colonial Provisions of the United Nations Charter' 1945, Modern Records Centre, Warwick University: TUC Archives, JV151; comment over indecipherable signature 22/8/1945, PRO: FO371/50736/U6595; page for file 14814/7 in Register of Correspondence PRO: CO974/22.
106. 'Hit U.S. Stand on Colonies', *Chicago Defender* 19/5/1945, p.1.
107. Mary McLeod Bethune to 'Dear Friends' 10/5/1945, Library of Congress: Horace Mann Bond Papers, group 411, box 35, series III, folder 102.
108. White to NAACP Board 9/5/1945; report by Secretary to NAACP Committee on Administration 28/5/1945, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box 639.
109. Du Bois to Arthur B. Spingarn 30/5/1945, Aptheker (1978), vol.3, pp.13–14.
110. White to NAACP Board 9/5/1945 (as n.160); Bethune to 'Dear Friends' 10/5/1945, Library of Congress: Horace Mann Bond Papers, group 411, box 35, series III, folder 102. Roy Wilkins praised Mrs. Bethune's 'most effective speech' at the consultants' meeting with two of the U.S. delegates on May 25. (Wilkins to White 27/5/1945, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box 639.)
111. *Black Despatch*, 26/5/1945 – cutting in Du Bois Papers, reel 58.
112. *California Eagle*, 17/5/1945, p.10.
113. Walter White to Roy Wilkins 2/5/1945, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box 639.
114. The statement had been worked out in consultation with Ralph Bunche, Rayford Logan and Metz Lochard (editor of the *Chicago Defender*). White to NAACP Board 9/5/1945; NAACP consultants to Stettinius 7/5/1945, NAACP Papers, group II, box 639 and Du Bois Papers, reel 58, frame 0061; *Pittsburgh Courier* 19/5/1945, p.6; 'Improved Colonial Setup Being Sought by Negro Group', *Christian Science Monitor* 9/5/1945, p.7. How closely Bunche worked with the NAACP is evidenced by a phone call he made to White in New York on June 3, urging him to return as the 'next few days are the most critical ones' and pressure should be maintained on the U.S. delegation, especially at forthcoming 'conferences with Stettinius and Stassen'. White was reluctant to return. Memoranda from Walter White 4/6/1945, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box 169. Roy Wilkins had met twice with Bunche between May 15 and 24. Wilkins to White 24/5/1945, *ibid*.
115. White to Stettinius 15/5/1945, confirming their conversation that day, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box 639.
116. PRO: CO968/160/4.
117. Du Bois to American delegates 16/5/1945, NAACP Papers, group II, box A639; Du Bois Papers, reel 58, frame 0095; reply from Stettinius, frame 0101; National Archives: RG59 500.00/5–1645 CS/LF. It seems that the U.S. delegates had proposed this Bill of Rights as a result of a fight 'led and won' by the NAACP. 'U.S. Opposition to Colonial Independence', *Chicago Defender* 26/5/1945.
118. Telegrams to Stettinius, Stassen and NAACP branches 19/5/1945, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers group II, box 639. See also *Public Opinion* 26/5/1945. According to White, Stassen was the 'one man who stood out in contrast' to Stettinius, whom he thought 'completely out of his depth . . . Connally and Vandenberg are operating as though they were making a deal for building a U.S. Post Office. Dean Gildersleeve has a job much too large for her.' (These were

the other U.S. delegates.) Secretary's report to the NAACP's Committee on Administration, 28/5/1945, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box 639.

119. Secretary's report, as above. It is not known whether White actually had an interview with the President or if they spoke on the telephone.
120. 'Hits Conference Charter', *New York Times* 6/6/1945, p.13.
121. Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box 639.
122. P.A. Reynolds and E.J. Hughes, *The Historian as Diplomat*, Martin Robertson, London 1976, p.70, diary entry for 26/6/1945. Webster states that the Trusteeship sections were 'worked out by Cranborne and Stassen on the advice of Gerig and Poynton.'
123. Quoted in Jessie Guzman (ed), *Negro Year Book*, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 1947, pp.565-6.
124. 'U.S. Leadership at Parley Disappointing', *Richmond Afro-American* 9/6/1945, p.6; 'Testimony of W.E.B. Du Bois' to the Senate hearings on the UN Charter, Library of Congress: NAACP Papers, group II, box 639; Kumar Goshal, *People in Colonies*, Sheridan House, New York 1948, pp.16-17; Wilkins in the *Crisis* June 1945, quoted in James L. Roark, 'American Black Leaders: the Response to Colonialism and the Cold War', *African Historical Studies*, 4/2, 1971, pp.253-70, quote from p.257; George Padmore, 'Trusteeship: The New Imperialism', *Crisis*, October 1946, pp.302-5, 318.

### ABBREVIATIONS

AACC	-	Anglo-American Caribbean Commission
ASA	-	African Students Association (U.S.A.)
CAA	-	Council on African Affairs (U.S.A.)
FDR	-	Franklin Delano Roosevelt
JPL	-	Jamaica Progressive League (U.S.A.)
MOI	-	Ministry of Information (U.K.)
NAACP	-	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (U.S.A.)
NSGT	-	non-self-governing territory (ie., colony)
PNP	-	People's National Party (Jamaica)
UN	-	United Nations
UNCIO	-	United Nations Conference on International Organisation
UNIA	-	United Negro Improvement Association
U.S.S.R.	-	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WINC	-	West Indies National Council (U.S.A.)
WFTU	-	World Federation of Trade Unions

## A Note on the Suspension of the Constitution of British Guiana (1953)

K.O. LAURENCE

The story of the suspension of the constitution of British Guiana by the British Government in 1953 is, in outline, well known. Attempts to explain it, however, have been hampered by the fact that a significant part of the records of the British Colonial Office concerning that event remains inaccessible to scholars. They are held secret by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the successor to the Colonial Office, despite the passing of the 30-year period for which such material is normally embargoed. In these circumstances a certain mythology has come to surround some aspects of the 1953 episode. First, it is often claimed that Britain suspended British Guiana's constitution in response to pressure from the United States Government to preempt the possibility of a supposedly communist take-over by the Colony's newly-elected ministers, rather than because her own government judged such action to be essential. The evaluation of this claim has been further hampered by the fact that, Colonial Office records apart, those of the United States Department of State are also held secret in significant and seemingly even greater measure.

Shortly after the event, Cheddi Jagan himself expressed the view that the United States had pressured the British Government, on the basis of comments in the United States press about his "communist" government and the remarks of an American Congressman who had stayed in Georgetown as the guest of the governor.<sup>1</sup> This was essentially an instinctive reaction for which he had no evidence of any substance, and perhaps at that early date none was to be expected. More recent writers have often expressed the same view without citing hard evidence<sup>2</sup> and while some have been more guarded they have not directly questioned the thesis,<sup>3</sup> though some do tell the story in terms of the fear of communism without specifically mentioning the United States.<sup>4</sup>

Second, it is alleged that the governor of British Guiana, Sir Alfred Savage, found himself out of his depth in dealing with young,