THESIS
4
2008

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

IN THE SHADOW OF GARVEY: GARVEYITES IN NEW YORK CITY AND THE BRITISH CARIBBEAN 1925-1950

presented by

DANIEL A. DALRYMPLE

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Ph.D. degree in History

Major Professor's Signature

May 7th; 2008

Date

MSU is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity employer

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

5/08 K:/Proj/Acc&Pres/CIRC/DateDue.indd

IN THE SHADOW OF GARVEY: GARVEYITES IN NEW YORK CITY AND THE BRITISH CARIBBEAN, 1925-1950

By

Daniel A. Dalrymple

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

2008

ABSTRACT

IN THE SHADOW OF GARVEY: GARVEYITES IN NEW YORK CITY AND THE BRITISH CARIBBEAN 1925-1950

By

Daniel A. Dalrymple

Throughout the 1910s and 1920s Marcus Garvey (1887-1940) and his Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) built an empire that stretched across the world and included numerous black businesses, the *Negro World* newspaper, the Black Star Line shipping company and a host of other ventures. Despite Garvey's impact during the 1920s and the lasting ramifications it had on the continuing history of the African Diaspora, scholars have been reluctant to continue to trace Garvey and his followers beyond his untimely deportation in 1927 and beyond national boundaries focusing most of their attention on New York City between 1916 and 1927. This study seeks to address this time period of post-deportation Garveyism by expanding the conversation about Garveyism into the 1930s and 1940s using New York City and the British Caribbean as case studies. I argue that Garveyites in these areas did not simply abandon the movement, but that they reshaped it to meet their own needs and contexts. Garveyites in New York City transformed the movement into a self help mechanism while those in the British Caribbean folded their enthusiasm for the UNIA into the labor movement under leaders such as Uriah Butler and Alexander Bustamante. Through these case studies I hope to show that Garveyism was adaptable and versatile, that it did not simply fade

away after Garvey's 1927 deportation from the United States, and that Garveyism was an international movement with impact far beyond the borders of the United States.

Copyright by
DANIEL A. DALRYMPLE
2008

dedicated to my family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project has received generous support from a number of different sources over the past few years. In 2005, the Gilder Lehrman Institute helped greatly with my research at the Schomburg Center in New York City with a research grant. This generous support allowed for a thorough examination of the rich resources housed art both the Schomburg Center and the New York Public Library. Additionally, the Michigan State History Department and Graduate School provided funding for this trip as well as a research trip to London in 2006. These research trips form the primary backbone of what I have done here, and I am very grateful for the support I was given to carry out this project. I must also thank John Bratzel and the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies for providing me with a helpful Fellowship for Haitian Creole Language Study and the support they provided during the early years of my graduate career.

Additionally, I have received mentorship on some level from a variety of scholars at Michigan State. Throughout my coursework David Bailey, Peter Beattie, Robert Bonner, Darlene Clark Hine, Christine Daniels, Lisa Fine, and Richard Thomas all helped me get to this point through course discussions and review of my written work. Specifically, a seminar paper written in Dr. Bailey's methods course was central in helping me re-imagine the Garvey movement beyond the 1920s. Throughout this process, I have attempted to incorporate as much as possible from my coursework into this dissertation.

process, I have attempted to incorporate as much as possible from my coursework into this dissertation.

Next, I must pay special thanks to my committee. Pero Dagbovie, Laurent Dubois, Daina Berry, Kirsten Fermaglich, and Steven Hahn have given generously of their time and read many drafts of this project. Dr. Berry and Dr. Fermaglich have provided refreshing outside perspectives on my work and helped me to broaden its scope and appeal to audiences beyond scholars of Garvey and African American history. Dr. Hahn has offered valuable advice and encouragement over the past two years and his feedback has been foundational to the development of this study.

Dr. Dubois has been an inspiration to me since I first took a seminar with him in Spring 2003. He has introduced me to the field of Caribbean history and has been a constant source of encouragement since I first discussed my project with him in 2004. When I entered graduate school, I was strictly focused on African American history. Dr. Dubois must be credited with broadening my interests as well as helping to make this dissertation a truly comparative project. Beyond the dissertation, Dr. Dubois has inspired me to take a wider Atlantic perspective on history, which I have incorporated into my writing as well as teaching. His feedback throughout this process has been positive, constructive, and useful and it has been one of the major factors in any contribution I have made to the study of the African Diaspora.

Dr. Dagbovie single-handedly inspired me to become a historian. The African American undergraduate survey that I took under him in 2000 changed the trajectory of my life for the better. He is the best teacher I have ever met, and the most inspiring mentor I could have ever hoped for. He has worked closely with me since I was an

undergraduate, meticulously reading countless drafts of any piece of writing I have asked him to review. I have worked to incorporate his historical philosophy, teaching approach, and work ethic into my own as much as possible. He inspires anyone who he comes in contact with and is one of the greatest ambassadors the field of history may ever have. Throughout this process, he has helped me in countless ways both personally and professionally, and I can't thank him enough for his support and strength over the past decade. Dr. Dagbovie will undoubtedly help to produce dozens of historians in the coming decades, and I am proud to be able to call myself his first student.

Next, I must thank my peers. The community of graduate students in Room 8 has helped me stay positive, keep writing, and laugh during this lengthy process. Carlos Aleman, Heath Bowen, Joe Genetin-Pilawa, Ben Sawyer, Sowande Mustakeem, Sonia Robles, Jeanine Mazak, Micalee Sullivan and Ryan Pettengill have all helped contribute to this project on some level. Whether through poker, video games, fantasy football, or just hanging out in the graduate office, their friendship has been one of the principle sustaining factors especially over the last three years. I sincerely appreciate everything they have done for me, their encouragement, and their ability to make me laugh even in the darkest of times.

I also have a significant community of friends who predate my career as a university student. Aaron "Cooker" Cookingham and Noah Wagner have been the best friends I could ever have asked for. Additionally, I must also thank other friends who I have met along the way including Christine Sobczak, Tyler Richards, and Matt Linsemier. While they don't have any particular interest in Marcus Garvey, they have unknowingly helped me in countless ways throughout this process. Their support,

positive attitudes, and strength have been a source of inspiration to me for well over 10 years and this document would never have been produced without their help in clearing my head and keeping things in perspective. For this, I will always be grateful.

Finally, I must thank my family. My grandfather, David Russ has been a great source of inspiration to me since long before I attended graduate school (or school at all). He has taught me how to be competitive, strong, and responsible. Furthermore, he taught me never to give up and always be persistent. Without this lesson, this document would have never been completed. My mother, Dianne Russ-Hammond has been a role model to me since I was born. Her strength, perseverance, and work ethic have always amazed me and without her constant encouragement and uplifting attitude, I would have never completed this study. I appreciate everything she has given me and all of the sacrifices she made for me since I was a small child.

My wife, Jaime McLean Dalrymple has been my strength throughout this process. When I was weak, she was strong, when I was tired she was alert, and when I was ready to give up she inspired me to carry on. This study has been fueled by her enthusiasm, humor, and close proofreading eye as well as countless conversations at all hours of the night. She has always been willing to listen as well as push me when it was needed. She was also responsible for taking thousands of pictures at various archives without complaint. It is only with her help and listening ear that I drafted this document. I will always be grateful for her for everything she has given me, most importantly our child due in September. I love her very much and look forward to sharing many years together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION
POST DEPORTATION GARVEYISM.....1

CHAPTER 1
"TREE WITHOUT ROOTS": LITERATURE REVIEW OF GARVEY SCHOLARSHIP
1920-PRESENT.....23

CHAPTER 2
CHALLENGES AND CHANGES: BIRTH OF THE CENTRAL DIVISION UNIA...56

CHAPTER 3
RECLAIMING THE FALLEN 92

CHAPTER 4
COFRATERNITY AMONG THE RACE 123

CHAPTER 5
ROOTS OF UNREST: BRITISH CARIBBEAN LABOR.....166

CHAPTER 6
A TRADITION OF ORGANIZATION 201

CHAPTER 7
DESCENDANTS OF GARVEY 238

CONCLUSION
GARVEYISM LOOKING FORWARD.....274

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....283

INTRODUCTION: POST DEPORTATION GARVEYISM

In 2001, the American Public Broadcast Service released their "American Experience" program focusing on Marcus Garvey's life, impact, and philosophy. It was aptly titled "Look for Me in the Whirlwind", a statement that Garvey made while facing charges for mail fraud in the mid 1920s that encouraged his followers to keep the faith even under duress. The film featured some of the most respected scholars who had analyzed Garvey's life including Rupert Lewis, Tony Martin, Robert Hill, Clarence Walker, and others. It utilized pictures and primary sources from the time period to retell the oft told tale of Garvey's spectacular rise to power and, according to the film, his crushing and complete demise.

The film was generally well received and is still used today as a practical tool for teaching and learning about Garvey's life. However, the film was lambasted by Garvey's son, Julius Garvey. Julius Garvey had been invited to see the film at the Little Theater in Kingston, Jamaica on February 20, 2001. Just six days later, he wrote a scathing critique of the film and submitted it to the editor of the *Jamaican Gleaner*. Julius, much like his father might have, presented an orderly list of inaccuracies and inadequacies in the film. They ranged from a critique of the film's dramatic account of Garvey being left in a grave as a child to a critique of the claim that Garvey was "awed by the bright lights, richness, and tall buildings of Harlem."[1] The final critique attacked the film's conclusion that dramatically portrayed Garvey as a pariah in his final years and stated that he died as a "forgotten man".[2] The film also reiterated a quote from an obituary published before

Garvey's death in 1940 which referred to Garvey as being "broke, alone, and unpopular".[3] In addition to these damaging quotes, the film offered a dramatization portraying Garvey's final years in a terrible light "being stoned by children and walking toward a hovel, presumably his home".[4]

Julius Garvey justifiably lashed out against this scene, calling this portion of the film "a despicable lie" and pointing out that Jamaicans are very familiar with Garvey's many accomplishments in the early 1930s.[5] Why did the PBS documentary choose to show Garvey's final years in such a grim light? This is quite possibly due to the dearth of scholarship on post-1927 deportation Garveyism. While many scholars have examined Garvey's life and rise to power in the 1910s and 1920s, considerably less scholarship exists focusing on Garvey's work and influence in the 1930s and beyond. This study seeks to begin to fill that void by focusing on Garveyites and leaders who were influenced by Garvey. This study seeks to bring to light the incredible adaptability and enduring quality of Garvey's philosophies and show how they lived on throughout the 1930s, 1940s, and beyond.

This study seeks to examine the lives of Garvey, his followers, and the people he influenced throughout the controversial period from the late 1920s until 1950. I use the term post-deportation Garveyism to describe not only Garvey and his philosophy during the period from 1927-1950, but the methods and adaptations pioneered by Garvey and adapted for later use throughout the United States and the Caribbean by local and international leaders, smaller branches of the UNIA that persisted throughout this period, and Garvey's ever-evolving philosophy as he left his stronghold in New York City for the British Caribbean.[6] I examine this philosophy through the use of two case studies: New

York City and the British Caribbean. I link these two case studies primarily because in both cases Garveyism lived on well into the 1940s and in some cases beyond. These two geographic locations are useful because they both represent a continuation of Garvey's philosophies, albeit in very different ways.

I argue that Garveyites reshaped the movement throughout the 1930s and 1940s depending on their contexts. While American Garveyites utilized the UNIA as a self-help mechanism, British Caribbean Garveyites discarded the structure and folded their interests into labor unions. Leaders like Captain A.L. King in New York City and Uriah Butler in the British Caribbean used and reformed Garveyism in various ways with the support of small but enthusiastic memberships. In New York City throughout the Depression, the UNIA Central Division acted as a self help organization helping the destitute. Throughout the British Caribbean, the descendants of Garvey's teachings used his rhetoric to help form unions for unskilled workers. These memberships used what Garvey taught in different ways based on their surroundings, contexts, and the goals of local leaderships. They adapted Garveyism and utilized it in important local ways well beyond the 1920s. By studying the local leaderships and persistent Garveyites who were active throughout the 1930s and 1940s, the greater impact and influence of the UNIA becomes much clearer.

In exploring the various ways that Garveyites adapted the Garvey philosophies to their contexts, I am linking the historiography of Garveyism with the African American tradition of self-help as well as the British Caribbean literature focusing on labor movements in the 1930s and 1940s. Garveyism is often more lauded for its theoretical contributions to racial uplift, but my study shows that Garveyites were also active on a

practical level throughout this period. New York City Garveyites helped secure relief aid for the poor, represented clients in cases of citizenship, and helped West Indian immigrants gain citizenship. Garveyism in the British Caribbean helped to lay the foundation of labor movements by laying the organizational groundwork and through Garvey's articulation of critiques directed at the British Colonial Office and employers in the region.

While the historiography on Garveyism has become increasingly developed over the past thirty years, it has been primarily focused on Garvey himself. I attempt to shift the focus as close to the actual Garveyites as possible, examining local leaders and organizations whenever possible. My project has three direct aims: one, to show how Garveyites adapted and molded Garveyism in different contexts, two, to investigate what benefits and programs Garveyism offered to its adherents and three, to investigate how members of a social movement continue on with the loss of their leader. By researching both what Garveyism tangibly offered people and how they shaped it to fit their own needs throughout the United States and the British Caribbean I contribute to both to our knowledge about the Garvey movement as well as offer some insights into how Garvey's rhetoric was disseminated and employed by his followers long after he had left the scene.

This project offers a number of new approaches to the study of Garvey and the UNIA. One of these approaches is that my study focuses on the UNIA at local levels by employing case studies.[7] To understand why this is important, it is important to understand the organizational structure of the UNIA. While the UNIA operated under one broad banner, the local branches themselves were often quite independent and managed their own affairs. While these smaller units may have paid dues to the "Parent

Body" UNIA, most of their monies, local directives, meetings, and ideas were all locally derived to meet very unique circumstances.

This organizational structure is best illustrated by Captain A.L. King's UNIA Central Division in New York City. King's UNIA was run nearly exclusively by King and his officers. They made all of the day to day decisions about what programs to run, how to discipline lacking members, and how much to charge in dues. Members saw King as the unquestioned leader of their UNIA and always addressed all important correspondence to him. The Central Division paid its own bills and was responsible for its own survival. If it were to falter, there would likely have been no help forthcoming from Garvey's "Parent Body" which faced its own challenged during the Depression. However, the Central Division was tied to Garvey in important ways. King was responsible for sending Garvey dues periodically and when Garvey died in 1940 they raised funds to help Amy Jacques Garvey in her time of need.

There is a wide range of studies focusing on Garvey and his parent body. Because Garvey was such a prolific figure and because information is more scarce on local UNIA branches, scholars have tended to shy away from in depth local level UNIA studies. I seek to help fill this historiographical void by investigating the impact the UNIA had on a local level. In doing so I have discovered that Garveyites were very creative in their application and use of Garvey's principles. Under the umbrella of the UNIA name, Garveyites used and shaped this organization to fit their specific contexts and needs. When the Depression struck in the 1930s, Captain A.L. King and his local New York Central Division moved with alacrity to aid desperate members of the Manhattan community. Garveyites came to the Central Division for a wide variety of

purposes. The Central Division at various times throughout the 1930s provided food, coats, representation in dealing with the government, a women's club, youth dances, and an entire program dedicated to offering kids an Afro-centric education in times of great economic peril.

In my second case study, I explore how the British Caribbean Garveyites carried on with much of Garvey's ideology under the banners of newly emerged labor leaders such as Alexander Bustamante and Uriah Butler. The spirit of Garveyism was also kept alive through smaller groups such as the Negro Progress Convention in British Guiana. While these people were no longer utilizing the UNIA name or reporting to Garvey, the ideology Garvey espoused was reshaped and adapted and written in between the lines of the labor struggle in the region.

Studying the UNIA on a local level adds a new dimension to the way that scholars view the Garvey movement. Historically criticized for being a utopian movement with little practical application, my findings indicate that the practical self-help the UNIA offered might have been one of its most powerful draws not only in the 1920s, but well into the 1940s. By investigating the UNIA in this way, my study demonstrates that Garveyites themselves helped to mold the UNIA into not only a viable worldwide voice for black people, but also into a powerful local self help organization. In the United States this offered benefits such as help in securing government relief aid. In the British Caribbean labor unions helped force the hand of employers and the government to secure better wages, working conditions, and better infrastructure throughout the colonies.

In addition to utilizing case studies to further understand Garvey and Garveyites, my study also takes a wider view of the movement by shifting the focus outside of the

United States.[8] Garveyites were active in shaping Garvey's ideas throughout the western hemisphere. Oppressed people on the island of St. Thomas gained a new racial pride and learned about their African heritage through UNIA meetings often held outdoors.[9] Garveyites in Trinidad were central in labor movements throughout the 1920s. I employ case studies primarily from New York City and the Caribbean to demonstrate that the UNIA was a vibrant movement in America and the Caribbean. Previous scholarship has often focused on Garveyism either as an American movement, or on Garvey the man before his untimely deportation.[10] By including the Caribbean experience in my study I demonstrate that the UNIA was a global movement malleable enough to respond to specific local needs. Beyond this, by using examples from a wide range of locations throughout the western hemisphere I employ a valuable comparative approach. By seeing local UNIA branches in such a variety of locations I draw important conclusions about the role local conditions have on the shaping of Garvey's philosophies. Furthermore, the comparative approach allows analysis from angles not readily apparent through the study of just one isolated branch.

On a wider level, my study seeks to show not only that Garvey had significant impact immediately beyond 1927, but that these smaller organizations and reverberations of Garveyism were felt throughout the 20th century. The legacy and Garvey of the UNIA is well documented in African American history. Perhaps one of the best examples of this is the connection between Malcolm X and the Garvey Movement. Malcolm's father, Earl Little, was a prominent leader in the UNIA throughout the late 1920s. He led or was heavily involved in branches in Omaha, Nebraska, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and East Chicago, Indiana while Malcolm's mother Louise Little was a reporter for Garvey's

Negro World newspaper. Little was actively involved in the affairs of the UNIA and maintained his ideals which were heavily influenced by Garvey until his death in 1931 when he was run over by a car in East Lansing, MI. There is some evidence to suggest that Little's UNIA influenced politics may have played a role in his death.

While the story of Earl Little is fairly common knowledge amongst scholars of African American history, the historiography on Garvey and the UNIA has not latched onto this event as a window into the success of the UNIA beyond Garvey's deportation. Little's extensive involvement with the UNIA in the American South and later the Midwest indicates the strength and viability of the UNIA beyond its glory years. As Little's story illustrates Garveyites remained as active as ever into the 1930s and this activity has been paid very little attention by scholars. Furthermore, these Garveyites inspired a generation of new leaders. While it took some time, eventually Malcolm X returned to some of the principles his father held dear when he became one of the most successful ministers in the Nation of Islam in the 1950s.[11]

In the British Caribbean, Garvey had a similarly lasting impact. Leaders such as Alexander Bustamante and Uriah Butler have stated that Garvey was a major influence on them. These leaders were involved in labor strikes in the 1930s and 1940s, but perhaps more importantly, helped in freeing the colonies from British rule in the early 1960s. This study seeks to begin to make the connection between Garvey's work in the 1920s and 1930s and leaders such as Malcolm X, Uriah Butler, and Alexander Bustamante who went on to make huge contributions to race relations and even international politics throughout the 20th century by showing that Garveyism remained an active part of black uplift throughout the 1930s and 1940s.

On its broadest level this project seeks to examine what happens to a social movement when its leader is removed from the scene. In many cases, scholars have pointed to the splintering of specifically African American movements upon the loss of their leadership and in many other traditions the loss of a charismatic leader is seen as a death knell for these movements. I hope to nuance this approach by using the Garveyites as a case study. While it is clear that the loss of a strong leader or in the case of Garvey the face of a movement, causes fundamental changes, I propose that movements do not simply die or fade away when their leader is lost, but that they reshape themselves and adapt to face the new challenges. In the case of the UNIA the loss of Garvey eventually led to a serious decline in membership and activity. However, it also prompted adaptation and reorganization that made the movement more viable within local surroundings. Garveyites did not go away and throw up their hands in defeat when Garvey was deported. On the other hand, they continued using, changing, adapting, and rethinking the pillars of the movement left behind by Garvey. Sometimes they discarded ideals, sometimes they clung to them, and sometimes they simply carried those ideals with them into the next movement or political action. Nonetheless, the impact of the UNIA is undeniable well into the 1940s and beyond when we consider that some of the founding principles of Garveyism were re-adapted and carried on into different movements.

I have used a number of different types of sources and collections to accomplish these goals. In the American context, I draw from the Schomburg's collection of UNIA Central Division materials focusing Captain A.L. King's Division in the mid to late 1930s. This collection includes a staggering number of letters between the Central

Division and Relief Aid Offices during the 1930s when the Central Division represented the interests of African Americans in Harlem. These letters offered key insights into the day to day operations of the Central Division as well as the goals of the organization. I also examined the internal letters, bills, publications, record books, and meeting minutes of the group to get an idea of how the group operated and its goals.

For the British Caribbean section I scrutinized Robert Hill's collection of Garvey papers. These papers included newspaper articles, letters from Garvey, and government letters focusing on Garvey. I also employed the British National Archive's Colonial Office collections. These records included letters, publications, and speeches from Butler, Bustamante, and a number of other labor leaders. They also included internal government memos focusing on labor leaders and suggesting potential strategies for neutralizing them without causing mayhem in the colonies. I have pointed out how labor leaders and uplift groups in the British Caribbean utilized Garvey's program, ideology, and strategies to battle the Colonial Office and employers for improved infrastructure, higher wages, and fair labor practices.

Understanding the ways in which people adapted Garvey's post-deportation program requires a basic knowledge of how he rose to power in the 1910s and early 1920s. It is a given that Garvey's height of influence was the early 1920s. The following section seeks to set up Garvey's continuing influence throughout the western hemisphere by offering a brief narrative of his rise to power.[12]

By the time Marcus Garvey (1887-1940) arrived in the United States on March 23, 1916 he was already deeply engaged in his life's work a worldwide uplift struggle for black people of all nationalities. From 1910 to 1914, Garvey had not only experienced

second class citizenship in his birthplace of Jamaica, but he had traveled throughout the world and seen the exploitation of black people throughout the western hemisphere. In Costa Rica in 1910, Garvey witnessed the United Fruit Company's low wages and anti-unionism.[13] In Panama in 1912, Garvey witnessed Afro-Caribbean immigrants working side by side with white workers for lower wages building the Panama Canal.[14] In Guatemala, Nicaragua, Ecuador, Chile, and Peru Garvey saw similar injustice.

This injustice inspired Garvey to organize and fight on the behalf of workers. In Costa Rica, while employed by the United Fruit Company, Garvey edited a pro-worker newspaper called *La Nacion.* He attacked Britain for not protecting West Indian workers, was arrested for trying to inspire workers to agitate for better working conditions, and was eventually expelled from the country.[15] In Panama, Garvey was also active in promoting labor unions. In 1912, Garvey spoke at a meeting of the Colon Federal Labor Union.[16] Garvey continued his work on behalf of black workers in England where he worked for the prestigious *Africa Times and Orient Review* and often spoke in Hyde Park in the interests of black people worldwide.

By June of 1914, on his return trip from London Garvey felt himself called upon to lead the descendants of Africa. He famously mused:

> Where is the Black man's government? Where is his King and his Kingdom? Where is his president, his country, his ambassador, his army, his navy, his men of big affairs? I could not find them and I declared, 'I will help to make them'.[17]

Inspired by the injustice people of African descent experienced across the globe and by Booker T. Washington's classic 1901 autobiography, *Up from Slavery*, Garvey was determined to put together a program for black uplift on both a local level in Jamaica and in broad terms. When Garvey returned to Jamaica, he immediately set about founding

the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA). This initial incarnation of the UNIA was intended to be based out of Jamaica and addressed both local and general objectives. The initial organization included "10 General Objects" and "8 Local Objects".[18]

Initially, the Jamaican UNIA was similar to a number of benevolent societies in the West Indies. It helped feed the poor and the sick and set up an office to aid unemployed people find work. There were also plans in place to set up a Washington – inspired adult night school that was to work in conjunction with both a farm and the UNIA. The UNIA also acted as a literary society and as a center for scholarly exchange. Guest lectures, lively debates, and political protest strategy were all major features of the initial incarnation of the UNIA.[19]

However, after Garvey completed his 38 state tour of the United States in 1917, he determined that the United States offered the fledgling UNIA a stronger base than Jamaica. Garvey intended only to come to the United States as a lecturer to raise money for the UNIA back in Jamaica. However, he ended up staying in the United States for over 11 years. Garvey was extremely impressed with what African Americans had achieved and lauded them for having "sufficient pride to do things for themselves".[20] African Americans flocked to Garvey. They appreciated his frankness and his unapologetic faith in black self sufficiency and his overt indictments of whites for their attacks on African Americans.

One such indictment came in the wake of the 1917 East St. Louis riots. Garvey attacked white America for burning African American neighborhoods and shooting fleeing survivors down "like rabbits".[21] Some estimated the African American death toll

to be as high as 100 people. In a New York speech in July of 1917, Garvey fiercely denounced the riot as "one of the bloodiest outrages against mankind".[22] Garvey's attacks on the riots drew people to him and helped to expand his young uplift organization in the United States.

From 1917 well into the 1920s, the UNIA was a force to be reckoned with in Harlem both ideologically and practically. In less than a decade, Garvey harnessed the energies of African Americans in Harlem to create an empire that expanded from Harlem to Latin America and even across the Atlantic to Europe and Africa. Garvey's influence was undeniable and while his estimates that millions of black people were members of his UNIA might be far fetched, his program and ideology influenced people from New York to the Caribbean. He preached black self sufficiency, self-respect, and racial solidarity across national borders. He argued that racial discrimination had been used to stigmatize black people, so they should use their race as a rallying cry and a strong point of unity. The UNIA was an organization with ambitious goals and a complex bureaucracy. Garveyites were remarkably successful at putting Garvey's rhetoric of self-sufficiency to work on a practical level. The UNIA had its own newspaper, *The Negro World*, their own shipping company, The Black Star Line, their own coalition of factories, The Negro Factories Corporation, and also periodically put on conventions for black people to discuss the race's future direction. All of this was maintained while Garvey gave talks worldwide and sent delegates to Liberia in order to form a mutually beneficial partnership between the country and the UNIA. Garveyism took the world by storm boasting hundreds of branches in the United States and many branches outside of America from Cuba to South Africa.[23]

Despite Garvey's impact during the 1920s and the lasting ramifications it had on the continuing history of the African Diaspora, scholars have been reluctant to continue to trace Garvey and his followers beyond his deportation in 1927 and beyond national boundaries focusing most of their attention on New York City between 1916 and 1927.[24] There is a great deal of evidence that suggests that such a project might be helpful in furthering our understanding of Garveyism and its followers, the narrative of African American history, and more broadly the study of what happens to a social movement on a local level when its leader is removed from the scene. This project seeks to introduce and offer a nuanced and innovative approach to analyzing Garveyism into the 1930s and 1940s, after Garvey was deported and his movement in the United States was declining.

My study is divided into two major parts consisting of three chapters each. The first part focuses on Garveyites in New York City throughout the late 1930s and early 1940s. The second part examines Garveyites in the British Caribbean in the 1930s and 1940s. These case studies are bound together by a common time period. While the two groups were not in contact, they both faced the reality of the decline of the UNIA. While they dealt with it in very different ways, the strategies of adapting and preserving Garveyism in changing contexts was a constant between the two.

Chapter 1, "Tree Without Roots", examines Garvey scholarship from 1915 until the present. This is one of the first significant studies of the literature on Garvey beginning with pieces written during the height of the UNIA's power in the 1910s and 1920s. I divide the scholarship on Garvey into four periods. These periods include Primary Work (1915-1940); Early Scholarship (1941-1969); Revisionism, Black Power, and the Garvey Movement (1969-1986); and Current Scholarship on Garvey (1987-

Present). Because Garvey was practically ignored after his death in 1940 until the Black Power era, the development of scholarship has been somewhat disjointed and uneven. In order to deal with this and still preserve some type of categorical logic, I have used soft categories to help show that some works are transitional and may fit into more than one generation. In addition to reviewing the literature, this chapter also looks to the future of the field by examining current trends such as comparative works, edited volumes, case studies, and contextualizing Garvey within the larger narrative. In examining the body of scholarship on Garvey, I aim to highlight how scholars in the past have written about the UNIA, the contributions of my project, and the future of Garvey scholarship.

Chapter 2, "Challenges and Changes: Birth of the Central Division UNIA", introduces the Central Division active in the mid to late 1930s in New York City. This chapter puts the group in the context of 1930s New York City by exploring the Central Division as a self-help group, the Depression's impact on African American New Yorkers, and exploring the challenges that it faced. The Central Division faced a major obstacle in recruitment considering that it was operating without Garvey, the charismatic leader and founder of the UNIA. Because of this, they also faced declining membership and funds. When Garvey was deported, it created a formidable challenge to Garveyites seeking to promote the movement. In addition to these internal challenges, the UNIA faced a diversifying African American population. Due to declining living conditions, extremely high rents, poor schools, and the high cost of living, African Americans were moving out of Harlem and into different parts of New York including the Bedford Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn. This chapter also shows how the Central Division met these challenges by continuing with ambitious plans to build a new building, continuing

fundraising efforts, publishing periodicals such as the *Harlem Sentinel* and *Centralist Bulletin* and through forming alliances with other groups in the city including the American Civil Rights Association, Better Harlem Association, United Afro-American Union, Harlem Unemployed Committee Council, Tenants and Consumer's Council, and the Gild-Will Social Service among others. Chapter 2 concedes that the group was facing difficult times and was not as widespread as it was in the 1920s, but shows that the membership that remained was still active and found ways to cope with these conditions and meet the challenges they faced.

Chapter 3, "Reclaiming the Fallen", continues in this vein by exploring the pillar of self help that the UNIA offered: its services as a liason to the government or employers on behalf of Harlemites. This chapter focuses on one of the most important examples of local Garveyites adapting to changes after Garvey's departure from the scene. Instead of shunning the white power structure and building their own black organizations and structures the Central Division was forced to cooperate with the white power structure throughout the Depression. While not strictly in line with the politics of Garvey, this adaptation was practical and of great help to members of the Harlem community and helped maintain the relevance and importance of the UNIA in that setting. This chapter analyzes the recipients of UNIA aid by age, gender, marital status, number of children, and work status. It also offers some cases of representation where the UNIA acted on behalf of people dealing with unfair demands from relief offices, inexplicable denials of government aid, citizenship cases, and legal representation, and even one case where a local student was punched in the face by his teacher. From 1938 through 1943, the

Central Division, headed up by Captain A.L. King, helped Harlem residents with almost any problem imaginable representing their interests and advocating on their behalf.

Chapter 4, "Cofraternity Among the Race", illustrates how the Central Division adapted itself to these conditions by focusing on their practical local programs such as the women's Lucky 9's Club, the Juvenile Cadet Corps, and other activities sponsored and organized by the Central Division. These local programs were individually small, sometimes numbering only 10-20 people. However, taken together they represented a strong program of self-help of obvious value to the community. The Lucky 9's ladies club offered women an outlet from the stress of day to day life, played card games, offered prizes, and planned events for the community. The Black Cross Nurses raised money for medical supplies, spread awareness about general health practices, and even visited the sick in the hospital. The Choral Singers put on performances and were a fixture at UNIA events throughout the 1930s and 1940s. The Central Youth Circle and the Central Youth League were well attended programs for youth that offered classes, meetings, and put on events. These youth leagues also offered Afro-centric education programs teaching youth the history of the UNIA as well as lessons about Africa and its contributions.

Chapter 5, "Roots of Unrest: British Caribbean Labor", shifts the focus to the British Caribbean. This chapter serves as an important contextual chapter detailing who Caribbean Garveyites were, where they were, and what historical circumstances molded them in the 1930s. This chapter offers a general survey of the people of the British Caribbean and the countries and details the populations, the work they were engaged in, and the primary staple products of the region. This chapter traces the history of the

region from the period of slavery up to the 1930s. It begins with an assessment of the effects of slavery and argues that while emancipation was a major step forward for Afro-Caribbeans, the terms of the battle between labor and employers remained largely the same throughout the 19th and early 20th century. This chapter examines the effect of World War I on labor movements and workers and explores some of the longstanding problems in the region including unemployment, unionization, low wages, low standards of living, poor health care, absentee landowners, and racial prejudice. The chapter also explores some of the revolts of the period and how the islands erupted in full-scale labor rebellion throughout the 1930s and 1940s.

Chapter 6, "A Tradition of Organization", argues that Garvey's impact on the Caribbean was significant throughout the 1930s and 1940s because many of the strategies he employed in the UNIA were utilized by labor leaders. It begins by showing that British officials were less concerned about Garvey's travels and uplift plans allowing him free passage throughout the Caribbean in the late 1930s. This chapter establishes Garvey's strength in the region, pointing out that the UNIA had chapters and divisions throughout Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana, and most of the smaller British holdings. It establishes that Garvey was welcomed with open arms upon his deportation from the United States in 1927 and shows that he had a willing following awaiting him upon his return to Jamaica. It also details his attempts to run for office in 1929 under a party of his own creation – the People's Political Party. I argue that this was a key moment in Garvey's return to the Caribbean, a rare moment when Garvey articulated a comprehensive program for uplift in his political platform. In this speech, Garvey addressed everything from land reform to establishing a facility for higher education in

Jamaica. This chapter establishes connections between Garveyism and labor leaders such as Uriah Butler and Alexander Bustamante and shows that his influence was present on them in the 1920s and 1930s. Finally, I show that Garvey's organizational strategies were central in setting the tone for labor movements during the period. Garvey's models for fundraising, public speaking, newspapers, and propaganda were employed by labor unions long after Garvey had stepped aside.

Chapter 7, "Descendants of Garvey", seeks to show how Garvey's philosophies and ideologies were adapted to meet the needs of the British Caribbean colonies and how they were utilized in different forms well into the late 1940s. I utilize Garvey's People's Political Party (PPP) platform as a way to show how Garvey adapted the UNIA strategies to life in Jamaica and trace the remarkable fluidity and adaptability of Garveyism. I further show how leaders from across the region either directly or indirectly adopted Garvey's philosophy in their quest for fair labor practices. I explore how Garvey's ideas were reshaped and adapted in various areas by labor leaders and uplift groups throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Garvey was inspirational on issues such as self-rule (and eventually independence from Britain), worker's rights, wages, working conditions, land reform, the building of infrastructure, education, self-help, and Afro-Caribbean unity. I show how labor leaders utilized some of Garvey's framework in order to make new arguments about black life in the region and how they were able to employ some of the same rhetoric to gain a devoted following, just as Garvey had.

The conclusion, "Garveyism Looking Forward", introduces a comparative element to my study. In this portion of the dissertation, I compare and contrast how and why Garveyites evolved their commitment to the UNIA in different ways. American

Garveyites remained fully committed to the organization and structure that Garvey had created throughout the 1910s and 1920s. British Garveyites were not as committed to the structure, but utilized Garvey's principles and ideas in their struggle to win worker's rights in the 1930s and 1940s. Both groups maintained a strong bond with Garvey's ideas and at times were even in direct contact with him. The conclusion analyzes why they took such different paths and emphasizes that the Garveyites did not simply fade away in the 1930s, but that they adapted and reinvented the Garvey movement to more closely fit their own contexts and needs.

Notes

---

[1] *"The Majority Press News Page 1."* February 26, 2001. http://www.themajoritypress.com/pr01.htm (March 6, 2008).
[2] *"American Experience, Marcus Garvey, Transcript."* 1999-2000. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/garvey/filmmore/pt.html (March 6, 2008).
[3] *"American Experience, Marcus Garvey, Transcript."* 1999-2000. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/garvey/filmmore/pt.html (March 6, 2008).
[4] *"The Majority Press News Page 1."* February 26, 2001. http://www.themajoritypress.com/pr01.htm (March 6, 2008).
[5] *"The Majority Press News Page 1."* February 26, 2001. http://www.themajoritypress.com/pr01.htm (March 6, 2008).
[6] This study explores post-deportation in a few different contexts, though certainly it has had many other expressions throughout the 20th century. The Rasta religion is one notable form not discussed at length in this study, but certainly could fall under the umbrella of post-deportation forms of Garveyism. *Rasta and Resistance* by Horace Campbell explores this to some degree. Horace Campbell, *Rasta and Resistance.* (Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1987).
[7] In utilizing this approach my study contributes to a recent trend in Garvey scholarship most recently employed by the scholars listed below. Mary Rolinson, *Grassroots Garveyism: The Universal Negro Improvement Association in the Rural South 1920-1927,* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Claudrena Harold, *The Rise and Fall of the Garvey Movement in the Urban South.* (New York: Routledge, 2007); Emory Tolbert, *The UNIA and Black Los Angeles: Ideology and Community in the American Garvey Movement.* (Los Angeles: Center for Afro-American Studies, University of California, 1980); Ronald Stephens, "Garveyism in Idlewild, 1927 to 1936," *Journal of Black Studies*, 34, Number 4, 462-488.
[8] In moving beyond the American perspective on Garvey I am building on the work of Rupert Lewis cited here, who began, more than 20 years ago, to attempt to begin the discussion of Garveyism outside of American borders. Rupert Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion.* (Trenton: Africa World Press, 1988).
[9] Lionel Yard. "George Weston Organizer of UNIA Branches, Oral Historian of the Garvey Movement, Black Nationalist", 11. Schomburg Center, George and Maudelle Weston Collection. Box 1, Folder 3.
[10] Martin, *Race First*; David Cronon, *Black Moses.* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).; Elton Fax, *Garvey.* (New York: Dodd and Mead, 1972).; Liz Mackie, *The Great Marcus Garvey.* (London: Hansib Publishers, 1987).; Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero.*
[11] Malcolm X and Alex Haley, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (New York: Ballantine Books), 1992, 1-12.
[12] Many sources are available focusing on Garvey's biography. Over the past 30 years, scholars have generated a sizable body of literature exploring Garvey's life from 1916-1927. See: Liz Mackie, *The Great Marcus Garvey.* (London: Hansib Press, 1987); Eric Huntley, *Marcus Garvey.* (London: Friends of Bogle, 1988); Tony Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press, 1986); John Henrik Clarke, *Marcus Garvey and the Vision of Africa* (New York: Random House, 1974); Rupert Lewis and Patrick Bryan, eds. *Garvey, His Work and Impact* (Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1991); Elton Fax, *Garvey: The Story of a Pioneer Black Nationalist* (New York: Dodd, Mead. 1972); Martin, *Race First*; and Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero.*
[13] Tony Martin. *Marcus Garvey, Hero.* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press 1983), 17.
[14] Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero*, 17; Martin, *Race First: The Organizational and Ideological Struggles of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press, 1983), 5; Irma Watkins-Owens. *Blood Relations: Caribbean Immigrants and the Harlem Community, 1900-1930.* (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996), 13-16.
[15] Martin, *Race First*, 4.
[16] Martin, *Race First*, 5.
[17] Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero*, 26.
[18] Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero*, 32.
[19] Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero*, 33-34.

[20] Quoted from Martin. *Marcus Garvey, Hero.* 41.
[21] Quoted from Martin. *Marcus Garvey, Hero.* 43.
[22] Quoted from Martin. *Marcus Garvey, Hero.* 45.
[23] Martin, *Race First*, 16.
[24] There are a few case studies that focus on Garvey outside the American context. Most notably, the work of Rupert Lewis, cited below, has helped to provide some window into Garvey's life and goals post deportation. See: Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion; The Pan African Connection: From Slavery to Garvey and Beyond.* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press, 1983); Rupert Lewis and Maureen Warner Lewis, eds., *Garvey: Africa, Europe, The Americas.* (Trenton: Africa World Press, 1994).

CHAPER 1: "TREE WITHOUT ROOTS": LITERATURE REVIEW OF GARVEY SCHOLARSHIP 1915-PRESENT

On Easter Sunday, at Liberty Hall in New York City on April 16, 1922 Marcus Garvey proclaimed to throngs of eager observers that "God created you masters of your own destiny, masters of your own fate".[1] This was the philosophy that Garvey espoused and that he, and the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) lived by throughout the 1920s. While it is difficult to account for the exact number of followers Garvey had at his peak, it is well known that he filled the streets of New York with various parades and that he was able to pack Madison Square Garden on more than one occasion.[2] The Garvey movement captured the hearts, minds, and imaginations of African Americans, establishing businesses with its Negro Factories Corporation, publishing a daily newspaper, the *Negro World*, and organizing conferences well attended with black representatives from around the world. Despite his obvious successes, Marcus Garvey and his Universal Negro Improvement Association have not been at the center of scholarship on the African Diaspora until fairly recently.

This is more than a little surprising considering the success that Garvey had in the 1910s, 1920s, and beyond at mobilizing thousands of African Americans, Afro-Caribbeans, and even Africans. Because so many studies on Garvey were produced without knowledge or interest in previous historical works on the subject, the great majority of studies do not speak to one another. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, in their zeal to reclaim Garvey's legacy from irrelevance, scholars produced an explosion of

biographies which have continued to dominate the study of Garvey until very recently. However, this trend is changing as the field matures and takes a new scholarly direction. This study not only seeks to demonstrate what Garvey scholars have done in past and how their interpretations have changed over time, but also makes suggestions for the direction of future scholarship that is a capable of revealing a fuller and more complete picture of Garvey and his followers.

To accomplish this aim, I divide the scholarship into four generations spanning from Garvey's arrival in the United States until the present. The first Primary Work period stretches from 1915 until Garvey's death in 1940, the second Early Scholarship period covers 1940 until 1969, the third period entitled Revisionism, Black Power, and the Garvey Movement stretches from 1970 until 1986, and finally the Current Scholarship period is from 1987 until the present. This methodology comes with its own set of problems. Because Garvey scholarship is so disjointed and uneven, any attempt to put it into strict categories or 'generations' inevitably loses credibility and fails to account for why and how different groups and individuals did historical work on Garvey. I aim to circumvent this problem by using soft categories that do not imprison a work in one generation simply because it was published at a certain time. This study was conceived to not only chart broad trends and divide the scholarship into generations, but also to explain why some of the work does not fit as snugly as it could and where it might also fit within the scope of my generational categories.

The Primary Work generation (1915-1940) of Garvey scholarship encompasses everything written about Garvey and by Garvey while he was still alive from the 1910s until his death in 1940. Generally, work that was published during this period falls into

one of two categories: work that was unflattering or critical of Garvey and his program (published by his opponents), or Garvey propaganda disseminated by the UNIA and Garvey himself. While the pro-Garvey materials primary stem from Garvey himself, the critiques come from a more diverse set of sources.

Unsurprisingly, the popular white press was hostile to Garvey and ultimately sought to discredit him. The overwhelming strategy to achieve this aim was to undermine the UNIA by questioning its financial motives, attacking the members of the UNIA as unintelligent drones following a charasmatic leader, or to launch personal attacks on Garvey himself. News coverage in the *New York Times* rarely focused on the positive aspects of Garveyism and articles always put Garvey's titles in quotes and made sure to claim that he was a self-appointed leader. Furthermore, the majority of the Garvey-related events they chose to cover always showed Garvey in a bad light. News articles overwhelmingly focused on his legal battles, his divorce from his first wife, and his failures in establishing strong ties with Africa.[3]

However, even when articles did focus on some positive aspect of Garveyism they were often rife with backhanded critiques and belittlement. In an article published in August of 1920 A.B. Williams wrote about Garvey's attempts to partner with Africa in a two page spread in the *New York Times*.[4] He refers to Garvey's program as an "ambitious scheme" and a "grandiose program".[5] Williams begins his article with a brief outline of Garvey's program and hints at its popularity by mentioning that Garvey filled Madison Square Garden. The majority of the article, however, focuses on the lack of originality of Garvey's plan and the dismal failure of previous attempts of African Americans to migrate "back to Africa". Williams paints a grim picture of the hardships

endured by previous migrants and as if to emphasize his point his article is written around a massive picture of seemingly dead or dying African Americans on a boat that barely looks seaworthy.[6] He captions the picture: "passengers began to die, first one a day, then two, then three." This article was a clear attempt to discredit the UNIA. Despite Garvey's protests within the text that he was not trying to relocate an entire population to Africa, Williams proceeded as if this was precisely what Garvey was advocating and seemed to take it upon himself to show African Americans what a folly Garvey's program was.[7]

The white press was not alone in critiquing Garvey during the 1920s. Garvey was also attacked by the black press and the black intellectual community. During his stay in the United States, Garvey had few allies in black intellectual circles. Garvey's most notorious foe was W.E.B. DuBois. DuBois saw Garvey's ambitious plans for the Black Star Line, his aim to establish an independent nation in Africa, and his talks with the KKK as poor and impractical strategies for black progress. DuBois often used the NAACP's *Crisis* to attack Garvey. One of the most famous anti-Garvey essays was entitled "Lunatic or a Traitor". DuBois argued that Garvey's plan to pursue black prosperity through an alliance with the KKK revealed that he must be either a traitor or lunatic.[8] The black intellectual community attacked Garvey on several other fronts as well claiming that his plans to send representatives to the Geneva convention on behalf of Africa was impractical and stating that black people "ha(d) plenty of problems of their own" and that Garvey should not go abroad and "stir up problems there".[9] The black critiques of Garvey culminated in the creation of the "Garvey Must Go" campaign in 1922 by a group calling themselves the Friends of Negro Freedom. This group, started

by Chandler Owen and A. Phillip Randolph attacked Garvey not only for his foreign focus and his meetings with the KKK, but for what they viewed as a highly impractical program that would have no tangible benefits for African Americans.[10] Randolph further critiqued Garvey for what he perceived as "despotism" and claimed that people are fighting for the erection of democracies, not empires".[11] These vociferous critics of Garvey generated an entire body of literature defaming Garvey's program and attacking him both on a personal and ideological level.[12]

Despite the strength of his numerous opponents, Garvey did not sit idly by and watch his enemies dismantle his program. Garvey defended himself in speeches made at various UNIA events and in the UNIA newspaper, *The Negro World.* In addition to using the *Negro World* as a forum for spreading his program, Garvey often used the paper to attack rivals. In the case of DuBois he responded by accusing him of not having pride in being black, writing in 1921 that DuBois "sees ugliness in being black".[13] Garvey also attacked DuBois for only appreciating the "cultured, refined" type of man and judged him too out of touch with working class African Americans to effectively lead them.[14]

The debate between Garvey, DuBois, and the black intelligentsia was an ever-present feature of the 1920s Harlem landscape. On one hand, Garvey's opponents had legitimate critiques of his programs. Despite Garvey's grand plans and compelling promises, most of his ventures folded and never blossomed into the profitable enterprises Garvey and his followers had envisioned. Furthermore, Garvey's association with the Ku Klux Klan made African Americans of all classes very nervous. This was the face of white American racism and to deal with them, even to further black aims, left many African Americans feeling confused, angry, or betrayed. That said, Garvey's program

may also have succeeded precisely because he was ambitious and the UNIA was such a force in the community. Laundries, restaurants, shops, and factories were all periodically available for Harlem residents to see and utilize. These were black owned businesses and Garveyites could see their money at work, even if these ventures did eventually fold. Garvey offered seemingly tangible results while DuBois and the black intelligentsia fought an equally important battle in courtrooms and through academic studies, their victories were not as stirring and their results not so tangible. Despite the many valid critiques against Garvey, nobody could deny that he was an honest man with vision that was not afraid to take a chance to promote black interests worldwide.

This Primary period of Garvey historiography from 1915 to 1940 was one characterized by harsh criticism of both Garvey personally and the UNIA as a whole. During this period, the UNIA had scarcely any allies to defend its name save its own paper and membership. Black intellectuals rallied around popular leaders such as DuBois to attack the UNIA and the white press employed a silent, condescending, or twisted approach in their attempts to minimize Garvey's impact on black people. As some of the most prominent historical sources, these critiques painted Garvey in a negative light to early historians. These early debates set the tone for early scholarship on Garvey. Few early scholars sought to retrieve Garvey's legacy from the deep quagmire that these debates left it in and because of this a tradition of downplaying Garvey's impact and belittling his "schemes" was established.

The significant historiography on Garvey begins when he died in 1940. I mark the second generation of early scholarship from Garvey's death in 1940 until 1969. Surprisingly, the man who had stirred so much debate when he was alive produced very

little scholarly debate in the years immediately following his untimely death. In the decades following Garvey's death, he was increasingly viewed as a demagogue or charlatan and his program was increasingly characterized as impractical and ill conceived. The overarching theme of this early scholarship period for Garvey and was that of silence.

During the earliest part of the early scholarship period (1941-1969), there were two separate schools on Garvey. White academia generally ignored Garvey or continued the trend set by Garvey's contemporaries by taking a hostile view towards the man and the movement. Scholars attempted at best to paint the UNIA as a flash in the pan and at worst to belittle both the UNIA and its leader. Concurrently, black scholars publishing primarily in the *Journal of Negro History*, were building a strong foundation for future scholarship on Garvey addressing him as a Pan-African leader and debating his influence.

Birgit Aron's 1941 article in *Phylon* entitled "The Garvey Movement: Shadow and Substance" is a representative example of this generation of scholarship in many ways. On one hand, Aron is to be commended for being one of the first scholars to recount the history of the movement and put forward the idea that Garvey's Afrocentric ideas helped to chip away at the idea of black inferiority. However, Aron fits himself snugly into the tradition of early scholars on Garvey by referring to the UNIA as a "little scene" with "relatively small causal significance.[15] Aron diminishes the influence of Garveyism and indicates that the movement was dead when he was writing in the late 1940s. He makes light of the splinter groups that formed after the split of the UNIA and essentially paints those who clung to Garveyism as irrelevant relics on the sinking ship of Garveyism. While Garveyism never flourished the way it did in the 1920s, groups such

as Captain King's Central Division thrived into the 1940s offering self-help services throughout the Depression and beyond. Beyond the 1940s, branches of Garveyites are still around today and still meet under the red, the black, and the green banner Garvey established over 90 years ago.

As for Garvey's politics and program, Aron emphasizes Garvey's ties to the KKK and oversimplifies Garvey's nuances by putting him simply at odds with integration and racial tolerance.[16] Aron only touches on Garvey's massive business empire, his positive black uplift programs, or the fact that Garvey was one of the first and strongest challengers of the inferiority of black culture and history. While Garvey may have made some ill-fated alliances and some bad business decisions, to define the UNIA in terms of its relationship to whites or hostility toward racial tolerance is to fundamentally misinterpret Garveyism. Unlike previous leaders, Garvey defined his program not in relationship to the white power structure, but as a separate entity in and of itself. Garveyism was not overtly hostile toward whites, it was simply not focused on them and their beliefs. Many African Americans during this period and beyond rightly interpreted a negotiation with the white power structure as fruitless based on failed attempts in the past. Aron paints Garveyism as a hostile movement rebuffing the advances of cooperative whites when in fact the movement itself was partially a result of the failure of white America to live up to its lofty ideals of liberty, freedom, and fair economic competition.

Aron's 1941 article did not go unchallenged. There were a few voices who were unwilling to paint Garveyism as a fad that quickly flamed out as quickly as it had ignited the masses. Ben Rogers was one of the earliest scholars to challenge the scholarship

generated during the first years of the early phase of Garvey scholarship. Published in Carter G. Woodson's *Journal of Negro History*, Rogers article, "William E.B. DuBois, Marcus Garvey, and Pan-Africa," was important in many ways.[17] While Rogers misinterprets Garveyism in some ways, he is the first scholar to admit the wide-ranging appeal of Garveyism and indicate that Garvey tapped into something real that did not die out when he was deported in 1927.[18] Rogers is the first scholar to take Garvey and his followers seriously and to understand that Garvey's followers were very loyal and very committed to Garvey's programs.

Rogers' article introduced a comparative element to Garvey studies by comparing Garvey's Pan-African program to that of DuBois. By showing how Garvey had succeeded where DuBois failed in appealing to African Americans on behalf of a Pan-African movement, Rogers began to tap into the essence of Garveyism and the strength of his movement: his appeal to everyday people. Rogers begins to emphasize some of the points that later scholars have since developed further. He introduces the idea of race pride as a "cornerstone of Garvey's teaching".[19] Rogers argued that this element was one element that was missing from DuBois' Pan African Congresses and that this element allowed Garvey to reach a primarily American audience and understand themselves as part of a larger group of oppressed people across the globe. This idea corroborated many of the defenses published by Garvey in the *Negro World* and portrayed Garveyism more as a beginning of the development of an idea rather than the fad or flash in the pan that Aron saw when he examined the UNIA.

Some second generation scholars saw more problems with the Garvey movement than simply its lack of staying power. Harold Cruse's 1967 classic *The Crisis of the*

Negro Intellectual brought thoughtful critiques of Garvey and the UNIA to the forefront. Motivated by the desire to categorize, critique, and analyze the majority of black intellectual thought in the mid 1960s, Cruse leveled important critiques at the Garvey movement, as he was nearly every leader prominent during the Harlem Renaissance. His most notable critiques were that Garvey was "defeated" in the West Indies and that he fled to the "greener pastures" of the United States to spread his message.[20] Cruse also characterizes the movement as "predominantly West Indian," critiques Garvey for his "blindness" of the differences between the "psychologies of West Indian and American Negroes".[21] Ultimately, Cruse's critiques of Garvey rest upon the leader's British – inspired "bourgeois nationalism" techniques and his "conceptually flawed" pro-capitalist stance.[22] Cruse argued that Garvey fundamentally failed to attract a large African American audience and that the majority of his movement was West Indian. He attempted to show that Garveyism was flawed and failed to gain revolutionary appeal because it was so aligned with capitalism and paints Garveyites' "unbending, inflexible pro-capitalist stance," along with Garvey's "economic ineptitude" as the chief reasons for the failure of the movement.[23] In bringing these important issues to light, Cruse advances the scholarship through his scathing critiques. For the first time, the differences between British and American Garveyites were highlighted and the problem of Garvey's British upbringing while operating in an American context is explored. Despite this, Cruse's portrayal of Garveyism as a primarily West Indian movement with less appeal to African Americans has since been discredited.[24]

David Cronon's *Black Moses* is an ideal transitional work in Garvey scholarship. Perhaps no study has shaped Garvey scholarship as dramatically as Cronon's first major

study. Both a rigorous study of the events of Garvey's life and an unapologetic indictment of Garvey's legacy, Cronon's work almost single-handedly inspired a generation of scholars to re-explore and re-evaluate Garvey legacy based on its conclusions. Because of the duality of the work standing as a scholarly achievement and an overly dismissive attack on Garvey, it is problematic to characterize. *Black Moses* is both the signature representative work of the early scholarship period overtly derisive of Garvey at times, as well as the first book length study to treat the Garvey movement with any kind of historical rigor. On one hand, Cronon was, at times, very critical of Garvey and his program. However, Cronon was also the first scholar to build a strong narrative of Garvey's life and career besides Garvey himself and Garvey's second wife Amy Jacques Garvey. The balance of these two sides places the work firmly in the early tradition of work on Garvey, but the strong focus on the narrative of Garvey and the UNIA hint toward the future direction of the third generation scholarship.

Black Moses offers a critique of Garvey and the UNIA. While Cronon grapples admirably with the idea that Garvey's contributions should be measured not strictly on the success and long term stability of his enterprises,[25] he ultimately falls short denying that the UNIA offered anything of "practical significance" remaining by the time he published *Black Moses* in 1955.[26] Cronon insisted that Garveyism was a failure because businesses supported by the UNIA such as the Black Star Line, the Negro Factories Corporation, and *The Negro World* never developed into the long term successful businesses that they promised to become. While there is no question that the massive mobilization of African American income that the UNIA represented might have developed into a more powerful and more long-term force, Cronon fails to account for

the myriad of forces working against Garvey and when he does acknowledge them he blames sabotage and employee dishonesty on Garvey's lack of "vigilant leadership".[27] Cronon was quick to criticize Garvey, but did not account for the many powerful enemies working against him. However, it should be noted that many of the FBI sources did not come out until after he had written *Black Moses*.[28]

Another aspect that places Cronon firmly in the critical second generation of Garvey scholarship is the tone that his study takes. Cronon ended the strongest historical narrative of the UNIA produced up to that point with an attack that at times seems personal and derogatory. Cronon's characterization of Garvey is that of an egomaniac willing to sacrifice everything to satisfy his lust for power and influence.[29] He accuses Garvey of "undercutting existing Negro leadership" and "rejecting all but the most extreme white backing."[30] In the end, Cronon boiled Garveyism down to failed business ventures and escapism.[31] He blames Garvey's personal failings and poor decision making as the sole reason why his movement failed to have any lasting impact. However, it is important to note that in his 1969 preface Cronon later rescinded some of his harshest critiques claiming "Garvey's legacy of racial consciousness and pride impresses me today as more significant than it did in the mid-1950s" and he second guessed his claim that Garvey, upon entering the United States at a later date might not find the same level of enthusiasm that he did in the mid 1910s.[32]

That said, Cronon's study offered a significant advance in the scholarship on Garvey. Its strong biographical elements help to bridge the gap toward generation three. While most scholars from the 1940s through most of the 1960s were content to dismiss Garvey altogether, Cronon at least brought the topic up for discussion in a meaningful

and scholarly way. While Cronon may not have considered a number of other factors in the collapse of the UNIA or respected its lasting impact, he was a pioneer in Garvey scholarship. While his conclusion reveals a certain bias, for the most part his recounting of the narrative is to be commended. Based on the time period he was writing in, Cronon's primary research and his recounting of the historical narrative was extremely strong as he utilized the *Negro World*, *Chicago Defender,* the Schomburg's collections, and Garvey's writings to produce his study.

Overall, this second generation was both a low point in Garvey studies and a foundation for future scholarship. On one hand, Garveyism was left with the rest of African-American history during the early part of the period, neglected and shunned by the majority of white scholars. However, as the period progressed, scholars were able to build a serviceable foundation on which future studies could be based and a healthy body of scholarship arose in the *Journal of Negro History.* While the sample of articles and studies was small, it was influential in the way that future scholars would write on Garvey throughout the 1960s and 1970s. However, because this foundation was so small, unsteady, and narrow, Garvey scholars faced an uphill climb throughout the 1960s and 1970s in making up for lost time and saying all of the things left unsaid by early scholars.

I further divide the scholarship on Garvey in a third period: Revisionism, Black Power, and the Garvey Movement (1979-1986). More books were published in this explosive third generation of Garvey scholarship than any other. The 1970s was for Garvey what it was for many other African American fields such as Reconstruction: a time of revisionism. Scholars during this period sought to reclaim Garvey's legacy and prove that he was a leader worthy of study. When they looked over the landscape of

what had previously been done they saw barren fields where previous scholars had failed to make their mark. The third generation of scholars established Garvey and his movement as an area worthy of serious study. There were two major trends during this period. The first was biography and the second was the collection and documentation of primary sources.

Since so little had been written on Garvey and the foundation was so small for scholars to build on, Garvey's biographers sought to widen or rebuild the foundation entirely. Many third generation scholars saw that Garvey had been excessively criticized and mocked, and they sought to correct some of the inaccuracies about Garvey as well as add new dimensions to the existing criticisms. In contrast to previously published scholarship, these authors sought to vindicate Garvey from the negative criticism he had received nearly since the beginning of the movement in the United States in 1917.

One especially vociferous response to the criticism that Garvey received was published in 1972 by Shawna Maglangbayan. *Garvey, Lumumba, and Malcolm: Black National Separatists* mounted a direct frontal assault on Cronon's *Black Moses*. Maglangbayan took Cronon to task for calling Garveyism a failure.[33] Maglangbayan asserted that Cronon, by focusing on Garvey's short lived business empire, failed to take into account the intangibles Garvey brought to African Americans. She asserted that Garvey was an inspiration to everyday people because he so vehemently fought the white power structure. In addition to this, she argued that Garveyism established important ties between African and African-American culture, that was an essential basis of a still developing Black Nationalist movement. Manglangbayan is a perfect example of a third

generation scholar. She reacts vehemently against the second generation and Cronon in particular.

Theodore Vincent's study *Black Power and the Garvey Movement* (1971) was revisionist as well. Vincent asserts that Cronon "misunderstood (his) subject" and was too hasty in portraying Garvey as being "unimportant".[34] Drawing primarily on the *Negro World* newspapers and "many evenings spent with Mrs. Amy Jacques Garvey", Vincent's biographical study is one of many revisionist texts that sought to retrieve the legacy of Garvey and reaffirm his historical significance.[35] He also draws on important connections between black nationalist organizations such as the Nation of Islam, arguing that "the Black Muslims were an outgrowth of the UNIA".[36] Vincent also reflects that "many of ideas and programs of the old UNIA are now being seriously considered".[37] Vincent's work is the perfect representation of the Black Power era. It reacted against Cronon's portrayal of the movement, infused the scholarship with new primary research, and made important connections between the contemporary Black Power movement and Garvey's UNIA.

In addition to Maglangbayan's assertion that Garvey could not be judged based solely on finances or the number of surviving UNIA institutions, Tony Martin's *Race First* (1973) revolutionized the conversation about Garvey by demonstrating how external factors weighed on Garvey's program. Martin highlighted how the FBI, British authorities, and white vandals sought to bring down the UNIA from within.[38] These new discoveries cast previous critiques of Garvey in a new light. Martin showed that Garvey was not a bumbling fool or self-destructive egomaniac who simply misspent his way out of business. Rather, Garvey was fighting a war on all fronts as insidious forces infiltrated

and sabotaged his movement. Martin argued that Garvey's unwillingness to compromise his vision put him at odds with Communists and the black intelligentsia and that his outspoken rhetoric alarmed the American and British governments. Given Martin's interpretation, scholars would never look at Garveyism in the same way again.

Martin broke Garveyism down in a workable and helpful way. Garvey's writings and speeches run the gamut across topics and time periods. He produced tomes of writings, speeches, and articles that represented an unwieldy and intimidating body of work. Martin reduced Garvey's program down to three useful pillars: Race First, Self-Reliance, and Nationhood. Race First, as Martin interpreted it, meant that any movement for black uplift must not be focused on humanity, but on the same category of analysis under which black people were "lynched, burned, jim-crowed, and segregated".[39] Cronon showed how Garvey attacked racism by imploring African Americans not to negotiate with whites, but to look within for solutions to the race problem.

Martin's second pillar of Garveyism was very closely related to the first: self-reliance. Martin discusses the businesses that the UNIA's Negro Factories Corporation built including a restaurant, three grocery stores, a printing press and a clothing manufacturing operation.[40] For the first time, Martin delved into the important smaller enterprises of the UNIA and went into detail about their services to the community, how many people they employed, and their practical value to the community. Martin addresses Garvey's relationship with Booker T. Washington, while at the same time highlighting the fact that the UNIA was more than a group of dreamers with big plans.[41] While the Black Star Line might have received more press, throughout the 1920s the UNIA was the driving force behind many small but important black business efforts in

Harlem. While the drama of Garvey's trial and feuds with DuBois might have taken center stage, Martin opened the door for future study here of small but influential businesses that influenced Garveyites and future black nationalists throughout the remainder of the 20th century.[42]

The third point Martin uses to encapsulate Garvey's ideas is Nationhood. Martin complicated earlier discussions of Garvey's conception of nationhood and debunked the idea of the UNIA as a "back to Africa" movement. He pointed out that Garvey was not looking to physically relocate black people worldwide into one physical space, but instead sought to utilize the power of numbers worldwide to create a force on the world stage that could give black people some leverage even in situations where they were badly outnumbered and underrepresented.[43] Martin showed how Garvey used the lyrics to "Every Race has a Flag but a Coon" in order to attack racist white rhetoric.[44] Martin shows that Garvey's nationhood program fought against ideas like this through creation of an African flag, conferences representing citizens from various African nations, and the Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World.[45] By showing that Garvey's idea of nationhood had power even though he never established a functional African nation state Martin was able to help to add legitimacy to Garvey's program and to help to temper the criticism that Garvey was an impractical egomaniac who offered few tangible gains with his nationhood rhetoric.

While Martin was able to add a path-breaking general study of Garveyism, other scholars were beginning to explore more focused aspects of the UNIA. Randall K. Burkett's *Garveyism as a Religious Movement* (1987) began to examine Garveyism on a more focused level taking one aspect of the movement and viewing it in isolation from

the rest of the program. By examining Garvey's exceedingly complex relationship with the black clergy, Burkett touched on an area of Garveyism that had gone largely unstudied. Because Garvey was so loved amongst his followers, he has become a cult icon of sorts; some people even looked at him as a Christ-like figure, destined to return. Other Afrocentric religious sects such as the Rastafarians began to hold Garvey in high esteem placing him in a position of honor amongst their holy men. Burkett's study opened interesting debates about Garvey, religion, the Rastafarian movement, and the way surviving members of the UNIA viewed and remembered Garvey.

Another work that foreshadowed future focuses and scholarly directions was Rupert Lewis and Maureen Warner-Lewis' 1986 edited volume *Garvey, Africa, Europe, the Americas*. This study explores Garvey's influence in Nigeria, the British West Indies, and as well as his later life.[46] This volume includes original articles by some of the leading Garvey scholars in the field including Tony Martin, Emory Tolbert, Theodore Vincent, and Lewis himself. Martin explored the history of Garvey's followers in Trinidad and argued for the "tremendous influence exerted by Garvey on the development of working class militancy in the West Indies".[47] Lewis foreshadowed a later study by focusing on Garvey's activism in Jamaica in 1929-1935 and placing "the Garvey movement in the context of the worldwide struggle against imperialism in the early 20th century."[48] John Henrik Clarke probed into the movement by focusing on the "American antecedents of Marcus Garvey" and various other scholars contributed diverse works focusing on Nigeria, the American left, and Garvey's notorious contributions to the League of Nations.[49] This collection represents a path-breaking work, much of which could do with further investigation today. This collection went beyond retrieving the

legacy of Garvey – it offered new directions in scholarly research beyond the American 1920s context.

In 1988, Lewis published *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion* a study that fits between the third and fourth generations for many reasons. The work is biographical in tone and in many ways it can be considered part of the revisionist tradition on Garvey – recounting the facts of Garvey's life in a more balanced way to combat Garvey's many vocal critics, though Lewis insists this book is not a biography.[50] Lewis' work is valuable in that he puts Garvey in a firmly international context as he focuses primarily on the understudied years from 1929-1934.[51] Lewis, in the tradition of Martin, emphasizes that Garvey was a "target of official machination and abuse" and the Garvey movement as one of a host of "anti-colonial" movements that "functioned at a time when most people felt that colonialism would last for centuries more".[52] While most previous works focuses strictly on Garvey's time in America and his reactions to American institutions and opponents, Lewis takes a wider view. He places Garvey on the international stage as a left-minded activist for the working class across national borders.[53] While this was not the first time Garvey was mentioned in such an international context, it was the first time a book length study was dedicated to viewing Garvey as a truly international figure or as a force for decolonization in the British Caribbean.

Another major trend of the third generation was the publication of more of Garvey's opinions and writings. These sources fit unevenly in both the first generation of primary sources and snugly into the third generation of vindication of Garvey because they offer Garvey's philosophy, but they were done so in a very political way meant to

help dig Garvey out of the hole created by the sharp critiques that had dominated the literature since the 1920s. By far the most important contributor to this project was Amy Jacques Garvey, Garvey's second wife. Jacques-Garvey was a meticulous record keeper and was passionately dedicated to preserving and spreading the philosophy and opinions of her then deceased husband. Jacques Garvey helped scholars to advance the field, and indeed advanced it herself, through the publication of central works such as *Garvey and Garveyism* and the *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey* series.[54]

Tony Martin and Robert Hill were also instrumental in the publishing of new primary work on Garvey. Martin published works such as *Literary Garveyism* (1983) and *The Poetical Works of Marcus Garvey* (1983). In these works Martin compiled previously uncirculated writings by Garvey, most notably his poetry. By publishing these works Martin was able to open the door to more interdisciplinary work on Garvey as well as give some insight into what Garvey was thinking through his art. Hill was no less important than Martin. In 1983 he began the process of publishing the Garvey papers eventually creating a 14 volume set that has become the starting point for most primary research on Garvey. Martin and Hill paved the way for future scholars by expanding the pool of primary sources that future scholars would have to draw from.

In one sense, this third period is defined by revisionism of past interpretations of Garvey both in the primary and early scholarship period. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s scholars continued to build on the foundations laid by Martin and to a lesser extent Cronon. A veritable explosion of scholarship brought Garvey from forgotten to the historical limelight within the space of a couple decades.[55] Each of these biographies contributed in their own way. Elton Fax's 1972 *Garvey* offered a narrative of Garvey's

life, but with a focus on both his life in the United States and on his time in Jamaica. Fax posits that his work sees Garvey "within the fabric of his environment" and that he sees Garvey within the "two environments that molded him": Jamaica and the United States.[56] *Garvey* offered an advance in that it discussed Garvey's childhood and younger years in more detail than had previous scholars ever had. Liz Mackie's 1987 *The Great Marcus Garvey* fights against Garvey being "labeled a failure" and emphasizes Garvey's "influence as a legacy to modern black politics".[57] This vein of scholarship is one of revisionism bent on correcting Cronon's enduring portrait of Garvey as a practical failure.

While many of these works served only to rehash the story of Garvey's life, they established for the first time a solid body of literature which took Garvey's program seriously and did not seek to belittle or discredit him. Scholars used an ever-expanding body of information on Garvey to accomplish these aims. Primary sources were being rediscovered and collected by scholars such as Martin and Hill and these new resources allowed for more nuanced and deeper interpretations of both the movement and its lasting impact throughout the 20th century.

While these studies were important and foundational, they still left large voids in the scholarship. The large book-length biography was the rule. Few scholars sought to isolate and study important aspects of Garvey's movement. Concerned with Garvey's larger legacy, these scholars did not begin the project of either relating Garvey to the larger historical narrative or studying the effects of Garvey's movement through narrower more focused study. However, there were at least three notable exceptions. The previously mentioned *Garveyism as a Religious Movement* by Burkett and Emory

Tolbert's 1980 *Garveyism in Los Angeles*. Tolbert introduced Garveyism as the wide ranging and regional movement that it was by focusing on Los Angeles, a previously unexamined region of Garvey's influence. While these studies do not technically fall within my generation 4 time period, they help to bridge the gap between the third and fourth generations and represent a move in the literature toward integrating the UNIA into the larger historical narrative while simultaneously isolating aspects of the movement that deserved further scholarly attention.

Although scholarship on Garvey remains uneven and disjointed in many ways, the current generation (1990s-present) is arguably more diverse than earlier periods. There are three veins that continue to drive Garvey scholarship, the first trend is the development of the narrower for focused study. These studies seek to continue to develop the literature on the UNIA by focusing on specific aspects of the movement such as Amy Jacques Garvey's contributions or Garveyites in the American south. The second trend is the broader study. These studies do not necessarily have Garvey or the UNIA at the center of their stories, but instead seek to utilize Garvey in telling a larger story and show how the UNIA acted upon its environment, not simply show how the environment shaped the Garveyites. These studies are central to the advancement of the scholarship because they begin the project of integrating the UNIA into the larger narrative of African American and American history. The third trend is the comparative element first explored by Williams when he put Garvey and Malcolm X together in a comparative study. Scholars during this fourth generation have begun to chart Garvey's influence, explore the debates he had with other leaders, and build scholarship on African American leadership strategies. All of these goals have been aided by the inclusion of Garvey with

other leaders in book-length studies. In addition to these trends, there is and probably always will be works being published which are primarily general biographies of Garvey. Because Garvey maintains status as a heroic and sometimes divine figure throughout the western hemisphere there will always be a demand for a new perspective on the biographical details of his life.

Over the past two decades scholars have begin to seriously investigate specific aspects of the Garvey movement while moving away from the biographical model. Often building on the works of previous scholars, these works represent a logical progression in the scholarship and are central to the development to Garvey-focused literature. One of the most important books in this trend was Peter Ashdown's brief study *Garveyism in Belize* (1990). This study brought both an international and regional focus to the study of Garvey. While not widely considered, it was an important development in the field and one that needs to be further explored. Ashdown's study explores the context of Garveyism in Belize by looking at "political and socio-economic features of Belizean society" and "the creation of the Belize branch of the UNIA after 1924".[58] In some ways, Ashdown built on Tolbert's study of Garveyites in Los Angeles. His study was regionally focused and he sought to isolate how one group of people utilized Garvey's ideas. However, it was also a step forward because he was one of the first scholars to deeply investigate the impact of the UNIA beyond American borders in a much different context than New York City.[59] While other scholars such as Tony Martin demonstrated the far reaching effects of Garveyism, Ashdown's case study reinforced the idea that Garvey's influence extended far beyond American borders and that it had an appeal throughout the western hemisphere.

This field once again expanded in 2007 as Mary Rolinson published her study *Grassroots Garveyism*. This study operated in the tradition of both Tolbert and Ashdown, but advanced the field further by not only tracking the importance of Garveyism in this previously unexplored space, but also arguing that the ideas of Garvey maintained relevance throughout the south well after the movement declined in the 1930s.[60] Rolinson contributes both to the project of narrative building through her exploration of Garveyites in the rural south, but goes a step further by showing that these previously unstudied Garveyites influenced the way southern African Americans protested, viewed their own African cultural roots, and developed strategies for community defense.[61] In making both broader connections and revealing previously uncharted narrative territory, Rolinson is successful in both putting the UNIA within the larger narrative and changing the way scholars view Garveyism. Previously widely considered an urban northern movement in the United States, Rolinson challenges this perception by showing the strong foundation the UNIA had in the rural south.

Working hand in hand with Rolinson's study is Claudrena Harold's recent publication *The Rise and Fall of the Garvey Movement in the Urban South 1918-1942*. This study is primarily a contribution to our understanding of Garveyism in different contexts. It focuses on Garveyism in three distinct southern cities: New Orleans (1920-1935), Miami (1920-1933), and Virginia (1918-1942).[62] While this work is not as exhaustive and stands more as three distinct case studies than the work of Rolinson, it both serves to broaden our understanding of the way Garveyites utilized the UNIA and hints at the organization's continued importance beyond the period usually seen as the decline, the post 1930 period. Taking these two new studies together, they represent a

dramatic advance in the conversation about Garvey. They show that the UNIA was at work in both a wider geographical range for a wider period of time. Furthermore, these studies serve to show that Garvey's ideas were more than a fad in the 1920s as early scholars assumed. They show us that Garveyism was a foundational part of African American protest starting in the 1920s and carrying well beyond Garvey's most active years of leadership.

Another path-breaking work on Garvey was Ula Taylor's 2002 study entitled *The Veiled Garvey: The Life and Times of Amy Jacques Garvey.* This work filled a gaping hole in that it finally seriously investigated the life of Amy Jacques Garvey who had been almost ignored by the scholarship up to this point. Taylor showed how Jacques-Garvey was able to exact her influence on the women of the UNIA through the *Negro World* and argued that Jacques-Garvey was able to walk a tightrope between protesting women's role in the movement and supporting her husband through a framework she terms community feminism.[63]

Furthermore, Taylor is the first scholar to produce a narrative of Jacques-Garvey's life, which was a long overdue advance. Because Jacques-Garvey dedicated herself to the preservation and furthering of Garvey's ideas, programs, and rhetoric understanding her is paramount to understanding Garvey. Many of the primary sources available today were edited by Jacques-Garvey, therefore to understand her is to get a deeper understanding of how Garvey sources were organized and what material was presented. Beyond her role with her husband's papers, Taylor shows, Jacques-Garvey was also a leader in her own right within the movement. Taylor published her own women's page within the *Negro World* and even served as the paper's associate editor between 1924 and

1927.[64] Taylor convincingly argues that Jacques-Garvey's popular articles in the paper served as a two pronged program for women who were to "work as political agents" while at the same time "perform as helpmates" to their husbands and children.[65] Taylor's work was path breaking because it gave a deeper perspective into the woman responsible for many of the sources on Garvey and it opened up the idea that the UNIA was not a solely Marcus Garvey driven project. Her perspective on Jacques-Garvey hints at the idea that not only women but other leaders beyond Garvey held important and influential roles within the ranks of the UNIA.

An equally important development was made in the publication of Horace Campbell's *Rasta and Resistance: From Marcus Garvey to Walter Rodney.* Campbell's study also contributed to an established thread on Garveyism: Garvey's important ties with religion. First explored by Burkett in 1978, the connections between Garvey and various religions have always been strong. This study represents both the furthering of more focused works as well as the broadening of the study of the UNIA. On one hand, Campbell explores the important connections between the Rasta religion and Garvey. However, perhaps more importantly, he places Garvey into a historical context in the development of Rasta. Campbell shows that Garvey, his symbols of racial pride, and the strength of the movement in Jamaica were influential in the early development of Rasta.[66] Furthermore, Campbell draws connections between the tradition of Resistance within the UNIA and how this became a central tenet of the Rasta religion throughout the 1940s and beyond. While this study is far more than an investigation of Garveyism, it is central to the historiography because it emphasizes the influence of Garveyism outside of UNIA

circles and shows that the movement was able to manifest itself in different ways long after the UNIA itself had declined.

Another scholar who sought to place Garvey within the larger context of early 20th century America was Judith Stein in her 1986 study *The World of Marcus Garvey.* While technically falling in the third generation, Stein's work is more in line with fourth generation scholars. Stein placed Garvey in conversation with his context as few previous scholars had done. While making the controversial argument that class was more important than race within the Garvey movement, Stein offered a fresh perspective, created debate amongst Garvey scholars, and managed to pull the field away from strictly Garvey focused study.[67] By focusing on the connection between Garveyism and capitalism, Stein put Garvey within the historical context and economic structure of his day. In viewing Garvey through a capitalist lens, she was able to show where many of his influences came from and how they played out during his life and ultimately influenced his rhetoric and programs. Stein offered greater perspective on the movement, perhaps because she was not strictly focused on Garvey. While scholars still debate her class-centered approach, her most important contribution might not have been her argument, but the way that she brought Garvey into his context and widened the field by integrating him into the wider narrative of American history.

In addition to exploring Garvey on both a micro and macro level, scholars have also sought to compare his leadership strategies, rhetoric, and views with that of other African American leaders in the 20th century. This third trend has helped to add nuance our views on Garvey and build upon Martin's three pronged characterization of the movement as well as understand the critiques and debates of the primary period more

clearly. John Ansbro's 2004 *The Credos of Eight Black Leaders*, Wilson Moses' 2004 *Creative Conflict in African American Thought* and 1997 *Classical Black Nationalism*, William Van Deburg's 1997 *Modern Black Nationalism*, Aki Hakim's 2003 *Pan African History* and Michelle Stevens' 2005 *Black Empire* attempt to place Garvey within the pantheon of black leadership in the 20th century. These works represent a strong thread in trying to place Garvey within a school of thought as well as offering useful comparisons to other African American leaders such as DuBois, Booker T. Washington, Malcolm X, Louis Farrakhan, among others.

Some works culminate with the introduction of Garvey such as *Classical Black Nationalism*, while other works see Garvey as a starting point.[68] These studies and edited volumes offer important new directions for future studies to take. They continue the project of bringing Garvey into conversation with other leaders, programs, and philosophies. Up to this point, scholars have done an admirable job of gathering information about Garvey himself, but have just begun to scratch the surface in terms of comparative work or contextualizing Garveyism. These studies begin that work, if only by putting perspectives on Garveyism in the same edited volume. While there is still significant distance to travel before we see a truly comparative work on Garvey, these studies are opening that door and offering something for future scholars to build on as the conversation on Garvey develops.

The fourth generation of work on Garvey has brought interesting new developments and has opened potential new paths for future scholars to explore in the coming years. Stevens and Taylor pioneered some important gendered discussions on Garvey, while Ansbro and Hakim continued the project of placing Garvey's leadership

techniques and programs within some sort of leadership tradition in African American history. By moving away from isolating Garvey as a topic of scholarly debate, these scholars have opened new avenues for the study of the UNIA. By utilizing comparative frameworks and offering Garvey's ideas side by side with both his contemporaries and later leaders, these scholars have illuminated new and important angles, ideas, and comparisons that will help nuance the interpretations of the UNIA as the 21st century continues.

This study has drawn inspiration from a number of previous scholars who have produced valuable studies on the movement. Specifically, the body of work produced by Rupert Lewis has greatly informed the international context of this study. Lewis was one of the earliest scholars to begin to view Garvey beyond his deportation from the United States in 1927. His work *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion* (1988), expanded the conversation on Garvey across international borders and he has been a pioneer in exploring Garvey and his influence beyond the 1920s American context.

In addition to Lewis, I am also working within a recent trend in Garvey scholarship established by Mary Rolinson, Claudrena Harold, and Ronald Stephens. Rolinson and Harold have begun investigating Garveyism throughout the American south in their studies *Grassroots Garveyism: The Universal Negro Improvement Association in the Rural South* (2007) and *The Rise and Fall of the Garvey Movement in the Urban South* (2007). Stephens has added to the scholarship by exploring Garveyites in Detroit in the 1930s in his article "Garveyism in Idlewild 1927 to 1936". These studies have helped to build on what we know about Garveyism in local contexts and my project is an extension of this aim focusing on New York City and the British Caribbean. In

excavating the history of Garveyism throughout the western hemisphere, my project and those that have preceded it are helping to show the tremendous flexibility and adaptability of the movement to reshape itself to meet different contexts. Garveyism is one of the largest mass movements in the history of the African Diaspora and through expanding our understanding of its appeal and meanings scholars will be able to more accurately assess its meanings and influence across the Diaspora.

Notes

---

[1] Amy Jacques-Garvey, ed. *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey* (Dover, Mass.: The Majority Press, 1986), 91.
[2] Tony Martin, *Race First: The Ideological and Organizational Struggles of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press, 1976), 12.
[3] Before 1928, the New York Times published around about 80 articles with some mention of Garvey. 33 of these articles focused on his legal troubles, 7 focused on critiques of Garveyism (usually from African American leaders), while only 16 combined talked about his program, mass meetings, or the protests Garveyites mounted to his trial and guilty verdict. Other articles mentioned Garvey only briefly or were only very small tidbits.
[4] A.B. Williams, "Clipper Ship of the African Exodus," *New York Times*, August 29, 1920.
[5] A.B. Williams, "Clipper Ship of the African Exodus," *New York Times*, August 29, 1920.
[6] A.B. Williams, "Clipper Ship of the African Exodus," *New York Times*, August 29, 1920.
[7] Critiques of Garvey's program were not limited strictly to the white press. Scholars and members of the academe took shots at his program as well. One of the earliest writers to critique Garvey was Cellie Reid. In his M.A. thesis entitled *Marcus Garvey as a Social Phenomenon: A Study in Crowd Psychology* published in 1928, Reid completely disregarded the aims of the UNIA and its practical benefits. Instead of evaluating the UNIA based on its charter, goals, and results, Reid was content to use it as a study in 'crowd psychology'. Reid's focus on Crowd Psychology indicated that he completely misinterpreted the UNIA on a number of levels. Unwilling or unable to accept the UNIA as a calculated and coherent group with plans, goals, and structure this thesis boils Garveyism down into a base display of a receptive population blindly following a charismatic leader. Rather than examine why the ideas and programs of Garvey were so appealing, Reid examines the movement as a case study in mob mentality.
[8] Cary D Wintz, ed. *African American Political Thought 1890-1930* (London: M.E. Sharpe, 1996), 129-131.
[9] "Garvey Must Go, Negroes Declare," *New York Times,* September 11, 1922.
[10] Martin, *Race First*, 322. The Garvey Must Go Campaign officially included noted African American leaders Carl Pickens, Robert Bagnall, A. Phillip Randolph, and Chandler Owen.
[11] Quoted in David Cronon. *Black Moses: The Story of Marcus Garvey* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1955), 107.
[12] Robert Bagnall, "The Madness of Marcus Garvey," *The Messenger*, March 1923, 638-648. This is one of the most damaging attacks on Garvey literally claiming Garvey as a "paranoiac" or clinically insane. He points to Garvey's grand plans, suspicion, and a lack of ability to distinguish between fantasy and reality.
[13] Marcus Garvey, Editorial, *Negro World*, February 13, 1923.
[14] Marcus Garvey, Editorial, *Negro World*, January 1, 1921.
[15] Birgit Aron. "The Garvey Movement: Shadow and Substance," *Phylon.* 8, Number 4. 1947, 337.
[16] Aron, "Garvey Movement: Shadow and Substance," 342.
[17] Ben Rogers, "William E.B. DuBois, Marcus Garvey, and Pan-Africa," *Journal of Negro History,* April 1955.
[18] Rogers claims that Garvey followed in Washington's footsteps by attempting not to irritate white America. This is flatly not true, Garvey published inflammatory remarks in the Negro World, published poetry, and gave speeches that were overtly critical of white America. Rogers, "William E.B. DuBois, Marcus Garvey, and Pan-Africa," 160-161. Rogers also portrays Garveyism as a "back to Africa" movement, which Garvey always denied vehemently. Garvey's aim was to populate an African territory with certain professionals from different parts of the world in order to better utilize its natural resources. He never advocated that all black people should return to Africa.
[19] Rogers, "William E.B. DuBois, Marcus Garvey, and Pan-Africa,"158.
[20] Harold Cruse, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* (New York: Quill, 1967), 47.
[21] Cruse, *Crisis of the Negro Intellectual,* 82, 119.
[22] Cruse, *Crisis of the Negro Intellectual,* 332-333.
[23] Cruse, *Crisis of the Negro Intellectual,* 330-333.
[24] Recent scholarship has shown that Garveyites held a strong presence in the American south, California, and Michigan. These areas certainly did not hold a strong enough Afro-Caribbean population to support

Garvey branches on their own. See: Mary Rolinson, *Grassroots Garveyism: The Universal Negro Improvement Association in the Rural South 1920-1927,* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).; Claudrena Harold, *The Rise and Fall of the Garvey Movement in the Urban South* (New York: Routledge, 2007); Emory Tolbert, *The UNIA and Black Los Angeles: Ideology and Community in the American Garvey Movement* (Los Angeles: Center for Afro-American Studies, University of California, 1980).; Ronald Stephens, "Garveyism in Idlewild, 1927 to 1936," *Journal of Black Studies*, 34, Number 4, 462-488.

[25] David Cronon. *Black Moses,* 4. Cronon gamely grapples with the idea that Garveyism was an important step forward for African Americans, even stating early on that the UNIA "awakened fires of Negro nationalism that have yet to be extinguished" but he ultimately decides that Garvey's contributions to black uplift were secondary to his failed business interests.

[26] Cronon, *Black Moses*, 223.

[27] Cronon, *Black Moses*, 101. Whether Garvey was a vigilant leader or not, it would have been difficult for him to monitor the actions of employees out at sea under the supervision of his staff. There is a strong argument to be made that no amount of vigilance on the part of Garvey or his lieutenants could have prevented the infiltration and sabotage of the Black Star Line by his foes.

[28] Cronon, *Black Moses*, 222. Cronon's analysis of Garvey is not completely off the mark when he cites Garvey's failure to delegate authority, seeking "fawning courtiers rather than competent co-workers", and his "egocentric" personality. Garvey certainly would have benefited from delegating some authority and he did make a few mistakes along the way, however, Cronon's imbalance is that he overemphasizes Garvey's personal failings while almost completely de-emphasizing the powerful forces aligned against him.

[29] Cronon, *Black Moses*, 224.

[30] Cronon, *Black Moses*, 224.

[31] Cronon, *Black Moses*, 224.

[32] Cronon, *Black Moses,* xii-xiii.

[33] Shawna Maglangbayan, *Garvey, Lumumba, and Malcolm: Black National-Separatists.* (Third World Press: Chicago, Il. 1972), 19-20.

[34] Theodore Vincent, *Black Power and the Garvey Movement* (Berkeley, California: Ramparts Press. 1971), 9.

[35] Vincent, *Black Power and the Garvey Movement*, 10.

[36] Vincent, *Black Power and the Garvey Movement,* 13.

[37] Vincent, *Black Power and the Garvey Movement,* 22.

[38] Martin, *Race First*, 174-343. Martin dedicated nearly half of his study to Garvey's opponents including the United States government, Communists, and the black intelligentsia. Furthermore, Martin added a more complete and thorough historical narrative of the Garvey movement than Cronon's version.

[39] Martin, *Race First*, 23.

[40] Martin, *Race First*, 34-35.

[41] Martin, *Race First*, 32-33.

[42] Stephens, "Garveyism in Idlewild, 1927 to 1936," 462-488. Stephens importantly points out that Garveyites hundreds of miles from New York City in Michigan utilized Garvey's ideas well into the 1930s adter Garvey's 'decline' to amass a sizable amount of land and local businesses. Furthermore, Garvey's Washington-influenced model of black business and later self-help was taken up by groups such as the Nation of Islam and the Black Panther Party for Self Defense.

[43] Martin, *Race First*, 42-43.

[44] Martin, *Race First*, 43.

[45] Martin, *Race First*, 42-45.

[46] Rupert Lewis and Maureen Warner-Lewis, eds. *Garvey Africa, Europe, the Americas* (Africa World Press: 1986).

[47] Lewis and Warner-Lewis, eds. *Garvey Africa, Europe, the Americas*, 47.

[48] Lewis and Warner-Lewis, eds. *Garvey Africa, Europe, the Americas*, 79.

[49] Lewis and Warner-Lewis, eds. *Garvey Africa, Europe, the Americas.*

[50] Rupert Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion* (Trenton-N.J.: Africa World Press, 1988), 13.

[51] Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion,* 13.

[52] Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion,* 275.

[53] Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion.*

[54] Amy Jacques-Garvey, ed., *Garvey and Garveyism* (Macmillan Publishing Company, 1973); Amy Jacques-Garvey, ed, *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press, 1986). While many of these books were initially published in the 1930s and 1940s, it was not until the 1960s when many of them began to be reprinted and became available in larger quantities.
[55] Liz Mackie, *The Great Marcus Garvey.* (London: Hansib Press, 1987).; Eric Huntley, *Marcus Garvey.* (London: Friends of Bogle, 1988).; Tony Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press, 1986).; John Henrik Clarke, *Marcus Garvey and the Vision of Africa* (New York: Random House, 1974).; Rupert Lewis and Patrick Bryan, eds. *Garvey, His Work and Impact* (Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1991).; Elton Fax, *Garvey: The Story of a Pioneer Black Nationalist* (New York: Dodd, Mead. 1972).
[56] Fax, *Garvey: Pioneer Black Nationalist*, xviii, xxii.
[57] Mackie, *The Great Marcus Garvey*; Huntley, *Marcus Garvey*, 10.
[58] Peter Ashdown, *Garveyism in Belize* (Belize: Benque Viejo del Carmen, 1990), 5.
[59] Ashdown, *Garveyism in Belize.*
[60] Rolinson, *Grassroots Garveyism.*
[61] Rolinson, *Grassroots Garveyism.*
[62] Harold, *The Rise and Fall of the Garvey Movement in the Urban South*, 29-114.
[63] Ula Taylor, *The Veiled Garvey: The Life and Times of Amy Jacques Garvey* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 1-5, 19-40.
[64] Taylor, *The Veiled Garvey*, 64-65.
[65] Taylor, *The Veiled Garvey,* 65.
[66] Campbell, *Rasta and Resistance*, 50-68.
[67] Judith Stein, *The World of Marcus Garvey.* (Louisiana State University Press, 1991).
[68] Wilson Jeremiah Moses, ed., *Classical Black Nationalism: From the American Revolution to Marcus Garvey* (New York: New York University Press, 1996).; William Van Deburg, ed., *Modern Black Nationalism: From Marcus Garvey to Louis Farrakhan* (New York: New York University Press, 1997). These companion volumes work together simultaneously placing Garvey as the culmination of 19th century black nationalism and as an important architect of continuing 20th century black nationalist thought.

CHAPTER 2: CHALLENGES AND CHANGES: BIRTH OF THE CENTRAL DIVISION UNIA

"With confidence, you have won before you have started."[1] *–Marcus Garvey*

On March 19, 1935 a sixteen year old African American boy attempted to shoplift a 10 cent pocket knife from the Kresge department store on 125th Street in Harlem. The employees of Kresge acted fast and apprehended the boy. By 2:30 p.m., the boy had given back the knife and was allowed to exit through the back basement door.[2] Unfortunately, a number of circumstances led to a fast spreading rumor: that police detectives had severely beaten the boy in the basement of the department store and that he was either dead or very nearly so.

Three major factors contributed to the spread of this rumor. One, the Kresge department store had a history of discriminating against African Americans (the bulk of their customers), especially with regard to employment. They had been the target of picketing and had recently hired a few African American clerks who worked at the lunch counter.[3] Two, an ambulance had been called to treat a Kresge employee whose hand was bitten in attempting to apprehend the thief.[4] Three, by coincidence, a hearse was temporarily parked behind the store in an alley.[5] These factors fueled the fire and the rumor spread quickly.

Within the next few hours, a crowd began to gather outside the department store. Refusing to believe the statements of Kresge employees and the police that the boy was unharmed, the crowd forced the store to close its doors by 5:30 p.m.[6] At 6:30 p.m. a

window of the store was smashed by the crowd and by 7:30 p.m. the Young Liberators, a group dedicated to preserving African American rights, began circulating a leaflet accusing the department store of mistreating the boy and stating that he was near death.[7] This set off a firestorm and the "ghetto mutiny" had begun.[8]

The damages from the riot were heavy. It is estimated that the rioters destroyed $150,000 in plate glass alone.[9] The result of the riot was loss of life, serious injuries to both police and rioters, and property destruction. While the costs were high, the riot was instrumental in bringing "the first vivid realization of the actual predicament of the mass life in Harlem".[10] After the riot it became clear that this was not just an outbreak of violence over the perceived mistreatment of a youth. It was a culmination of frustrations for African American New Yorkers. Harlemites had been dealing with poor health care, police brutality, poor schools, and discrimination in relief services throughout the Depression.[11] Furthermore, African Americans were squeezed harder by the Depression than other New Yorkers. In some areas the unemployment rate climbed to 70%. Harlemites' wages dropped an average of 43.6% from 1929 to 1932 and the early days of Roosevelt's New Deal brought little hope that these conditions would improve.[12]

African Americans coped with these bleak conditions in a number of ways, with perhaps the most successful method being the formation of community-centered self-help groups. This chapter focuses on the UNIA Central Division as a group operating in that tradition. It offers a narrative of the formation of the Central Division, discusses some of the challenges the group faced, outlines some of the ways the group evolved to face these challenges, and ultimately argues that although this group has received minimal scholarly attention, that it was in fact a viable force on the Harlem landscape throughout the 1930s

and into the 1940s. This chapter also places the group within the dynamic landscape of 1930s Harlem and discusses controversial issues such as housing, schools, and hospitals. The goal of this chapter, then, is in two fold: one, to illustrate the problems and issues the Central Division rallied to address; and two, to show that the Central Division was a vital, important, and effective self-help group in Harlem in the 1930s,

Although the Harlem riot was devastating in many ways, some scholars and Harlem residents of the time have seen it as an unexpectedly positive force that drew attention to the problems that Harlem was having and revitalized African American self help uplift movements.[13] In addition to revitalizing many African American uplift groups, the riot brought attention from the city government as well. Immediately following the riots Mayor La Guardia appointed a council headed by respected African American citizen Dr. Charles H. Roberts to investigate the causes of the riot.[14] After twenty-five hearings and just over one year the groups released a detailed report about healthcare, schools, crime, police, and social services.[15] The city's response to this report was a positive one. The city government broke the longstanding tradition of neglecting Harlem by funding works projects, pushing for a remodeling of Harlem Hospital, and opening the Harlem River housing project to provide more affordable homes for residents.

It was into this context of revitalization that Captain Alfred L. King's (henceforth A.L. King) Universal Negro Improvement Association: Central Division eventually emerged in late 1935. The 1930s were just as tumultuous for Garvey's UNIA as they were for the residents of New York City. While Garvey was imprisoned for mail fraud, loyalty amongst some of his American divisions faded and infighting ensued over who

would lead in Garvey's absence. The once strong and centralized UNIA broke into a number of splinter organizations that often clashed, sometimes violently.

After Garvey was deported back to Jamaica in 1927, he began to attempt to reassemble what was left of his movement. In August 1929, Garvey organized the Sixth Annual UNIA Convention at Edelweiss Park in Jamaica. It was heavily attended by both American and Jamaican Garveyites. Garvey used the conference to reorganize the UNIA entirely under the name "UNIA, August 1929, of the World".[16] This reorganization brought further strife to the UNIA and widened the gap between Garvey and the American leadership. After being essentially stripped of power at the 1929 Convention, Fred Toote, formerly one of Garvey's most trusted aids, returned home and helped to construct the competing UNIA, Inc.[17]

The American UNIA, Inc. was unauthorized by Garvey and challenged Garvey's authority and leadership. It contained some of Garvey's formerly high ranking officials who no longer felt that Garvey was the right man to lead the movement. UNIA, Inc. members sought to discredit Garvey throughout the United States whenever possible. They debated Garvey's vision and sought to undermine his representatives when they came to speak to American audiences. Furthermore, due to the efforts of UNIA, Inc., during this period correspondence from the United States to Garvey was banned and no postal money orders could be made out to Garvey or his Jamaican UNIA.

Even in such a tumultuous time, however, a number of smaller organizations remained loyal to Garvey throughout the 1930s. This chapter focuses primarily on the Central Division headed up by Captain A.L. King. I have chosen this group for two reasons. One, King still represented Garvey's interests and at least attempted to stay

loyal to him.[18] Two, the Central Division was active within the community on a number of different levels. Broadly speaking, the Central Division reinvented Garveyism within the 1930s Harlem context. While still remaining loyal to the spirit of Garvey's ideas, King was able to transform the UNIA ideals which had previously focused on large business enterprises, worldwide black cooperation, and partnerships with African nations into more manageable goals that could be met on the local level. Lacking the resources and manpower of the 1920s UNIA, the Central Division showed that the movement did not completely splinter and fade away after the 1920s, but that it was able to adapt itself and change to fit local needs in Depression stricken Harlem.

During the early 1920s, the UNIA had great success in reaching and mobilizing working African-Americans and Afro-Caribbeans throughout the western hemisphere. Feeding off of this success, the UNIA blossomed into a huge bureaucratic organization that contained countless smaller branches each dedicated to achieving different aims. UNIA members all had their place in the pantheon of allegiances and there was a role to fill for almost anyone who was interested in participating. Man or woman, young or old, employed or unemployed, the UNIA offered a place for any fervent Garveyite to help the organization prosper.

The UNIA's *Book of Laws*, first published in 1918, not only outlined the procedures for setting up local UNIA branches, but also listed names and procedures of auxiliary organizations.[19] The Association offered hundreds of positions of authority for potential Garveyites including spots for Presidents, Lady Presidents, and numerous Secretaries, Treasurers, and Advisory Board members.[20] In addition to these positions, the UNIA also maintained a great many successful auxiliary units within the larger

organization. These auxiliaries were of varying sizes and addressed a plethora of needs and issues within the Harlem community. For example, the Employment Bureau set out to help the unemployed find jobs, the Juveniles Division sought to teach "Spiritual and Racial uplift", the Universal African Legions Band was maintained as the "official band of the Universal African Legions", and the Universal African Black Cross Nurses organized women from ages 16 to 45 to meet general health needs within the UNIA and in Harlem more generally.[21]

This massive organization and its auxiliary branches required an incredible financial commitment from its membership. Throughout the early 1920s this was a commitment that the UNIA membership was more than willing to make. They met this obligation through a number of different means, especially by selling the UNIA's flagship newspaper – *The Negro World.* Banned throughout the British Empire, the *Negro World* was a subversive mouthpiece for the UNIA. Aside from being a powerful force for black uplift worldwide, it was also a very profitable enterprise. In August of 1924 the *Negro World* generated over $6000 in revenue from subscriptions, sales, and advertisements.[22]

However, the UNIA was not funded through sales of the *Negro World* alone. Membership contributions, stock sales, and loans were all central in keeping the UNIA running smoothly. In the case of loans, theoretically members would be making an investment that was both profitable and in the meantime could be used by the UNIA for "the furtherance of the Industrial, Commercial, and Agricultural purposes of the Association". Thousands of Garveyites throughout the United States signed up to loan money to the UNIA. Members could choose how much to loan, how much the payments

would be, and when the payments would begin.[23] Members would receive 5 percent interest yearly on their loan and typically would offer loans between $10 and $500 to be paid back over a three year period.[24] These loans were a very popular way for people to fund the efforts of Garvey while potentially making some money in the process. Garveyites loaned the Association money not just in New York City but in other more remote branches such as Detroit, Cleveland, and Youngstown.[25]

The early 1920s was a time of unprecedented growth and success for the UNIA. Many Harlemites wanted to get in on the ground floor of Garvey's plans and most people believed that these businesses, buoyed by such popular support, were sure to be good investments. The Garvey empire flourished, but the money was spent as quickly as it was brought in. Treasurer's Reports from as early as 1924 indicate that the UNIA spent at an incredible rate. While the UNIA generated thousands of dollars on a monthly basis, it almost always spent more than it had taken in.[26] These unsound investment practices combined with the American government's targeting of the UNIA and hostility from popular African American leaders such as W.E.B. DuBois were central in fundamentally changing the movement when Garvey was deported after being convicted of mail fraud in 1925 in what he called an "international 'frame-up'".[27] While Garvey was eventually pardoned after sitting in jail for nearly two years, he was deported back to Jamaica.

Following Garvey's deportation in 1927, the UNIA was forced to radically reshape itself. Throughout the late 1920s and 1930s, the New York City Garveyites led by Captain A.L. King struggled to remain relevant while confronting three serious challenges. First, with the loss of their leader, Garveyites were forced to forge ahead without the clear direction they once had. Secondly, the Great Depression of the 1930s

helped to bring a decline in membership and funds that threatened to swallow the UNIA. Finally, the conditions in Harlem were driving African Americans to different parts of the city. By 1940, it was impossible to say that an organization based in Harlem reached the entire African American population in New York City. The African American population was increasingly fleeing Harlem for more desirable areas. These challenges demanded that King's UNIA fundamentally reorganize. Fortunately, the foundation that had been built in the 1920s was strong enough to endure throughout the 1930s and early 1940s.

The first challenge the post-1926 UNIA had to immediately address was the loss of their leader, Marcus Garvey. Garvey was deported in 1927 and never returned to the United States. With Garvey off the scene, factions immediately formed, each claiming to be the true heir to the legacy of the UNIA. From 1926 to 1929, Garveyite factions battled for control over the UNIA, occasionally violently.[28] After Garvey was imprisoned in 1926, the leadership of New York Division #340 was evicted from Liberty Hall by a splinter group called The Garvey Club.[29] Local leaders took it upon themselves to take up Garvey's standard and interpret his ideas in their own ways. The future leader of the UNIA's Central Division, Captain A.L. King took this opportunity for form a splinter group known as the Pioneer Negroes of the World.[30]

By 1929 Garvey had established some measure of order within his splintering movement. From Jamaica, he reunited many of the warring factions under the name "The Universal Negro Improvement Association and African Communities League of the World". Many of the factions were able to reunite during this period and from 1929 until 1935 the New York movements maintained a united front. However, in 1935 Captain

A.L. King split off for the final time forming his UNIA Central Division that was formally recognized by Garvey and his Parent Body shortly after its inception in 1936.[31] While the transition from Garvey's leadership to King's was not a smooth one, King managed to maintain his Central Division well into the 1940s.[32]

The next challenge the post-Garvey UNIA faced was a decline in membership. After Garvey's arrest, trial, and subsequent deportation many Garveyites lost faith in the movement. Garvey's charisma had been the one constant throughout the early 1920s and when he was removed, the movement lost much of its appeal. Furthermore, by 1927 most of the Garveyite businesses were in financial ruin. These businesses had represented the promise of independent black business and in many cases offered to pay their investors handsome dividends. For a variety of reasons, these businesses never panned out the way that Garvey and the membership had hoped. With so many investors left with nothing to show for their investments, the movement's appeal weakened considerably.

To make matters worse, economic conditions in America had changed, making the climate much less favorable for the UNIA. In 1929, the stock market crash signaled the end of a period of relative prosperity. The Great Depression shook America to its core, but had an even more devastating impact on African Americans. In 1932 African Americans faced an unemployment rate over 50 percent, double the rate of white unemployment.[33] In desperation, whites flocked to traditionally African American jobs such as street cleaning, domestic work, and laundry work further marginalizing an already struggling population.

As a result of this economic burden the UNIA membership and funding declined steeply. Faced with the reality that they could no longer contribute to the UNIA and support it as they once had, many Garveyites simply withdrew and lost contact with the organization. Since the UNIA had long been supported almost exclusively through funding from its membership it only stands to reason that when that membership lost economic standing, the UNIA suffered in kind. Therefore, as a result of the Great Depression's impact on the New York African American community, the UNIA suffered both in terms of membership and in funds. The UNIA no longer wielded the membership or the financial backing to be the worldwide force it had been for the previous decade.

The final challenge faced by the Central Division was that the very makeup of the New York African American population was in a state of flux during the 1930s. The 1930s saw the end of Harlem as the "most wonderful Negro city in the world". Historian Cary D. Wintz suggests even throughout the 1920s at the height of Harlem's popularity it had serious problems such as poor living conditions and a lack of a viable middle class.[34] By the 1930s, these nagging problems had begun to catch up with Harlem as African Americans looked to diversify their living spaces moving to alternate neighborhoods such as Brooklyn's Bedford Stuyvesant. The first push out of Harlem stemmed from one of the neighborhood's oldest problems, housing. Buildings in Harlem were not initially built as affordable housing for low income residents. They were built for affluent whites by ambitious builders who overbuilt this section of the city. The supply exceeded demand and this opened up the market for African-Americans to move into Harlem. Despite heavy resistance from whites, African-Americans eventually gained a strong enough

foothold to stay in Harlem when the Pennsylvania Railroad Company purchased thirteen large apartment houses with the intent to rent to African-Americans.[35]

After such a large blow to white hope of locking African-Americans out, most whites fled the scene leaving their stylish brownstones and single family houses behind. This was a victory for African-Americans, but it did not come without a price. Since the majority of the homes in Harlem were built for single families most of the rents were well out of the average black families' price range. In order to compensate for this dilemma, most landlords would often subdivide the homes so that African-Americans could afford to move in.[36]

Since most landlords still owed on their mortgages and were eager to get out of debt, subdivisions within these single family dwellings were often taken to ridiculous levels. Overcrowding in Harlem soon became the order of the day. African-Americans were packed into Harlem at a rate of 336 per acre.[37] This led to a number of creative situations including African-Americans who worked on different shifts sharing a small apartment - one sleeping during the day then leaving for work and the other sleeping at night and leaving for work as their roommate arrived home.

Overcrowding was not the only housing problem African Americans had to deal with. There was a constant battle between tenants and landlords about unfairly high rents. Landlords often charged ridiculously high rents and exploited the relatively small amount of housing that was available.[38] Harlem tenants organized a number of initiatives in order to combat these high rents.[39] In 1936 they organized a march against rent increases in which over 4000 people participated.[40] Six years later Harlem residents

appealed to the rent control section of the Office of Price Administration to establish a rent ceiling to stop rents from continuing to climb.[41]

Harlem residents were not being unfair in their requests for government aid against high rents. According to many sources, Harlem rents were ludicrously high.[42] Harlem residents often paid upwards of 40% of their incomes in rent and they invariably paid more and got less than whites in the property market.[43] Harlem rents were also constantly rising. Between 1919 and 1928 Harlem rents nearly doubled. Furthermore, high rents were enough to keep properties in Harlem appreciating at a time when most surrounding property was declining in value.[44]

Perhaps more discouraging than paying high rent was that Harlem residents always seemed to be paying more for less. The accommodations many Harlemites received in exchange for exorbitant rent were often run down and dangerous. Many of the makeshift apartments in Harlem were becoming structurally unsound and lacked adequate sewer service by the late 1930s.[45] Despite the fact that the buildings were often inspected, these conditions continued to go unchecked with rumors of payoffs to the inspectors running rampant.[46] To make matters worse the landlords and whites in general often blamed African-Americans for these conditions when it was the overcrowding combined with lack of upkeep on the part of landlords that put their property in such sad shape.

Another longstanding problem in Harlem was the schools. Schools in Harlem were known for their high level of segregation as well as poor quality of education.[47] Harlem schools were in old buildings that were completely breaking down by the early 1930s. Harlem schools lacked sanitation facilities, medical and vocational service,

auditoriums, and had adequate play space.[48] Out of the eighty-five schools investigated by a 1931 study by the Joint Committee on Education only one of them had any sort of vocational counselor and medical care was found to be severely lacking especially considering that many of the children attending Harlem schools had no family doctor and were poverty-stricken.[49]

Beyond the student facilities, Harlem schools could also be a difficult place to learn and teach. In 1941 Robert W. Cyner, a printing teacher at Junior High School in Harlem was savagely beaten after he detained a student in his classroom after the student was found engaged in a hallway "scuffle".[50] Despite constant efforts to emphasize "good citizenship" at Harlem schools, a high level of juvenile delinquency and upheaval in the schools was ever present.[51] Harlem schools were lacking in facilities and were distracting places to learn. Many families in Harlem saw the schools as a detriment to their children's success, which made relocation from Harlem and increasingly attractive possibility.

A third problem that plagued Harlem from the beginning was crime. Springing from the problems of housing, employment, and overcrowding, Harlem's crime came to be a persistent and chronic ailment that neither waxed nor waned.[52] Along with crime, there was another constant in Harlem: police brutality. The use of excessive force by Harlem police was nothing new and it continued throughout the 1930s and 1940s.[53]

The problem of crime coupled with police brutality had devastating effects on Harlem. While most Harlem residents did not approve of the crime that riddled their streets, they had also lost faith in the police. This lack of support compelled the police to patrol and protect Harlem only halfheartedly. The standoff between police and Harlem

residents facilitated the growth and spread of crime in Harlem. Specifically, drugs and theft flourished in Harlem because of the lack of trust in police.[54] The ever present specter of crime loomed over Harlem for the better part of three decades; this longstanding problem was what many Harlemites sought to escape by moving to Bedford-Stuyvesant.

Another persistent problem that plagued Harlem almost since the outset of black settlement was poor quality healthcare. Harlem Hospital was the only hospital that serviced the community and access to it was a persistent problem.[55] For this reason, birth and death rates in Harlem were higher than city averages. At one point during the 1930s there was such a severe outbreak of Tuberculosis that the 142nd and 143rd street block became known as the "lung block" because there were such a large number of cases reported.[56]

Beyond lack of access to Harlem Hospital, further conditions contributed to the epidemics and generally low quality of Harlem healthcare. Of particular concern to residents was the overcrowding at Harlem Hospital. They did not have enough staff or beds to service the population. The consequences of this lack were illustrated in February 1932 when the Hospital had barely over half the beds it needed to service the patients waiting for care.[57] Furthermore, the charge of "Jim Crowism" was often leveled at Harlem Hospital for a number of reasons. One doctor who worked at Harlem Hospital charged that patients were neglected, the staff was overworked, the hospital was overcrowded, and the equipment was in poor shape, black doctors were treated with no respect by white doctors. Perhaps most disturbing was the charge that white doctors would often "practice on" black patients.[58] The conditions of Harlem hospital were best

summed up by scholar Larry Alfonso Green when he wrote, "At the end of 1936 Harlem Hospital was still overcrowded, understaffed, and primarily under the control of officials indifferent to the plight of Harlemites".[59]

A final condition that plagued black life in Harlem was the lack of employment.[60] Despite the fact that Harlem was a black Mecca, the majority of the businesses were owned by whites. The most popular Harlem business district was on 125th Street and it was here that African-Americans had some of their toughest battles for employment. William Blumstein, owner of one of the largest department stores on 125h Street, typified white attitudes by refusing to hire African-Americans as anything other than porters, maids, or elevator operators.[61]

This trend is illustrated in disturbing clarity by T.J. Woofter's 1928 study of African-American employment opportunity in Harlem. Despite the fact that 25% of all commerce was put into the Harlem economy by African-Americans their job prospects did not reflect this. Out of 2,000 total employees in Woofter's survey there were only 163 blacks employed.[62] Furthermore, out of 129 responses to the survey 110 businesses said they would indeed hire African-Americans, but only as porters.[63] The lack of solid job prospects in Harlem helped expedite the worsening of several other conditions such as crime and juvenile delinquency. Harlem combined high rents with few job prospects, which proved to be a recipe for the neighborhood's decay.

The neighborhood also decayed from economic pressure from within. Harlem's businesses did not help struggling residents to keep their heads above water. In fact, local businesses helped drown them in economic troubles. In a comparative study of the food supply and pricing in New York, researches found that Harlem's prices were

significantly higher than the Lower East Side. For example, a head of lettuce was priced at 8 cents on the lower east side and it went for 12 cents in Harlem.[64] Similarly a pound of bacon that was 34 cents on the lower east side was 42 cents to Harlem residents.[65] This price gouging put more pressure on a clearly strapped population that could scarcely afford exploitation from another source.

The steady loss of revenue, the poor housing, and the inadequate public services made life in Harlem increasingly difficult to cope with. By the 1940s Harlem had lost much of what it had represented throughout the early 1920s. It was no longer the "fountainhead of social movements" and the vibrant culture that it had housed for so long was slowly melting away. Harlem would always have its history as the "most wonderful Negro city in the world" but by the 1940s few people living there would have agreed with that statement.

The changing face of Harlem and its residents presented formidable challenges to the once dominant UNIA. Membership was dwindling and those that remained had less disposable income to keep the UNIA going. While the UNIA Central Division was able to make various adjustments to account for the challenges the Great Depression presented throughout the 1930s, they still faced a myriad of problems. Throughout this period the UNIA frequently had problems paying its bills. In 1943, the UNIA was sent to a collection agency by John Mullins & Sons Inc Home Furnishings for a long overdue account.[66] In July of 1935 the UNIA ordered 250 chairs from Adirondack Chair Company for $85.[67] By April 1936, these chairs had still not been paid for in full and a balance of $22.80 remained on the account and was a matter that Adirondack was "very

anxious" to get closed.[68] Furthermore, from 1935 to 1937 the UNIA Central Division struggled to pay its rent and was finally forced to relocate in June of 1937.[69]

It would be easy to dismiss the UNIA as an organization that was fading fast in the 1930s, a shadow of its former self that had lost all relevance. While this might have been true on the international stage, it was far from true for the residents of Harlem. The UNIA maintained relevance on the Harlem landscape and remained a force to be reckoned with. The UNIA continued to function throughout the 1930s and early 1940s in Harlem, it remained an active force in the community, its leadership made public appearances, and it participated in various celebrations, rallies, and events, and it maintained its relevance by being a sought after partner for coalition and a source of information about New York African Americans to outsiders. Despite the perception of a declining UNIA, in Harlem it was still very alive and relevant.

While membership and participation in the UNIA had declined somewhat by the 1930s, there are a number of indicators showing that the organization still had significant membership. Despite the fact that there has never been a comprehensive list of all New York Garveyites, surviving records indicate an active if not thriving UNIA population in the 1930s. Hundreds of Garveyites are listed as paying dues, meeting sometimes as frequently as twice weekly and banding together to pay dues to keep the organization afloat in tough financial times.[70] These records indicate that there was indeed a reduced number of Garveyites, but those that remained were committed in their aim to preserve the movement as best they could.

Furthermore, while the UNIA's ability to collect money never reached the levels it had in the 1920s, the Depression era UNIA was more than capable of collecting enough

money to get by and eventually meet all of their obligations. While the Depression firmly clamped down on them, it did not choke the life out of them. The Central Division was almost always able to eventually meet all of its fiscal responsibilities. Despite the challenges outlined earlier, the group did pay their debts and they were able to maintain operations. Garveyites still collected money from various sources including dues, joining fees, collections, and donations from outside sources.[71] The UNIA's financial records from the 1930s indicate that most months they were able to meet their expenses such as rent, printing press expenses, and electric bills with the money collected from membership.[72] During short months, the UNIA was able to use surplus from previous months and proceeds from special events such as cake sales to supplement their income and stay financially afloat.[73]

In addition to just paying the bills, the UNIA of the 1930s planned an ambitious building project to create a new headquarters for the UNIA. By creating such a place, they hoped that they could revitalize the UNIA. Membership strongly supported this goal and saw it as a logical next step in rebuilding the organization. They pledged loans to the UNIA from as little as two dollars all the way up to $100 from membership totaling commitments of $252.[74] While this never materialized in the way that the Central Division hoped, it shows that there was an active interest in promoting the growth and continuation of the UNIA.

The UNIA was also fairly active in publishing literature both focusing on the UNIA and about conditions in Harlem in general. Most of their expenses include a monthly bill from Pyramid Press, the printer they primarily employed. Furthermore, the UNIA sporadically published community focused periodicals such as the *Centralist*

Bulletin and the *Harlem Sentinel*. These publications not only showed that the UNIA was alive and well into the 1940s but served a number of other important purposes to the Harlem community.

One of the earliest of these publications was the short-lived *Harlem Sentinel* published in 1938. While the *Sentinel* could never have been considered a long running or widely circulating periodical, it served important functions for both the Harlem community and the UNIA which put it out. One of the most important aspects of the *Sentinel* was that it was a response to a community outcry. Throughout the Depression in New York City African Americans had particular trouble securing assistance that was in theory there to be tapped into by citizens in need. This was the primary problem the *Sentinel* sought to bring into the public eye. As it stated in its first issue, the *Sentinel* aimed to "be of some good to the less fortunate" by publicly critiquing those public service employees who were not serving their community in good faith and more importantly by publishing accounts of people who had been unfairly denied aid. The leaflet published brief snippets from Harlemites like Gertrude Williams who was "locked out" because she refused to accept a job paying her $1.10 per day for 12 to 14 hours of work.[75] The *Sentinel* also publicly attacked the local aid authorities for allowing the "slave markets" to exist in the Bronx and Brooklyn and pointing to these vast pools of desperate people as proof positive that the relief aid systems throughout the city were failing.

While the *Sentinel* was a response to a very well known problem for African Americans in New York City, it also served a function for the UNIA Central Division. This small publication was a call for justice and fairness in the local governments but it

also provided help for people who felt like the District Office was not treating them fairly. Through the *Harlem Sentinel* people in need could contact the UNIA and take advantage of the services offered by the UNIA Central Division Unemployment Unit. This unit within the UNIA represented people who were in need of help in securing aid from the government by writing letters on their behalf, helping them commit their complaints to writing, and meeting with government officials if the need arose. Furthermore, the UNIA could publish stories of people denied aid in the *Sentinel* which would hopefully apply enough pressure to the local District Offices to reopen cases that were previously denied. By offering people some real solutions and some avenues they could pursue if they were having difficulty securing aid that they desperately needed, the *Sentinel* was a recruiting organ for the UNIA. During these difficult times, if the UNIA fought on behalf of the poor to get them help from the government, they could simultaneously bolster their membership by proving to these people that the UNIA was still relevant and that it could help them in important ways.

The *Centralist Bulletin*, published later, served a great variety of purposes and was a more complete periodical offering more lengthy coverage of local and national issues. The *Bulletin* was first published in 1941 and continued until 1944. It offered sections on world events, articles on African American history, reports on the successes of the UNIA Central Choral Singers, updates on the juvenile division, and Captain A.L. King's thoughts on a variety of issues. As the "official organ" of the Central Division, this periodical aimed at recruitment, offering news updates, and as a recruitment platform to celebrate what the UNIA offered its membership.[76]

The *Bulletin* was an important source of current events that pertained to the African American community. The writers in the bulletin not only offered accounts of Italy's takeover of Ethiopia but rallied support for Ethiopia stating that black people should join "in Ethiopia's fight to regain her independence."[77] The *Bulletin* also covered other national issues giving the Central Division's point of view on issues such as anti-lynching demonstrations and World War II.[78] These issues helped Harlemites stay up to date with the latest news and gave them a rare Afro-centric perspective on the events and where they should stand.

However, the real strength of the *Centralist Bulletin* was its local focus as both a recruiting organ and as an informative publication. The *Bulletin* was a regular source for announcements pertaining to the UNIA, encouraging "the public" to attend meetings and listing times and dates of meetings for UNIA sponsored groups such as the Juvenile Class, Central Choral Singers, and the Nurses Unit.[79] The *Bulletin* was also a source for the UNIA to inform members and non-members alike about new programs that were being offered such as the Youth Division that sought to recruit African American men and women from ages sixteen to twenty-one. In an early issue published on March 2, 1941 the *Bulletin* made an announcement on behalf of the Juvenile Department reading:

> "The Juvenile Department, 'the hand that rocks the cradle,' is one of vital Importance to the organization; and in spite of the capable and competent service being rendered by Mrs. King and Romer we are desirous of obtaining better cooperation from the parents to make this group an outstanding one. Competent teachers with patients, vision, and fortitude are also in demand."[80]

In addition to offering a way for the UNIA to introduce new programs, request further participation in existing ones, and familiarize the public with old ones, the *Bulletin* was

also an important fundraising tool announcing parties, gala dinners, and UNIA sponsored events open to the public, usually available for an entry fee of around twenty-five cents.

However, the *Bulletin* was more than a simple fundraising and recruiting tool for the Central Division. It was also an important source for information pertaining to community welfare. In the second issue, the *Bulletin* reported on the mass meeting held on Friday, March 21, 1941 to discuss the food stamp plan.[81] This was a follow up to a report in the first issue that announced a meeting between the Central Division and representatives from the Social Security Board in which films were shown to "acquaint the members of our community" with the considerable amount of government funds "just awaiting rightful claimants".[82] By announcing and organizing these meetings, the *Bulletin* helped recruit future UNIA members and helped support struggling members of the community. By organizing these events and publishing them in the *Bulletin* the UNIA continued to situate itself deeply in the African American tradition of self-help. The "official organ" of the Central Division was not just an informative publication, it was one that offered tangible options and avenues for people to resolve their problems and gave them access to officials who they might not have otherwise had access to. The *Bulletin* showed the Harlem population that the UNIA was not just about expansion and growth for its own sake, but that the UNIA really offered something tangible to both its members and non-members.

The *Bulletin* also offered an important cultural element to its readership. It regularly featured articles about African American history, poetry, and occasionally a historical quiz as illustrated here:

"HISTORICAL QUIZ

> Ques. Who invented the first machine for sewing the soles of shoes to make uppers?
>
> Answers to previous quiz
>
> A. Choops, a Negro
> B. 10,000 men
> C. Completed 3730 BC"[83]

As illustrated above, the *Bulletin* was not only a place to recruit and build the UNIA, but a place in which to celebrate the UNIA's rich heritage and the heritage of African Americans in general. In one issue, the *Bulletin* covered Captain King's speech in which he honored Frederick Douglass for his "fearless representation" of African Americans during a difficult time.[84] King encouraged members of the audience to remember the contributions of past leaders and not to forget the progress they helped to forge. In addition to specific occasions to honor great African Americans, the *Bulletin* also frequently included a quiz question about African American history.[85] These cultural elements gave readers a chance to learn a little bit about African American history and about leaders of the past.

Finally, this key publication offered a reiteration of the UNIA's aims and purposes. It often republished portions of the UNIA's handbook and reprinted poetry written by Marcus Garvey to pay homage to its roots.[86] In other cases, the publication used Garvey's words to combat attacks from other organizations and leaders to show that the Central Division was compatible with other popular black uplift groups. This piece assembled in May of 1944 shows just that:

> "Excerpts of Powell's platform as published in the 'PEOPLE'S VOICE' and excerpts of MARCUS GARVEY'S platform as published in his great book, "THE PHILOSOPHY AND OPINIONS OF MARCUS GARVEY".

POWELL: There will never be a real victory or lasting peace, until the rights of Negro men are recognized on an equal basis with the rights of all men.

GARVEY: The U.N.I.A. believes in the rights of all men.

POWELL: I will protest openly the defamation of <u>any group</u> because of race, color, or creed.
GARVEY: We believe <u>all men</u> entitled to common human respect.

POWELL: I will insist on the representation of Negro people at the peace Peace table."
GARVEY: We demand that our duly accredited representatives be given proper representation in all leagues, conferences, conventions, or courts of international arbitration wherever human rights are discussed."[87]

While on some levels King's Central Division was a very different organization than what Garvey had built in the 1920s, King still had tremendous respect for Garvey and intended the Central Division to build upon Garvey's ideals rather than discard them and start anew. He showed his commitment to Garvey through publishing these important historical UNIA documents and through the reprinting and reverence for foundational UNIA texts.

These small publications did not have the circulation of Garvey's *Negro World*, DuBois' *Crisis* or even the Urban League's *Opportunity*, but it does not mean that they did not have real value to the community. Garvey's *Negro World* had been a weekly newspaper that circulated tens of thousands of copies worldwide. It was truly a worldwide periodical. The *Negro World* offered Garvey's latest views on a certain issue or reprinted a speech he had recently given. It also covered newsworthy events of interest to black people worldwide. The *Negro World* also included dozens of editorials, countless advertisements, a page devoted to women's interests, a Spanish page, and a page devoted to news from local divisions across the globe.[88] The *Sentinel* and *Bulletin*

could not hope to offer such a wide scope. However, they were important to their communities in important ways and offered services and news the *Negro World* had never focused on. These local papers offered a real place for people to turn in gravely difficult times. They published information on affordable entertainment, affordable Afro-centric education for children, and information on the New Deal's often confusing programs for welfare and home aid. This local self-help focus made these periodicals a real service to the community, the kind of service the *Negro World's* wide circulation prevented it from providing.

The *Sentinel* and *Bulletin* also never offered the kind of up to date scholarly articles about the state of black America that the *Crisis* and *Opportunity* became known for. These more widely known and respected periodicals were noted for their sophisticated commentary on civil rights issues, lynching, and the state of African Americans in general.[89] Furthermore, they offered poetry and serious monthly features on African American art and writing that these smaller newspapers could not match. However, those periodicals were targeted at an affluent interracial audience and frequently used very technical language. For instance, in a June 1938 article on the meaning of Social Security, the author delves deeply into the meaning of this program on a national level. He talks a great deal about the long term viability and benefits that the new Social Security plan offered but very little about how one could secure benefits.[90] An article like this held great interest for middle class whites and African Americans curious about the state of the economy in the coming decades but was of little practical use to a struggling Harlem resident seeking out help in claiming benefits. Another example of these types of articles was published in the January 1932 edition of the *Crisis*.

The article, entitled "Negro Relief Work in New York", was written by a government employee Carita Owens Roane. Roane focused on all of the positive work that was being done by relief agencies, but scarcely mentioned the well publicized difficulty many lower class African Americans had in securing aid from their local District Offices.[91] The *Sentinel* and *Bulletin* may not have offered the level of scholarly rigor of *Opportunity* or the *Crisis*, but they offered African Americans helpful information and somewhere to turn for help while simultaneously giving them news updates that were straight forward and easy to understand. The smaller publications of the Central Division offered news that Harlem residents could use as well as some perspective on international affairs.

The *Negro History Bulletin* operated under a similar philosophy as the *Sentinel* and the *Centralist Bulletin.* This affordable monthly periodical published a series of straight forward easy to read articles that covered every aspect of African American history from African origins well into the 20th century. Edited by Carter G. Woodson, this periodical featured not only a plethora of important articles about important figures in African American history but also a children's page and a news page that featured the various activities of teachers focused on African American history throughout the country.[92] Woodson's *Bulletin* was user friendly, but it was also sophisticated in its approach to African American history forecasting future areas of study by running entire features on "the Negro in Foreign Lands" throughout 1941 and featuring regional studies throughout the year of 1942.[93] From a strictly historical perspective the information and articles published in the bulletin were unmatched during the 1930s and 1940s. They were not only useful to students interested in learning about African American history but were invaluable tools for African American teachers during the period who wanted to show

students that African Americans played an important role in founding, building, and fighting on behalf of the United States.

The Central Division's *Sentinel* and *Bulletin* could not compete with the exhaustive reporting of the *Crisis* or *Opportunity*, did not feature near the content of Woodson's *Negro History Bulletin* and was not the international powerhouse that Garvey's *Negro World* had been. However, it was important within its context. The *Centralist Bulletin* might not have offered as much as these larger more widely circulated publications, but it was also free and the editorial staff encouraged people to pass it on to a friend. While these more established periodicals charged between 10 and 15 cents an issue the *Sentinel* and *Bulletin* were free and much more readable alternatives. These UNIA publications were important because they offered information that was valuable to the community, whether it was invitations to UNIA events or an informational session on obtaining relief from the government.

Furthermore, during difficult times these small publications not only showed that the UNIA was still active but also illustrated how the UNIA coped with the challenges of declining membership and economic decline. Forced to scale down dramatically, the UNIA did so, but it did not lose relevance and it did not disappear. These publications are at least a partial indication of that. Despite the *Harlem Sentinel's* very limited print run and short life it served a real purpose to show destitute Harlemites that there was some place to turn during the Great Depression and there is evidence that the *Sentinel* was successful in spreading this word. When asked on UNIA questionnaires about who referred them to the Central Unemployed Unit for help, UNIA leaflets are the single biggest source of referrals.[94]

Publications, fundraising, and ambitious plans were not all the UNIA had to offer in the 1930s, the Central Division was also a very strong presence in the community in other ways. The most important of these ways was through practical help. The UNIA was a valuable force in combating poverty during the Great Depression and throughout the late 1930s they offered help "in one form or another to more than 10,000 persons living in the Harlem area" by their own estimation.[95] This is a significant contribution to the community during the Depression era. If taken to represent the period from 1935 to 1940 this means that on average the UNIA helped about five people a day. For an organization facing the same harsh Depression conditions as most Harlem residents, this was indeed a significant contribution.

Not only did Harlemites look up to the Central Division for the work they did in the community, but other branches of the UNIA did as well. Relations between the East Brooklyn Division #252 and the Central Division remained strong throughout the 1930s. The Central Division extended friendly invitations to the Brooklyn Division for meetings such as the opening of their new headquarters in April of 1937.[96] The Brooklyn Division returned the favor by regularly extending invitations to the Central Division for rallies, meetings, and special events such as "Parent Day" in November of 1937.[97] These invitations indicate a mutual respect between the two organizations and a willingness to lend a hand during difficult times. President H.C. Mitchell of the Brooklyn Division wrote in 1935 that the Brooklyn Division needed help because they were "struggling under tremendous odds to carry on the work of the organization".[98] Throughout the late 1930s these two divisions showed solidarity in difficult times and helped one another survive. It was rare that either would have an important event and not invite

representatives from the other division. It was even rarer that the invited division would not attend or at least provide a legitimate reason for non-attendance. In many ways the Central Division provided the rock for other smaller UNIA Divisions to cling to during the late 1930s. They continued to hold events, fund themselves, and provide important services to the community. This made them a role model for other UNIA Divisions in New York City during this difficult period.

However, the Central Division was not only interested in helping other Divisions of the UNIA. Captain A.L. King and his Central Division were open to cooperation with many different groups in Harlem during the late 1930s. One such group was Reconciliation Trips headed up by Clarence V. Howell. Reconciliation Trips was focused on "contact studies of mystic, psychic, economic, social, political, industrial and labor groups" and was determined to foster contact between students and groups deemed radical.[99] Howell requested that King speak at a meeting Reconciliation Trips was holding on November 10, 1935. He also requested representatives from the Central Division and "music from (King's) group".[100] King accepted this invitation and it was the beginning of a fruitful relationship between the two groups. After King's speech, Howell again wrote to request that he bring a group to an UNIA meeting to see what the UNIA was about and what it stood for. The UNIA gladly obliged with a program that Howell called "splendid" in a letter thanking the UNIA for its cordial cooperation with his group.[101]

The UNIA also formed more tangible alliances with groups active in the Harlem community. The most noteworthy of these alliances was the Harlem Civic Exchange made up of the UNIA, the American Civil Rights Association, Better Harlem

Association, United Afro-American Union, Harlem Unemployed Committee Council, Tenants and Consumer's Council, and the Gild-Will Social Service.[102] This powerful coalition mobilized from 1939 until 1942. These groups banded together to fight a number of injustices in Harlem and conducted rallies open to the public in order to educate the public. No issue was too small or too large to be tackled by the Harlem Civic Exchange. On Friday, December 1, 1939 they rallied at 204 Lenox Avenue in support of a six point program including Harlem's insufficient clothing allowances (specifically coats), District Office's arbitrarily assigning youth, professionals, and skilled workers to laborer's positions, and cuts in public relief during a time when the cost of living was rising.[103] This Joint Mass Meeting was followed up by the Momentous Mass Meeting and the Mammoth Mass Meeting in 1940 which focused on many of these same issues. By 1942 the Civic Association had put together an official petition to Mayor LaGuardia demanding that people on assistance be able to retain 50% of all wages earned by non heads of household, a $25.00 rental allowance, a 50% increase in food allowance, and the continuation of the procedure of community groups presenting grievances on behalf of families twice weekly.[104] The UNIA was a powerful force within this alliance and many of the same goals the Civic Exchange aimed for were pursued by the UNIA in other ways.

The Civic Exchange and Reconciliation Trips were not the only organizations seeking to approach the UNIA for mutual benefit in the 1930s and early 1940s. The UNIA was also in contact with the American Virgin Islands Civic Association, the American and West Indian Negro Committee on Caribbean Affairs, the Coalition Democratic Club, the Better Harlem Association, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car

Porters, the Colonel Young Memorial Foundation, Better Harlem Schools, and the Communist Party.[105] These organizations approached the UNIA in a number of different ways for a number of different purposes. Most of them sought to have UNIA delegates appear at their meetings to represent the organization and its interests. Other organizations such as the Communist Party requested literature on the Garvey movement such as Garvey's *Black Man* periodical.[106] Within this web of local uplift groups, the UNIA was a vital voice for the working class African Americans in Harlem. These powerful partnerships were mutually beneficial for both the groups seeking the backing of the UNIA and the UNIA itself.

These coalitions indicate that the UNIA was a very viable force in the community because other groups were approaching them with offers for coalitions and joint projects. These bonds show that the UNIA still held considerable sway in the community and still had the ability to draw people in Harlem. The fact that many of these groups were outsiders not based in Harlem also indicates that the UNIA was somewhat representative of the community. When outsiders sought to learn about African American life in Harlem, many times they came to the UNIA to help them get information.[107] These coalitions and the very fact that others approached the UNIA with proposals at all shows that the UNIA was still a vibrant force in the community and one that would bring clout and respect to any group associating themselves with the name.

King's UNIA Central Division was not the force that the UNIA had been in the 1920s. It did not fund expensive business enterprises, warrant surveillance by the FBI, or employ hundreds of people. However, the UNIA adapted itself to difficult Depression era circumstances and remained a valuable and powerful force for reform and self help in

the community. King's papers helped to spread the word about UNIA services for the needy, rallies and alliances helped residents to bring Harlem's problems to the attention of government officials, and persistent Garveyites tirelessly raised funds to keep the organization and its valued services available for Harlemites well into the 1940s. Chapter three will explore the specifics of these services and show precisely how the UNIA shifted itself to meet with changing conditions and expectations of its membership.

The Central Division was not without its obstacles of detractors in the mid 1930s. They were in competition with the UNIA, Inc for what followers remained of Garvey's original empire and the Depression made operations very difficult. Despite these challenges the UNIA remained viable in Harlem. Capitalizing on the wave of reform after the 1935 riot the UNIA Central Division targeted government relief agencies, Harlem schools, hospitals, and police as their goals for reform. King's Division found itself increasingly having to harness Garvey's ideals in a much different Harlem than which they were conceived.

This was a tricky path which King successfully navigated. While staying loyal to Garvey's 1920s ideals, he managed to adapt his plan for more viable use within a local context. In essence, King shifted the focus from worldwide goals to local aims both of which were present in Garvey's initial program. While Garvey had set his sights on the grander aims of black business enterprise and industrializing Africa, King scaled that back to compensate for difficult challenges the UNIA faced and to be more helpful in a community that was desperate.

Notes

---

[1] Amy Jacques-Garvey, ed., *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey* (Dover, Mass.: The Majority Press, 1986), 11.
[2] Alaine Locke, "Harlem: Dark Weather-Vane," *Survey Graphic,* 1936, 457.; Oswald Garrison Villar, "Slumbering Fires of Harlem." *The Nation,* 1936, 99.
[3] Locke, "Harlem: Dark Weather-Vane," 457. Cheryl Greenberg, *Or Does it Explode? Black Harlem in the Great Depression* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 3.
[4] Locke, "Harlem: Dark Weather-Vane," 457; Greenberg, 3.
[5] Locke, "Harlem: Dark Weather-Vane," 457; Greenberg, 3.
[6] Villar, "Slumbering Fires of Harlem," 99.
[7] Villar, "Slumbering Fires of Harlem." 99.
[8] Locke, "Harlem: Dark Weather-Vane," 457.
[9] Villar, "Slumbering Fires of Harlem," 99.
[10] Locke, "Harlem: Dark Weather-Vane," 457.
[11] Villar, "Slumbering Fires of Harlem," 99.
[12] Clyde V. Kiser, "Diminishing Family Income in Harlem," *Opportunity, Journal of Negro Life,* 13:6: 171.
[13] Alaine Locke saw the riots as a "flash of lightning" that shed light on the very old problems that Harlem had. Locke, "Harlem: Dark Weather-Vane," 457. Cheryl Greenberg argues that the riot helped to spark African American uplift groups and revitalize them, see: Cheryl Greenberg, *Or Does it Explode? Black Harlem in the Great Depression.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
[14] Locke, "Harlem: Dark Weather-Vane," 457.
[15] Locke, "Harlem: Dark Weather-Vane," 457.
[16] Robert Hill, ed., *The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Association Papers* (Berkeley: University of Calfornia Press, 1991). Volume 7, Introduction.
[17] Hill, *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, Introduction.
[18] Although King was a loyal Garveyite, he did have a falling out with Garvey in 1936 over his support for Ethiopian protest movements which temporarily removed him from leadership of the Central Division.
[19] "Constitution and Book of Laws", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 1, Folder a5. "UNIA and African Communities League – Constitution and Book of Laws"
[20] "Constitution and Book of Laws", pages 40-44. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 1, Folder a5. "UNIA and African Communities League – Constitution and Book of Laws"
[21] "Constitution and Book of Laws", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 1, Folder a5. "UNIA and African Communities League – Constitution and Book of Laws"
[22] "Report for President's Office", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 2, Folder a19. "*Negro World.* Report for President's Office From Executive Office, Parent Body, African Communities League, August 20-Dec. 30, 1924"
[23] "Membership Loan Books, 1922-1923", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 4
[24] "Membership Loan Books, 1922-1923", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 4
[25] "Membership Loan Books, 1922-1923", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 4
[26] "Treasurer's Report on African Communities League for President's Office January and December 1924", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 2, Folder a20. "*Negro World.* Report for President's Office From Executive Office, Parent Body, African Communities League, August 20-Dec. 30, 1924"
[27] Amy Jacuqes-Garvey, ed., *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press, 1986), Volume 2, 217.
[28] Tony Martin, *Race First: The Ideological and Organizational Struggles of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press, 1976), 18.
[29] "Preface", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959.
[30] "Preface", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959.

[31] "Preface", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959
[32] "Bills and Receipts", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c20-c21. King's Central Division generated receipts well into the 1950s, but evidence suggests that the Central Division had ceased providing its most relevant services by the mid 1940s.
[33] Robin D.G. Kelley and Earl Lewis, eds., *To Make Our World Anew* (Oxford University Press, 2000) 411.
[34] Cary D. Wintz, *Black Culture and the Harlem Renaissance* (Houston, TX: Rice University Press, 1988).
[35] Eric Homberger, *The Historical Atlas of New York City* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1994), 138.
[36] Robert Weaver, *The Negro Ghetto* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1948), 282-283.
[37] Gilbert Osofsky, *Harlem: The Making of a Ghetto Negro New York; 1900-1930* (New York: Harper and Row 1966), 140.
[38] "Landlords Exploit Colored Tenants," *New York Times*, July 27, 1924.; "Negro Rents Held Artificially High," *New York Times*, December 15, 1937.; Roi Ottley and William J. Weatherby, eds., *The Negro in New York: An Informal Social History* (New York: New York Public Library, 1967), 265-266.
[39] Robert A. Holmes, "The Afro-American in the Urban Age," *Journal of Black Studies* (1974): 443.
[40] "4000 March in Fight on Harlem Rent Rise," *New York Times* October 11, 1936.
[41] "Harlem Plea to O.P.A," *New York Times* September 3, 1942.
[42] Ottley and Weatherby, eds., *The Negro in New York*, 265-266.
[43] Osofsky, *Harlem: The Making of a Ghetto*, 136-137; John Henrik Clarke, *Harlem: A Community in Transition* (New York: Citadel Press, 1969), 109.
[44] Osofsky, *Harlem: The Making of a Ghetto*, 136-137; Clarke, *Harlem: A Community in Transition*, 109.
[45] Ottley and Weatherby, eds, *The Negro in New York*, 266.
[46] Clarke, *Harlem: A Community in Transition*, 110.; "Harlem Schools," *New York Times*, June 4, 1931.
[47] Clarke, *Harlem: A Community in Transition*, 114.
[48] Clarke, *Harlem: A Community in Transition*, 114.
[49] "Mayor is Criticized on Harlem Schools," *New York Times*, November 22, 1935.
[50] "Teacher is Beaten in Harlem School," *New York Times*, September 20, 1941.
[51] "Harlem Schools Aim at Good Citizenship," *New York Times*, September 9, 1934.; Alexander Feinberg, "Student 'Strikes' Flare into Riots in Harlem Schools", *New York Times*, September 29, 1945.
[52] "Harlem Crime Wave Called Nonexistent," *New York Times*, November 18, 1941.; David Levering Lewis, *When Harlem was in Vogue.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), 297.
[53] "Police Shoot to Kill Rioters, Kill Negro in Harlem Mob," *New York Times*, March 20, 1935.; "Paraders Protest 'Police Brutality," *New York Times*, March 25, 1934.; "Negroes Accuse Police at Hearing," *New York Times*, April 21, 1935.; "Police Brutality Seen," *New York Times*, Nov 13, 1947.
[54] Clarke, *Harlem: A Community in Transition*, 111.
[55] Ottley and Weatherby, eds., *The Negro in New York*, 272.
[56] Ottley and Weatherby, eds., *The Negro in New York*, 271; *The WPA Guide to New York City* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 257.
[57] George A. Soper, "Hospital Crowding Grave City Problem," *New York Times*, July 17, 1932.; Larry Alfonso Green, "*Harlem in the Great Depression 1928-1936*" PhD. Diss., Columbia University, 1979, 2.
[58] "'Jim Crowism' Laid to Hospital Staff," *New York Times*, May 11, 1935.; Green, *Harlem in the Great Depression 1928-1936*, 2.
[59] Green, *Harlem in the Great Depression 1928-1936*, 2.
[60] Outhwaite, Leonard, "Harlem's Knotty Problem," *New York Times*, March 31, 1935.
[61] Bloch, Herman D. "The Employment Status of the New York Negro in Retrospect", *Phylon Quarterly*. 4, (1959): 327.
[62] T.J. Woofter, *Races and Ethnic Groups in American Life.* (New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1933), 133. cited in Herman D. Bloch, "The Employment Status of the New York Negro in Retrospect", *Phylon Quarterly*, 4, (1959).
[63] Woofter, *Races and Ethnic Groups in American Life*, 133.
[64] Greenberg, *Or Does it Explode?*, 208-209.
[65] Greenberg, *Or Does it Explode?*, 208-209.
[66] Letter from John Mullins & Sons Inc to Captain King March 25, 1943. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 9, Folder d37. "Correspondence – J 1935-1945"

[67] Letter from Arindock Chair Co. to New York Division #340 July 12, 1935 Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e2. Adirondack Chair Co.1935-1936"
[68] Letter from Arindock Chair Co. to New York Division #340 April 22, 1936. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e2. "Adirondack Chair Co.1935-1936"
[69] Letters from Morris J. Goldston to Captain A.L. King Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 9, Folder d28. "Correspondence – Goldston, Morris J. (Attorney), 1935-1937."
[70] Ledger of Membership Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder b1. "N.Y. Div – Ledger (Officers, Membership Dues...) 1934-1935"; "Campaign Book" Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder b6. "N.Y. Div - Campaign Book for New Membership)
[71] Report of New York Division #340, August 1934 Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder b2. "N.Y. Div – Financial Reports 1933-1935"
[72] Reports of New York Division #340, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder b2. "N.Y. Div – Financial Reports 1933-1935"
[73] Report of New York Division #340, August 1934 Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder b2. "N.Y. Div – Financial Reports 1933-1935"
[74] "Members of the Div #340 Who Have Pledged Loans on the Bldg. Project", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 9, Folder b6. "N.Y. Div – Membership Lists, 1935"
[75] "The Harlem Sentintel, Volume 1, No.2", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c23. "Central Div. - Harlem Sentintel - 1938"
[76] "Centralist Bulletin", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[77] "Centralist Bulletin Volume 1, No, 1", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[78] "Centralist Bulletin, Volume 2, No.1" and "Centralist Bulletin, Volume 2, No.2", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - Centralist Bulletin – 1941-1944"
[79] "Centralist Bulletin", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[80] "Centralist Bulletin", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[81] "Centralist Bulletin Volume 1, No, 2", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[82] "Centralist Bulletin Volume 1, No, 1", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[83] "Centralist Bulletin", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[84] "Centralist Bulletin Volume 1, No, 1", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[85] "Centralist Bulletin Volume 1, No, 3", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[86] "Centralist Bulletin Volume 1, No, 3" and "Centralist Bulletin Volume 2, No, 2", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[87] "Centralist Bulletin", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folder c4. "Central Div. - *Centralist Bulletin* – 1941-1944"
[88] *Negro World*, 1926-1933.
[89] *The Crisis* 1935-1942; *Opportunity* 1935-1941.
[90] *Opportunity*, June 1938.
[91] Carita Owens Roane, "Negro Relief Work in New York", *The Crisis*, January (1932): 430-432, 471.
[92] *Negro History Bulletin*, 1938-1942.
[93] *Negro History Bulletin*, 1941-1942.

[94] "Central Div. Central Unemployed Unit – Registrations 1938-1941", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c38-c40.
[95] "Truth About UNIA booklet", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c55. "Central Div. – Propaganda (Bureau of) – Manuscript of Booklet, n.d."
[96] "Letter from Captain A.L. King to A. Jacobs" , Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d1. "Correspondence Brooklyn Divisions (1934-1950)"
[97] "Letter from E.L. Chambers, Lady President to Captain A.L. King November 16, 1937" , Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d1. "Correspondence Brooklyn Divisions (1934-1950)"
[98] "Letter from H.C. Mitchell to New York Division #340 September 17, 1935" , Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d1. "Correspondence Brooklyn Divisions (1934-1950)"
[99] "Letter from Clarence V. Howell to Captain A.L. King September 26, 1935" , Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 9, Folder d34. "Correspondence - Howell, Clarence V. Reconciliation Trips, Ind. 1935, U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[100] "Letter from Clarence V. Howell to Captain A.L. King September 26, 1935" , Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 9, Folder d34. "Correspondence - Howell, Clarence V. Reconciliation Trips, Ind. 1935, U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[101] "Letter from Clarence V. Howell to Carmen Cordoze, Secretary February 18, 1936" , Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 9, Folder d34. "Correspondence - Howell, Clarence V. Reconciliation Trips, Ind. 1935, U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[102] "Press Release", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e65. "Subj. and Organ -Harlem Civic Exchange (Bylaws, Minutes, etc. 1939-1942)"
[103] "Joint Mass Meeting Leaflet", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e65. "Subj. and Organ -Harlem Civic Exchange (Bylaws, Minutes, etc. 1939-1942)"
[104] "Harlem Civic Exchange Petition to Mayor", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e65. "Subj. and Organ -Harlem Civic Exchange (Bylaws, Minutes, etc. 1939-1942)"
[105] "Meeting Invitation", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e18. "Subj. and Organ –American Virgin Islands Civic Association, 1941-1942)"; "Letter from Victor E. Williams, President to Captain A.L. King April 26, 1938", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e35. "Coalition Democratic Club1938"; "Member Invitation", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e38. "Subj. and Organ – Committee for Better Schools in Harlem, 1936-1942"; "Letter from Ashley L. Totton, National Secretary-Treasurer to Universal Negro Improvement Association", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e26. "Subj. and Organ –Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, 1935-1940"; "Letter from A. Merral Willis, President to Captain A.L. King", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e36. "Subj. and Organ –Col. Young Memorial Foundation Inc., 1939-1940"; "Letter from Theodore Bennett, Chief of the Agitation and Propoaganda Dept. of the Harlem Section of the Communist Party of the United States to Captain A.L. King on December 9, 1935", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e40. "Subj. and Organ –Communist Party, 1935-1940"
[106] "Letter from Theodore Bennett, Chief of the Agitation and Propoaganda Dept. of the Harlem Section of the Communist Party of the United States to Captain A.L. King on December 9, 1935.", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e40. "Subj. and Organ – Communist Party, 1935-1940"
[107] This is further illustrated in a correspondence the UNIA had with the French Magazine "Regards". Vladimir Pozner approached the UNIA as his first stop when researching a series of articles on Harlem for the magazine. "Letter from Vladimir Pozner to Captain A.L. King February 7, 1936", Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 10, Folder d59. "Correspondence – P 1936-1939 U.N.I.A. Central Division."

CHAPTER 3: RECLAIMING THE FALLEN

-"Let it be your highest purpose in life to assist the needy members of your race. Use all your influence in your country, in your state, in your town to help the needy elements of your race. Seek government help for them, seek philanthropic help for them, seek help anywhere you can find it for them to improve their condition."[1]
-Aims and Objects of the UNIA

In the 1930s the Central Division was faced with the reality of fewer members, dramatically reduced funding from the local African American community, the UNIA was forced to reshape itself to a degree. This chapter focuses on how the UNIA moved from being a force that was hostile to the white power structure to one that sought to cooperate with it to help its membership and larger community. Throughout the mid to late 1930s and early 1940s, the Central Division acted as an important liason between the Harlem community and the local governments who were theoretically in service to this community. The UNIA helped get aid into the hands of the people who needed it by protesting racist treatment, writing letters on behalf of those in need, conducting informational seminars for local citizens regarding government programs, helping immigrants secure the correct paperwork, and generally offering a place to turn for citizens (UNIA members or not) who needed help dealing with the government.

In many ways this was a radical departure for the UNIA. Garvey viewed popular forms of government in the 1920s as infected with a "growing spirit of selfishness" and indicated in a 1925 essay written from the Atlanta penitentiary that "modern systems of Government have partly failed and are wholly failing".[2] Garvey believed that African Americans should not turn to the government of whites for help, but that African

Americans should help one another overcome difficult times through their own charity.[3] He sought not to negotiate with white power structures to help African Americans, but to withdraw from them altogether. Through the accumulation of wealth and the establishment of a strong African nation, black people throughout the world would be better equipped to deal with the problems of economic distress and poverty on their own terms. While Garvey was certainly aware of the difficulties caused by the Depression, his doctrine of self-help remained unchanged and it was this doctrine that the Central Division de-emphasized throughout the mid 1930s and early 1940s.

This chapter examines the role of the UNIA as a liason to the government on behalf of African Americans and black immigrants living in Harlem during this period. The Central Division files include hundreds of interviews, letters written by the UNIA, and forms filled out by people requesting representation from the UNIA in some dispute with local relief agencies or governmental departments. I divide these cases into three broad categories: relief requests, information requests, and citizenship representation. This service was in direct response to a community need, a need for informed support from an organization that had dealings with the government and knew how to gain access to the right officials on behalf of the people. Captain A.L. King provided such a service by staying in constant contact with local officials and frequently requesting information about newly enacted programs such as: relief services, pension plans, workman's compensation, and Social Security.

King understood how the power structure of the city worked and exploited it to the best of his ability in order to represent the people that came to him for help. From 1938 to 1942 King met with relief aid managers, relief aid investigators, and the police

department frequently in order to make sure that African Americans were not being treated unfairly and that they were given all of the relief that they were due through Roosevelt's New Deal program. He acted as a watchdog on behalf of his constituents and through formal letters, meetings, and informational seminars he stayed up to date with the latest laws and policies of the government. King offered the type of representation free of charge that most African Americans could not have otherwise afforded. The letters written by the Central Division were formal and on professional letterhead. They rigorously outlined the complaints and allegations of the person in question and demanded a response. Frequently, the UNIA would exchange three or four letters with the local relief District Offices to advocate on behalf of their clients.

King and his Central Division were, by and large, loathe to challenge white authority in their dealings. King's Unemployed Division especially operated more within the tradition of the NAACP, using the laws that were in place and the language used within them to prove that aid was being unfairly denied to New York residents in need. While there were instances where King would level the charge of racism at local government officials, it was only done in cases of blatant racism or after all other avenues had been pursued. This was also dramatically different from the way that Garvey handled business when he led the UNIA throughout the 1910s and 1920s. When he was imprisoned and subsequently deported on a trumped up mail fraud charge, Garvey did not attempt to negotiate with the American government or deal with them on their own terms.

In fact, Garvey was notoriously stubborn and outspoken in his criticism of the American government throughout his trial, conviction, and subsequent imprisonment for mail fraud. Garvey persistently attacked the government for bringing trumped up charges

against him. In doing so, he was not only maintaining his innocence but challenging the entire justice system of white America. Garvey did not seek to negotiate with the system or to compromise with it. In fact, Garvey challenged the system directly by serving as his own defense attorney and using this platform to not only proclaim his innocence but also to challenge the jury and mount a rigorous attack on the witnesses called against him by the state. He boldly challenged the American government and while he also blamed "selfish and jealous" members of the black race for his imprisonment it was the American government who he regretted was involved in an "international frame-up" to "get me" (Garvey)".[4] Garvey was a bold and dynamic public speaker with strong opinions. He refused to negotiate with forces he saw as unjust and very publicly lashed out against anyone he perceived as an enemy.

When reading King's conversations with government officials it is sometimes hard to imagine that he was a follower of Garvey. His easy style and formal respectful tone do not immediately bring to mind echoes of Garvey's fiery speeches. However, when comparing the two it is important to note that they were operating in vastly different circumstances. Garvey headed a movement of millions. He used his conviction to motivate his followers, claiming his imprisonment would "arouse the fighting spirit of millions of black men all over the world".[5] Garvey had a huge membership, a worldwide newspaper, and international coverage of his trial and his movement in general. When he spoke, people listened. King was struggling to keep a localized movement afloat in bleak economic conditions. The Central Division membership was desperate for the aid that these federal officials could provide them and King was conscious of the people he represented. While King might have believed racism and foul play to be involved in

many of the cases he brought before the local District Offices, overly challenging them would at best delay the process and at worst lose aid for his membership at a time when they needed it most. While Garvey and King used radically different methods to achieve their goals, the motivation was largely the same, to improve the lives of the people they represented economically.

Captain A.L. King's Central Division helped a great many people deal with local New Deal District Offices throughout the 1930s and 1940s. These offices were the local outposts of relief in New York City and the Central Division dealt primarily with numbers 4, 26, 28, 32, and 33. Most people who the Central Division represented were required to fill out an application that stated important information about who they were, how old they were, where they lived, and what their situation with the government was. While some applicants filled out their applications very sparingly, leaving quite a few questions blank, there is a significant enough sample of people who filled them out completely to get some sense of who these people were and what problems the UNIA was being called in to help with.

Of all the factors associated with these New Yorkers, age was perhaps the least significant. It was nearly equally likely that a given applicant would be in their 20s, 30s, or 40s when applying for help from the UNIA.[6] Furthermore, there was no significant gender divide by age. The average age of women applying for representation was around 38 which is virtually identical to the average age of male applicants.[7] While people in their 20s might not have had much of a sense of the historical sense of the UNIA, applicants in their 30s and 40s were likely familiar with the work that Garvey had done throughout the 1920s in New York City. A 35 year old applicant in 1938 would have

been in their late teens or early 20s in Garvey's heyday and probably appealed to the UNIA at least partially due to the memories they had of the former strength of the movement.

The Central Division was also very active in representing people in their 20s.[8] Memories of former glory cannot account for this large sector of the records. The fact that so many young people turned to the Central Division is a credit to their organization's skillful promotion techniques. Most clients in their 20s indicate being referred by friends or leaflets to the Central Division. This indicates that the organization was not simply relying on the reputation Garvey built over the previous decade. In fact, the Central Division was active in recruiting members. By relying on members recruiting more members and distributing fliers and local publications, the UNIA Central Division was able to build up a very sizable amount of sympathetic young members who relied on them to help them deal with the government during these difficult times.

Finally, while not the majority of the members aided by the Central Division, there were significant recipients from ages 50 all the way up to 74.[9] These people were probably driven by the combination of memories of the old UNIA and the effective word of mouth recruitment by the Central Division. Furthermore, recipients of all ages were probably driven to the UNIA not just from memories of the past or from a testimonial from a friend but simply because the services the Central Division offered were so unique and born out of such a necessity in the community. When refused aid, African American New Yorkers had few places to turn for help. The Central Division offered them a place to go and representation for free, a service not offered by many other uplift groups.

This service was most often utilized by those who were single, separated from their spouse, or widowed. Over 2/3 of the people who provided an answer in the registration fell into these three categories.[10] This indicates that the average person the Central Division represented was living in a single income household (if the applicant was employed at all). This information suggests that the Central Division members were similar in many ways to the Garveyites of the 1920s in terms of income. The majority of the people who came to A.L. King's Central Division had very few options and the representation and hope that this organization offered made it very popular amongst some of the poorest people in Harlem.

The UNIA's popularity amongst the poor is further reflected by the professions that Central Division aid applicants list on their applications and the level of education attained.[11] By far the most common professions were laborer, domestic, and factory worker. These professions represented unskilled and undesirable labor in the best of times, but it is clear the Depression had pushed many of these people from the margins to the edge of survival. Education levels of the applicants corroborate this. While there were a few college graduates, high school graduates, and people with a sizable portion of their high school education completed, the great majority of Central Division applicants list their last year of school between 7th and 9th grade with a greater percentage falling lower than 7th grade than higher than 9th.[12]

Nearly half of applicants had very pressing reasons to be concerned with their economic status – around 42% of them had children to attend to.[13] Most commonly applicants had one or two children, but some applicants had as many as seven. There is also a strong correlation between gender and children. Of all of the applicants who list

having any children on their application around 86% of them are women. Furthermore, 2/3 of women with children who applied to the Central Division for help in dealing with the government were single parents listing either widow or separated as their marital status.

While the applications do not lead to an "average" or "typical" applicant, they do give enough information to point toward some general trends within the application pool. One group commonly applying for aid was single mothers. Based on these numbers a large percentage of the applicants coming to the Central Division for help were single women with a minimal level of education who worked as domestics. These were women with few connections, limited earning potential, and children caught in the grip of the Great Depression. Faced with the prospect of starvation or eviction many of these desperate women came to the UNIA for help. Similarly, single women with no children frequently applied to the Central Division for help in securing aid from the government. With or without children many abandoned African American women were left with little money, a lack of job skills, and even fewer options in terms of feeding their children or even themselves.

Trends amongst men were much more difficult to hammer down than among the women. For one, men represented fewer of the applicants overall. Only about 1/3 of the applicants from the sample data were male.[14] The one trend that was evident was that men were much more likely to be coming to the Central Division on behalf of their families. Nearly half of the sample of male applicants were married, which is a significant increase from the 1/3 of married women who applied.[15] Therefore, it is much

more likely that men were often applying for help on behalf of their families while women often turned to the UNIA after their husbands had left them.

Beyond marriage patterns and average ages it is very hard to discern any real pattern of the applicants. More than anything, the sample shows the amazing variety of people coming to the Central Division for help. Ages average around 38, but people as young as 19 and as old as 75 came to King's organization for help. While women were more common, there were still a great deal of men that petitioned the UNIA for representation. The sample also shows that both able bodies and people who were unable to work came to the UNIA as well as people from all walks of life. While laborers, factory workers, and domestics were the most common, professions such as elevator operator, shoemaker, and machinist were all mentioned in the sample data.

This wide variety of people, professions, ages, and situations shows that while the UNIA had a specific sector of the population it appealed to more than others, the organization was fairly wide-reaching and respected in the community throughout several different classes of people. It also shows that the UNIA was adapting to and filling a role that was desperately needed in Harlem during the Great Depression. This role was that of a liason between the government and the residents of Harlem. Throughout the Depression era American policies became increasingly complex and many Americans were very hazy about how they could actually secure benefits from the government. Policies offering relief, Social Security, and employment with the government were important to counteract the effects of the Depression, but many poor residents of Harlem had little experience dealing with the government on that level.

These problems were compounded by the fact that many government officials responsible for distributing the aid or verifying the eligibility of applicants were racist and looked at African American applicants with much more scrutiny than other applicants. In these cases many Harlemites were left having been denied aid without fully understanding why or what they could do to qualify for aid. In other instances, such as that of John and Anna Barefield, the District Offices left desperate Harlemites at an impasse with very few options available to them to pursue much needed relief. In 1941 the Barefields along with their four children ranging from two months old to eight years old lived on West 122nd Street and had been residents of New York City for 11 years. John Barefield was 32 years old and was originally from Florida. Throughout the Depression era from 1933 to 1939 Barefield had worked for the Works Progress Association before getting a job as a painter in 1939 which he held until December of 1940 working for a man by the name of John Dyson. Two months after losing this job on February 26 John Barefield contacted District Office 26 to apply for aid and on March 7 a case investigator appeared at his house and conducted a thorough investigation of his application. After interviewing the Barefield family they were told by the investigator that Dyson had denied that Barefield had ever worked for him as a painter and that because of this they would not be able to secure any aid from the District Office.[16] In cases such as the one outlined here focusing on the Barefield family there is no way to determine who may have been lying or what reason there may have been for the deceit. However, the point of this example has been to illustrate how few options many of these people had when dealing with these government agencies. Impasses like the one experienced by the Barefields were common. Left with few avenues to make or appeal

their cases, denied applicants simply sunk further into desperate circumstances with nobody to represent their grievances.

In other cases investigators created large paper trails forcing applicants to come back again and again for reasons applicants did not understand. One such case was that of Madeline Bright, a 41 year old housewife and mother of one. Bright had one adult child who was 21 years old not living at home, but she also cared for her niece, who she adopted after the mother of the child died when the baby was only three weeks old in 1934. Since she took over caring for the baby, Bright had been receiving aid for both herself and the baby. However, in 1938 her aid was inexplicably cut off and when she tried to reapply she was repeatedly referred to different departments within the government to review her case. Throughout this process she remained in need and according to the Central Division records, she was denied aid based on "technicalities which she does not understand".[17] The letter the Central Division wrote on her behalf was very typical of the formatting used on behalf of their clientele:

> "C A S E
>
> Bright, Madeline
> 278 West 199th Street
> New York City
>
> The above applicant alleges:
>
> 1. That she has made several applications at D.O. 26 for aid as late as Jan. 10, 1939.
> 2. That she has been referred to BOW and BOW has again referred her back to The D.O.
> 2. That over and against all these referrals, she is till in need and is yet denied aid because of technicalities which she does not understand.
>
> This organization respectfully requests that D.O. 26 to give a clear and specific explanation for the denial of aid to this applicant and referrals to BOW."[18]

Bright was told at different times that she needed to go back and live with her husband, that she was being denied aid because her son in law worked for the Works Progress Association, and that she could not get aid because the child she cared for was not biologically hers. Based on the records of the Central Division it is impossible to tell whether Bright was attempting to get aid without a real need or whether the government was unfairly denying her. What is not in dispute is that she was given the runaround and that District Office 26 did not explain to her why she was denied aid in a way that she understood or that was satisfying to her because in January 1939 she sought help from the UNIA in dealing with the government.

Harlem residents would also call on the UNIA when the government made demands of them they felt were unfair. District office employees or investigators would in certain cases make a series of recommendations to applicants that they would have to comply with in order to receive relief. Frequently, these recommendations were difficult, if not impossible, to follow for applicants. This was the case in 1937 when Mary Jackson, a 30 year old domestic worker was told that she must take a sleep-in position that was being offered by the Hopkins Agency.[19] Jackson and the UNIA described this position as a "slave job proposition", as well as later sleep in positions paying as little as $30 per month.[20] Many people were left in the same position as Jackson after dealing with the District Office. They were left with no choice but to take positions that were woefully inadequate and were stonewalled from receiving any aid because they were seen by the District Office as qualified to work these jobs. Wages, previous experience, or the applicant's situation were at most minor considerations for the relief offices. With little

knowledge of government workings or of the laws and policies these agencies were abiding by many Harlem residents were left with no avenue for appeal or even without anyone to explain to them why these policies were in place and how they might present a more favorable case in the future.

Finally, in some cases Harlem residents were told they would be receiving relief in only a few days and the checks just never came. This was the case with Harvey Lovick, a 30 year old laborer applying for aid in 1941. Lovick was employed with the Works Progress Association until March of 1941 when he was laid off due to having three fractured ribs. At the advice of the WPA, Lovick took his pink slip to the District Office and applied for relief on April 4, 1941. His case was reviewed by investigators and it was determined that he was a qualified applicant for relief from the government. By mid April Lovick had still received no relief check. On April 17 and April 22 Lovick was told by District Office 32 that he would be receiving a check in a "couple of days", but it never came.[21] The District Office told both Lovick and his landlady Ethel Lee that his check would be arriving in just a few days. Lovick and people like him had very few options when dealing with the government and were in very dire financial situations. Lovick, an unskilled laborer unable to work due to injury, was in a desperate position and needed that check to survive.

The UNIA Central Division offered solutions for desperate people like Lovick, Bright, and the Barefield family. While many people undoubtedly suffered in silence, those who had been referred to the UNIA at least had a voice when it came to appealing their cases. They had some way to get answers from the government because they had the UNIA backing them – a force the District Offices were forced to respect, not because

of the legacy of Marcus Garvey but because the leaders of the Central Division had trained themselves in how to deal with the government and knew all of the correct channels to go through when filing complaints on behalf of their membership. While people like Madeline Bright may not have understood the technicalities of why they were denied, the UNIA did and they could verify that the people being denied were not being denied unfairly under false pretenses. The UNIA acted as both a representative for the people in the Harlem community as well as a watchful eye on the local District Offices. If they were unfairly denying people relief, the UNIA would make them explain it and hold them accountable for it.

The UNIA Central Division was not just an organization that advocated on behalf of the Harlem community. The Central Division was a real part of the community, a group whose fate was closely tied to the residents of Harlem. As they went so went the Central Division. This symbiotic relationship can be seen by looking at the way that the Central Division was advertised and how it accrued more cases. Most new cases were word of mouth referrals from members of the UNIA or from other people that had received help from Captain King's Central Division. While a few of the applicants for representation listed leaflets as the referring party the vast majority of applications listed a friend or acquaintance as the person who referred them.[22] This indicates that the Central Division developed a reputation for getting things done in the community. Had the Central Division failed to be a valuable representative they would not have been able to sustain an Unemployed Division representing the interests of Harlemites for well over four years based almost solely on word of mouth advertising.[23]

The Central Division was a very busy place for the latter part of the Depression. The registrations indicate that from 1938-1941 the Unemployed Unit was receiving a good deal of traffic each week.[24] Because of this traffic the Central Division developed very specific procedures for how new cases would be handled. After the referral new applicants would have to meet with Central Division representatives. Presumably before the meeting began applicants were asked to fill out a detailed questionnaire about who they were and what their reason for requesting help from the UNIA was. The form required applicants to fill out basic details about their lives such as name, address, age, and marital status. It also requested details about their professions, the last time they had worked, and whether they were able to work. Finally, the form asked about their citizenship status.[25] Based on these forms it was very easy for UNIA officials to gauge who the person was and construct a rudimentary history of their lives based on one easily filed form.

However, the registration form was only the first step in the process of registering a case with the Central Division. Most applicants also had to interview with a representative from the Central Division to move to the next level with their cases. These interviews were extremely detailed and provided the UNIA with adequate information in which to represent the person in question. Frequently these interviews were accompanied by a written description of the case by the new applicant. These written descriptions usually ranged in length from two to three pages although for especially complex cases there could be as many as five or six pages supplied to the Central Division.[26] The form and the written interview were the two major parts of any applicants' file with the UNIA. While some cases included additional information and some included significantly less,

most case were pursued based on these two vital pieces of information. After talking with the applicant and providing these two key pieces of information the UNIA would begin actively representing the applicant at no official charge.

The representation provided by the Central Division usually came in the form of official letters sent on behalf of the applicant by the UNIA Central Division. Most letters were sent within one week of the initial interview with the Central Division, but in urgent cases they could be sent as soon as the next day. These form letters were typed and followed a very specific format for each applicant. The letters began first and foremost with the UNIA address and followed up by introducing the person they were representing by name and address. Letters went on to list the grievances of the applicant in a numbered list. The grievances were outlined in very clear language and were taken from the interview the applicants went through with the Central Division. Grievance lists ranged from one to as many as six or seven depending on the applicant. Any issue the applicant wanted clarified with the District Offices would be listed here in clear, concise language. Finally, letters were concluded by "respectfully" requesting information about the grievances, clarifications about why a decision was made, or by requesting that the decision in question be reversed.[27]

These letters formed the backbone of the Central Division Unemployed Unit. They were the primary form of representation provided by the Central Division, although Captain A.L. King and representatives of the UNIA would gladly meet with local government officials or deal with grievances by phone if the need arose. These letters gave voice to people who otherwise might not have been able to speak so clearly and eloquently on the government's terms. They were typed, mostly free of typographical

errors, and demanded a response from a group that was recognized the world over as a force to be reckoned with. These letters forced the District Offices to take the concerns of working class African Americans seriously and made them much more difficult to dismiss.

The UNIA was not a group that would put aside the concerns of the people they represented lightly. If the Central Division was unsatisfied with the answers they received, not treated with respect, or were ignored they would write additional letters until their concerns were taken seriously. In some cases the UNIA wrote as many as seven letters to the District Office to resolve the cases of their membership. The tenacity of the Central Division is best illustrated by the case of Moses Jackson filed in March of 1939. Jackson, a 56 year old widower originally from South Carolina was initially cut off from relief because investigators believed that he had found work and was supplementing his aid with the income from this job.[28] At this time Jackson approached the UNIA for representation in order to reinstate his relief. The Central Division wrote a letter on behalf of Jackson claiming that he had never found outside work and that he survived with generous help from some of his friends:

> "The above named organization having presented the case of Moses Jackson on March 29, 1939 for the purposes of ascertaining requirements made on said Moses Jackson for the purposes of further establishing eligibility, and where it is alleged by the District Office that he had been employed at odd jobs as a tailor for a given period of time, the recipient enters a general denial, and states that at no time he ever gave such information. That he informed both investigators that interviewed him that he had been assisted by several persons and that investigators instructed him to bring the names and addresses of these persons, and that when this was done, the investigator refused to accept them unless the names had some collaborating statement from the persons acknowledging their acts."[29]

District Office 4 sent an investigator to meet with Jackson at which time they determined that he needed to provide names and addresses of these friends. District Office 4 responded by stating that this would not be sufficient to reinstate his relief. Once again, the Central Division sprang into action, writing a letter to the District Office to attempt to discern exactly what Jackson would need to do in order to reinstate his much needed relief benefits. After receiving no response to this letter, the Central Division gathered Jackson's information on which friends had helped him and where they lived and submitted this information to the District Office in a letter demanding "the standing status of this case".[30] This letter prompted a meeting with a District Office investigator at which time Jackson was informed that the suspension of his relief would be lifted. By May of 1939 Jackson had still not received any "much needed" relief at which time the UNIA once again wrote a letter to the Office respectfully asking the District Office to "give a specific time" when Jackson might be able to expect a check.[31] Within two days of the Central Division's May 8 letter Jackson was back on the payroll and scheduled to receive aid. This case shows that the UNIA worked tirelessly on behalf of its membership in order to secure them the benefits they were entitled to. They wrote five different letters on behalf of Jackson requesting clarification when he was initially denied aid, providing official information on his behalf when they said his list would not suffice, and finally following up on the case when the checks did not come in a timely fashion. This was the kind of representation Harlem residents could expect when they asked the UNIA to pursue their cases and this is why word of mouth about the Central Division's Unemployed Unit spread so rapidly throughout the Harlem community.

The reputation of the Central Division covered a number of different areas. Harlem residents could count on their steady representation of their interests in any case where there might be complex regulations or procedures and they were unsure how to proceed. The Central Division did not limit the types of cases they would accept or turn people away even if they did not succeed in securing every applicant exactly what he or she were seeking. While the vast majority of the cases the Central Division handled were relief and aid related there were many other different kinds of cases the UNIA would handle if the need arose, including representation in citizenship cases, representation in dealing with utility companies, legal counsel or representation against employers or former employers.

Despite the wide variety of assistance in representation the UNIA offered, the vast majority of their cases came in relief cases when they represented African Americans in grievances against the District Offices in attempts to secure relief. Harlem residents frequently found themselves denied aid from the District Officers for a great variety of reasons. One of the most frequently reported reasons was that applicants were denied aid based on the situations of their family members. District Office investigators would frequently take into account the status of family members often not even living with applicants when considering their case for relief. Such was the case with Hallie Brammage, a 23 year old single factory worker whose mother had secured a W.P.A. position.[32] In early 1938 Brammage was cut off aid strictly because her mother worked for the W.P.A. The Central Division took up her case and attempted to prove that even though her mother was employed through the government, that she had other expenses and could not support Brammage on her wages as a W.P.A. worker.[33] A similar case

occurred in June of 1938 involving Susie Anderson and her son-in-law Union Jackson. Anderson, a 50 year old domestic, was cut off from relief because her son-in-law had gotten a position working for the W.P.A.[34] Again, the UNIA was called upon and forced to point out to District Office 24 that the wages paid to W.P.A. employees ($55.60 in the case of Union Jackson) were not sufficient to support one household and aid another.[35]

Another reason applicants could be denied aid is confusion regarding the visits from investigators. Meetings with investigators were necessary steps in receiving aid from the District Offices and these meetings were one of the biggest determinants deciding whether or not a given applicant was qualified for relief or not. If an investigator had any problems meeting with an applicant for any reason it was almost a sure thing that their case would be denied. Francis Johnson experienced first hand the kind of difficulty one could have in securing aid after a missed meeting with an investigator in May of 1938. Johnson, 57, had a scheduled meeting with an investigator but he never reached her apartment because of a faulty doorbell.[36] Because the meeting was never successfully carried through, Johnson was denied aid on the grounds that she missed a scheduled meeting with an investigator.

At other times, difficulties might occur with relief from District Offices if investigators shifted cases. Sarah Wilson, a 27 year old mother of 6, received aid from 1936 to Jun of 1940 "without any trouble" until her investigator changed in July of 1940.[37] This change of investigator sparked a reinvestigation of her case that resulted in the loss of her support. Personality conflicts between applicants and investigators could also result in applicants being denied. Theresa Pias, 23, found this to be the case in March of 1938 when her investigator came to visit. Pias' investigator accused her of

lying about the number of children she had and did additional research into her personal life by speaking with other residents of her building.[38] Furthermore, the investigator informed Pias' landlord that Pias should be "thrown out of the building".[39] Any transgression on the part of applicants against investigators usually ended up in the applicant losing their aid and being denied by the investigator. Since investigators were assigned to specific cases it could be daunting for applicants who wanted to speak to someone else at their District Office to find an outlet to voice their complaints against a given investigator. This was one of the main reasons why the Central Division was so important, they could help applicants who were denied by a specific investigator gain audience with someone else to hear their case.

While many of the relief case applicants came to the Central Division with specific problems such as family members employed by the W.P.A. or a problem with a given investigator the vast majority of applicants to the Central Division simply stressed that they were denied aid and that they met the requirements to receive it. Carl Anderson, 38, had a fairly typical case that required attention and assistance from the Central Division. Anderson was a widower from Norfolk, Virginia who had been living in New York City for over 10 years.[40] When he applied for representation from the UNIA in 1938 it had been about one year since he was last employed. In a letter from the Central Division to District Office 4 the UNIA claims that Anderson was "wantonly rejected" relief despite his efforts to "prove his need".[41]

In other cases, applicants were searching for answers not out of frustration, but out of desperation. The Central Division would label these cases "Emergency" and made special effort to mail the letters to District Offices as soon as possible. One such case

was that of Morris Bell, a 31 year old single painter who applied for representation from the Central Division in November 1938.[42] Bell was in desperate need of relief because he was set to be evicted from his apartment. Initially he was to be evicted on November 10, but this date was pushed back until the 14th. Between the 10th and the 14th Bell decided to get the Central Division to help him retain his place of residence. On November 12 the UNIA had mailed a letter out to District Office 25 clearly marked "Emergency" that outlined Bell's situation and "respectfully request(ed)" reasons why he should not be given aid.

Another emergency case was that of David Bennett, a 33 year old married laborer and father of two.[43] Bennett found himself in desperate circumstances in March of 1938 after applying for aid five different times.[44] On the first four applications Bennett found himself denied but, at least in his estimation, the District Office did not give sufficient reason for denying him aid. Ultimately, on March 1, 1938 Bennett was granted an investigation into his case, but after the investigation he was never informed of his relief status. At this point Bennett pursued representation from the Central Division to help him deal with the District Office. While Bennett's application had been caught in the inner workings of the District Office files the situation in the Bennett household had grown very desperate. By the time the Central Division wrote the emergency letter on March 22 there was "no food in the house for the children".[45] In the emergency letter to District Office 26 the Central Division requested a "specific statement" on the status of Bennett's application and reasons why he should not be given aid.[46]

While the great majority of cases the UNIA handled were not of the Emergency variety, these are still useful in that they are representative of the types of applicants the

Central Division frequently represented. While some had been given sufficient explanation for why their cases were denied, most were confused about why they were in such a desperate situation and the government could not help them out. The Central Division was not always able to get people aid from the District Offices. In fact, some applicants who used the services of the UNIA were not deserving of aid and had been denied fairly by the government. However, at the very least the Central Division acted as a conduit for information between the government and the residents of Harlem. Even if they could not secure any assistance for their clientele they could at least explain to them plainly why they would not be receiving relief and give them options about what kind of steps they could take to either secure work or make their application more attractive to the government.

Representation and interpretation were important skills for Central Division members to have during the Depression. They were important in not only securing federal relief but also in dealing with a myriad of other problems that arose on a day to day basis. While the great majority of cases handled by the UNIA Central Division were relief related, they were open to representing their membership in almost any capacity for almost any issue imaginable. Furthermore, the Central Division operated across international borders, one did not need to be an American citizen to receive the benefits the Central Division offered.

In fact, one of the most important services offered by the Central Division outside of relief representation was to help non-citizens secure their citizenship papers. Throughout the late 1930s the Central Division represented a variety of people who sought to become American citizens and were unsure of how to begin the process. The

Central Division instructed and aided these people in being able to get their citizenship and by doing so get better work in the United States. Most citizenship candidates were in their 30s and 40s, hailed from the British West Indies, and were able bodied workers.[47] Despite the fact that the Central Division did not handle a huge amount of citizenship cases, their experience in dealing with government agencies was helpful in preparing potential citizenship applicants for the process of becoming American citizens. Furthermore, the high level of personal referrals for citizenship cases indicates that the Central Division had some success in helping people get their citizenship papers.

Aside from relief and citizenship cases, the Central Division also represented people who were trying to secure pensions or Social Security benefits. One such case was that of Joseph Bowman, a 62 year old laborer, husband, and father of one.[48] Bowman consulted with the Central Division in December of 1938 after having persistent problems with his Social Security check. Bowman had been receiving his weekly checks in the amount of $12.39 regularly from March 1938 until September 1938 however they were "never prompt" and would frequently arrive late.[49] This was something that Bowman was willing to deal with until they stopped coming completely in October 1938. A similar case occurred in July 1940 when Dora Thom's pension was mysteriously cut from $50 monthly to $48.[50] Thom, a 75 year old widow, found her budget in complete disarray when she received a monthly check for $2 less than she planned on receiving. It was in cases like this that the UNIA could step in and deal not only with local District Offices, but with Social Security officials or privately owned businesses who were failing to pay agreed upon pensions.

Finally, the Central Division would represent its membership in miscellaneous cases and at times act almost as legal council for their members. This was what happened in 1939 with the case of Blanch Booker, a 32 year old single maid. Booker had two children ages 13 and 15. The elder son, Calvin, attended school at New York Industrial High School. On Wednesday, April 19 Calvin Booker was in class with his teacher Mr. Hobbs when he began to feel ill. At this point he left the class and went to the principal's office in hopes of securing a pass to the nurse's office. The principal, Mr. Case, sent Booker back to his classroom to receive proper permission from his teacher to leave the classroom. At this point both Booker and Hobbs came back to the principal's office to discuss the boy's condition. The principal had a talk with Hobbs and Booker and apparently what he said did not sit well with either. Upon leaving the office Hobbs and Booker began to argue, which culminated in Hobbs striking booker in the nose. At this point young Booker went to the nurse to receive first aid because Hobbs was wearing a ring that cut Booker's nose when he was struck.[51] In cases like this the UNIA served as a watchdog group to hold teachers accountable for any abuse leveled at students in school. In the case of Blanch Booker, she was outraged about what had happened to her son but without the UNIA she may have been unsure about how to proceed and may never have found anyone willing to fairly represent her interests in a dispute with the school system and Mr. Hobbs.

Another such case was that of 40 year old domestic Sarah Brown. Brown was coming down the stairs of her apartment building on January 28, 1939. Brown was asked to write down her story and she gave the pertinent details:

> "Feb 6/39 Accident Case
> Mrs. Sarah Brown of 69 West 131st apartment 313 met with an accident on

> The staircase while supt. was cleaning. Mrs. Lee caretaker of the house West 131 apt. 1 collect rents and see to the place is kept clean. So she have a man to do the cleaning. On Thursday, Jan 29 from 10 to 9 o'clock this said assistant supt. was mopping on the first landing + Mrs. Brown was coming down going out at the time. In coming down I slipped five (5) steps down face downward. The janitor came to my aid he picked me up and asked if she wanted him to carry her upstairs. I told him I would sit there awhile and when I felt composed I went up the street. She felt O.K. until the following Tuesday Jan. 31/39. I had pain so I went to the hospital and was examined and they found enough to cause the pains so they gave me medicine to use and take. I had no money to go to a private Doctor. Mrs. Brown just want to know, if there is anything she could get out of it or do."[52]

While it is doubtful that Sarah Brown ever received any kind of large cash settlement or any reimbursement from the landlady for her fall the fact that she approached the UNIA with this case shows the type of reputation the Central Division had in the community. People were able to submit cases free of charge for at least an evaluation and the Central Division would pursue it to the fullest.

Very few of the surviving records chart the progress of the full cases from start to finish. Because of this it is impossible to really determine how much "success" the Central Division had when taking these cases to various government departments, businesses, and landlords. However, overall success rate should not be used to measure the impact that Captain King's Unemployed Unit had on the face of the Harlem community. The strength of the Central Division was not that it was successful every single time it represented clients, but the fact that it was there and it created options for people who otherwise had few, if any. The Central Division offered a way for working class African Americans to have fair access to government agencies and offered them someone of authority to appeal to if they felt they were not getting a fair deal. District Offices responsible for doling out relief in the late 1930s and 1940s in New York City

were very familiar with the Central Division having to deal with them hundreds of times regarding different cases the UNIA brought before them. The Central Division forced these offices to listen to complaints and disagreements that might have normally fallen through the cracks or been outright dismissed. With Captain A.L. King and the rest of the Central Division representing African American interests District Offices knew that if they unfairly denied aid to an applicant that there was a good possibility they would be receiving a letter from the Central Division.

The policies and actions of the Central Division represented a dramatic departure from Garvey's UNIA of the 1920s and shows how Garveyites reformed and adapted the UNIA to meet different goals and needs in the community. Caught in the grip of the Depression and facing dramatically scaled back operations these Garveyites converted the UNIA into something different that still held true to the beliefs of Garvey, but practically executed them in a much different way. Instead of representing black interests in an international stage through conferences and large scale meetings as Garvey had done throughout the 1920s, the Central Division took this same principle and operated it on a local level. Just as Garvey had written letters rejecting various foreign policies and the treatment of black people throughout the world, Captain A.L. King wrote letters of a similar tone advocating for the rights and fair treatment of local African Americans in Harlem.

In other ways the Central Division's policy of representation was nearly unrecognizable from what the UNIA had been at the height of its influence. Relying chiefly on the government to support its membership, the Central Division was not the economic juggernaut that Garvey's UNIA had been. Instead of offering self help from

the funds in the coffers, the Central Division was forced to use its influence to secure relief from the government. Garvey was never in a position where he had to request financial assistance from the government; in fact, he was more interested in organizing his own new government and corporations throughout the world. The Central Division did not have that kind of luxury, so they reformed Garvey's vision along more practical lines and discarded some of the least practical aspects of Garveyism such as state building and large scale black owned enterprise.

The Central Division departed from Garvey's vision in a number of ways but it harkened back to what the organization had originally intended to accomplish when it was founded in 1915 in Jamaica. Originally included were both local and general goals that the UNIA intended to accomplish. The general goals included many of the projects and programs Garvey became famous for in the 1920s, nation building, the establishment of universities, and the promotion and establishment of a "commercial and industrial intercourse".[53] These general aims proved too much for the scaled down Central Division to handle by the mid 1930s but they did not discard the principles and the aims of the UNIA altogether. They simply changed their focus to the local aims which included "administering and assisting the needy" and to "reclaim the fallen" of the race.[54] Despite the fact that the UNIA could no longer stop traffic n New York City with a huge parade of members or create unease amongst imperial officials simply by distributing their newspaper, the Central Division remained both true to Garvey's original tenets and a significant force in the community by responding to the people's call for help in dealing with government officials and other people in power.

Notes

[1] Robert Hill and Barbara Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 207.
[2] Hill and Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons*, 29-32.
[3] Hill, and Bair eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons*, 307-308.
[4] Amy Jacques Garvey, ed., *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press, 1986), Volume 2, 217.
[5] Jacques-Garvey, ed., *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, 228.
[6] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". Statistics taken from these registrations are not complete. Many of the registrations are not completely filled out. Furthermore, there is significant evidence that these registrations do not include everyone the Central Division represented. Throughout the collection letters can be found written by Captain A.L. King on behalf of a person not found in these registration files.
[7] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". While there were many fewer men than women the average age is nearly identical for these applicants. The precise numbers are 37.8 years of age for male applicants and 38.4 years of age for the female applicants.
[8] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41".
[9] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41".
[10] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41".
[11] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41".
[12] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". Approximately 35% of the applicants who filled out that portion of the survey list their last year of education between 7th and 9th grade. About 47% of applicants had less schooling than this and only around 18% of applicants had an education level higher than 9th grade.
[13] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". It is very possible that even more Central Division applicants had children than this. Frequently applications are incomplete so I have taken any entries of 0 or left blank to indicate no children. It is reasonable to assume that some people may have wished to keep their children out of this process or that they simply felt that information was not relevant to their application so they may have left it out.
[14] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". This data may not be exactly accurate as there was no blank for male or female. I used the applicants' names to determine within reason who was male and who was female. The actual percent from the sample was 28% of applicants were male.
[15] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". This data has some margin for error considering men more frequently than women left their marital status blank. The actual percentage of married men applaying for aid from the sample was 46%.
[16] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra) U.N.I.A. Central Division". The story of the Barefield family is drawn from the application submitted to the UNIA in March of 1941 and the accompanying form detailing the grievance against the District Office 26.
[17] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c40. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bre-By) U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[18] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c40. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bre-By) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[19] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c41. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bre-By) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[20] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c40. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bre-By) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[21] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 32, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c43. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (L-P) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[22] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41".
[23] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". There are indications that the Unemployed Unit began operations as early as 1936 and that it did not close down until 1942, however there are not enough entries from these years to support the claim that it was running on the same level as it was from 1938-1941 during these earlier and later periods.
[24] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". Based on the number of records available it is safe to say that the Central Division was receiving 3-4 new cases weekly from 1938-1941. Obviously it was not distributed completely evenly, some weeks may have been exceptionally busy while others may have been slow.
[25] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". Occasionally these forms were not available to new applicants in which case applicants filled out the same information requested on the form on a blank piece of paper. These entries are far less detailed and frequently omit one or more fields present on the official registration forms.
[26] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". Not all of the applications have the written interview included with them in the Registration file.
[27] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41". Examples of these letters can be found throughout the registration file along with copies of the interviews and registration forms.
[28] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations (C-Je), Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folders c41. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41".
[29] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations (C-Je), Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folders c41. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41".
[30] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 4, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c41. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (C-Je). This language is found in the letter from the UNIA to the District Office dated April 5, 1939.
[31] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 4, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c41. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (C-Je).
[32] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 28, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra).
[33] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 28, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra). The Central Division submitted a bulleted list to the District Office detailing Brammage's mother's expenses and also pointing out that her mother was raising another child and could not afford to support two households.
[34] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 24, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41.

[35] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 24, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41.
[36] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c42. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Joh-K).
[37] Application of Sarah and Benjamin Wilson to UNIA Central Division for representation in relief case, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (R-W).
[38] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c43. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (L-P).
[39] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c43. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (L-P).
[40] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 4, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c38. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (A).
[41] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 4, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c38. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (A).
[42] Application Form and Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 25, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra). Bell was set to be evicted because he took sick in September of 1938 and shortly after his wife left him. These difficult circumstances caused him not only great emotional stress but also caused him to have to reapply for aid as a single man instead of as a married household.
[43] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra).
[44] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra).
[45] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra).
[46] Letter from UNIA Central Division to District Office 26, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra).
[47] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41".
[48] Interview with Joseph Bowman, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra).
[49] Interview with Joseph Bowman, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra).
[50] Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41".
[51] Interview with Blanch Booker, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c39. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bai-Bra). The story of what happened to Calvin Booker is included in this interview. It is transcribed by a Central Division representative.
[52] Interview with Sarah Brown, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c40. "Central Unemployed Unit, Registrations, 1938-41 (Bre-By).
[53] UNIA General and Local Objects, quoted in: Tony Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press), 1983, 31-32.
[54] UNIA General and Local Objects, quoted in: Tony Martin, *Marcus Garvey, Hero* (Dover, Mass: The Majority Press), 1983, 31-32.

CHAPTER 4: COFRATERNITY AMONG THE RACE

"Never deny help to your own race. This is the meaning of cofraternity. One for all and all for one. Never depart from this."[1]
-UNIA Aims and Objects

On January 10, 1934 a group of women gathered for a meeting at the home of Mrs. Hamilton. Around 10 p.m. the meeting was called to order and role was taken. The meeting was conducted somewhat informally, with only around eight women in attendance. It was off to a rousing start with a series of competitive card games being played out between the women. Scores were tallied and Miss Lovett finished first, Mrs. Hamilton, the hostess, earned second place, and Miss Holliday won third prize. After the games, which ran for about an hour, the women turned their attention to more serious matters. They took stock of the profits from their last event, a moderately successful dance, and find that they made $12. Next, the women decided that they needed to create a more formal structure so they elected a series of officers to run the affairs of the club more smoothly. The hostess, Mrs. Hamilton, wins the presidency and she is flanked by the new vice president Miss Alice Williams. Miss Lovett, the day's big winner, is elected treasurer and the officers are rounded out with Mrs. Holliday taking the role of business manager.[2]

The first order of business was a motion to use the money in the treasury to buy ledger books to keep track of all monies entering and leaving the club's treasury. The group also addressed the future protocol and structure of the meetings deciding that the

matters of business must come before games as well as enacting a rule that any club member who wishes to speak must stand up and address the officers to be recognized. Violation of this rule resulted in an immediate 25 cent fine to be paid to the group's treasury. Furthermore any member not able to attend a meeting must notify an officer, Failure to do so resulted in a 25 cent fine. These rules were to be effective immediately and were in effect at the start of the next meeting. After having accomplished a great deal, the meeting was finally adjourned at 1:30am.[3]

This meeting was one of many held throughout the mid to late 1930s by a group of women in the UNIA Central Division. They called themselves the "Lucky 9s Club", and they were just one of many organizations and groups that prospered in the Central Division in the 1930s. This procedure of electing officers, outlining rules and protocol, and planning for the future was a frequent occurrence within the ranks of the Central Division as many small clubs formed within the larger division. Small, tight-knit groups with very diverse focuses formed the backbone of the newly local Central Division throughout the Depression. Forced to scale back operations on a national and international level, the Central Division coped through strengthening their ties to the community on the most local levels. Organized trips, youth groups, singing groups, and UNIA clubs kept the UNIA relevant within the Harlem community and illustrated the Central Division's amazing adaptability powered by a strong local leadership.

However, to say that the Central Division simply became an entirely locally-based community uplift organization in response to Depression conditions, Garvey's deportation, and decline in membership would not be a fair characterization. While more focus was certainly on these local activities, the UNIA was also active on a national and

international level even if they did not receive the attention or news coverage they might have during the 1920s. The Central Division continued to take Garvey's ideas seriously and continued to promote his ideals throughout the late 1930s as boisterously as possible. When Ethiopia was invaded, the Central Division was there protesting as strongly as anyone staging protests on the streets of New York and spreading the word about this injustice.

This chapter delves into both the local and international affairs of the Central Division throughout the late 1930s and early 1940s. I continue to argue that local community uplift was the foundation of the Central Division, I also hope to show that these Garveyites continued to take the international politics of Garvey very seriously even after his death in 1940. By illustrating the Garveyites' simultaneous commitment to self help as well as the preservation of Garvey's politics I am able to show both how the Central Division molded itself into a viable community centered organization while staying true to its roots as an international force for social justice for black people worldwide.

While the Central Division did scale back many of its programs, business ventures, and community activism during the 1930s and 1940s, these things did not go away. In fact, they remained an important part of the Central Division throughout this difficult period. This chapter investigates how the Central Division remained true to certain threads of Garveyism while adapting them to the circumstances they faced during the Depression. I divide the activities of the Central Division into two major categories for the purposes of easily analyzing them: community uplift and global issues. I define community uplift as small programs or clubs designed to help make life during the

Depression easier for UNIA members in some way. This covers a wide range of activities including everything from social clubs to organized trips. Global issues represent everything on the national level and beyond. While the voice of the Central Division might not have been heard as strongly (if at all) on the national stage this did not stop them from being very vocal about their positions on issues such as the Scottsboro case and Italy's invasion of Ethiopia in October of 1935.

Local contributions from the Central Divison were made in the midst of a life and death struggle for the organization. Day to day operations for the Central Division in and of themselves were difficult for members of the Central Division. Various nagging problems plagued the group throughout the 1930s and 1940s. These problems and how the UNIA dealt with them are best examined on the most local levels as the group struggled simultaneously to forge forward and avoid closing its doors altogether. This section aims to show both the difficulties the group had on a local level but also to show how they fought against disbanding and how they used these smaller clubs and groups to remain relevant and offer some valuable services to membership.

Three major problems plagued the organization on the most grassroots level: membership commitment, financial deficits, and infighting within the ranks.[4] These problems were the symptoms of the larger problems facing the Central Division discussed at length previously. As a three prong attack on the UNIA's operations they colored the strategies the Division was forced to take in organizing and carrying out its plans throughout the 1930s and 1940s.

The first and potentially most serious problem faced by the membership of the Central Division was a lack of commitment on behalf of some members of the

organization. While the UNIA had always built its foundation on a membership that had varying levels of participation, the declining membership and dire financial straits made it necessary for King and other Central Division officers to call upon each member to take more personal responsibility for the success and proliferation of the group. Throughout 1938 King repeatedly attempted to address the issue of an inactive and complacent membership through a number of measures. King attempted to curb this tendency by encouraging all affiliates to become "bona fide" Central Division members by mid April of 1938 to increase the member count, financial base, and overall strength of the group.[5] The following week, apparently not satisfied with the progress being made by membership, King announced that the Central Division was "not a convenience" and that it should be taken more seriously by membership by contributing time and money.[6] A few months later, apparently still dissatisfied with Central Division member commitment, King leveled even sharper criticism on his membership citing his "utter disgust" at the lack of participation in the organization.[7]

King and the other officers of the Central Division stepped up recruitment efforts and became stricter with membership attendance in response to this problem and in doing so were able to hold the group together. UNIA members who missed scheduled meetings could expect visits from members and correspondence from King. People who showed an interest in the UNIA were courted and if they did not return after one meeting a letter of inquiry was sent out questioning why that person had not continued to take part in the Central Division's affairs. The strictness of these attendance policies is evident when one looks through the correspondence files to King. Much of the correspondence includes letters from members apologizing for not attending meetings and giving reasons for their

lack of attendance. At one point King even proposed a tax for missing Central Division meetings without proper excuse.[8] A good Central Division member realized that his or her role in the organization was paramount during this period. With membership dwindling in comparison to the boom of the 1920s each serious member was asked to make it his or her responsibility to build the ranks of the UNIA through recruitment and participation.

The second major grassroots problem, financial distress, was certainly not unique to the Central Division during this period. The Depression not only wreaked havoc on organizations, but on the households that supported them. Groups like the UNIA found themselves in dire straits as economic conditions put a stranglehold on their memberships. A running monthly deficit was a constant in the Central Division. Of the thirty two meetings catalogued in 1932, twenty one mention a deficit or outline some type of plan to meet the deficit.[9] This constant deficit, usually ranging from $40 to $110 on a monthly basis put a great deal of stress on membership as well as the leaders and exacerbated other problems causing increased tension and putting the officers in a position where they were always in a fundraising mode. At times, this lack of funds completely crippled the Central Division and brought operations, plans for future programs, and the group's political goals to a complete standstill.

That said, the Central Division was not destroyed by financial hardship. They developed a number of innovative ways to not just survive but to continue with the uplift programs that made them a fixture of the Harlem community. King and the officers devised a number of survival techniques including membership drives, expenditure reductions, souvenir sales, cake rallies, entertainments, a tax for missing membership

meetings without a proper excuse, and breakfast drives. The persistence and tenacity of the Central Division is admirable considering the circumstances they faced. In the spirit of Marcus Garvey, they organized a series of innovative business ventures to meet the financial need. While these business ventures met with mixed reactions from the community there was obviously some measure of success considering the group continued to plan events and operate throughout the 1930s and into the 1940s.

The final problem facing the Central Division was not a new one for the UNIA, infighting. Throughout this period there are instances of personality conflicts and disagreements taking center stage over the goals of the organization. Throughout the sample of meeting minutes King repeatedly asks the membership and officers to "close ranks" and stop the insubordination that had been plaguing the organization.[10] At times this dissent in the ranks even led to the dismissal of members best illustrated by the case of an unnamed Musical Director who was summarily dismissed from the organization on April 9, 1939 for insubordination.[11]

However, it was not only low level members who felt the sting of internal conflict within the Central Division. In October 1939 Propaganda Minister Sibley submitted a list of three grievances to the organization regarding various decisions that had been made without his involvement or consent. Sibley felt that he was not being involved enough in the decisions of which activities to attach the name of the UNIA to. He felt that the Central Division was becoming involved with activities and events that did not focus enough on the UNIA, its goals, and mission.[12] Furthermore, Sibley felt undermined at various times because he was not contacted to make decisions. He felt his job was being taken from him and that he felt he should resign if his services were not required.[13]

Sibley also felt that he was being treated poorly in the group and that members were sending him insulting correspondence.[14]

Infighting and debate is a natural part of any group, but at times the Central Division undermined itself with non-constructive critique and venomous disagreements. At one point King even tendered a resignation which was luckily denied by the membership.[15] These disagreements destabilized the group and caused cracks in an already stressed foundation. While there was no defining disagreement that finally split the group the result of this was a certain instability that followed the group throughout its lifetime. The Central Division had an ever changing cast of characters moving in and out of all but the highest positions of leadership. While this can not be solely blamed on internal squabbling and bickering, this was certainly a contributing factor to the group's lack of stability.

In certain ways the infighting was an unintended consequence of the way that the Central Division reformed itself in response to the context it was operating in. Faced with the reality that they would no longer be able to mobilize thousands at a moment's notice the fundamental makeup of the group changed. Instead of employing hundreds of people in variety of industries and side projects and having periodic mass meetings, the Central Division scaled back into a series of smaller groups with a dedicated core membership. These core members and internal clubs made for a family like atmosphere of committed people, but the smaller clubs contributed to competing interests and the formation of cliques within the ranks. One example of this is a situation where one member was forced to write a letter to Captain King because of tensions in the group. She outlines the problems with the choir here:

> "I always like singing in the choir and have in many cases so I learned this person did not want me in the choir...I am as good and respectable as anyone here or any place I belong...I have feelings and I don't care to have my feelings hurt when I don't do anything to anyone but treat them as I should and do my duty around here. Well I will never work under her or anyone else who thinks themselves above another."[16]

Based on her account she joined with enthusiasm and an interest in helping out in any way possible, however after having only been a part of the Central Division for a short period she feels disconnected and disenchanted with the whole group and feels that some members think they are better than others.

Despite these challenges and the problems the structure of the organization created, the Central Division offered a number of unique and important benefits, services, clubs, and opportunities to members. While these smaller groups might have created some tension within the whole, the 1930s Central Division with its tight knit membership was able to offer a number of uplift measures throughout the 1930s. While these measures may never have achieved the fame or received the recognition of the Black Star Line or Negro Factories Corporation, they were valuable grassroots programs that filled important needs in Harlem – not just to Central Division members, but for the community as a whole. These local contributions were not of the scale of the Central Unemployed Unit, but they each had distinct value in their own way and operated in the self help tradition that Garvey had espoused throughout the 1920s.

This section addresses six diverse uplift measures assembled by the Central Division throughout the 1930s. I further divide these measures into two categories: persistent clubs which existed throughout the Central Division's lifespan and one-time events that did not spawn a club or organization in and of themselves but were important

for what they offered the community. The persistent groups addressed here are the Lucky 9 Club, the Black Cross Nurses, the Chorus Singers, and the youth program. The one time events discussed here are a trip taken by the Central Division to Philadelphia and a Christmas program organized by the group. These diverse programs offered a number of different benefits to members and occasionally non-members and can all be grouped under the banner of uplift. Taken individually, the programs and events may seem insignificant, but when analyzed together they show that the Central Division was able to put together an impressive array of programs to help the struggling Harlem community during this dire time.

Groups such as the Lucky 9 Club, Chorus Singers, Black Cross Nurses, and even the youth program drew heavily from a tradition of black women's uplift. While these groups never blossomed into the national phenomena that women's clubs such as the National Association of Colored Women did, they mirrored their operations on a local level. These women evoked the language of respectability and performed some of the same types of service work as other local groups such as the Colored Women's Club Tuskegee Woman's Club, and Phyllis Wheatley Club around the country by educating African American youth, providing medical supplies, and organizing events on a local level. While they were never formally tied to the women's club movement, they operated in that tradition.[17]

The Lucky 9 Club was one of the most interesting groups formed within the Central Division. The Club was made up of all women and they pursued a number of different aims throughout the life of the club. Like most of the Central Division's clubs and programs, membership and participation varied over time due to a variety of

circumstances. Their meetings usually took place in the evening, often from 10pm until midnight.[18] Membership also fluctuated over time, but the typical meeting was usually attended by eight or so members.[19] It is difficult to say with much certainty how many women passed in and out of the club during its approximately one year lifetime, however, their official registration book lists twelve women in total.[20] The membership also had green dresses made for the members of the club to promote unity and strengthen the organization.

The group was formally organized in the tradition of the UNIA with several officer positions including president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, and business manager. The meetings also followed a strict code to promote order and cooperation among the members. Speaking out of turn or arguing (while an inevitable part of any club or group) were discouraged and healthy debate was encouraged. Group members who wanted to make changes or suggestions to the way the Club's affairs were run had to submit a motion, it had to be seconded, and finally it was voted upon.[21]

A typical Lucky 9 Club meeting was "called to order with prayer" and was divided into two parts: games and business.[22] Most meetings offered competitive games that the women participated in. The winners of the games would frequently be awarded prizes.[23] At times the games disrupted the other half of the Lucky 9 mission: event planning and fundraising and there was a certain amount of tension that existed between the women who wanted to play games and the women who were more interested in event planning. The Club put together a tremendous number of events considering the small scale they were operating on. The club, with membership numbering less than a dozen, put on events such as tea parties, dances, and parties.[24] Parties put on by the club

frequently required potential attendees to purchase tickets. The revenues from the tickets were used to buy refreshments, food, and to pay out prizes for games (when they were available at the event). Leftover funds were used as a base to plan for the next event.

By using this format the Lucky 9s were able to sustain themselves, make profits, and offer affordable events to the Harlem community. These events offered people with limited financial options a place to have a good time without spending a great deal of money. Lucky 9 parties were events that were not just good for the Club itself but also valued in the community. Events were targeted at women, youth, and the general Harlem population at various times. This great variety of events combined with solid planning kept the events profitable and helped to popularize the club. While not all of the Lucky 9 events were rousing successes, for the most part each event made enough to put on another as well as cover the expenses of the club.

By organizing these very grassroots events the Club was able to help keep the Central Division name relevant in the community. These events were not just affordable social outlets, but an opportunity for the Central Division to expand and to promote itself to people who otherwise might not have known about the group. The Lucky 9 Club only has surviving records from 1934-1935, but even for this brief period it was an important contributor to the overall community, and the Central Division itself.

Another group that was an active part of the Central Division during this period was an extension of Garvey's UNIA: the Black Cross Nurses. The Nurses were a part of the UNIA almost from its inception and were one of the largest and most active sub-groups throughout the 1920s. The Central Division's Nurses were no different. Made up entirely of women, the Black Cross Nurses sought to promote general health in the

African American community and did so through a variety of creative and innovative ways throughout the late 1930s and early 1940s.

Much like the Lucky 9 Club, the Nurses had weekly meetings in which they would discuss budgetary concerns, overall goals, and report on their works. The group was also formally organized with a series of officers including Head Nurse and President, Vice President, Treasurer, Secretary, Assistant Secretary, Organizer, and Librarian.[25] Despite these abundant officer positions, the Nurses did not have many more members than the Lucky 9 Club. Meetings were held on a weekly basis and most meetings included the majority of the officers with only a few rank and file members.[26] While there is again no way to be sure who might have been in and out of the group, it is safe to say that the Black Cross Nurses numbered less than 25, including part time members who only attended sporadic meetings.

Nurses were expected to contribute to the ongoing project of keeping the group going. They frequently debated how to raise funds, finally deciding that weekly dues would form the major part of the budget and would be supplemented with various fundraising events.[27] The nurses had big plans for the group and mounted a recruiting effort in the community through mailings.[28] Recruiting was a more central focus for the Nurses than for other groups within the Central Division.

Because of this rich history, the nurses played an important ceremonial role in the Central Division. As one of the few clubs to be directly descended from Garvey's UNIA the Black Cross Nurses were deeply embedded in the lore of the UNIA. They still maintained the official uniform of the UNIA developed by Garvey in the 1920s. Rank and file nurses wore a basic white uniform and a red cross on the left arm; officer shared

the same uniform with a green band above the cross; leaders of the nurses added a cape of red, green, or black for parades or daily wear as they preferred.[29] These uniforms and the presence of the nurses held special significance to older Garveyites and helped to preserve and enhance the connection of King's Central Division with the rich history of the UNIA. The Nurses decked out in uniform also held a certain appeal for general members of the community indicating that these women were at least somewhat trained to give medical attention and bolstering the image of the Central Division throughout Harlem.

Despite their small numbers, the Nurses made a significant impact on the community in many different ways. Perhaps the most obvious way the Nurses contributed to the community was through the purchase of medical supplies. The nurses were able to purchase modest numbers of bandages, thermometers, and linens to aid in their promotion of general community health.[30] While the nurses should not be confused with a huge medical supplier to the Harlem area, they were able to sustain themselves and offer a few medical supplies to people who were in need during dire times.

In addition to their purchase of medical supplies the Nurses offered less tangible benefits to community members. They served as a source of knowledge and as promoters of general health wherever they went. They held meetings to train their membership about basic health concerns and in this way they were able to spread knowledge about the benefits of cleanliness, disease awareness, and sickness prevention to people who might otherwise have no source for this kind of information. In addition to knowledge, the Nurses also offered companionship and care for sick members of the community. Frequently they scheduled meetings with people who were sick and had few

visitors. In July of 1937 the Nurses scheduled a series of visits with Sarah Beazer who was recently diagnosed with diabetes.[31] They visited her several times throughout her rather lengthy stay in the hospital and updated Central Division on her status and when she might be released from the hospital. They continued their visits for a time after she returned home as well. Furthermore, while they were at the hospital, they also spoke with many other patients in the hospital offering their counsel and lifting their spirits[32]

Much like many of the other Central Division programs during the 1930s, the Black Cross Nurses struggled to bring in enough money to really make themselves a force in the community. Despite this, they found affordable ways to help people such as visit them in the hospital and offer free basic health instruction in the community. The impact of these services is difficult to quantify in any meaningful way, but it is safe to say that various members of Harlem were familiar with the nurses and their information and relative expertise offered at least some benefit to sick Harlemites. It is also safe to say that the people these women came into contact with appreciated their services and were happy to see visitors in the bleak surroundings of Harlem Hospital. Much like the Central Division itself, the nurses struggled financially, but found important ways to get the message of Central Division out and more importantly to help people in need. Despite the difficulties that ultimately undermined the efforts of the Black Cross Nurses, they made a meaningful impact in people's lives by offering their support in difficult times, providing medical advice, and on occasion offering much needed medical supplies to the sick.

The Central Division Chorus Singers were similar to the Black Cross Nurses in that they were both very longstanding UNIA subgroups. While the Nurses aimed to heal

the sick, the Singers had a much more ceremonial role. The Central Chorus Singers, while being the center of a great deal of infighting, served an important role in the Central Division and frequently in the community in general as well. The Singers went through a number of incarnations throughout the 1930s and early 1940s. Groups were frequently founded and disintegrated as quickly as they had formed in a firestorm of controversy and disagreement. The 1940 edition was no different, almost from its inception the group had problems delegating power and deciding who would play what role in the popular group.

The Singers were organized in roughly the way most Central Division groups were, they had a President, Miss E. Thompson, a Secretary, Mr. U. Stephens, and a Treasurer, Mr. O Bowen.[33] However, they had many fewer meetings. The group was less based around a meeting structure and more about performing and renewing ties in that way. Because of this less formal structure at times the group could fall victim to infighting and disagreements. As discussed previously there were occasionally members who wanted to become a major part of the group but were denied for personal reasons.

Despite the tensions caused by the group, they were one of the most visible forces on the Harlem landscape promoting the Central Division and its interests. The group performed at a series of local events whenever they were called upon. The group also occasionally put on their own concerts.[34] This was of definite practical help to the Central Division because of funds that were directly brought in. The Central Choral Singers donated half of their profits to the Central Division and kept the other half to promote the group and keep it running smoothly.

That said, the money that was generated by the Choral Singers was most likely quite modest. The most important role of this singing group was not that they were a huge draw, but that they were a useful promotional tool. The Choral Singers represented the Central Division in places where they would normally not have had a presence. They were at social events, rallies, and putting on their own concert. They gave the Central Division a face in the community. By performing at various events the Singers were not simply generating money but keeping the UNIA fresh in people's minds. They were able to recruit and promote the services of the Central Division throughout Harlem beyond the typical methods of leaflets and fliers. Furthermore, the Choral Singers brought an important tie to the rich history of the UNIA. They were a reminder of the former strength of the group and the strength the group might once gain again through hard work and persistence. Seeing the Central Division Choral Singers not only brought back memories of the 1920s, it inspired potential hope for the future and showed that in this bleak time possibilities were there for self help and advancement.

Another way the Central Division promoted a positive image of the future was through their youth education programs. Throughout the 1930s and early 1940s Captain King and the Central Division created a number of different programs that went through several incarnations including the Central Youth Circle, the Central Youth League, and the Juvenile Cadet Corps.[35] Of these three groups the Central Youth Circle and the Central Youth League operated as youth governed organizations with their own goals and plans. The Juvenile Cadet Corps was a much more regimented group that involved a great deal of adult supervision and attempted to teach youth from two all the way until 17 the values of the Central Division and Marcus Garvey.

The youth driven groups, the Circle and the Youth League, consisted of around 40 students and they were led by a committee of officers.[36] The officers were president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer. They mirrored the structure of other Central Division groups and the youth operated in much the same way as their parents – debating, arguing, and deciding about the next course of action for the group. One of the primary goals of these youth driven groups was very similar to the aims of other Central Division groups – put on events in the community. Despite the unified vision, at times the membership argued and debated over what type of event to host and why. In early 1941 the group had planned to utilize its $20.20 budget to put on a popularity contest. However, finding a lack of equipment eventually caused the membership to have to abandon this plan.[37] After a timely motion from Cecil Estwick, it was proposed that this event be changed from a popularity contest to a dance. After Gladys Wilcher seconded the motion it was voted through and the group was able to have their event.[38] The group was also responsible for allocating their own budget and they decided that their event should offer soda and wine as refreshments, hot dogs to eat, various decorations while the largest share of the budget went to music.[39]

The group's formal membership structure, meeting minutes, and focus on putting on local events were a direct carry over from other groups within the Central Division. Much like the Lucky 9's, the youth were able to put on events for their peers that were affordable and profitable for the group.[40] However, more importantly, youth were introduced to the structure of the Central Division and prepared for full membership when they became older. Furthermore, even if they did not employ these skills in the Central Division, they were able to learn responsibility and money management certainly

important skills. Allowing the youth to operate their own structures not only gave the Central Division a strong youth presence, but was also valuable to the youth in future endeavors.

Another way the Central Division trained their youth was through the Juvenile Cadet Corps organized in 1939 under the direction of Captain King.[41] The Cadet Corps were a much more rigid and structured organization than other youth driven organizations devised by the Central Division. While the Youth League and Central Circle were for the most part youth run, the Cadet Corps was about discipline and learning from adults. The group focused their attentions on "race pride, Negro history, and cadet craft".[42] The group met three times a week on Mondays and Thursdays at 4:30 p.m. and Sundays at 8:45 p.m. and charged dues of three cents weekly (or whatever the member could afford).[43] There were also various other times the group might meet for special trips, presentations, or events.[44] Youth could be attending as many as four or five meetings in a given week depending on special events and their commitment level to the group.

The membership of the group was extremely diverse in terms of age. Each prospective member was required to fill out a permission slip listing their name, age, sex, and have it signed by their parents. The groups featured a wide variety of children and often siblings joined together. Ages ranged from under five years old all the way until 17. There were over 80 applications submitted to the group, most youth being between nine and 14 with 11 being the most common age with 14 members.[45] The group also had a significant following amongst younger children with 20 being between the ages of four and eight. There were a few later teen members of the group as well, six from the ages of 15 to 17. While there is no doubt that all 80 of these applications did not result in 80+

committed members, this still represents a very sizable youth group and one that obviously appealed to parents as well as youth interested in an extracurricular activity.

The group was primarily dominated by girls. Their officers: President, Yvonne Cordoze; Secretary: Elaine Cook; Assistant Secretary: Bernice Brown; and Treasurer: Gloria Christian was completely dominated by the female membership.[46] Despite this, the organization did not stress traditional gender roles. The group put on their own plays, wrote their own constitution, and had their own musical performances.[47] They were also encouraged to help build the organization through paying dues or providing "what they (could)".[48]

The group's lessons were specifically aimed at promoting African and African American history. The meetings were frequently courses on specific issues, geographic locations, or historical figures central to African history. One particular lesson focused on Egypt and Ethiopia, the "seat of the highest culture in the world".[49] At times, students were required to complete homework assignments to assure they had learned their lessons. Cadet Corps members attended the lecture and were expected to take notes and commit this knowledge to memory. To assure the students focused on their work there was a homework assignment asking them to compare and contrast Ethiopia and Egypt and describe and ancient city among other tasks.[50] These lessons were important because they supplemented the white-centered education students received at school with Afro-centric knowledge that was exceedingly rare (if not non-existent) in schools throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Cadet Corps members were able to take pride in an African heritage that included some of the earliest and most advanced civilizations in the ancient world. In addition to these history lessons, the group put on events as well. They raised

money through plays, Christmas Caroling, and parties such as the "Peanut Hunt" in 1939.[51]

The Juvenile Cadet Corps was a formidable force for youth during this period. Not only did they share important history with African American children that would not have been widely available during this period, but they also groomed the children to be Central Division members. They memorized and studied the UNIA Constitution originally composed by Garvey in the 1910s and formed their own constitution based on what they read. They learned the history of the UNIA and of its historic value to the community and began to understand the greater significance of their own Central Division branch. Furthermore, the formation of this club gave Central Division kids a sense of unity and purpose within the organization. The Central Division was not an "adults only" organization, it was inclusive and everyone had their role in keeping it vital and vibrant during the 1930s and 1940s.

Taken individually the Lucky 9s, the Black Cross Nurses, the Chorus Singers, and the youth program seem like discordant and ineffective measures which had little practical impact. Taken together, they show the tenacity, commitment, and adaptability of the Central Division. By putting on local events and raising money through dues, concerts, plays, etc these groups were able to reinforce the image of the Central Division throughout Harlem as well as make the group stronger by forming smaller units. Faced with the reality that huge meetings of membership were no longer practical due to facilities and monetary concerns the group moved from a concentration on large scale demonstration to a series of tight knit groups that could meet at an individual residence and contribute in their own ways. Some of these groups had more monetary success than

others, but they all added something to both the Central Division and the Harlem community that was sorely lacking during this period. The Lucky 9's offered a social outlet, the Nurses visited the sick in the hospital, the Singers put on concerts, and the youth program gave kids a place to go and learn about Garvey and African history after school. These measures all helped to make Harlem a friendlier place to live and make the Central Division a significant force on the landscape.

In addition to these smaller groups, the Central Division frequently came together as a larger unit for various events. These events combined with the smaller units of the Central Division, and the Central Unemployed Division formed the majority of Central Division operations. Some of the most notable and valuable events the Captain King's group sponsored were a trip to Philadelphia and a Christmas party. While there were many more events the Central Division had a hand in promoting these two were important because of what they offered members as well as the local community as whole.[52] They illustrate the Central Division's focus on the local aspects of the Central Division and on practical measures to improve the lives of Harlem residents both members and non-members alike.

The first of these events was a Christmas party the Central Division sponsored in 1940. The party was held on Friday, December 27 in order to "make this Christmas a cheerful one for the children".[53] This event was put on for the children of the Central Division as well as any guests they wanted to bring.[54] The party was conducted free of charge and children between two and 16 were welcome to attend. Children attending the party received gifts (many of which were donated by Central Division members).[55] Offering a Christmas Party free of charge was of great service to the membership for

various obvious reasons. Children whose families had been hit hard by the Depression and were unable to provide presents during Christmas were able to take their children to this Central Division event and receive various presents. Furthermore, the event was not strictly limited to Central Division membership. Children affiliated even loosely with the organization were welcome to attend and take part in the Christmas party and receive gifts which they may have otherwise never gotten.

A much larger event that the Central Division sponsored was a bus trip to Philadelphia planned for June of 1935. This bus trip was booked through the Allied Motor Company by King for the purposes of a day trip to Philadelphia. The trip began at 8:30am and was to return around 10-12 p.m..[56] The Central Division rented a large 41 passenger bus described by the Motor Company as the "very finest obtainable" for $62 for the day trip.[57] On Sunday, July 2 some of the membership of the Central Division embarked upon a trip to Philadelphia presumably to see the sights of the city, visit family and friends, and meet with other UNIA members.

While the aftermath of the trip included a payment dispute the Allied Motor Co (the Central Division was charged more than the estimate), the trip itself was pleasant and the members enjoyed themselves. Events like this one show that the Central Division's smaller clubs and groups were at times able to pool their resources set aside their differences and generate enough money for a significant event that would have otherwise been impossible. It was unlikely that most members of the Central Division would be able to afford a rather expensive trip across state lines on their own. The Central Division offered them that chance during the 1930s. While these trips were not weekly occurrences, they certainly did have a positive impact when they did occur. People who

did not own automobiles and had very little means of long distance travel were able to take the rare opportunity to get out of the New York and sight see, meet with family, and bond as an organization. This trip was a welcome change of pace from both the personal struggle to survive and the organization's struggle to survive. The Philadelphia trip speaks to both the unity of the Central Division as well as the continued viability of the group.

While the majority of the Central Division's time, energy, and resources went into local groups such as the Black Cross Nurses and events such as parties, trips, and parades the Central Division did not completely forsake the national level politics that had made the UNIA such a force worldwide during the 1920s. They were still very active in getting their voice heard whenever possible at least on a city wide level. While the group's decline and lack of resources made it impossible for them to speak to a national audience as Garvey had, they remained relevant on the New York landscape and were still seen as a powerful ally by many respected forces in the community. They continued to speak as they believed Garvey would have and take stands on issued that were relevant to the African American population.

This section shows how the Central Division continued to take stands on these issues by highlighting a couple of the subjects that King and the Central Division were most passionate about. Two of the issues that the Central Division took on most strongly were the support for Theodore Bilbo's Greater Liberia Act, and the defense of Ethiopia against foreign invaders during World War II. These issues should not be seen as a definitive list, King was active politically throughout the late 1930s and voiced his opinions on a number of issues. The membership and leadership of the Central Division

was a fixture in various movements throughout the Harlem community. Many groups focusing on a myriad of events proposed alliances with the UNIA amongst other groups. One example of this is an invitation King received to take part in a meeting focusing on protesting the Scottsboro case in the late 1930s.[58]

Despite this wide range of participation, the Central Division took on a few issues as those that were most directly related to their Garvey-inspired platform. The first issue that King and the Central Division strongly supported was the Greater Liberia Act or "Bilbo Bill" as it was known throughout the Central Division. The Central Division, or "what is left of the UNIA" as they were known, worked under Mittie Maude Lena Gordon's Peace Movement of Ethiopia to help get the Bill passed and show African American support.[59] The Act, proposed by Senator Theodore Bilbo a Democrat from Mississippi, was a measure to help France and Great Britain pay back their war debts while offering an opportunity for (primarily African American) migrants to leave the United States and begin a new life in Liberia with significant financial aid from the American government.

The Central Division retraced the steps of Garvey in the 1930s when they found an unlikely ally in Senator Bilbo. Much like when Garvey met the Edward Young, Clarke, the imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan in 1922, the Central Division overlooked racial hostility in order to open the door to achieving their goal of creating a strong African nation.[60] Garvey and Clarke were able to come to an agreement because the UNIA's program discouraging racial mixing was compatible with the Klan's similar views.[61] The Central Division supported Bilbo's plans for much the same reason, they saw the bill as a mutually beneficial measure, despite its source.

Detractors of Senator Bilbo had a lifetime of racism propagated by Bilbo to support their case. Bilbo was unapologetically and very vocally "anti-Negro" and had a strong record to support this characterization. He was born in 1897 in Pearl River County, one of the southern most counties in Mississippi. Despite attending but not graduating from either Peabody College or Vanderbilt Law School Bilbo was able to parlay this into a successful political career that lasted from 1908 until 1947 when he died as he was about to take office under protest from various members of Congress. During his early career Bilbo served as a state senator, Lieutenant Governor, and finally as governor of Mississippi from 1916-1920 and 1928-1932. By 1934, Bilbo had used his fiery personality, penchant for debate, and at times out and out intimidation to win a seat in the United States Senate.

Throughout his 12 year career as a United States senator Bilbo feuded with various congressmen and frequently supported and presented legislation that was hostile to African Americans. Bilbo not only promoted legislation that proposed African American emigration, but also was an open critic of African American voters gaining the franchise. At one point before he was scheduled to take his seat in the U.S. Congress in 1947 Bilbo was accused of openly inciting violence against African American voters. He also plainly stated his opinion in 1945 when he declared that his goal was to "keep the niggers away from the polls".[62] Bilbo also wrote his defining work in 1939 entitled *Take Your Choice, Mongrelization or Separation* in which he stated that the civil rights movement had reached "alarming proportions" and that race mixing would lead to "a mixed-race-mongrels-product of sin itself".[63]

Many African Americans justifiably saw the Bilbo Bill as an extension of Bilbo's venomously racist record. The Bill was born out of France and Great Britain's sizable war debts incurred over both World Wars. It called for the United States to take possession of no more than 400,000 square miles of territory adjacent to the American holding of Liberia in exchange for the United States waiving a good portion of European war debts. In addition to taking the land the Bill provided for American purchase of various goods, service, transportation, and pre-existing facilities through the same method as the purchase of the land: by waiving war debts.[64]

After the land was acquired, the new "Greater Republic of Liberia" was to be taken over by an American military government until a system of governance could be set up by the American Congress. The military governor would be responsible for taking possession of new American holdings, prevention of crime, smuggling, and policy making. In order to achieve these goals the military governor was to have a budget with which he could hire additional officers and experts to help with various issues such as health, building of roads, draining of marshlands, etc.[65] The military governor was to be supported in the American government through a newly created Bureau of Colonization that operated as a part of the American Department of the Interior. Eventually this military government was to be transitioned into a more Liberian-centered form of government for long term governance.

In order to secure the land for the new immigrants, the military governor would be able to recruit three "war strength divisions" between the ages of 21 and 50 of labor troops to help with the work of preparing the land for settlement, defending the land, and taking over from the former colonial governments.[66] These soldiers were to be paid at

the same rate as those in the United States Army. Many of the supplies and shipping equipment were to be provided by the debtor nations of France and Great Britain, the costs to be incurred by the war debt.[67]

The Bilbo Bill also outlined a plan to create an entire governmental structure in "Greater Liberia". There were to be special appointments for experts in healthcare, public works, banking, and utilities, and agriculture.[68] These ministers were to oversee the implementation of the new "organization" for the newly acquired lands.[69] Furthermore, Bilbo's plan called for the creation of the Greater Liberia Corporation. This was to be the center for utilities such as water and electricity and migrants could invest in this company through either stocks or bonds valued at $10 each.[70] Bilbo put a great deal of thought and proposed a great deal of money to get this program off the ground and while he never mentioned African Americans by name, his well known fear of race mixing combined with the support of African American emigration advocators made it very clear who this bill was directed at.

Those who wished to migrate first were forced to meet certain requirements. They must be between 21 and 50, be in good health, not be a convict or fleeing justice, and they would not be able to flee creditors without their written consent.[71] Migrants could expect to have all of their expenses incurred by the American government. Travel costs, food costs, and healthcare concerns were all to be handled by government funds.[72] Once they arrived in Liberia migrants would be a given a maximum of $300 for clothing, $300 for work related expenses, and up to $1 per day for food for up to 50 days.[73] Furthermore, migrants coming from the United States would have access to cheap land as well as pre-constructed housing built by the government.[74] Migrants who wanted to

make Greater Liberia their home permanently could also change their citizenship from American to Liberian.

This type of revitalization was not unlike what Garvey proposed in the 1920s. The expansion of the Liberian territory fueled by the government's money presented an attractive opportunity for African Americans in the United States. Whereas land had always been something African Americans were blocked from, Liberia offered the opportunity to start over and be a land owner in either a rural or urban setting (Bilbo's plan offered both). These were ideas that Captain King and the Central division supported. Despite the fact that the opportunity might have been offered from an unsavory source, this was a matter the Central Division was willing to overlook based on the huge potential the plan offered. Immobilized on the front of large scale international operations by a lack of funds and membership, the Central Division saw this as an opportunity to reevaluate some of the possibilities that had been previously dismissed as unfeasible. By utilizing American money, African Americans might be able to pursue Garvey's aims without having to fund it all themselves.

Captain King and Bilbo frequently spoke vie mailed messages. They had very cordial relations and the letters were always very businesslike and included all of the usual niceties.[75] Bilbo saw that the only way for his plan to get off the ground was through African American support and King was one of his strongest allies on this front. While the Central Division did not collect millions of signatures stating interest in the plan as Mittie Gordon's Peace Movement of Ethiopia did, King did what he could to stir up enthusiasm around the New York area.

The primary way that the Central Division spread the word about the Bilbo Bill was through distributing copies of both the Bill and the speech throughout Harlem. Bilbo often sent copies of the Bill and his speeches in support to King for him to distribute amongst UNIA members or on the street.[76] Likewise King kept Bilbo advised as to how the Bill was being received and sent him newspaper articles from opposing African American leadership. Bilbo encouraged King by saying that African American opponents of the Bill were "living off the fat of the land by exploiting their own race" and that the solution they were working on was a "service" to both the black and white races.[77]

While Bilbo's intentions were certainly based in deep seeded race hatred and concern that African American movements for equality were picking up steam, his plan coincides fairly well with the aims of 1920s Garveyism. While certainly King and the Central Division as well as Mittie Gordon's group would much rather have this coordinated by African American self help movements, this was simply not feasible by the late 1930s. The moment had passed when African Americans would be able to fund the program themselves. King and Gordon were not ignorant of the record of Senator Bilbo. It was no secret that he was a vehement racist and that this plan was aimed at African American removal. However, in the spirit of Garvey's cooperation with the KKK, King decided to deal with the enemy in hopes of making things better for the Central Division and of restoring the legacy of Garveyism. Had the Central Division been able to make the move they might have been able to fulfill Garvey's dream of a strong African nation by living amongst like minded people and having a receptive audience.

Ultimately, Bilbo's dream never came to fruition, support of Gordon and King notwithstanding. However, the Central Division's contributions to this movement show that they still had certain national goals even if they were unsuccessful in carrying them out. They distributed hundreds of speeches and bills throughout the community and brought considerable attention to this issue on a local level. While they may have had to keep undesirable company in their quest to establish a strong nation in Africa, King and the Central Division continued to promote Garvey's ideals in whatever ways they could given their limited budget, membership, and national exposure.

The second issue the Central Division was very passionate about was the defense of Ethiopia against Italian invaders. The story of the conflict between the Italians and Ethiopians began late in the 19th century as the European scramble for Africa concluded, though Italian interest in the African nation dated back around 1857.[78] After the most powerful nations had taken the largest and most desirable of the African colonies Italy was left with only Eritrea and Somalia. Seeking to increase its holdings in Africa as well as create a land bridge between its holdings Italy sought to overtake Ethiopia, one of only two independent nations remaining in Africa after the scramble.

This first war, the First Italo-Ethiopian War, was waged between 1895 and 1896. The brief war culminated with the Battle of Adowa.[79] Italian forces numbering around 17,700 armed with 56 artillery pieces and made up of both Italian and African recruited troops had reached a standoff near Adowa.[80] Italian troops, inexperienced and equipped with outdated weapons and maps were attempting to wait out the Ethiopian troops who had presumably been living off of the land during a lengthy siege. The Ethiopians, numbering over 150,000 had indeed been utilizing the local resources to survive during

the siege.[81] However, as the Italians planned their attack they did not know the Ethiopians were simultaneously planning an offensive against them due to low supplies and their exhausting of the local resources. Already outnumbered, Italian troops were split and their poor maps led to further confusion between the different detachments. The Italians were routed, though not driven from their colonial holdings by the Ethiopians. The result of the First Italo-Ethiopian War was the Treaty of Addis Ababa which forced Italy to formally recognize Ethiopia as an independent state.

This loss left a sour taste in the mouths of Italians and was remembered as a notorious military failure by the 1930s.[82] This was a failure that Italian dictator Benito Mussolini was determined to correct. Mussolini had a strong desire to compete with other European powers and establish a strong Italian empire and he saw no better place to begin than with conquest of Ethiopia. The aggression began with a violation of the 1928 Italo-Ethiopian Treaty which established boundaries between Italian Somaliland and Ethiopia. Italians built a fort at Walwal Oasis in disputed territory in 1930. This incursion was protested by Ethiopia in 1934 and there was a skirmish leaving 150 Ethiopians and 50 Italians dead. Shortly after the League of Nations declared neither country negligent for this incident in September 935 Italian forces began to build upon around the border of Ethiopia.

Emperor Haile Selassie, leader of Ethiopia, began to immediately mobilize troops fearing an attack. He gathered 350,000 Ethiopians to defend the borders. Despite these efforts, the Ethiopians were badly outmatched. Many of the Ethiopian troops wielded outdated weapons such as bows and spears and their firearms were badly dated late 19th century models. [83] Under Generals De Bono and later Badoglio the Italians had little

trouble taking control of Ethiopia. Italian forces were brutal in their destruction of Ethiopia. Violating the 1925 Geneva Protocol they had signed, Italian troops utilized liberal amounts of mustard gas on both Ethiopian troops and civilians.[84]

Italian rule lasted from 1936 until 1941 when Ethiopia was liberated by the British led East Africa campaign against Italy. Italy's overt aggression against Ethiopia brought with it a series of condemnations from a variety of sources. This violent play for territory was critiqued by European powers and violated the international law laid out by League of Nations. Italy faced sanctions from League of Nations membership and was publicly attacked not only for their aggression but for the use of mustard gas, the killing of civilians, and war atrocities.

African Americans were among some of the strongest critics of Italy during this period and the Central Division was no exception. In the mid 1930s the invasion of Italy was one of the most talked about issues in Harlem and it stirred the passions of many African Americans. Ethiopia represented the last bastion of African self rule after the continent was divided by European powers. By the 1920s only 3% of Africa remained free of European rule: Ethiopia and Liberia. The loss of Ethiopia via blatant European aggression was the last straw for many African Americans closely watching the situation in Africa and a series of groups rose up to loudly protest the invasion and send aid to Ethiopia.

Garveyites were among these groups and in many cases spearheaded the efforts. Historically tied to Africa and seeing the continent as the key to salvation for black people worldwide, UNIA members quickly organized and teamed with local groups such as the Provincial Committee for the Defense of Ethiopia, the Universal Ethiopian

Students Association, and the Ethiopian Coptic Church.[85] These groups along with the Central Division helped to both collect relief funds for Ethiopians as well as to protest the war. While the Central Division was an important component in this movement, this was really a coalition effort amongst several groups.

Alliances and coalitions to support the people of Ethiopia against Italian invaders shifted quickly and frequently. On one hand these groups were all united in their goal of protest and aid to the struggling nation, however to say they formed a united front and worked together without conflict in all cases would be an overstatement. Alliances formed and there was cooperation, but there was also a sense of competition between the groups for authenticity and representation of the protest position. Each group ideally sought to be at the head of the movement and occasionally this caused friction between them. At times, King himself even expressed concern that the Central Division was falling behind other groups in the Ethiopian cause and losing face in the community because of it.

Despite this competition, the groups usually did not resort to open hostilities and had great success when they did decide to combine forces for combined events. The events and protests can be divided into a few key categories: fundraisers, marches and meetings for peace, the distribution and creation of protest literature and the hosting of informational speakers. Each of these different events frequently involved the Central Division working side by side with one of the various protest groups active in Harlem. While permanent binding alliances were infrequent, cooperation between the Central Division and other groups on individual projects was common.

One of the most common ways that Harlemites aided the cause of Ethiopia was through fundraisers. Various groups throughout the community put on a wide variety of social events in order to raise money for the occupied Ethiopians. These events were intended both as a social outlet for the community as well as an opportunity for the community to pool its resources and help the Ethiopian cause. One group that frequently put on these events was the Ethiopian Social Club which worked with the Central Division to publicize its events and make sure they were well attended. The Social Club, first organized in January of 1930, was a well established group that held a similar officer structure to various Central Division groups containing various leaders, secretaries, and treasurers.[86]

One example of the type of events the Central Division, the Social Club, and various other groups in the community would put on was a Benefit Dance on January 18, 1936.[87] The Benefit Dance was intended to provide medical care for Ethiopians who were "left to perish for lack of medical care" and was co-sponsored by the Ethiopian Social Club and the Medical Defense Committee of Ethiopia.[88] For 39 cents attendees of the Benefit Dance were able to enjoy music from the Ethiopian Club Orchestra and an evening of dancing. These types of events were fairly common during this period and showed the commitment of the community to aiding Ethiopia.

While most of these events were not single-handedly sponsored by the Central Division, the groups who did sponsor these events saw the importance and value in cooperating with the Central Division as a partner to both promote the events and gain additional attendees. Groups such as the Ethiopian Students Association pledged their support to any "concrete effort" to aid in the Ethiopian cause by the Central Division.[89]

Other groups requested the UNIA presence at important events. The Ethiopian World Federation implored the Central Division to cooperate with them both in their meetings as well as in their demonstrations.[90] These as well as many other smaller groups for the aid of Ethiopia asked for Central Division cooperation, aid, facilities, attendance, or participation in various events.[91]

In addition to various events the Central Division was also involved in both public protests and the distribution of literature about the plight of Ethiopia. The Central Division was both a target for pro-Ethiopia propaganda as well as a group that local protestors could count on to help bolster the attendance at meetings protesting Italy's invasion of Ethiopia. Most frequently, these came in the form of flyers, pro-Ethiopia news articles, and articles emphasizing the importance of Ethiopia's history to black people worldwide. Meeting minutes distributed to the Central Division encouraged Harlemites to "buy black","Join the Army", and boycott "all Italians and Italian merchandise.[92] Other flyers advertised mass marches to boycott Italy's invasion of Ethiopia. One flyer distributed by the Central Division prominently advertised a speech by King and featured a quote from the Central Division leader in support of Ethiopia denouncing "the slaughter of my people in Ethiopia".[93] Other flyers distributed in late 1935 called for a "Monster Mass Meeting" and featured different guest speakers with various perspectives on the Ethiopian crisis.[94]

The outcry throughout Harlem in defense and sympathy with Ethiopia was tremendous. Many different groups sprung up in order to protest the Italian invasion and the Central Division was definitely in coalition with a great deal of them. To determine which group was the leading force behind the protests is difficult to ascertain and beyond

the scope of this study. However, what is clear beyond a shadow of a doubt was that Central Division members were working very hard to make their voices heard on this international stage. They were helping to organize protests, marches, benefit parties, and their attendance at these events was central in getting them noticed by authorities and bringing the cause of Ethiopian victimization to the forefront of local politics.

While the Central Division and its allies might not have had a great deal of success in swaying the distant forces of international politics, they were demonstrating that the UNIA in Harlem was still a force to be reckoned with well into the 1930s and early 1940s. King and his officers had swayed the Central Division and moved it more toward local self-help, but they had not abandoned the politics of Garvey. And, despite the fact that Garvey himself was not an outspoken critic of the invasion, extrapolated what Garvey might have done had he been in Harlem during this invasion with a strong UNIA to back him. This protest of Ethiopia represents an extension of the spirit of Garveyism throughout the Central Division. Garvey often operated on an international level and commented about a plethora of issues on which he had little hope of achieving much response from powerful forces such as the American government and British Empire. Captain King continued to operate in this tradition when he threw the support of the Central Division into protesting the Italian invasion.

At the most basic levels Garveyism throughout the 1920s saw Africa as the best opportunity for worldwide black redemption. Garvey's failed negotiations with Liberia, his frequent speeches about the important of African history, his desire to establish a strong black nation in Africa, and his scathing critiques of colonial powers in the continent made this clear. The Central Division members clung to this idea, even as

Garvey himself had grown conservative as he neared an untimely death in the late 1930s. Faced with dire local problems and a population in desperate need of local aid King did reshape the Central Division to meet the needs of the membership and the community at large. However, he did not abandon the ideas of Garvey and turn the UNIA into a simple self help service. While he did de-emphasize the international and less pragmatic goals of the 1920s UNIA, he used the Ethiopian invasion as a way to re-establish the UNIA as an international critic and a place for black people across the city to look to as these grave injustices were carried out against the one remaining bastion of African independence. The Central Division was a different organization from the one Garvey headed throughout the 1910s and 1920s in Harlem. They focused more on getting the unemployed jobs, putting on social events as fundraisers, and making people's lives better in small but important ways. However, the Central Division was as active as anyone when it came to the defense of African independence and atrocities against Africans committed during the occupation of the Ethiopia. The Central Division had reformed, but it still clung to many of the basic tenets that had made the UNIA so appealing to African Americans during the glory days of the 1910s and 1920s.

Notes

[1] Robert Hill and Barbara Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 207.
[2]Lucky 9 Club, Meeting Minutes January 10, 1934, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Lucky 9 Club" Minutes of Meetings Jan 3, 1934 – Oct 11, 1935 U.N.I.A. Central Div ".
[3] Lucky 9 Club, Meeting Minutes January 10, 1934, Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Lucky 9 Club" Minutes of Meetings Jan 3, 1934 – Oct 11, 1935 U.N.I.A. Central Div ".
[4] Minutes of Meetings Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938". Throughout these meeting minutes these three problems are re-occurring themes showing up throughout the collection of minutes in various ways.
[5] Minutes of Meetings, March 22, 1938. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938".
[6] Minutes of Meetings, March 29, 1938. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938".
[7] Minutes of Meetings, December 20 1938. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938".
[8] Minutes of Meetings, December 20, 1938. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938".
[9] Minutes of Meetings Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Diiv – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938".
[10] Minutes of Meetings July 19, 1938. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938". The "close ranks" comment can be found here.
Minutes of Meetings April 12, 1939 Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938". The need to stop insubordination within the Central Division is found here.
[11] Minutes of Meetings, April 12, 1939. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938".
[12] Minutes of Meetings, February 1940. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938". Sibley specifically objected to a beauty pageant that was being supported.
[13] Minutes of Meetings October 24, 1939. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938". Sibley submitted a three point grievance to the Central Division complaining about the above mentioned issues.
[14] Minutes of Meetings October 24, 1939. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938".
[15] Minutes of Meetings July 12, 1939. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Boxes 6-7, Folders c38-c44. "N.Y. Div "Central Div – Minutes of Meetings Jan 19- Dec 22, 1938".
[16] Letter from E. Brown to Captain King October 17, 1935. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folders d9. "Corresp. – Brown, E. 1935-1940 U.N.I.A. Central Div.".
[17] Deborah Gray White, *Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves 1894-1994* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999). 25-30.

[18] Minutes of Lucky 9 Club. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folders b5. "N.Y. Div – "Lucky 9 Club" Minutes of Meetings Jan. 3, 1934 – Oct. 11, 1935 U.N.I.A. Central Div.". Meeting times vary somewhat throughout the given sources, but 10pm is a fairly common start time.

[19] Minutes of Lucky 9 Club. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folders b5. "N.Y. Div – "Lucky 9 Club" Minutes of Meetings Jan. 3, 1934 – Oct. 11, 1935 U.N.I.A. Central Div.".

[20] Lucky 9 Club Membership and Budget Book. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folders b5. "N.Y. Div – "Lucky 9 Club" Minutes of Meetings Jan. 3, 1934 – Oct. 11, 1935 U.N.I.A. Central Div.". This number is gleaned from counting the different names featured throughout the book. There is no comprehensive list of the membership with names and addresses. There are various lists of monetary contributions, presumably scores from card games, and to do lists. It seems likely that there were women who participated whose names would not appear in this incomplete book for one reason or another.

[21] Minutes of Lucky 9 Club. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folders b5. "N.Y. Div – "Lucky 9 Club" Minutes of Meetings Jan. 3, 1934 – Oct. 11, 1935 U.N.I.A. Central Div.".

[22] Minutes of Lucky 9 Club. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folders b5. "N.Y. Div – "Lucky 9 Club" Minutes of Meetings Jan. 3, 1934 – Oct. 11, 1935 U.N.I.A. Central Div.".

[23] Minutes of Lucky 9 Club. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folders b5. "N.Y. Div – "Lucky 9 Club" Minutes of Meetings Jan. 3, 1934 – Oct. 11, 1935 U.N.I.A. Central Div.".

[24] Minutes of Lucky 9 Club. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 5, Folders b5. "N.Y. Div – "Lucky 9 Club" Minutes of Meetings Jan. 3, 1934 – Oct. 11, 1935 U.N.I.A. Central Div.".

[25] Minutes of Black Cross Nurses October 10, 1939. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c32. "Central Div. – Black Cross Nurses, Minutes of Meetings – 1939-1940. U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[26] Minutes of Black Cross Nurses. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c32. "Central Div. – Black Cross Nurses, Minutes of Meetings – 1939-1940. U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[27] Minutes of Black Cross Nurses. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c32. "Central Div. – Black Cross Nurses, Minutes of Meetings – 1939-1940. U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[28] Minutes of Black Cross Nurses. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c32. "Central Div. – Black Cross Nurses, Minutes of Meetings – 1939-1940. U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[29] Minutes of Black Cross Nurses. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c54. "Central Div. – Black Cross Nurses, Minutes of Meetings – 1939-1940. U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[30] Minutes of Black Cross Nurses. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c32. "Central Div. – Black Cross Nurses, Minutes of Meetings – 1939-1940. U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[31] Minutes of Black Cross Nurses. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c54. "Central Div. – Black Cross Nurses, Minutes of Meetings – 1939-1940. U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[32] Minutes of Black Cross Nurses. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c54. "Central Div. – Black Cross Nurses, Minutes of Meetings – 1939-1940. U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[33] Minutes of Black Cross Nurses. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6, Folder c54. "Central Div. – Black Cross Nurses, Minutes of Meetings – 1939-1940. U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[34] Central Div – Central Choral Singers. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 6 c34-c35. "Central Div – Central Choral Singers Financial Records 1941-1942".

[35] Roll Book – Central Youth Circle. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7 c45. "Central Div – Central Youth Circle roll book, n.d."; Central Div – Central Youth League. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c46. "Central Div – Central Youth League".
[36] Central Div – Central Youth League. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c46. "Central Div – Central Youth League". This number is taken from a roll book produced by the group. It is unlikely that all 40 members were ever present. The group includes a variety of members some who may have only attended one meeting, others who attended faithfully. It is also very possible that this is not an exhaustive list of the membership of the youth group. A fair estimate for a typical meeting would be between 8-15 members on a given day however, which members were there could vary quite a bit.
[37] Meeting Minutes. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c46. "Central Div – Central Youth League".
[38] Meeting Minutes. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c46. "Central Div – Central Youth League".
[39] Expenses for Party. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c46. "Central Div – Central Youth League".
[40] Meeting Minutes. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c46. "Central Div – Central Youth League". The records are not explicit about the number of events held or the budgets of the events, there are various receipts and records of at least two dances being planned, a series of receipts for various expenses, and roll books. It seems likely that a majority of the records of the Youth League did not survive.
[41] Central Division Applications. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c51-c52. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[42] Central Division Applications. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c51. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[43] Central Division Applications. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c51. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[44] Central Division Applications. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c51. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[45] Central Division Applications. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c51. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div." While there is no way to discern how many of these kids actually attended the meetings with any regularity the permission slip represents a firm commitment to the group and indicates that joining should not be something taken lightly. There is good reason to believe that many of the applications and permission slips translated to actual committed membership.
[46] Meeting Minutes. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c52. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[47] Meeting Minutes. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c51. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[48] Meeting Minutes. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c51. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[49] Meeting Minutes. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c53. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[50] Lesson Plan. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c51. "Central Div – Juvenile Department – Attendance and Membership Book 1939-1942."
[51] Meeting Minutes. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 7, Folder c51. "Central Div – Juvenile Cadet Corps Applic. And Reg. Blanks, 1941 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[52] The Central Division hosted a series of dances, an Anniversary celebration for the group, parades, and mass meetings. I have chosen these two instances as a representation of the unique services offered by the

Central Division. Correspondence. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d1. "Correspondence, A 1934-1945 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[53] Form Letter from C. Cordoze November 26, 1940. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 10, Folder c61. "Corresp. Parris, Euston 1937-1944 (Includes Report of Negro Emancipation Celebration) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[54] Form Letter from C. Cordoze November 26, 1940. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 10, Folder c61. "Corresp. Parris, Euston 1937-1944 (Includes Report of Negro Emancipation Celebration) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[55] Form Letter from C. Cordoze November 26, 1940. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 10, Folder c61. "Corresp. Parris, Euston 1937-1944 (Includes Report of Negro Emancipation Celebration) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[56] Letter from Captain King to Allied Motor Co. Correspondence. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d1. "Correspondence, A 1934-1945 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[57] Letter from Allied Motor Co. to Captain A.L. King Correspondence. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d1. "Correspondence, A 1934-1945 U.N.I.A. Central Div."
[58] Letter to Captain A.L. King Correspondence. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box XX, Folder e149.
[59] "Mr. Bilbo's Afflatus", *Time Magazine,* May 8, 1939.
[60] Martin, *Race First,* 345-347.
[61] Martin, *Race First,* 345-347.
[62] *Time Magazine,* July 1, 1946, p. 23. cited in Robert Fleegler, "Theodore G. Bilbo and the Decline of Public Racism 1938-1948", *Journal of Mississippi History* XX.
[63] Theodore G. Bilbo, *Take Your Choice: Separation or Mongrelization.* (Poplarville, Mississippi: Dreamhouse Publishing Company, 1947) Chapter 1.
[64] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 3-5.
[65] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 6-8.
[66] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 3-5.
[67] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 3-5.
[68] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 3-5.
[69] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 3-5.
[70] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 3-5.
[71] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 14-16.
[72] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 16-18.
[73] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 16-18.
[74] Senate Bill S. 2231. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division". 24-26.
[75] Letters from Bilbo to King and King to Bilbo. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division"
[76] Letter from Bilbo to King, June 2, 1939. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division".

[77] Letter from Bilbo to King, May 28, 1939. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 8, Folder d5. "Corresp. Bilbo, Sen. Theodore g. (Dem-Miss.) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[78] Robert L. Hess, "Italian Imperialism in Its Ethiopian Context", *International Journal of African Historical Studies,* Vol. 6, No. 1. (1973), 94-96.
[79] F. Ernest Work, "Italo-Ethiopian Relations", *Journal of Negro History,* Vol. 20, No. 4, (Oct. 1935), 442-444.
[80] David Levering Lewis, *The Race to Fashoda: European Colonialism and African Resistance in the Scramble for Africa* (New York: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1987), 116f.
[81] Richard Pankhurst, *Economic History of Ethiopia* (Addis Ababa: Haile Sellassie I University Press, 1968), 555-557.
[82] William R. Scott. *Sons of Sheba's Race: Afro-Americans and the Italo-Ethiopian War* Ph.D. dissertation, 1982, 1.
[83] Pankhurst, *Economic History of Ethiopia*, 605-608.
[84] Angelo Del Boca, *I Gas de Mussolini.* (Rome: Editori Ruiniti, 1996). This study features accounts of Italian use of gas in World War II, specifically against Ethiopia.
[85] Letter from Edwin H. Collins to King, November 19, 1937. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 918-1959. Box 8, Folder d12. "Corresp. Collins, Edwin H. Bishop – Coptic Orthodox Church U.N.I.A. Central Division"; Letter from The Friends of Ethiopia in America to King, 1/4/1936. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 918-1959. Box 11, Folder e51. "Subj. and Organ. –Ethiopia (Misc.) U.N.I.A. Central Division"; Letter from Jas Brown to King, February 19, 1935. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 918-1959. Box 11, Folder e56. "Subj, and Organ. – Ethiopian Students Association, U.N.I.A. Central Division". Each of these groups had various correspondence with King regarding the "common cause" and the aid of Ethiopia.
[86] Letter from Ethiopian Social Club to King, December 1935. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e55. "Subj. and Org.- Ethiopian Social Club. U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[87] Letter from Ethiopian Social Club to King, December 1935. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e55. "Subj. and Org.- Ethiopian Social Club. U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[88] Letter from Ethiopian Social Club to King, December 1935. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e55. "Subj. and Org.- Ethiopian Social Club. U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[89] Letter from Universal Ethiopian Students Association to King, February 19, 1935. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e56. "Subj. and Org.- Ethiopian Student's Association 1935. U.N.I.A. Central Division". This letter was in response to one that King had sent and expressed the solidarity of the group with the Central Division on behalf of the "common cause".
[90] Letter from Ethiopian World Federation to King, July 14, 1939. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e57. "Subj. and Org.- Ethiopian World Federation 1939-1942. U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[91] Letter from Carl Ferdinand to King, February 3, 1936. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e51. "Subj. and Org.- Ethiopia (Misc.) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[92] Ethiopian Boycott Flyer. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e51. "Subj. and Org.- Ethiopia (Misc.) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[93] Ethiopian March Flyer. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e51. "Subj. and Org.- Ethiopia (Misc.) U.N.I.A. Central Division".
[94] Monster Mass Meeting Flyer. Schomburg Collection, UNIA Records of the Central Division 1918-1959. Box 11, Folder e51. "Subj. and Org.- Ethiopia (Misc.) U.N.I.A. Central Division".

CHAPTER 5: ROOTS OF UNREST: BRITISH CARIBBEAN LABOR

"Yes Gentlemen, we can no longer be denied!"
- Negro World Cartoon, October 5, 1929[1]

Hundreds of miles away from Captain King's Central Division, Garveyites also stirred in the British Caribbean. The conditions and contexts of their day to day lives were vastly different from the urban membership of the Central Division. Many of them lived in rural areas and the urban areas they inhabited lacked much of the infrastructure present in New York City. While the Central Division advocated for relief from established urban District Offices, labor leaders in the British Caribbean were attempting to establish a minimum wage and attempting to convince the government of the British Empire to invest more money in their Caribbean holdings. Lacking much of this infrastructure, they turned to labor unions and leaders to advocate for it on their behalf.

The UNIA did not persist in the British Caribbean the same way it did throughout the United States. Undoubtedly, branches lived on into the 1930s, but Afro-Caribbeans did not utilize this structure in the same way that African Americans did in their urban contexts. Instead, they folded their interests into the labor movement. Carrying with them many of the same techniques for organization as well as Garvey's ideas they utilized this structure to reform the interests of Garveyism into something of practical use during difficult economic times. Garvey himself was not left out of this equation. When he arrived back in the region in 1927, he recommitted himself to representing the interests of the Caribbean colonies. He was active in politics, public speaking, and drew

large audiences wherever he went. In the process, he was also involved in the reshaping and adapting of his own ideas.

Garvey and his supporters increasingly looked for new venues to express newly reformed ideas of racial unity, self-reliance, and self rule. Garvey and his followers no longer sought alliance with Liberia, funded large scale corporations, or even owned businesses in the region. However, the strategies for fundraising, propaganda, and public speaking remained intact and their goals, even scaled down, represented the many of the same basic principles that guided the UNIA in the United States throughout the 1910s and 1920s. As Garveyites turned to labor unions and leaders such as Uriah Butler and Alexander Bustamante, they retained their commitments to Garveyism and saw some of Garvey in their new leadership. While the expressions were different, the commitment was the same.

As the sun rose over the Caribbean island of Trinidad on June 19th, 1937, black smoke billowed into the air from two Apex Company oil wells that had caught fire. This pungent smoke was a signal to the oil workers of the fields that the impending strike had begun. Workers on the Forest Reserve field of Trinidad Leaseholds Limited had already organized and had a sit down strike well underway by the time the signal went up at around 5:30am.[2] Spurred on by the militant demands of their Afro-Caribbean leader, Uriah Butler, and by long unaddressed concerns about unemployment, wages, hours, and a declining standard of living, the strikers settled in for a showdown with the oil barons backed by the full strength of the British military and police forces.

The Trinidad police acted quickly to counteract this show of solidarity among the workers in the Trinidad oil fields. Their first target was Butler, already out of jail on bail

for charges of "obstruction". As police mustered their full strength in direct view of the strikers, investigators worked behind the scenes to locate Butler, and charge him with "using violent language that might cause a breach of peace".[3] By 6pm that day, warrants were issued and Inspector Power was on his way to meet Butler and arrest him in connection with the strike.[4]

Power wasted no time in locating Butler, who was residing in the village of Fyzabad. Police located Butler addressing a crowd of around 200 people and immediately moved to make the arrest. Initially, the crowd did not react to the police presence with hostility. However, after Butler requested the charges against him be read aloud and the police could not accommodate this request the situation turned ugly.[5] Butler turned to the crowd for support, and they responded by hurling "missiles of all descriptions" at his would be captors.[6] The situation degraded into chaos with Butler's supporters trying to help him escape and the police attempting to make the arrest. While the small police force was able to make an arrest it was not without drawing firearms and losing one officer, Corporal King, to the mission.

Over the course of the next few weeks, the working class on the island of Trinidad made their voices heard on a number of occasions. On June 20th, a crowd of "several hundreds" cut the chain securing the oil refinery of Point Fortin and filed in with the goal of burning it to the ground.[7] The crowd stoned buses of police who were being brought in to control the disturbance and only the order to "load" weapons was successful in dispersing the crowd.[8] On the morning of June 22nd in Port-of-Spain, a "mob" shut down local businesses and attempted to intercept a train filled with "rifles and ammunition" to supply British authorities.[9] That same morning a "band of malcontents" numbering 500-

600 demanding pay increases surrounded the police station and were only dispersed by police fire wounding 20 and killing one civilian.[10] Ultimately, it took the introduction of the British military to bring the situation in Trinidad under control, a move that agricultural and oil employers not only endorsed, but encouraged in the future for "maintenance of internal security".[11]

The disruption and discontent voiced by the workers in a variety of Trinidadian industries were not isolated incidents on the island or in the British Caribbean as a whole. Strikes, riots, and aggressive reactions against the British-run system of wage earning erupted throughout the British Caribbean in the 1930s. In 1934 in Jamaica there were labor disturbances at Falmouth, Oracabessa, and at a wharf in Kingston where banana carriers went on strike.[12] In February 1934 in Belize City, Honduras the Unemployment Brigade marched. Throughout the fall of 1934 there were strikes on plantations Leonora, Vitulugt, De Kinderen, and Tuschen in British Guiana.[13] Into 1935, the unrest continued in British Guiana with strikes at six different plantations. In early 1935 on St. Kitts workers refused to cut cane at the offered rate and marched all over the island encouraging labor unrest.[14] Once again, the whole island had to be suppressed by the British military because the strike had become so widespread. Over the next three years strikes continues to be a problem in British holdings, with coal workers going on strike in St. Lucia and Jamaican sugar cane workers refusing to harvest cane for the rates offered. Nearly every possession in the British West Indies erupted into a firestorm of labor rebellion.

This chapter seeks to contextualize these revolts, establish a basic narrative of this period, and finally explore some of the underlying causes. I begin with a general

description of the area, its population, and industries, continue with a brief summary of historical conditions leading up to the revolts, and finally explore the major reasons for the labor revolts in the 1930s. In doing so, this chapter lays the groundwork for chapters five and six which explore the significant Garvey influence and role in the British labor controversy in the 1930s.

The British Caribbean of the 1930s included a broad range of islands as well as a few areas in Central and South America. Specifically the area defined here as the British Caribbean includes Jamaica, Belize (then British Honduras), the Bahamas, the Caicos, the Caymen Islands, St. Kitts, Antigua, Montserrat, Dominca, St. Lucia, Grenada, St. Vincent, Barbados, Trinidad, Tobago, and Guyana (then British Guiana). Overwhelmingly these territories were islands of varying sizes in the Caribbean, the largest being Jamaica numbering around 4,111 square miles. However, this designation also includes a few territories technically located in Central and South America such as Belize and Guyana. While these areas were separated geographically, they were all linked by the network of British authority and law.

The population on these islands in the 1930s was easily topped by Jamaica numbering 1,138,558 in 1936.[15] Following Jamaica was Trinidad (412,783), British Guiana (332,898), the Windward Islands of Grenada, St. Vincent, and St, Kitts (209,846), and the Leeward Islands of Antigua, the British Virgin Islands, and Dominca (139,759).[16] The total population of the British Caribbean during this time period was roughly 2.5 million people.[17] The populations of these islands were largely devoid of Native populations, long since decimated by European disease and the process of colonization. The populations of these areas included a variety nationalities and races including

Europeans, Afro-Caribbeans, Indians, and Chinese.[18] Peoples of African descent numbered the largest group at around 80%, East Indians were around 12%, and whites on average represented only around 3% of the populations of these nations.[19]

Contemporary census reports estimated that 50% of the population of this region was "engaged directly in agriculture" while the other half of the population worked in "commerce, transport, light industry, and domestic service".[20] During the world Depression era of the 1930s, there was also a significant portion of the population that was unemployed. These unemployed workers would often be portrayed as "hooligans" by British authorities and would often join forces with protesting or striking workers due to their similar interests. Issues of unemployment and working conditions during this era frequently became intertwined as workers who were unemployed were largely former employees of striking industries looking to break back into them in desperate economic times.

British Caribbean laborers worked in a number of industries depending upon where they lived. Throughout the Caribbean the most common industries were sugar, oil, lumber, bauxite, pimentos, and coffee.[21] Many of these industries were specialties only available in certain locales. For example, oil was native to Trinidad, lumber to British Honduras, bauxite to British Guiana, and pimentos to Jamaica. If one industry could be said to unite the region, it was sugar. By far the most historically profitable crop, sugar had been grown in the British Caribbean as far back as the 17th century. Sugar had outlasted shifting alliances, wars, the islands changing hands from one colonial power to the next, and even the elimination of its primary labor force in 1834 when slavery was finally abolished throughout the British Empire. Almost none of these products were safe

from the labor upheaval that swept through the region in the 1930s and into the 1940s. Oilfields, sugar plantations, and urban landscapes were all affected in some way by the worker's revolts that characterized this time period.

The labor rebellions in the British Caribbean were deeply rooted in the development of the region reaching back to the slavery era and according to many scholars the "history of labour organization and labour reform... cannot be studied outside nineteenth century trends".[22] Historians of the British Caribbean have been effective in arguing that the history of the Caribbean has by in large been a history of labor.[23] Since colonization in the late 15th century, colonial powers were present in the region vying for control, importing a slave-based labor force, and attempting to devise the most effective methods for withdrawing the region's significant natural resources and exportable staple crops.[24]

European colonialism and expansionism were the driving force in the industrialization of these colonies from the 1600s moving forward. Nigel Bolland has pointed out that the "particularly prolonged and pervasive" colonial experience has been one of the defining characteristics of British Caribbean history.[25] The existing civilizations were caught in the machinery of the colonial vision and completely destroyed. Scholars have characterized these societies less as mixtures of indigenous cultures, European culture, and African culture and more as societies that were "destroyed... and started over".[26] Early colonial powers centered their efforts around re-making the colonies in the vision of industrial profit extractors. Right from the start, these British colonies were built to be little more than outposts built on the principles of capitalism and extraction with little concern for the people working or living on a

permanent basis. In fact, as Eric Williams points out, wealthy British planters and landowners were content to amass sizable fortunes from their Caribbean sugar plantations. However due to the climate and general state of the colonies, "no man will chuse to live there".[27]

Slave owners and slave traders were the first to profit from the ruthlessly efficient system. What began innocuously enough with Sir John Hawkins' inaugural slave trading venture in 1562, developed, starting in the 1660s, into an increasingly profitable way of life in the British Caribbean based on coerced labor. The brutal working conditions and the ruthless ambition of European traders meant that the trade was an ever expanding part of the machines of sugar production. Between 1680 and 1786 one scholar estimates that over two million Africans entered the region while countless others paid the ultimate price traveling the nightmarish middle passage from Africa to the New World.[28] Throughout the early history of this region, the story of sugar production, brutal slave regimes, profiting absentee landowners, and persistent resistance to this order best characterized the British Caribbean.

The extent to which planters profited from slavery has been a hot topic of debate amongst scholars for most of the 20th century and beyond. C. Eric Williams helped to spur much of this debate with his classic 1944 study *Capitalism and Slavery*. Williams argued that the system of slavery paved the way for capitalism and the further development of Britain industrially. In turn, capitalism and the free labor system that emerged at the beginning of the 19th century helped to destroy the system of slavery.[29] While Williams has been challenged many times since, the main point of analysis does not change, slavery profited absentee white planters and a small white majority

tremendously while setting the stage for centuries of exploitation long after the specter of slavery had faded from the British Caribbean landscape.

The blight of slavery on the British Caribbean was wiped away with legislation passed in 1834. The collapse of slavery in the British Caribbean has been a complex historical problem brought about by a variety of factors. A growing abolitionist sensibility throughout the British Empire was one reason why slavery was finally dismantled in the British Caribbean. The age of revolution brought about fundamental changes in the relationships between masters and slaves with the dangerous mix of liberty and violence coming in close proximity to slave societies and shattering the "fragile security of many slaveholding societies".[30] As literature proclaiming the rights of man was produced throughout Europe and the United States to fuel the fires of Revolution, many producers of this literature began to see the idea of fundamental human rights and the chattel slavery as incompatible institutions. Throughout the late 18th and early 19th century, a complex debate raged in Britain which was ultimately a key factor in the destruction of the institution.[31]

This problem of revolutionary rhetoric which was inconsistent with slaveholding societies was not lost on the slaves themselves. Despite colonial officials' best efforts to deny slaves access to this inflammatory rhetoric, most slaves were aware of the debates that fractured European slaveholders and abolitionists. The danger that this type of information presented erupted most spectacularly as smoke from burning sugar cane blotted out the sun in Saint Domingue throughout the last decade of the 18th century.[32] The Haitian revolution was perhaps on the minds of Parliament when they abolished slavery for good in 1834 on the heels of the only major slave revolt in 19th century

Jamaica. The Christmas 1831 revolt had covered over 750 miles and involved close to 20% of the entire Jamaica slave population.[33] This rebellion was particularly disturbing to British planters and citizens in Britain because it was plotted not by long-exploited field workers, but by the most trusted of the slave elite many of whom were literate and worked in close proximity to whites.[34]

Beyond opposition from both abolitionists and the slaves themselves, planters faced the economic reality that the system of slavery was becoming increasingly antiquated as the industrial revolution swept across Britain and her Empire. As capitalism and free-trade ideology spread throughout Britain, the monopoly of slavery was increasingly looked upon as a violation of the new laissez fair system of doing business. East Indians resented the West Indian sugar monopoly and claimed that it was pursued based on tradition rather than sound business practices.[35] In practice, West Indian opponents of West Indian sugar privilege were correct, the British were paying a great deal more for sugar simply to support the West Indian monopoly and in turn the system of slavery.[36] As Williams convincingly argues, the system of slavery which had funded the rise of capitalism "turned and destroyed that system".[37]

Since Williams, scores of scholars have weighed in on the important debate about what caused the system of slavery to ultimately collapse. Many have agreed with Williams, claiming the system of slavery had outlived its usefulness and was collapsed by the power of capitalism. Others claimed that economic arguments were utilized skillfully by abolitionists who had long sought to be rid of the barbarism of slavery.[38] Further studies have cautioned us not to dismiss the slaves themselves and their persistent resistance on a plethora of levels as a major cause for slavery's demise. What is not up

for debate, however, is that the fundamental realities of the British Caribbean did not change with the destruction of slavery. The terms of the battle had changed, but the major sticking points, the combatants, and the terms of work remained the largely the same throughout the 19th century.

The transition from slavery to freedom was a gradual one in the British Caribbean. The most common way British authorities sought to navigate this dangerous liminal period was through an apprenticeship program. Former slaves were expected to spend 40 and one half hours laboring on a weekly basis receiving the same benefits and largely the same treatment they had received under slavery.[39] During their free time, former slaves were encouraged to seek out wage labor and were to be paid fair market wages. Magistrates and Drivers were the key to the system serving roles as judge, teacher, and taskmaster".[40] Magistrates and drivers were responsible for ensuring former slaves put in a full day's work and while punishments were relaxed (though still applies via the lash), the system bore much too close a resemblance to slavery for many former slaves.

The continued prosperity of the British islands was not a priority for freed slaves, and the British colonial vision of freedom was a far cry from what slaves demanded when they demanded abolition and a new system of work. Throughout the Caribbean, and indeed throughout the western hemisphere, slaves defined freedom increasingly in terms of production.[41] British authorities found that former slaves wanted to participate in work that was unsupervised, task related, and unregimented.[42] Furthermore, former slaves were interested in the provision grounds they had farmed for centuries before emancipation. These small holdings offered a substantially greater profits than wage

based plantation labor, required much less labor, and allowed former slaves to escape the lash and gang labor that had characterized black life in the British Caribbean for centuries.

Many former slaves became squatters on crown lands or continued to farm the lands that they had utilized during slavery. The system of provision labor offered slaves the opportunity to define freedom for themselves as well as participate in the free market economy of capitalism and the market. However, it also set a dangerous precedent for the British colonies from an imperial perspective. Former slaves working their own small parcels of land left sugar production on a steep decline. Without the black population laboring on the plantations, the British Caribbean lost great viability as a profitable part of the Empire.

British authorities and former slaves jousted over these issues for decades as the 20th century approached.[43] Former slaves continued attempts to define labor on their own terms, and British officials continued to disapprove of their definitions and attempted to force them to participate in the system of labor that would best benefit the Empire. White Caribbeans continued to skillfully maintain power, promote democracy, free markets, and capitalism while denying many of the base tenets of these lofty ideals to former slaves. While the black population outnumbered the white population handily, the power in the islands continued to rest with the white minority.[44]

In addition to protracted negotiations between former slave owners and former slaves, British authorities encouraged migrant workers to "supplement or supplant" former slave labor beginning in the 1840s and continuing into the 20th century.[45] Portuguese, Chinese, and East Indian laborers were all brought to the British Caribbean

in various quantities.[46] While British Guiana and Trinidad employed this practice most frequently, it was employed throughout the British Caribbean in order to keep the plantation system alive and functioning.[47] While flogging and torture had to be abandoned as tools to ensure a productive work day the living quarters formerly utilized by slaves were more than adequate for the indentured workers.[48] These workers usually stayed for a "definitive contract period" and had the right to return home with paid passage when they were finished serving their negotiated terms, though many decided to stay well past the expiration of their labor contracts.[49]

Former slaves and indentured labor worked together to form the backbone of the British Caribbean labor force throughout the 19th century. Indentured labor relied almost entirely upon the plantation system for employment while Afro-Caribbeans continued to push the boundaries of their newfound freedom by establishing small "peasant freeholds" as well as seeking employment in more urban settings.[50] In some areas of the British Caribbean, tensions erupted between the two groups with Afro-Caribbeans rightly seeing the new servants as a threat to their ability to define freedom and secure employment. The groups traded verbal barbs with Afro-Caribbeans calling the servants "pagans" and "heathens" and the servants responding in kind by referring to Afro-Caribbeans as "awkward and vulgar in manners".[51]

From 1846, the passing of the masters and servants ordnance, until 1920 laborers in the British Caribbean operated under a suffocating contract labor system which carried some of the same authoritarian coercion that defined British Caribbean labor during the era of slavery.[52] Labor contracts were stifling in their restrictions. Many labor contracts offered only one day off per week and sometimes only one day off in two weeks.

Workers could not terminate the contracts without at least one month's notice and were usually paid 9 or 10 pence daily equating to around $6 daily by today's standards.[53] Workers could face "fine or imprisonment with or without hard labour" for breaches of contract including "absence from his service", "neglect or refusal to fulfill his contract", and "misconduct, misdemeanor or ill behavior in the service of his employer".[54] In some cases, workers in violation of the labor contracts found themselves punished by being thrown back into apprenticeship, just one short step removed from slavery. Laborers operating under such contracts were also often beaten and flogged, despite the fact that such practices had supposedly been outlawed with the advent of emancipation.[55] The labor contract system applied to both indentured servants and the free labor force. Both were subject to these restrictive contacts and employers worked very hard to bond their workers to the estates they were employed, just as slaves were bound to their owners during the period of slavery.

In addition to labor contracts, employers also utilized their power as both landowners and employers to install the wage-rent system in an effort strengthen the ties of the workers to the land. Employees found themselves reporting simultaneously to landlords and employers both at work and at home. In many cases their rents were directly taken off the top of their paychecks. This system strengthened the grip of employers over employees throughout the 19th and early 20th century. An employer who was dissatisfied with a contract laborer's performance on the job could utilize one of the many punishments available in his contract or he could simply threaten to evict him from his home leaving him with few options.[56] While not all British Caribbean islands employed the system of wage rent deductions it was common in areas such as Jamaica,

Tobago, Grenada, and Barbados. The charges for rent fluctuated wildly with workers paying from around 20% of their wages all the way up nearly half of their monthly earnings.[57]

Throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, workers in the British Caribbean faced a bleak situation. Many of them recently were emancipated and the system of slavery was finally ousted, but the reality of the situation was exceedingly grim. Many workers were faced with ironclad contracts bonding them to the land, automatically deducting a sizable portion of their earnings for rents, and facing jail time, eviction, hard labor, or even physical abuse if they challenged the system, refused to complete their contracts, or even "misbehaved" on business for his employer.[58] While these circumstances made it difficult for the recently freed slaves to define freedom for themselves, many found ways to circumvent the system through the creation of their own "peasant" settlements. Throughout slavery, slaves had successfully claimed the right to farm their own provision grounds and with emancipation many of them sought to continue and expand their provisions holdings and farm on a subsistence level.[59] While freed slaves found themselves in a cutthroat competition for land with their would-be employers, many of them were able to have some success in squatting or even buying their own land.[60] Squatters were able to define their own hours, control their own workloads, as well as avoid commitments to oppressive contracts under which most of the workforce in the British Caribbean toiled. Their very presence indicated a resistance to the quasi-slavery system that had arisen after emancipation and their alternate vision of freedom was contested and attacked by local authorities who saw them as lazy and uninterested in putting in a full week's work.

Squatters, especially in the larger territories such as Jamaica, represented a formidable challenge to the newly minted system of "free" labor imposed by large estate owners in the British Caribbean and they acted quickly to buy up land and push squatters back into the plantation system. Squatters and British authorities clashed frequently and violently on several occasions throughout the 19th century, most famously in the 1850s and 1860s when squatters and authorities clashed at Falmouth, Florence Hall, and St. Thomas-in-the-East, and most notably Morant Bay.[61] White British landowners sought to discredit this way of life any way that they could, frequently resorting to moral arguments and painting the squatters as lazy, uncivilized outlaws who were living marginal lives on the fringes of civilized society. In their efforts to maintain a strong grip on their workforce and prevent the loss of already dwindling sugar profits, the white landowning power throughout the British Caribbean sought to prevent the practice of squatting and Afro-Caribbean land ownership through rising land prices, taxes, and removal of squatters.

Throughout the conclusion of the 19th century into the 20th century, industries changed and evolved, but the basic terms of debate between the laboring class and the powerful elite remained largely the same. Sugar production was still a major source of income in the islands and was seriously affected by the dramatic drop in prices in the 1880s and 1890s. However, in addition to sugar and cocoa, Trinidad developed profitable oil and asphalt industries.[62] Despite the development of some new industries, throughout the early 20th century throughout the 1930s and early 1940s the "mainstay of the West Indies [was] agriculture" primarily consisting of sugar, bananas, cocoa, and coffee.[63] As the 19th century came to a close, both workers and employers found

themselves increasingly at odds. Employers found themselves under economic pressure and a decline in sugar prices in the 1880s and 1890s encouraged them to clamp down on their workers even more freezing already modest wages and expecting more from an increasingly overburdened and underpaid workforce. Workers, on the other hand, rightly viewed themselves as overworked and underpaid. Therefore, as employers sought to get more and more from their workforce, workers were justifiably less and less sympathetic to the economic woes of their relentless employers.

In 1897 one of the earliest labor organizations in the British Caribbean formed, the Trinidad Workingman's Association (TWA).[64] The TWA along with the Working Men's reform club represented some of the earliest efforts to unionize in the face of difficult working conditions. While these unions were primarily composed of skilled laborers such as carpenters, tailors, and tradesmen, they were a first step toward large scale labor organization. The TWA's early years were marked with minimal membership (around 1000) and long periods of inactivity.[65] Eventually infighting and the start of World War I curbed the fledgling union's activities before it could really get anything underway.[66] Despite its inauspicious start, the coming years brought the TWA to the center of labor life in Trinidad.

Great Britain announced its declaration of war against Germany in Trinidad on August 6, 1914. While World War I obviously had far reaching consequences in Europe, somewhat unexpectedly it became a polarizing event in the British Caribbean, specifically in Trinidad, as well. Leaders in Trinidad utilized the war as an opportunity to unite a fracturing population.[67] For a time, nationalism was the salve that the splintering population needed to forget the centuries of unfair labor practices. In fact, the TWA

advised workers against political agitation during this difficult time for the Empire.[68] Workers temporarily tabled their longstanding grievances and threw their support behind the British war efforts. Residents of British Caribbean colonies showed their support by contributing to many different war funds, despite their difficult financial situations.[69] However, despite its initial unifying effect, the war ultimately brought British Caribbean labor issues to the forefront and pushed laborers into organization and protest.

World War I took a toll on British colonial laborers from 1914-1918. Their wages were not increasing and in some cases even decreasing and due to wartime supply rationing, goods became more and more sparse and prices rose to compensate. Laborers worked harder and harder to support the war effort at the same time they saw their wages buying less and less of what they needed to survive. The prices of food, clothes and medicine increased "from 100 to 350 percent".[70] Furthermore, the reality of racism became a polarizing issue during this period. Afro-Caribbeans found themselves segregated from their white countrymen in different regiments as they volunteered for war. Furthermore, most of the merchants and employers responsible for declining wages and increases in the cost of living were in the white minority. While World War I might have quelled protest initially, the Great War was ultimately at least partially responsible for publicizing and exacerbating issues that had plagued British Caribbean workers for centuries.

Beyond terrible living conditions and racial prejudice, which were nothing new for British Carirbbean laborers, there was also a growing radical element within the population taking root during this period. Increasingly radical publications coming from as far away as Russia, reached the British Caribbean laborers who had some of the

highest literacy rates in the world. Newspapers, pamphlets, and literature reached the islands in huge numbers and led the population to rethink the situation.[71] This was compounded by returning veterans who expected some change in the islands. After fighting for democracy and being inundated with British rhetoric in the army, these soldiers wanted to participate in some of the democracy they were supposedly defending against Germany.[72] When the veterans returned home they found declining wages, increased cost of living and the realities of racial prejudice laid bare.

Out of these conditions, the TWA was reborn in 1918 "to assist in all matters affecting the interest of the workingman".[73] However, this second incarnation of the TWA was far removed from the inactivity that had become the group's hallmark from its founding in 1897 until the start of World War I in 1914. Longstanding tensions brought to a head by British working class agitation in the metropole, increased cost of living expenses, stagnant or declining wages, unemployment, and racist mistreatment of West Indian soldiers and veterans both at home and abroad had quickly polarized the working class population. From 1917 through 1920 these tensions boiled over in Trinidad and served as a grim portent for the white minority's iron grip over cheap labor and commitment to exploitative labor practices.

The new TWA wasted no time in acting on long ignored grievances and unfair labor practices. It began with a strike of railway workers ad dockworkers in March of 1919 who demanded wage increases and was able to secure wage increases of 33 1/3%, a reduction in of one hour in the working day, overtime pay, and an agreement that the workers be provided with better plots of land on which to grow vegetables.[74] In November 1919, the growing organization was instrumental in organizing another labor

uprising, this time on behalf of stevedores who were attempting to negotiate a wage increase in San Fernando from the Port-of-Spain Shipping Company. After considerable violence between strikers and hired strikebreakers the shipping company finally agreed to negotiate with the TWA as the stevedores' representatives which earned them a 33% wage increase. These successful strikes led to a veritable epidemic of work stoppage throughout the island and on the neighboring island of Tobago. City sweepers, scavengers, carpenters, estate laborers and more went on strike with varying degrees of success.[75]

White employers did not sit idly by as their stranglehold on cheap labor was questioned and shaken by the efforts of the strikers. They levied fines, called in military forces, and jailed strikers where they could. The government attempted to head strikers off whenever possible, in 1920 they passed legislation banning publications they deemed inflammatory encouraging black cooperation and promoting strikes including Garvey's *Negro World.* Even so, strikes and labor disturbances occurred with regularity throughout the tumultuous period of 1917-1920. Workers, employers, and the government clashed over issues such as wages, workdays, unemployment and a host of other ancient issues that had haunted the British Caribbean since the first sugar plantations were established under the chattel slavery principle. Despite their best efforts to revert work conditions to the status quo they had enjoyed for centuries, the white minority realized they were at a crossroads. Government observers noted plainly that the black population needed stronger representation and that the strikes were symptomatic of a centuries old problem of unfair labor practices.

Undoubtedly, most white British Caribbean planters, employers, and government officials hoped the disturbances were a temporary bump in the road caused by the extraordinary conditions brought on by the Great War. Many hoped with some minor concessions that they would be able to pacify the labor force and continue business as usual. However, the rise of the TWA, its success in labor agitation, and a growing unity under Garvey and other labor leaders had opened a veritable Pandora's box that the white minority had attempted to keep closed for centuries. Once these frustrations were unleashed, there was simply no way to pack them neatly away again. What white British authorities, employers, and landowners had desperately hoped was an aberration in only one colonial territory was, in fact, the new horrifying reality of labor relations for them. Their world was reshaping itself before their very eyes, and while they did not yet know it, the relationship between workers and employers was about to fundamentally shift in ways they could never have imagined.

The preceding contextualization has portrayed Afro-Caribbean workers dealing with very old problems of labor in their negotiations with employers. From slavery to apprenticeship to contract labor Afro-Caribbean laborers seemed to persistently find themselves on the wrong end of cleverly designed modes of oppression and unfair labor practices while employers demonstrated a "lack of concern for the well-being of their labour" creating an "underlying current of resentment" among these workers.[76] While the terms, context, and industries of the battle were ever shifting throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, the realities frequently remained startlingly similar. This section seeks to outline some of these contexts and conditions leading up to the full scale labor rebellion that swept across the British Caribbean in the 1930s and show how they set in

motion a fundamental renegotiation in how laborers worked, how much they were paid, how much time they had off, and the question of what to do with the unemployed. In this section I analyze in some detail some of the sticking points in these negotiations between employers and employees including unemployment, housing, job security, union representation, hiring practices, grievance proceedings, involvement in politics, education, and working conditions.

As the world depression progressed throughout the 1930s, a number of conditions coalesced to make life exceedingly difficult for employers and employees alike. Sugar cane was beset by mosaic disease, bananas from Panama disease, cocoa from witch broom and even limes and pimentos were affected by the epidemic of agricultural diseases.[77] Furthermore, workers who had been hard at work overseas as emigrants working on projects such as the Panama Canal were returning home as difficult conditions in foreign lands closed previously rich opportunities for overseas employment with comparably strong wages.[78] These workers returning home negatively affected conditions in two ways. First, the additional workers stressed the already taxed job market with additional job seekers, and secondly wages that were being sent home ceased and people previously depending on relatives working elsewhere were forced to enter the job market as well.[79] This glut of job seekers combined with crops under fire from diseases made unemployment an increasingly serious problem throughout the British Caribbean.

Unemployment for at least part of the year was always a persistent problem throughout the islands.[80] One government official described plantations as a three tiered employment system. First, were the "skilled or semi-skilled" who were "in stead

employment throughout the year".[81] Next, were the "main body of labourers" who were could generally have expected earn wages for around half of the year.[82] Finally, there were the laborers only required during the very peak of harvest required for at most two months out of the year.[83] The largest of these three groups was the second group, who could expect employment for half the year. These workers were usually tied to the plantations and made their homes on-site, therefore attempts to work elsewhere would jeopardize not only their livelihoods and six months of gainful employment annually, but also compel them to lose their residence. Because of this, workers, by virtue of the system, spent half of the year seeking odd jobs, barely getting by, or supplementing their diets with subsistence farming.

Unemployment statistics were scarce during the 1930s throughout the British Caribbean.[84] In fact, well into the 1940s officials found it difficult to gauge with any accuracy the unemployment numbers due to a number of factors.[85] While offices had been established for the purposes of measuring the extent of the unemployment problem, there was a great deal of distrust surrounding these offices and a disinterest in dealing with frequently arrogant and often racist British colonial officials. The problem of measuring unemployment was compounded by the fact that many workers were half time because they were busy tending their own lands and gardens in their free time.[86] Therefore, they might be officially qualified as half time, but in reality between the half time work on plantations and their own subsistence farming they were full time both in terms of time spent and in terms of income earned.[87] This scarcity of information was distrusted by many union labor leaders as they accused government officials of "keep(ing) away the facts of the conditions of this island from the Home government".[88]

Throughout the 1930s unemployment was an issue almost as hotly debated as the terms of employment. Unemployment in the islands was frequently mentioned right alongside the grievances of the workers. One noted Jamaican labor leader Alexander Bustamante illustrated this as he described Jamaican working life as being plagued with "abusive and intolerable economic and living conditions through vicious low pay and unemployment".[89] By the 1940, unemployment had become such an issue that many British officials were forced to concede that union leaders were correct in some of their critiques despite "extravagant language".[90] While British officials did eventually take some steps toward unemployment relief in 1938 in the form of relief aid to the island, Bustamante and other labor leaders can be excused for their venomous language toward high ranking British officials and passionate attacks on local officials due to a persistent tradition of inaction and lack of representation for the working class dating back to the 19th century.

While unemployment was a persistent and very old problem in the British Caribbean, one that was perhaps even more longstanding was the condition of the homes that most laborers lived in. Since many of these homes were rented through the wage rent system, laborers frequently did not own their homes and because employers took such little interest in improving them, they were frequently in disrepair. In one government report issued in 1938 the housing situation in the British Caribbean is described as "deplorably bad" with buildings made of "poor material" and houses constructed in "primitive type" and lacking in size.[91] Furthermore, the homes frequently lacked facilities for "cooking, washing, bathing, and sanitation" making cleanliness "almost impossible.[92] These homes were also plagued with overcrowding, in many

cases homes of "ten or twelve feet square" were serving as accommodations for "two or three adults and several children".[93] The overcrowding, sad state of the homes, and the lack of basic facilities further led to the spread of diseases such as tuberculosis.

One year earlier, in 1937 the Trinidad Commission of Inquiry also investigated labor conditions in Trinidad in response to the violent labor uprisings occurring there and put together a report and a series of recommendations for avoiding future uprisings and creating a more favorable labor situation. One of the major areas they addressed in these recommendations was the housing situation. The report addresses both individually occupied housing as well as the older homes occupied by those living on the agricultural estates. From these recommendations, it is possible to further flesh out many of the major problems with housing in Trinidad and to varying degrees throughout the British Caribbean.

One of the most basic and disturbing problem with housing in Trinidad based on these reports is a lack of basic infrastructure. "Roads, drains, and water" are some of the needs that the commission suggests need addressed as soon as possible utilizing government funds.[94] The committee also suggests that people willing to build their own structures be offered "free building grants" and land to build them on for "nominal rents".[95] The plan for the government to subsidize housing indicates a serious lack of suitable housing lacking a basic infrastructure. Many of the houses being occupied during this period were lacking in basic modern conveniences and the land grab of the previous century meant to discourage squatters and peasant freehold subsistence farming left the working class without land, suitable housing, or any opportunity to secure land and build their own housing.

The commission also had a series of recommendations for the housing occupied by agricultural laborers working on plantations. Recommendations for these homes indicate that many of the structures were in a state of utter disrepair. Despite this, the commission was very lenient with what owners should actually be required to undertake. The commission indicated that homes should be inspected by the Health Department and that any homes deemed unacceptable should be demolished and rebuilt within "a limited specified time".[96] Despite the state of the housing, there was no official action required on such housing, outside of the slum clearance legislature passed earlier in the decade and what owners did with their dilapidated laborer housing was for the most part left up to them.

Another very old problem laborers were faced with was the prevalence of disease and the dearth of quality healthcare facing them in the British Caribbean.[97] Malaria, a disease that had plagued the islands for centuries, Tuberculosis, and hookworm were all very common throughout the Caribbean, especially in the labor force.[98] Venereal diseases of various varieties were also especially common.[99] As one government researcher points out, the problem of a disease was an especially difficult one to measure. Since many of these diseases did not completely incapacitate workers, they were loathe to accrue medical bills and take time off of work to get adequate medical care. Major Orde Brown estimated in 1938 that the epidemic of venereal disease might have reached as much as 70% of the overall population.[100]

Getting these epidemics under control was often times only as far away as improved basic infrastructure. The flow of malaria was one that merited swamp drainage and mosquito control which experts suggested as part of unemployment relief plans.[101]

Hookworm was a problem that was exacerbated by poor sanitary systems. As soon as doctors sought to aggressively treat it, people found themselves infected once again due to sewage drainage issues.[102] Tuberculosis was largely a disease of overcrowding. The housing situation with many people crammed into poorly equipped homes often in disrepair mad Tuberculosis a constant threat.[103] Many workers were undoubtedly frustrated by the diseases ravaging their communities when these diseases might have been brought under control with relative ease and a few basic improvements to city and rural structures.

Workers were also compelled to strike based on the fluctuation of the cost of living. While the government and the working class battled back and forth a great many times on this issue, it is clear that workers felt like their wages were inadequate to provide them with the necessities of life.[104] Throughout the early 20th century the cost of living was in flux. World War I, World War II, and the world Depression of the 1930s made this a difficult statistic to measure. In the British Caribbean workers faced steep increases in the prices of many goods during wartime even though most labor leaders and workers were very supportive of the war effort.[105] As Britain sought to bring all of its resources to bear on the war efforts, the Empire often suffered. Workers in the British Caribbean saw rapidly rising costs of living. As the prices on necessities of life such as food and clothing rose during wartime, workers found that their wages did not increase in kind.

Wages throughout the British Caribbean were the biggest, oldest, and deepest dispute between employers and employees. In a statement issued by the Trinidad Labour Party in 1938, they acknowledge that even though Trinidad was in a good position

relative to other British Caribbean holdings, that "a very large number of the workers are affected by poverty".[106] Since slavery was abolished, workers had found themselves making barely enough to scrape by and many utilized subsistence farming to supplement their incomes. As the labor disturbances of the 1930s showed, wages were by far the most divisive and longest standing issue that arose between workers and employees. In 1938 15 of the 24 recorded labor disturbances cited wages as a major cause of the dispute.[107] Workers in St. Vincent best summed up the feelings of the laboring class in a speech given at Georgetown in 1936 when a leader by the name of McIntosh claimed that "the better classes of St. Vincent take no interest in the poorer people, and it does not appear as if they are willing to do it."[108] While government officials quickly worked to put together studies to minimize worker critiques such as the rising cost of living, the reality remained the same, workers were fed up with decades of poor wages and poor treatment from employers. While sugar profits may have been down, workers were long past the point where they felt it necessary to cater to the problems of employers who had exploited them for generations.

Another issue laborers wanted addressed was the lack of educational opportunities within the British Caribbean. The League of Colored Peoples under the guidance of founder and President Harold Moody was most vocal in these agitations. Moody's group similarly to Garvey's UNIA promoted "welfare of Coloured people in all parts of the world", and pledged to cooperate with all organizations "sympathetic to Coloured People".[109] However, the League's primary goal was in bringing issues of colonial education to the forefront. The group, along with unions such as the Trinidad Labour Party, advocated for industrial training in the short term, but also put forward a long term

agenda to establish universities and colleges.[110] The League promoted an educational plan that centered around industrialists "from this country or by selected refugees from the continent" who should "train people and fit them for industry".[111] The League was prevalent throughout the British Caribbean and as one Moody put it they were "in close touch with the people of the West Indies".[112] The goals of the League help to corroborate the story that the working population in the British Caribbean was largely unskilled and were faced with few opportunities outside of the traditional paths into skilled and semi-skilled trades. Most workers found themselves pushed into unskilled agricultural work as the lack of infrastructure in the region extended well into the arena of educational opportunity.

A final issue between laborers and employers was the very existence of unions. Early in the 20th century and into the 1930s employers would frequently call in the military to solve labor disputes. On many occasions a potential strike was derailed by the involvement of British military forces. However, one of the short term effects of the labor rebellions was the legalization of unions and the creation of government offices to help smooth over labor disputes. Early attempts to unionize were looked upon by British officials and employers with disdain, they critiqued early unions for organizing at a "most inconvenient time" and "injur[ing] the position of industries already struggling to survive".[113] Caribbean working class unions were looked upon by British authorities as primitive and "lacking the traditions of those English organizations on which they are modeled".[114] Furthermore, officials saw unions as so inefficient and underdeveloped that they saw believed majority of the responsibility of negotiating fair wages and working conditions would inevitably "devolve upon the Administration".[115]

Naturally, British Caribbean working class people viewed their ability to represent themselves in a much more hopeful light. While government officials were quick to attack early unionization efforts by attacking their inexperienced leadership and deriding their rallies that occasionally turned violent, the development of the working class voice of discontent was unmistakable. Groups such as the Trinidad Labour Party were articulate and clear about their demands and their hopes for the future of the region. The TLP issued a 50 page memorandum that addressed issues such as working conditions, healthcare, infrastructure, and housing. Despite what British officials said about the inexperience of these groups, the documentation they left behind tells a different story about the capabilities of their leadership.

The 1930s brought about an exceptionally contemplative tone from both employers and the Colonial Office. They were deeply invested in diagnosing the region's problems and what might be done to solve them. This tone and interest in researching the region's problems was brought about by the efforts of thousands of laborers throughout the region who were at times in full scale revolt. As hundreds of workers marched and protested, occasionally violently British officials and employers began to take a more active interest in improving the islands.

Scholars such as Nigel Bolland have been instrumental in helping us understand why exactly this happened in the 1930s. Bolland specifically points to Afro-Caribbean uplift groups such as Garvey's UNIA as central mobilizing forces in addition to the Depression, World Wars and persistently poor standards of living. Garvey himself is not usually prominently mentioned among the groups who were involved in the nuts and bolts of these revolts or labor disputes because he had little actual presence during the

period. However, in many ways the ideas and spirit of Garvey was written in between the lines of labor party's memorandums. Groups like Moody's League of Coloured Peoples reiterated a message Garvey had articulated in the late 1910s.

In many ways the UNIA helped to open negotiations between employers and laborers. Working class Afro-Caribbeans were inspired by Garvey's message of unity, economic independence, and Afro-centric approach to history and it showed in their battles with employers throughout the 1920s. While the UNIA name did not persist in the same way throughout the Caribbean as it had in New York City throughout the 1930s, it was definitely alive and well in Caribbean as the oilfields belched pungent black smoke into the air. Garveyites who had grown up reading the banned *Negro World* were quick to fold the ideas Garvey had propagated the decade before into their labor struggles. What principles they incorporated, how they incorporated them, and who were the major figured in reforming Garveyism are discussed in more detail in the following two chapters.

Notes

[1] *"Negro World Cartoon, October 5, 1929".* Robert Hill, ed. *The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Association Papers.* (Berkeley, Ca: University of California Press, 1990), Volume 7, 357.
[2] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 59.
[3] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 59.
[4] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 59.
[5] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 59-60. It is unknown why the police could not read the charges aloud. Two different officers attempted to read the charges but were unable to do so.
[6] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 60.
[7] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 63.
[8] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 63.
[9] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 65.
[10] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 66.
[11] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 90.
[12] Richard Hart, *From Occupation to Independence* (London: Pluto Press, 1998), 120.
[13] Hart, *From Occupation to Independence,* 121.
[14] Hart, *From Occupation to Independence,* 121.
[15] Populations Public Record Office CO 338/433/7. cited in Richard Hart. *Labour Rebellions in the British Caribbean Region Colonies* (Caribbean Labour Solidarity/Socialist History Society, 2002), 26.
[16] Populations Public Record Office CO 338/433/7. cited in Hart, *Labour Rebellions in the British Caribbean Region Colonies*, 26.
[17] W. Arthur Lewis, *Labour in the West Indies* (London: New Beacon Books, 1938), 11.
[18] Lewis, *Labour in the West Indies,* 11.
[19] Lewis, *Labour in the West Indies*, 11.
[20] Lewis, *Labour in the West Indies*, 12.
[21] Hart, *Labour Rebellions in the British Caribbean Region Colonies,* 2-3.
[22] Sahadeo Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad 1919-1939* (St. Augustine, Trinidad: Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1983), 1.
[23] Nigel Bolland, *The Politics of Labour in the British Caribbean* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 2001), 1. Bolland introduces his landmark study on labor politics in the Caribbean by pointing out that the story of the British Caribbean is the story of "labor coercion and colonialism". Bolland further backs this assertion by citing a plethora of other scholars who have completely conflated the history of the region with the labor struggle that has characterized the region for centuries. While the nature of the struggle has shifted from slavery to wage labor, the terms, work, and negotiations have been an ongoing battle where the participants and issues have remained the same, while the playing field and contexts have evolved over time.
[24] Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944), 30-31.
[25] Bolland, *The Politics of Labour in the British Caribbean*, 4.
[26] Bolland, *The Politics of Labour in the British Caribbean*, 6.
[27] Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, 85. Williams further posits that sugar plantation owners were often revered in 18th and 19th century Britain. They amassed huge fortunes and land holdings and were some of the richest people in Britain due to their profits from huge sugar production enterprises.
[28] Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, 33.
[29] Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery.*
[30] David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution 1770-1823* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 72.
[31] Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution,* 72. The discussion of the complex theoretical problem of the emancipation of the British enslaved population is beyond the scope of this study. Scholars such as David Brion Davis (cited here) explore this problem in rigorous depth.
[32] C.L.R. James, *The Black Jacobins* (New York: Random House Publishers, 1963).; Laurent Dubois, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005). First James and late Dubois make convincing arguments that the slave

revolt turned revolution that spawned Haiti were inextricably linked with the rhetoric of revolution spread from France and the gens de colour in Haiti.

[33] Thomas C. Holt, *The Problem of Freedom: Race, Labor, Politics, in Jamaica and Britain, 1843-1938* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 14.

[34] Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*, 15-16.

[35] Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, 137-139.

[36] Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery,* 137-139.

[37] Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery,* 136.

[38] Holt, *The Problem of Freedom,* 22-25.

[39] Holt, *The Problem of Freedom,* 56-57.

[40] Holt, *The Problem of Freedom,* 57.

[41] In the British Caribbean, the United States, and even in Haiti there is significant evidence to suggest that freed slaves wanted to participate in a system where they could become producers on their own small estates. "Little Plantations", as slave provisional grounds were sometimes called, had represented the slave's expression of freedom and his or her own ability to resist and produce under oppressive conditions for centuries. Naturally, with the advent of freedom, freed slaves envisioned these sites of resistance and freedom to be ground zero for remaking their lives. However, in almost all cases authorities defined freedom as the continued operation of the plantation system and discouraged former slaves from actually participating the system of capitalism that they so vigorously promoted. Examples of this are found incase studies such as the ones listed below.

Holt, *The Problem of Freedom.*; Dubois, *Avengers of the New World.*

[42] Holt, *The Problem of Freedom,* 66.

[43] Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*). Thomas Holt gives a rigorous case study of the negotiations between the former slaves and the British authorities in this classic study. In this work, he details competing visions of freedom between former slaves and the powerful white minority.

[44] Hart, *Labour Rebellions in the British Caribbean Region Colonies*, 4-5. Trinidad is a good representation of this. There was virtually no representational government 9in Trinidad throughout the 19th century. It was not introduced until 1925 when the British government was "forced to concede a degree of representative government".

[45] Major G. St. J. Orde Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies* (London: Printed By His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1939), 15.

[46] Lewis, *Labour in the West Indies,* 12. East Indians constituted around 12% of the population in 1938 and were mostly congregated in British Guiana and Trinidad.

[47] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies.* 15.

[48] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies.* 15. Indentured workers usually stayed in former slave barracks and were provided with many of the same "necessities" as slaves formerly had been.

[49] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies.* 15.

[50] Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad*, 6-7.

[51] Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad*, 6-7.

[52] Bolland, *The Politics of Labour in the British Caribbean*, 35. Bolland uses the ideas of coercion, authoritarianism, and resistance to characterize Caribbean work systems throughout the colonial period.

[53] "Masters and Servants Legislation – Jamaica" The National Archive CO 318/442/17; "Measuring Worth", Purchasing Power Calculator, http://www.measuringworth.com/ppoweruk/, accessed on December 10, 2007.

[54] "Masters and Servants Legislation – Jamaica" The National Archive CO 318/442/17, Section 9; Bolland, Nigel. *The Politics of Labour in the British Caribbean.* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 2001), 35. The citation from the National Archive is taken from 1940 when these laws were under fire, but still on the books.

[55] Bolland, *The Politics of Labour in the British Caribbean*, 35.

[56] Bolland, *The Politics of Labour in the British Caribbean,* 37.

[57] Bolland, *The Politics of Labour in the British Caribbean* 37.

[58] "Masters and Servants Legislation – Jamaica" The National Archive CO 318/442/17, Section 9.

[59] Sidney Mintz, *Caribbean Transformations* (Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing, 1974).

[60] Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*, 263-270.

[61] Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*, 263-270. The debates between employers, employees, and squatters is best outlined here in Holt's study. Approaching the details of the disputes and rebellions is beyond the scope of this study. Sheller, Mimi. *Democracy After Slavery: Black Publics and Peasant Radicalism in Haiti and Jamaica.* (London: Macmillan Education, 2000). Sheller outlines a similar process in her comparative work on Haiti and Jamaica dividing the process of emancipation into three phases including a brief moment where the possibility for democracy exists before landowners destroy the opportunity for subsistence farming and small scale land ownership among the newly freed slaves.
[62] Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad*, 7.
[63] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 16.
[64] Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad* , 9.
[65] Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad*, 11-12.
[66] Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad*, 11-12.
[67] Roy Thomas, ed., *The Trinidad Labour Riots of 1936-1937: Perspectives 50 Years Later.* (Extra Mural Studies Unit: University of the West Indies, 1987), 23.
[68] Thomas, ed. *The Trinidad Labour Riots of 1936-1937*, 37.
[69] Thomas, ed. *The Trinidad Labour Riots of 1936-1937*, 23.
[70] Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad,* 13.
[71] Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad,* 13-16.
[72] Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad,* 13-16; Thomas, ed., *The Trinidad Labour Riots of 1936-1937,,* 37.
[73] *Trinidad Guardian,* July 7, 1918 cited in Basdeo, *Labour Organisation and Labour Reform in Trinidad* 18.
[74] Thomas, ed., *The Trinidad Labour Riots of 1936-1937,* 33.
[75] Thomas, ed., *The Trinidad Labour Riots of 1936-1937,* 37-38.
[76] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 76.
[77] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies*, 13.
[78] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies*, 13.
[79] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies*, 13.; Birac, Anthony. *Jamaica.* The National Archive CO 137/852/2.
[80] Hart, *Labour Rebellions in the British Caribbean Region Colonies*, 5; Birac, Anthony. *Jamaica.* The National Archive CO 137/852/2.
[81] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 17.; Birac, Anthony. *Jamaica.* The National Archive CO 137/852/2.
[82] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies*, 17; Telegram from Governor Sir A. Richards to Secretary of State for the Colonies, September 27 1942" The National Archive CO 137/852/2; Birac, Anthony. *Jamaica.* The National Archive CO 137/852/2.
[83] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies*, 17; Telegram from Governor Sir A. Richards to Secretary of State for the Colonies, September 27 1942" The National Archive CO 137/852/2.
[84] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies* 43-44; "Letter from Ivor Thomas regarding Unemployment". Jamaica – Unemployment, The National Archive CO 137/883/7.
[85] "Letter from Ivor Thomas regarding Unemployment". Jamaica – Unemployment, The National Archive CO 137/883/7. While hard numbers were difficult to discern, officials in the late 1940s had been able to determine that unemployment was a largely urban problem.
[86] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 43-43. Telegram from Governor Sir A. Richards to Secretary of State for the Colonies, September 27 1942" The National Archive CO 137/852/2.
[87] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies* 42-43.
[88] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to British Government", Unemployment – Jamaica. The National Archive. CO 137/825/12. In this letter Bustamante accuses the government of being "callous" and malicious toward the lower working classes of Jamaica. The letter was not only sent to local officials, but published in a Jamaican newspaper in the editorial section.
[89] Bustamante, Alexander. "Petitioner's Prayer", Jamaica Labour Conditions. The National Archive CO 137/846/15.
[90] Letter to Secretary of State from Jamaican Governor", Jamaica Labour Conditions. The National Archive CO 137/846/15.
[91] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 20.

[92] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 20.
[93] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 20.
[94] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 83.
[95] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 83.
[96] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 83.
[97] "Memorandum of the Trinidad Labour Party to the Royal Commission 1938". The Trinidad Labour Party Memorandum. The National Archive CO 950/776.
[98] "Memorandum of the Trinidad Labour Party to the Royal Commission 1938". The Trinidad Labour Party Memorandum. The National Archive CO 950/776; Brown, Major G. St. J. Orde. *Labour Conditions in the West Indies.* (London: Printed By His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1939), 25.
[99] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 20.
[100] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 20.
[101] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 26.
[102] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 26.
[103] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 26.
[104] The Colonial Office commissioned various studies on the cost of living in the British Caribbean and rarely saw any problem. Workers, on the other hand, defined "needs" differently and felt like British studies did not take all of the factors into account when calculating the cost of living.
[105] "Telegram from Governor of Jamaica September 6, 1939". Reactions of West Indian Labour to the War. The National Archive CO 318/441/4.
[106] "Memorandum of the Trinidad Labour Party to the Royal Commission 1938". The Trinidad Labour Party Memorandum. The National Archive CO 950/776.
[107] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 131-136.
[108] "McIntosh Speech at Georgetown", Labour Organizations St. Vincent 1936. The National Archive CO 321/369/13.
[109] "Letter from Harold Moody to Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies May 22, 1940. Royal Commission Correspondence with the League of Coloured Peoples. The National Archive CO 318/445/47. The group's aims are most clearly stated on their letterhead along with their officers.
[110] "Interview with Deputation from the League of Colored Peoples, August 16, 1940." Royal Commission Correspondence with the League of Coloured Peoples. The National Archive CO 318/445/47; "Memorandum of the Trinidad Labour Party to the Royal Commission 1938". The Trinidad Labour Party Memorandum. The National Archive CO 950/776.
[111] "Interview with Deputation from the League of Colored Peoples, August 16, 1940." Royal Commission Correspondence with the League of Coloured Peoples. The National Archive CO 318/445/47.
[112] "Letter from Harold Moody to Under-Secreatry of State for the Colonies May 21, 1940. Royal Commission Correspondence with the League of Coloured Peoples. The National Archive CO 318/445/47.
[113] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 44.
[114] "Trinidad Commission of Enquiry – Riots Report" The National Archive CO 295/601/2, 87.
[115] Brown, *Labour Conditions in the West Indies,* 45.

CHAPTER 6: A TRADITION OF ORGANIZATION

"Garvey, living or dead, is our patron saint, our supreme leader and counselor, and neither the cannon of hate nor the whip of prejudice can swerve us from our allegiance to him." -Samuel Haynes, 1928[1]

In July of 1937, as British Passport officials sifted through hundreds of passport applications, they came across one that was of special interest: that of one Marcus Mosiah Garvey.[2] The head of the passport office immediately forwarded this application on to the Colonial Office inquiring how they should proceed. Garvey's passport had previously been flagged in various portions of the British Caribbean and in some cases "bore a restriction" for movement within the region.[3] He was also specifically targeted by the Passport Control Office in the mid 1920s by circulars detailing his activities and citing the dangers of allowing him to move uninhibited throughout the British Caribbean.[4]

However, by the late 1930s, British officials had changed their mind about Garvey and his potential to undermine the empire or stir up trouble amongst its working class population. With very little discussion, the Colonial Office promptly replied that they had "no objection" to Garvey's travel plans to Bermuda, Barbados, St. Lucia, Grenada, Dominica, or Trinidad.[5] Officials viewed Garvey as a broken man and called his followers "men of no substance".[6] As a whole, British officials saw Garvey and his movement as a moment that had passed and summed up his status saying, "his fortunes are on the wane" and describing his latest attempts at advocating on behalf of the working class as "grotesque proposals...which could not even bear looking into".[7] As far

as the Colonial Office was concerned, the storm of Garvey had subsided and there was little chance it would brew in the same way that it had in the 1920s ever again. In their view, Garvey was a shadow of his former self clinging to the past and desperately trying to maintain some semblance of status after his movement, authority, and income had crashed down around him.

How then could such a man with his "grotesque proposals" and following of "men of no substance" have any impact on the labor revolts ripping through the British Caribbean even as the Passport Office reviewed Garvey's records? This chapter seeks to explore how Garvey and his adherents helped to play a role in the complex issues of labor renegotiation that swept the region throughout the 1930s. While the UNIA itself was a significantly weakened in the region, this does not mean that Garvey's ideas, plans, or values were simply abandoned. In fact, the UNIA set an important precedent in social movement, anti-colonialism, and unity amongst the working class that was folded into the labor movements. This was a process that Garveyites, British authorities, or even Garvey himself could have never imagined in the mid 1910s when Garvey first formed the organization.

This chapter seeks to show how the UNIA, Garvey, and his membership were foundational to the labor struggle throughout the 1930s in the British Caribbean. Garveyites did not simply fade from the scene after the UNIA fell from prominence in the 1920s. Garvey's followers continued to champion his ideas, albeit in different ways than American Garveyites. While American Garveyites continued to utilize the structure and organization of the UNIA to carry out their local aims, in the British Caribbean, this structure was largely discarded. The fact that the UNIA itself ceased to operate in the

same way in the region makes it a much more difficult process to track where and how former Garveyites utilized what they had learned under Garvey in later years. However, such a process is not impossible, as I show in this chapter. Garveyites may not have referred to themselves as such or seen themselves as the followers of Garvey, but the ideas, structure, organization, and rhetoric of Garvey lived on through important labor leaders, smaller uplift groups, and through many of the laborers themselves.

This chapter seeks to make these connections through three major arguments. First, I show that Garvey was a popular, recognized, and important figure in British Caribbean politics and life in the 1920s and well beyond. While officials may have been willing to write Garvey off as early as 1930, there is significant evidence to suggest that these same officials were watching his activities closely and that they held very real concerns about his potential to stir the laboring population.[8] The fact that British passport officials were willing to pull Garvey's passport as late as 1937 (10 years after his deportation and the splintering of his movement) shows just how seriously they took the threat of the UNIA to colonial authority.

Secondly, I seek to draw direct connections between powerful labor leaders, smaller labor organizations and the Garvey movement wherever possible. Many labor leaders such as Uriah Butler, Alexander Bustamante, and William Wellington Wellwood Grant held ties with the Garvey movement and utilized what they had learned from the UNIA (either as members, associates, or simply observers) to draw the Afro-Caribbean working class to their labor organizations. The UNIA, despite the Colonial Office's banning of the *Negro World* and wide attempts to discredit the organization, had managed to mobilize the Afro-Caribbean population in ways that were previously

unthinkable. This was not lost on labor leaders and they drew both on Garvey's program and rhetoric to draw people into the fold of their fledgling unions and labor groups.

Finally, I argue that the UNIA set a precedent through their organizing strategies which were later utilized by the labor movement throughout the 1930s and 1940s. The UNIA offered the laboring class new ways in which to conceptualize and organize themselves as black workers, and new strategies with which to combat their colonial employers. While the UNIA itself did not live long enough to realize goals such as the unionizing of workers and renegotiating the terms of labor, it was certainly central in laying the groundwork for these projects. Much as it did in the United States during the same period, Garveyism faced significant challenges and ultimately declined on a number of fronts. However, this did not mean that the movement's fundamental tenets faded altogether or that the message of Garvey was lost, forgotten, derided, or discarded. Garveyites in the British Caribbean may not have been card carrying UNIA members as American Garveyites were, but their convictions to ideas Garvey had organized the UNIA around remained strong and they folded their former commitments to the UNIA into these newly formed labor organizations.

While a great deal of the scholarship on Garvey has been primarily focused on his activities in the United States during the 1920s, he had a very significant following throughout the British Caribbean in the 1920s and significantly beyond. Garvey's message of unity and "race first" held appeal throughout the western hemisphere and into Africa.[9] Perhaps the best way to track Garvey's success in this region is through the Schomburg Archive's collections of records of locations of various Garvey divisions and chapters. This rich collection shows that the UNIA had over 50 divisions spread

throughout the British Caribbean, including locations in Antigua, St. Lucia, St. Kitts, Dominica, Barbados, British Guiana, Antigua, and Bermuda.[10] Garvey's strongest outposts were in Jamaica and Trinidad with each housing over ten branches of the organization. Interestingly, Garveyism was not confined to English speaking portions of the British Caribbean. There were also significant alcoves of Garveyite activity in Cuba, Panama, and Costa Rica.[11] While these areas are beyond the scope of this study, the significant presence of Garveyite strongholds in these areas further demonstrates Garvey's influence throughout the Caribbean, Central, and South America.

British Caribbean strongholds were especially significant because of the British government's anti-Garvey stance throughout the 1920s. These British Caribbean Garveyites faced many obstacles in organizing their units and following Garvey's speeches, movements, and plans. The Colonial Office frequently collaborated with the American government to give Garvey difficulties in traveling abroad, and it also suppressed his *Negro World* newspaper throughout the British Caribbean.[12] Furthermore, the mail of the Association was frequently the target of both the British and American governments. Mailings from the UNIA were "detained and often returned to sender" causing "a great hardship which we do not consider to be justified" according to Garvey.[13] Because of such measures, Garveyites throughout the region found it more difficult to communicate with Garvey, donate money to the Association, or even get their hands on the newspaper that represented the lifeblood of the organization throughout the 1920s. The persistence of these Garveyites illustrates that the movement held great meaning for them as they demonstrated throughout the 1920s, 1930s, and beyond.

For these loyal UNIA followers, Garvey's deportation represented a new beginning and new era in Garveyism. For the majority of the 1920s, Garvey's activities and focus had primarily been on the United States, Europe, and Africa. Upon his return home to Jamaica, he reconnected with the politics, local issues, and people of his home country.[14] Even before Garvey reached Jamaica he was afforded a hero's welcome in December 1927 in Panama on his way home. He was greeted with an article in the Panama *Star and Herald* stating that Panamanian UNIA members' hearts "leaped for joy" when his sentence was commuted and that they had "kept the candle burning though not without great difficulties" during the period of Garvey's imprisonment.[15] Garvey was buoyed by such support and UNIA members worldwide took heart in the revitalization of their leader. Immediately upon his release and deportation Garvey vowed to "prosecute the program more vigorously than ever before in my life".[16] Garvey's arrival home into the British Caribbean signified a new era in the history of the UNIA. He was more committed than ever to recruiting, fundraising, and promoting his programs throughout the world.

When Garvey finally did arrive in Jamaica, he was welcomed home as an international hero. Garvey immediately published articles and gave speeches upon his return. "Tremendous" crowds and "thunderous applause" followed Garvey wherever he went.[17] In 1927 Garvey spoke in Ward Theatre (capacity 1,000) and emphasized that he was pleased to be back in the country of his birth, that it was as "inviting as it ever was", and fondly called it his home.[18] The speech addressed a number of issues including Garvey's plans to represent the people of Jamaica in the "home country", the future direction of the UNIA, Constitutional rights, and the development of Jamaica.[19] Garvey

was overwhelmed by the "warm reception" he received upon his return to Jamaica and said many times that the welcome he received after his deportation was far more than he could have ever imagined, given all this negative propaganda spread about him.[20]

Garvey wasted no time endearing himself to Jamaican audiences by addressing the longstanding problems plaguing the workers of the colony. Despite Garvey's initial impressions that conditions such as disease, living conditions and wages were "a little improved", he quickly realized that these longstanding problems had only festered in the decade he spent in the United States.[21] Garvey promised to "raise hell in Jamaica" until living conditions, poverty, and the condition of the working poor was improved. He cited the injustice of overcrowding and poorly constructed housing for the black people of the colony while other classes were living in "cottage(s) of four rooms".[22] Throughout December 1927 to February 1928 Garvey continued to speak throughout Jamaica primarily at the Ward Theatre in Kingston and the Liberty Hall at St. Andrew.[23] These events were well received and well attended even after the initial excitement of Garvey's arrival had died down. He spoke on numerous topics including black unity, Africa and future endeavors on the continent, recruiting new membership to the UNIA, man's relationship to God, education, and a host of other diverse topics.[24] Garvey's reputation, program, and success in America had preceded him and he had no trouble translating this success to Jamaican audiences. His following in his home country only continued to grow after his deportation, but Garvey continued to think big and widen his scope of recruitment. He had no intention of quietly retiring to a life in Jamaica despite the great success he experienced upon his homecoming.

In early 1928, Garvey planned to set out on a six week tour throughout Central America and the British Caribbean where he was to continue stirring enthusiasm for the UNIA and his program. However, British officials were one step ahead of him.[25] Seeing the success Garvey had in Jamaica, officials feared a resurgence of the movement throughout the region. Garvey was picking up steam, filling theatres, collecting sizable donations, and stirring the imaginations of working people throughout Jamaica. Because of this the Colonial Office sent out a poll to leaders from the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Grenada, the Leeward Islands, and Trinidad.[26] While some leaders vowed to allow Garvey to continue his work unmolested, other colonies such as Trinidad and British Honduras planned either to deny his entry or outright ban him from the colony.[27] Ultimately, British authorities abbreviated Garvey's tour. Garvey was denied entry to British Honduras when John Burdon, Governor of British Honduras "took steps... to prohibit his landing".[28] Garvey was similarly denied entry into Costa Rica because he was "convicted of a criminal offense in the United States".[29] The efforts put forth by British authorities to confine and control Garvey's movements indicate that there was a significant following of the UNIA throughout the region. Even when Garvey began charging admission for his speeches, he was still speaking to significant audiences wherever he traveled.

Throughout most of the remainder of 1928, Garvey embarked upon a tour throughout Europe. While he was still very closely monitored by government officials, he found travel much easier and was able to speak at a plethora of venues addressing the British, German, French, and even the League of Nations. Garvey's speaking tour throughout Europe brought him "determination" and "lots of friends" throughout

Europe.[30] His talks, frequently advertised by handbills that were widely distributed, were well attended and he drew significant attention from the press, both black and white. Throughout Europe, Garvey was still recognized as a leader who represented the interests of "thousands of...black folk" throughout the world, even according to Garvey critic, Hubert Peet.[31]

On his way home from Europe, Garvey made a stop in Canada where he gave a few interviews with the local press and attempted to organize a meeting before he was unceremoniously deported.[32] American Republicans played no small role in Garvey's quick removal from the neighboring country, fearing his impact upon the upcoming elections.[33] Upon his return home, Garvey was not suffering not from a lack of enthusiasm, a debilitating loss of his followers, or irrelevance - he was, as he had been for almost two decades, at odds with powers too great for him to defeat. Unable to battle government officials, police, and local powers, Garvey was frequently isolated from his enthusiastic cadre of supporters. Where he was able to speak, Garveyites came, when he gave speeches, they applauded, and when he visited he was greeted with open arms. However, the close surveillance he was constantly under and widespread attempts to prevent him from addressing UNIA branches cut him off from thousands of supporters and undermined enthusiasm for the movement. Furthermore, negative propaganda surrounding Garvey gave members pause when they considered rejoining the movement. Just as Garveyites in New York City struggled to find new leadership direction after Garvey departed, many of the chapters and divisions throughout the western hemisphere were stymied by being cut off from Garvey by his powerful enemies and critics.

Despite these challenges, 1929 was an important year for Garvey in the British Caribbean, specifically in his home country of Jamaica. The UNIA planned to re-establish itself at the 1929 Convention and Garvey was seeking to establish his own political party - as Garvey wrote in July 1929, "all roads shall lead (to) the Sixth International Convention of the Negro Peoples of the World".[34] Garvey continued his recruiting efforts throughout the British Caribbean and encouraged African Americans to travel and even planned an "excursion ship" to depart from New York City on July 31, 1929.[35] He encouraged American Garveyites to meet up with their West Indian counterparts and cooperate and, probably in an attempt to curb rampant infighting, demanded that black people "unite as one people to go forward with the great work that is before us".[36] The Convention was, in many ways, an opportunity for Garvey to seize control of the UNIA back from a variety of forces who had taken control of various branches during his two year prison term. He was venomous in his critiques of "straw men" who were "able to give nothing to the organization, but came in to take something out of it".[37] Garvey aimed to re-establish the UNIA and make it more of a permanent group. He also set out a goal of establishing a political party to unite black people throughout the United States, British Caribbean, and Central America. Furthermore, Garvey emphasized that he had not since 1922 received his salary as promised in the founding documents and emphasized that he had used his own personal funds to keep the unit afloat while they were locked out of the assets held by American branches.[38] Finally, he reorganized the group so that all local branches would be compelled to report to the new headquarters in Jamaica instead of the former home base in New York City.[39]

Despite Garvey's best efforts, his attempts to hold together the splintering UNIA and continue the work he had started in the late 1910s did not create the resurgence he might have hoped. The 1929 Convention suffered from a number of debilitating setbacks which prevented it from being the return to glory that Garvey had hoped it might be. First, it was poorly attended and in a remote location. The Convention's delegates numbered only 145, about half coming from the United States.[40] This was tiny considering that the first Convention had packed Madison Square Garden with crowds that "spilled out onto the streets".[41] While the Convention undoubtedly numbered well over the number of official delegates present, the 1929 Convention, by all accounts was a low key event in comparison to Garvey's previous affairs. One of the major factors in this was the location of the Convention, in Jamaica. Garvey had worked diligently to spread the word and promote the gathering, but for many UNIA members it was just not feasible to travel to Jamaica to attend a lengthy conference. Garvey's followers were never drawn from the most affluent sector of the population and while they may have wanted to attend, it was just not financially possible.

The second major reason the 1929 Convention did not live up to previous standards was the splintering of the movement itself. By 1929, there were already many examples of Garveyites clashing against one another throughout the United States.[42] In one case a fifteen minute violent clash ensued with opposing factions using unloaded "rifles as clubs" and "striking out wildly with drawn sabers" which ultimately resulted in eight Garveyites being hospitalized.[43] While the lion's share of ideological debates between factions never resulted in violence, this incident serves to demonstrate how deeply rifts had grown between those who supported the Jamaican based organization

and those who supported offshoot leaders who had risen to power during Garvey's imprisonment. By 1929, tensions between Garvey and these American leaders had risen to the boiling point and many of the delegates to the 1929 Convention came with the intention of battling Garvey for control of the movement.[44] Ultimately, the 1929 Convention was a breaking point for the UNIA as Fred Toote, the acting president general during Garvey's prison term, became a lightning rod for Garvey's accusations of disloyalty. Eventually, Toote left the convention in mid August because he was under such scrutiny from Garvey and his Jamaican supporters.[45] The battle between Garvey and his former supporters in America was a fierce one over power, funds, and assets held by the sprawling UNIA. Conversely, each side sought to rid itself of the significant debts incurred by the UNIA throughout the 1920s and blame for these debts was liberally passed around. Throughout its early life the Association was always run by Garvey and his departure from the scene had thrown the movement into disarray and given rise to splintering leadership throughout the United States. This absence, combined with Garvey's travel restrictions within the United States made it increasingly difficult for Garvey to reestablish himself as the sole leader of the movement he popularized throughout the late 1910s and early 1920s.

With the UNIA disintegrating around him, however, Garvey was far from finished. The eternal optimist and always an adept fundraiser, Garvey turned his attention to his latest attempt to unite UNIA membership under one banner, the People's Political Party (PPP). The PPP, if viewed as an offshoot of the Garvey movement and a revitalization effort was a measure that brought view actual gains. However, the 12 point program of Garvey outlined in September 1929 (in a meeting attended by over 5,000

people) can be usefully interpreted as a precursor to the demands of labor unions and protestors active throughout the 1930s during the years of the labor rebellions.[46] While Garvey may have been under too much duress from government authorities, warring factions, and critics to give his plans legs, the PPP platform, along with the tradition of organizing established in the UNIA was a central precursor to the successful labor revolts and agitation that arose out of the ashes of the increasingly defunct UNIA.

Despite Garvey's many difficulties and the general decline of the UNIA, his activities in late 1929 make a compelling case for his continued relevance and connection with issues central to the wellbeing of the working classes in Jamaica and throughout the British Caribbean. In fact, Garvey's platform was to be the beginning of a new career in politics. He declared himself, at the request of his "countrymen", a candidate for the Legislative Council representing the Parish of St. Andrew, where he was living at the time.[47] His platform and candidacy were warmly received as he brought to light issues of living conditions, government corruption, education, and representation for the poor in the courts of law. However, Garvey's articulation of these issues did not come without significant opposition or hardship. Immediately after outlining his platform in detail Garvey found himself in the crosshairs of the British Colonial government once again. British authorities managed to find fault with the very speech that detailed his plans given on September 9, 1929 in Kingston. In this same speech Garvey firmly condemned "race hatred" and promoted cooperation with the very same government that had stalked and sabotaged him for over a decade by that point.[48]

The offending portion was one in which Garvey spoke about what he perceived as the widespread corruption of judges. Garvey accused judges of conspiring with the rich

men of the colony and "tak(ing) away an innocent man's property or his rights simply because they want to satisfy their friends".[49] He further claimed the poor of Jamaica had lost faith in the justice system, frequently saying "the Court is for the rich man".[50] Garvey perhaps a little too enthusiastically vowed to put an end to this corruption and cronyism. Interrupted frequently by supportive applause from the crowd, he vowed to take this issue all the way to London if needed to solve the problem of "illicit arrangements of such judges".[51] He advocated for a law that would imprison any judge that violated the "sacred trust" of the justice system and intimated that justice was a luxury only the rich men of Jamaica could afford.[52]

Unsurprisingly, the authorities of the island took this opportunity to grind Garvey's fledgling political forays to a halt – by charging him with contempt of court for the comments made in this speech. Garvey was quickly indicted and brought before the court where he was advised to discard his defense and "say (he) was sorry" in an attempt to gain some leniency in sentencing for the crime.[53] Against his better judgment, he acquiesced and offered the apology after he which he was swiftly convicted and a stiff penalty of 100£ and three months in jail with an additional three months to be served if the fine went unpaid.[54] Despite his best efforts to cooperate with the Courts and show remorse for his remarks, Garvey was punished with a sentence "generally considered excessive".[55] Garvey immediately paid the fine, but his hopes of being able to run a close race for the Legislative seat were essentially extinguished by his conviction and subsequent jail term.

However, remarkably, Garvey's political aspirations were not destroyed by this setback. In what can only be considered a powerful statement by the people of Jamaica,

Garvey was nominated and "overwhelmingly" elected to a local seat in the Mayor and Corporation Council of Kingston and St. Andrew.[56] Unfortunately Garvey remained imprisoned for three meetings and could not attend and act as an active counselor during the early part of his term. Garvey mounted a valiant effort in trying to gain a leave of absence to account for the missed time, but was denied by a group of people he firmly believed to be his "political enemies".[57] After his release from jail, Garvey subsequently attended meetings and "voted three or four times" before the same group who denied him the leave of absence declared his seat to be vacant and dismissed him from office.[58]

Garvey firmly believed that his conviction was the fruition of a plan intended to block him from running a successful campaign and gaining influence in the political sphere. He claimed that this plot was "common knowledge" among the people.[59] While there is certainly compelling evidence to suggest he was correct in his assumptions, what is more central to the scope of this study is what the elections and his campaign says about the resonance of his platform and its lasting relevance. While Garvey did not win the seat he set out to capture, he was elected to office during the period when he was imprisoned. The fact that Garvey was able to win a seat on the Corporation Council with his hands tied and literally sitting behind bars speaks volumes about his connection with working class Jamaicans. While the UNIA as a profitable organization was clearly mired in debt and infighting, Garvey's political platform clearly resonated with many voters to the point where they got him successfully nominated and voted him onto the council almost entirely through word of mouth and the distribution of his 26 point manifesto and handbills declaring that he wished to "see Jamaica prosperous and ALL its people HAPPY".[60]

Furthermore, there is significant evidence to suggest that the same British government officials who said Garvey's "fortunes were on the wane" and that his followers were "men of no substance" feared his potential to mobilize the poor of the colony.[61] This was best summed up as officials discussed Garvey's release date, slated for December 24, 1929. When officials realized Garvey was slated for release on Christmas Eve, they hastily gave him a one day reprieve changing his release date to the 23rd. Officials were openly anxious about the danger of releasing Garvey on this date fearing that this might cause a firestorm in the colony, enthusiasm for Garvey's program, and indeed confirm that he was a "black messiah".[62] Colonial officials were eager to dismiss Garvey and put the success of the UNIA behind them. Privately, they spoke of his decline and belittled his efforts to rebuild his following. However, their actions tell a much different story. The constant harassment, monitoring of his movements, reports on his speeches, and attempts to charge him with minor crimes indicate that Garvey was tapping into issues they did not want addressed and the support he drew as a political candidate exacerbated these fears. Therefore while colonial officials frequently joked about Garvey behind closed doors, they also recognized that if they did not put sufficient roadblocks in his way they he was more than capable of reinventing himself and becoming as powerful, if not more so, than he had been throughout the early 1920s.

In many ways, Garvey's political exploits in late 1929 and 1930 represented his last cogent stab at reclaiming a coherent representative leadership position. From 1930 until 1935 Garvey's programs and attempts to reestablish himself as the firm leader of the UNIA only went downhill. By fall 1931 these internal disputes had escalated to the point where Garvey was no longer writing for the periodical he helped to make an international

phenomenon, the *Negro World.* Garvey's battle with many American UNIA factions continued to intensify as 1930s wore on. While there were factions that attempted to remain loyal to Garvey (most notably the Garvey Club) the New York based UNIA, Inc continued to gain steam and even recruited the formerly loyal Cincinnati branch headed up by William Ware.[63] This split led to the banning of mails between America and Garvey's Jamaican UNIA between June 1932 and April 1934 from the American government choking Garvey's fund-raising efforts and making it extremely difficult for him to maintain allegiances and financial ties with the Garveyites who chose to stay loyal to their original leader.[64] Garvey established new periodicals with which to spread his message: the *Blackman* (published from 1934-1939) and the *New Jamaican*, a less successful evening newspaper that only lasted from summer of 1932 through fall 1933. However, these publications faced the realities of Garvey's financial troubles when Garvey was forced to cancel the *New Jamaican* altogether and scale the *Blackman* back from a daily to a weekly publication.

Garvey's difficulties culminated with the 1934 international convention held at Edelweiss Park in 1934 which was a "poorly attended affair" after which Garvey lashed out at the Jamaican populace for their lack of attendance.[65] As Garvey fought to maintain some semblance of control over the UNIA, he only lost ground as American Garveyites firmly declared that Garvey had "absolutely (no)" connection with the UNIA, Inc.[66] Billing themselves as the original UNIA, and denouncing Garvey's version as a "British association" and a "comparatively young body" the UNIA, Inc sought to cut ties with Garvey once and for all.[67] The unit claimed that Garvey had lost his "old fire" and that his writing lacked the ability to send "the blood of the black men racing through their

veins is sadly lacking".[68] Garvey was accused of taking an increasingly conservative stand and of being out of step with the very movement that he brought to the forefront of black uplift throughout the early 20th century.

While Garvey never lost his organizational spirit, as late as October 1934 he was still planning to outline "the new programme" that arose out of the convention in the *Blackman*, he found himself increasingly under siege and his movement a shadow of what it had been.[69] Garvey, the eternal optimist, never gave up on revitalizing his flagging movement, even after he relocated to London in early 1935. Throughout the remainder of his life Garvey continued to attempt to recreate the success he had early in the movement. He never gave up, and his enthusiasm was unmatched. Despite this, he just did not connect with people in the same way that he initially had. Probably the most important reason for this was Garvey's evolution into an increasingly conservative leader throughout the mid to late 1930s demonstrating a lack of support for American sympathies with conquered Ethiopians and unimaginative view of the British Caribbean labor renegotiation.[70]

Garvey's lack of interest in the support for Ethiopia and the British Caribbean labor revolts were perplexing, especially to his followers. Many of the most fervent supporters of these issues were Garveyites or heavily influenced by the work Garvey had done throughout the 1920s and they denounced Garvey's portrayal of Ethiopia in the *Amsterdam News* as a "lost cause" with indignation.[71] The fluidity of the Garvey movement and the followers of Garvey was well illustrated by examining these examples. Indeed, Garveyism had evolved to the point where his followers were no longer in need of his approval and they did not wait for his opinion to decide which

stance to take. Initially inspired by Garvey, UNIA members and Garvey sympathizers built their own set of values that they referred to as Garveyism. Based more closely on Garvey's powerful 1920s message of resistance, reclamation of Africa, and black business, these local leaders refused to accept the increasingly conservative message Garvey stood behind in the late 1930s. Why Garvey was so hesitant to support the Ethiopians or laborers throughout the British Caribbean remains somewhat of a mystery. Robert Hill, editor of the Garvey Papers, suggests it was because he was "cut off geographically and emotionally from his old supporters".[72] Whether it was distance, age, or a change of heart will never be conclusively known. However, what is clear is that Garveyites continued to reinvent, rework, and evolve Garveyism – even after Garvey was no longer involved. They utilized his tradition of organization and his ideas to promote their own plans. While Garvey was not with them as a staunch supporter in the ways they might have preferred, they had Garvey in their ideas, resistance, and uplift techniques. Garvey died in London in 1940.

While Garvey found himself on the decline during the 1930s, the people who had been his followers and sympathized with the UNIA fought to keep the movement alive. Just as UNIA members in New York City adapted and evolved the movement to fit their local needs, former Garvey adherents in the British Caribbean utilized Garveyism as a launching point for labor protests. One of the major casualties of this evolution was the loss of the UNIA name. While American Garveyites preserved the name UNIA and kept their ties with Garvey intact, British Caribbeans left the name behind. They folded ideas of unity, social protest, land reform, and the building of infrastructure into new ventures, primarily labor unions.[73]

The labor movement throughout the British Caribbean was undoubtedly the result of many forces coalescing simultaneously. Longstanding grievances had finally reached their boiling points, workers were increasingly unwilling to continue to labor under unfair labor agreements and live in terrible conditions. I do not seek to paint Garveyism as the sole reason the labor revolts erupted in the 1930s, only to show that the movement itself did not fade into irrelevance and die off. Instead, Garvey's programs were a part of the complex web of events that pushed the British Caribbean labor force into large scale rebellion. As Garvey sought to regain a leadership position, ran for office, and gave speeches throughout Jamaica in the 1930s, he could not have understood how profound an impact he was having. Garvey's work helped to bring racist power and injustice into sharp relief. While sympathetic listeners might not have been willing to throw in with Garvey as the solution to these problems, Garvey's work throughout the region was central in inspiring people who did have a practical plan for uplift: labor leaders.

Labor leaders frequently employed language, tactics, ideas, plans, and uplift measures proposed by Garvey in the 1920s and 1930s. Some of these leaders utilized Garvey's ideas directly and credited him with inspiring them. This was the case with William Wellington Wellwood Grant Uriah Butler, and Alexander Bustamante. Even as Garvey denounced the labor rebellions from London, labor leaders were busy utilizing the work of his lifetime to fight British authorities, landowners, and employers to get a better life for working class British Caribbeans. While Garvey himself might not have agreed with the methodology or seen labor unions as a long term solution to Afro-Caribbean problems, his ideas were nonetheless employed and adapted to serve this very movement. This section seeks to make important connections between these leaders and

the Garvey movement to show how this exchange took place. The specific ideas, plans, and uplift measures inspired by Garveyism are explored in more detail in chapter 7.

One figure whose life closely paralleled the evolution from Garveyism to labor politics was St. William Wellington Wellwood Grant. Grant, born in St. Andrew Parish, Jamaica in 1894 worked as a dockworker until the start of World War I when he stowed away on a British ship and joined the Eleventh British West India Regiment.[74] After World War I concluded, Grant relocated to New York City where he became an active Garveyite. Grant worked actively with the loyal New York City branches of the UNIA until a break with Garvey in 1934 when Garvey chastised him for his "violent street corner techniques" and expelled him from the organization.[75] After this rebuke from Garvey, Grant elected to stay in Jamaica and continued his work with the UNIA there.

Supporting himself as a cook and through his public speaking, Grant spoke at a variety of locations throughout Jamaica including Victoria Park, Cope Memorial Church, and Oxford Street often bearing the UNIA flag on his platform and utilizing Garvey's name liberally.[76] Much as Garvey had a decade before in the United States, Grant built a following through travel and impressive oratory. He was known for his UNIA uniforms of his own design and he cut an imposing figure as he traveled the countryside wearing this elaborate clothing.[77] Throughout the 1930s, Grant's platform evolved from the proliferation of Garvey's nationalism and African-centered variety to a practical labor platform. Grant continued his move toward the politics of labor when he partnered with Alexander Bustamante in 1937 at one of his public speaking engagements.

Bustamante, who became Jamaica's first prime minister in 1962, and Grant made an imposing pair as they worked and spoke together frequently throughout the late 1930s.

Bustamante, standing 6'4", was born in 1884 of Irish Catholic and Taino origins. Bustamante, born William Alexander Clark, spent most of his youth traveling throughout the Caribbean and Central America visiting countries such as Panama and Cuba. Much like young Marcus Garvey, Bustamante felt himself destined for greater things believing at a fairly young age that he was destined to lead Jamaica. After securing himself financially through wise investment in the American stock market, Bustamante returned to Jamaica in 1932. Upon his arrival he rediscovered that the majority of the country were working and living in terrible conditions.

He quickly made a name for himself in the mid 1930s advocating against colonial rule and becoming a regular contributor to the *Daily Gleaner* as well as a few British newspapers. He was also a very engaged social activist involving himself with an anti-water meter protest and offering his services as a negotiator to a strike at the Serge Island Estate. By 1937, Bustamante had secured a position as treasurer in the Jamaica Workers and Tradesmen Union founded one year earlier by AGS Coombs.[78] Bustamante, who had traveled widely and worked in a wide variety of professions (including working on the docks and as a cook) was a natural speaker and leader. He was well versed in labor problems in other British Caribbean nations such as Barbados and Trinidad and billed himself as a representative of "lower and middle class people". The self styled "people's champion" led a series of strikes throughout Frome in 1938 which led to six deaths, fifty injuries, and eighty-nine people charged with rioting. His championing of the peoples' causes as well as his tireless ambition, brought him a greater leadership role and throughout the remainder of the 1930s and 1940s. Bustamante, or the "Chief" as he became known, advocated on behalf of workers and was instrumental in organizing

strikes and even took control of the Tradesmen Union, renaming it the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union (BITU).[79]

Bustamante and Grant formed a powerful duo throughout the late 1930s and early 1940s advocating on behalf of workers throughout the British Caribbean. The pair utilized marches, protests, and strikes throughout the period to mobilize workers and had a meteoric rise to power in May of 1938. In early May, Bustamante and Grant led 3,000 demonstrators to the offices of the *Jamaica Standard* and called for recognition for workers and an end to low wages and poor working conditions.[80] The public speaking of Bustamante and Grant energized workers across the island. Initially, sugar workers were their strength but within a week or so Kingston dock workers joined forces with the sugar workers.[81] Workers flocked to hear Grant and Bustamante speak and the duo was arrested while leading a march through the streets of Kingston. They were charged with sedition and a host of other lesser charges.[82] The arrests of Bustamante and Grant fueled the fire of labor discord and gave the workers a cause to solidly unite behind and by the time they were released Bustamante was recognized as the pre eminent labor leader in the colony and Grant was similarly recognized as a "cult hero" throughout the island.[83]

Bustamante and Grant had a powerful but tumultuous partnership as labor icons throughout the late 1930s and early 1940s. They represented a formidable team in the best of times, but at their worst they fought each other tooth and nail just as hard as they fought employers. Many of these debates centered around the impact of Garvey, how many of Garvey's values should be included in the labor movement, and how Garveyism should play into the rising labor movement. Grant saw the labor movements as the logical extension of Garveyism. Bustamante saw a continuation of Garveyism as

problematic on many levels. He was concerned about the historic mismanagement of monies connected with the UNIA as well as the continued relevance of focusing on Africa.[84] Grant's allegiance to the Garvey movement and his continued vision of the labor movements as an extension of the UNIA was one of many points of friction between the two leaders culminating with Grant's publication of "For a Better Union" which challenged Bustamante's leadership.

Despite the battles waged between the two leaders, they continued to remain mutually supportive. However, the role that Garveyism should play in labor movements continued to be a major sticking point between the two. Grant, who had a rather cantankerous reputation as an instigator in both the UNIA and the BITU was reluctant to focus strictly on workers' issues despite the fact that he had battled intensely with Garvey over various issues throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Grant, described by one commentator as a "dyed in the wool Garveyite" sought to cooperate with the UNIA and keep it alive through trade unionism.[85] Bustamante, through Grant and many of his other followers, certainly found himself operating in the shadow of Garvey. His leadership, plans, ideas, and fundraising techniques were always subject to comparison with Garvey's and constantly measured for their congruence with the UNIA. While, over time, Bustamante built his own legacy (he is also a Jamaican national hero) the popularity and the foundations built by Garveyism shaped what he could do and laid the groundwork for his important negotiations on behalf of workers. While Bustamante might not have headed an "official" UNIA branch, he found that his top lieutenant and much of his membership were shaped by the work Garvey did throughout the world in the 1920s and 1930s.

Bustamante, however, was not alone in working on the foundations built by Garvey during this tumultuous period. Uriah Butler, introduced at the outset of this chapter, was also a Garveyite. Butler, often seen as a "heroic" and "charismatic" leader was born in Grenada on January 21, 1897.[86] After fighting in World War I as a young man, Butler relocated to Trinidad in 1921 where he took up the cause of working class labor. Butler joined up with Arthur Cipriani's Trinidad Labour Party shortly after his arrival and employment in the oil industry and worked in the industry for many years before an industrial accident in 1929 at the Venezuelan Consolidated Oilfields in Palo Saco left him "permanently incapacitated".[87] Throughout the 1920s and early 1930s Cipriani's leadership amongst the working class of the British Caribbean was of a brand that colonial authorities were perfectly willing to accept. Cipriani made progress, registering more people to vote, and representing the "barefooted man" as a representative in Trinidadian politics from Port of Spain.[88] Cipriani was able to skirt the line between real agitation and acceptance by colonial authorities adeptly. While he did represent the interests of the working class, he did so in such a way that was "perfectly acceptable to colonial authorities" because he was a member of the upper class, a cocoa plantation owner, and a member of high society.[89]

Throughout the 1920s and early 1930s, workers were willing to follow Cipriani and he did make some progress on their behalf. However, by 1936 Cipriani's leadership began to splinter as Adrian Cola Rienzi and Uriah Butler broke off from the TLP. Rienzi left the movement to form the Trinidad Citizen's League, a Leninist Communist organization that "operated as a small educational unit" aimed at forming a "core vanguard" of the proletariat.[90] Rienzi's organization was monitored by colonial officials,

but was never considered as serious or as great a threat to colonial stability as the activities of Uriah Butler. When Butler resigned from the TLP in July 1936, he was almost immediately embraced as a leader who had real connections with the working class of Trinidad.

Butler wasted no time in critiquing Cipriani and forming his own organization to address the shortcomings he saw in the TLP. He formed the British Empire Workers and Citizens Home Rule Party to Reach out to the rural areas of the colony.[91] While Cipriani had success reaching the urban working class, Butler saw that the rural citizens were woefully underrepresented. Butler's "action oriented" appeal to this sector of the population did not go unnoticed by the rural working class or by government officials. Butler advocated on behalf of rural workers, most notably by demanding the nationalization of the Trinidad oil industry. Butler's message was heard loud and clear by rural workers and they flocked to his movement. While Cipriani's union had been a more urban organization, most of Butler's influenced stemmed from his own working class background and his focus on the urban working class.

Butler's rhetoric also differed from that of Cipriani in important ways. While Cipriani favored a constitutional approach working gradually through official government channels, Butler (like Garvey) frequently advocated home rule fueled by the wishes of the working class.[92] While Cipriani was interested in employing the British system of government to advance the working class, Butler saw reform in the hands of the "workers and peasants".[93] The constituents that represented the majority of Butler's followers were many of the same people who had so had been strong supporters of Garvey throughout the 1930s. In some ways Butler's message represented the logical

conclusion of Garvey's ideas of the 1920s. Butler's interest in self-rule mirrored Garvey's quest for nationhood in that it promoted Afro-Caribbeans benefiting from the natural resources the island provided in the same way that Garvey sought to utilize the vast resources of Africa to benefit a strong black nation.

Butler's passionate speeches and representation for the working class rural population earned him a valuable place in the hearts of colonial workers as well as the attention of colonial officials. While the charges of sedition were eventually dismissed, Butler was still jailed from 1937 until 1939 for inciting to riot. He was further detained upon the outbreak of World War II as a dangerous figure and was not released until 1945. Despite this, Butler was an important figure in the labor struggle and his representation of rural oil and agricultural workers was central in the struggle for fair wages and labor practices. Butler has been credited as the first person to strike a blow against colonialism and June 19, the anniversary of the oilfield riots or "Butler riots" has been designated a national holiday in Trinidad.

Leaders like Bustamante, Grant, and Butler certainly were more than pretenders to Garvey's throne. These leaders brought important ideas, proposals, and plans to the table and are widely considered heroes throughout the British Caribbean – similarly to Garvey. However, it is unlikely these leaders would have been able to make the same impact without Garvey. Virtually all of these leaders have acknowledged the contributions and importance of Garvey to their own political movements. The UNIA and Garvey offered two types of aid to the leaders that followed him in the 1930s. The first was ideological, discussed at length in the following chapter. However, just as

importantly was the protest infrastructure that Garvey made commonplace throughout the British Caribbean.

The UNIA itself offered a new way for people to think about advocating for change in their communities. Throughout the 1920s, African Americans and Afro-Caribbeans joined the group in massive numbers. Its structure, format, and communication networks became something familiar as the decade wore on. Members got their news from the *Negro World*, came to regularly scheduled meetings, listened to Garvey's public speeches, and were well acquainted with issues of race, politics, wages, and international events. While Garvey's UNIA may not have been as strong as it was during the 1920s, it offered future movements an infrastructure on which to build. Leaders drew generously from the tradition the UNIA established in the 1920s, specifically in the areas of fundraising, propaganda, mass meetings, and in how they dealt with public authorities. New leaders did not have to work nearly as hard to recruit members nor define nearly so clearly what membership meant. Because many Afro Caribbean workers were familiar with the tradition of the UNIA, it made them more enthusiastic to join other movements of similar aim.

One of the central needs of any organization is a way to raise money and keep operations running smoothly. Fundraising was one of Garvey's greatest strengths as evidenced by his empire of newspaper, local businesses, large scale corporations, and elaborate conventions. While Garvey was a disciple of Booker T. Washington, a skilled fundraiser in his own right, he did not employ Washington's tactics of appealing to white philanthropists to fund his enterprises. Most UNIA activities, business, and ventures were funded through UNIA members and sympathizers. Nearly every issue of the *Negro*

World included advertisements inviting readers to help "carry on its work".[94] Furthermore, Garvey suggested methods for fundraising in his Five Year Plan of the UNIA. In this document Garvey employed a Washingtonian philosophy of adapting the pitch to the audience suggesting:

> "One of the arguments to be used with the preacher is that the association by preaching unity, is assisting the Church by getting Negroes to support their own religion as their own everything else.
> In approaching a doctor you should point out that by the Association preaching unity, self-support and self reliance, you are helping to increase his practice in the community; the same argument should be used for Negro lawyers and Negro business men."[95]

Garvey's strategies were not limited to black professionals, he also suggested strategies for "common people", as well as strategies such as printing hand bills, collecting "special contributions", and instructions for how to set up a new UNIA division.[96] Garvey was truly a master of not only fundraising himself, but of teaching others the art.

A foundational part of supporting labor unions and their leaders was also fundraising. When Butler made a trip to Britain to advocate on behalf of workers and promote Trinidad's independence, he was aided in part by the "Butler in Britain" fund collected by his supporters.[97] While British authorities had their doubts about how much money was actually in the fund, Butler's supporters claimed to have collected well over $5000 to support their leader.[98] During the same fundraising trip, Butler also appealed to the people in a Garveyite fashion stating that "halls in certain parts of London cost around $100 per night and as a result more money was needed".[99] Butler's fare home from London was also covered by his constituency in response to a call he put out to them asking for money to pay his fare.[100] In addition to requesting funds at home, Butler

also requested funds at his speaking engagements. After one speech given in London, Butler reportedly asked the crowd for contributions to cover the cost of the hall.[101]

Butler's fundraising techniques bore many similarities to Garvey's. While Butler was obviously not in control of nearly the sum of money Garvey had at his peak, his call for contributions from his followers was made in a very similar vein and he seems to have gotten a strong enough response from them to not only travel but book fairly expensive halls in London to spread his anti-colonialist message. Butler was a former Garveyite and undoubtedly was first exposed to fundraising through his local branch.

In addition to fundraising, labor leaders also borrowed Garvey's techniques in organizing people. The UNIA was well known throughout the United States for its lavish displays, parades, and public speaking events. In fact, Garvey built the UNIA in its earliest days through a thirty-eight state speaking tour throughout the United States. Garvey was also a very active public speaker after he returned home from the United States and later when he moved to London. Always a powerful speaker, Garvey moved people when he spoke and at least helped to establish public speaking engagements as recruiting sessions for potential UNIA members.

This was a tradition labor leaders drew on as they sought to promote their groups and build a following.[102] Much like UNIA meetings, Butler's meetings often involved several speakers and were promoted through the use of handbills.[103] At one session over ten speakers took the podium expressing views from various perspectives.[104] One after another speakers paraded to the podium to cheers from audiences. Much like Garvey's celebrations, these meetings were frequently held on holidays. On one such occasion, May Day, Butler's supporters organized a mass demonstration on the island of St.

Vincent.[105] Workers marched through the island carrying Butler-themed signs with the march finally culminating on the front steps of the town hall where resolutions were passed and one colonial official noted that "May Day passed off quietly".[106]

During other times labor leaders employed the strategies of Garvey to avoid drawing the ire of colonial authorities. While Garvey is frequently seen as a controversial figure in constant strife with both British and American authorities, such was not his rhetoric. Garvey frequently attempted to appease his enemies by stating that "you should never join rebellious movements against society" and that his followers should "always adopt a friendly attitude toward the police in your community" because they are "never the public enemy, but the public protector."[107] Considering Garvey's reputation for anti-colonial demonstrations and frequent run ins with public authorities, this position is somewhat unexpected. It is likely this was a tactic on Garvey's part to avoid unnecessary conflict with the power structure. While it obviously failed to keep him out of the line of fire completely, it at least made it more difficult for authorities to arrest and imprison him.

Butler's exchanges with British authorities bear uncanny similarities to the battles Garvey had with Jamaican officials in the late 1920s as he tried to launch a political career. Much like Garvey, Butler always sought to couch his demands in language that indicated his loyalty to the British crown and colonial authorities. Despite these attempts, in May 1937 British colonial officials charged Butler with sedition for a speech given in Fyzabad.[108] Butler was accused of inciting murder because of comments he made relating to the conditions of workers in the oilfields. Specifically Butler stated that workers were willing to "fight and fight like hell" to avoid working conditions which he

said were "like slavery".[109] Butler passionately stated that he was willing to fight and die for workers rights and that charges of sedition would not deter him from agitating on behalf of workers. He also stated that if the people call upon the King and he does not cooperate that "you can break the law and come out in open rebellion".[110]

Bustamante also used this strategy, though he also was eventually imprisoned during World War II for being a threat to national security. In a letter to British authorities that demanded crown officials address problems of hunger and unemployment on Jamaica Bustamante cushioned the blow by saying:

> "For these conditions I attach no blame to the present Governor; he has been trying his best under a certain amount of adverse circumstances by giving relief work to a few thousand people, and there is also a Land Settlement more or less."[111]

While it failed to keep Bustamante, Butler, or Garvey out of jail this strategy was one commonly employed in order to appease government officials. In fact, government officials frequently commented that it was difficult to find the right time and offense to arrest these leaders because they did not want to upset their large followings. Such language and strategy made this task even more difficult for the authorities.

The next strategy utilized by Garvey and taken up by later leaders was the establishing and promotion of a periodical. The *Negro World* defined the Garvey movement for over a decade. The periodical allowed Garvey to have access to his followers on a frequent basis and kept the followers across the western hemisphere connected with what the movement at large was up to. Women's pages, international pages, and the front page address by Garvey made Garveyites in Africa, the Caribbean, and outlying regions of the United States feel like they were standing in Liberty Hall

hearing Garvey speak. Garvey helped establish the newspaper as a powerful tool of mobilization.

Butler utilized *The People* newspaper to cover his speaking engagements, cover the news of the movement, and promote labor unionization. While the newspaper was not solely dedicated to promoting his aims and viewpoints, it frequently covered Butlerite events and published regularly on Butler's activities. *The People,* published out of Port-of-Spain Trinidad advocated against colonial rule and covered Butler's activities. While the newspaper was not as large in terms of circulation or size as the *Negro World,* it served to remind people that Butler was an active leader poised to strike against colonial oppression. It kept people connected and assured them that progress was being made by Butler. The newspaper also made note of Butlerite victories throughout the region including one where Butlerites forced the resignation of Sir John Shaw due to a recent Butlerite fueled oil strike which "caused much alarm in London through public meetings by Uriah Butler."[112]

In many ways the most important contribution of Garveyism throughout the British Caribbean may not have been ideological at all, but in the tradition of organization. Garveyism set the stage for political protest and set the ball rolling for future leaders. It threw a switch that could not be switched off despite colonial officials' best efforts. When they jailed Garvey, new leaders arose. When they jailed the new leaders, the movements continued on. While Garveyism itself may not have continued on under the UNIA banner as it did in the United States, the tradition of organization certainly did. Furthermore, the majority of these groups, unions, and political parties drew generously from the Garvey platform as the next chapter discusses.

Notes

---

[1] *Negro World*, January 14, 1928. cited in Hill, *Garvey Paper*, Volume 7, xxxvii.
[2] "Letter from Chief Passport Officer to Colonial Office, July 23, 1937". Marcus M. Garvey, Passport. The National Archive CO 318/427/10.
[3] "Letter from Chief Passport Officer to Colonial Office, July 23, 1937". Marcus M. Garvey, Passport. The National Archive CO 318/427/10.
[4] "Letter from Chief Passport Officer to Colonial Office, July 23, 1937". Marcus M. Garvey, Passport. The National Archive CO 318/427/10.
[5] "Colonial Office Memo in Response to Garvey's Passport Application". Marcus M. Garvey, Passport. The National Archive CO 318/427/10.
[6] "Colonial Office Memo on the Status of Garvey", June 30, 1930. Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[7] "Colonial Office Memo on the Status of Garvey", June 30, 1930. Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[8] Colonial officials watched Garvey especially closely upon his return to Jamaica in 1927. His every speech, meeting, and move was closely monitored and reported on usually by Detective Charles A. Patterson. Hill, Robert, ed. *The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Papers,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), Volume 7.
Colonial officials were also wary of Garvey's activities in Africa and were more than willing to attempt to block his attempts to travel and speak amongst the people of that continent. While as early as 1923 officials continued to express hope that Garveyism was a flagging movement, there was always significant concern that a speaking tour by Garvey might revitalize it in new ways in British colonial holdings in Africa and the British Caribbean. Hill, Robert, ed. *The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Papers, African Series.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).
[9] Garvey's appeal in Africa has been best documented in the introduction to Volume 10 of The Marcus Garvey Papers. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, xxxviii. The idea of "race first" to describe Garvey's philosophies was first put forward by Tony Martin in the following text. Martin, Tony. *Race First: The Ideological and Organizational Struggles of Marcus Garveyand the Universal Negro Improvement Association. (*Dover, Ma: The Majority Press, 1986),
[10] Tony Martin, *Race First: The Ideological and Organizational Struggles of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association* (Dover, Ma: The Majority Press, 1986), Appendix A.
[11] Martin, *Race First,* Appendix A.
[12] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, xxxviii. Upon Garvey's release from an American prison he immediately encountered difficulty organizing a speaking tour throughout Central America. His efforts were stymied by American, British, and Central American authorities who did not want him interfering with the colonial regimes.
[13] "Editorial in *Negro World*, February 2, 1924." Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* 146-147.
[14] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, xxxviii.
[15] "Article by Cespedes Burke in the Panama *Star and* Herald", December 8, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 7.
[16] "Speech by E.B. Knox, Personal Representative of Marcus Garvey", December 11, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 16.
[17] "Report of Speech by Marcus Garvey in the *Daily Gleaner*", December 11, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 21; "A.S. Jelf to Sir Vernon G. W. Kell, Head, British Security Service" December 19, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 41.
[18] "Report of Speech by Marcus Garvey in the *Daily Gleaner*", December 11, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 31.
[19] "Report of Speech by Marcus Garvey in the *Daily Gleaner*", December 11, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 21.
[20] "Report on Marcus Garvey by Detective Charles A. Patterson ", December 13, 1927 Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* ,Volume 7, 21.
[21] "Speech by Marcus Garvey" December 25, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 73; "Speech by Marcus Garvey" September 2, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 221. In this speech Garvey takes

special attention to concentrate on the condition of the poor in the British Caribbean and American south and seeks to combat the "Howl of Unemployment".
[22] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", December 25, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 75.
[23] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", December 25, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 94-161.
[24] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", December 25, 1927. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 94-161. Garvey not only was an active public speaker during this period, but was also publishing regularly in the *Negro World* hoping to consolidate the splintering factions of the UNIA.
[25] "John Burdon, Governor, British Honduras, to L.C.M.S. Amery, Secretary of State for the Colonies," March 3, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 135, n.3.
[26] "John Burdon, Governor, British Honduras, to L.C.M.S. Amery, Secretary of State for the Colonies," March 3, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 135, n.3.
[27] "John Burdon, Governor, British Honduras, to L.C.M.S. Amery, Secretary of State for the Colonies," March 3, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 135, n.3.
[28] "John Burdon, Governor, British Honduras, to L.C.M.S. Amery, Secretary of State for the Colonies," March 3, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 134.
[29] "Roy T. Davis, U.S. Minister to Costa Rica to Frank Billings Kellogg" March 5, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 136.
[30] "Editorial by Marcus Garvey in the *Negro World*", October 8, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 281.
[31] "Interview with Marcus Garvey by Hubert W. Peet", October 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 286.
[32] "Wesley Frost, American Consul General to Frank Billings Kellog" November 8, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 290.
[33] "Article in *Montreal Gazette*", November 1, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 289, n.1.
[34] "Editorial by Marcus Garvey in the *Negro World*", July 29, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 311.
[35] "Editorial by Marcus Garvey in the *Negro World*", December 5, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 293.
[36] "Editorial by Marcus Garvey in the *Negro World*", December 5, 1928. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 294.
[37] "Speech by Marcus Garvey at the 1929 UNIA Convention" August 5, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 315.
[38] "Speech by Marcus Garvey at the 1929 UNIA Convention" August 5, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 316.
[39] "Speech by Marcus Garvey at the 1929 UNIA Convention" August 5, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 316.
[40] "Article in the *Daily Worker*", September 27, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 341.
[41] Martin, *Race Firs*, 12.
[42] "Article in New York Times", June 24, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 304.
[43] "Article in New York Times", June 24, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 304.
[44] "Article in the *Daily Worker*", September 27, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 341.
[45] "Article in the *Negro World*", September 7, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 327.
[46] "Letter from Marcus Garvey to Phillip Snowdown, February 27, 1930". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[47] "Letter from Marcus Garvey to Phillip Snowdown, February 27, 1930". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[48] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 335-336.
[49] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 337.
[50] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 337.
[51] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 337.
[52] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 337.
[53] "Letter from Marcus Garvey to Phillip Snowdown, February 27, 1930". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.

[54] "Letter from Marcus Garvey to Phillip Snowdown, February 27, 1930". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3; "Jose de Ilovares to Henry L. Stimson Secretary of State"Enclosre September 27, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 345.
[55]Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, xlii.
[56] "Letter from Marcus Garvey to Phillip Snowdown, February 27, 1930". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[57] "Letter from Marcus Garvey to Phillip Snowdown, February 27, 1930". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[58] "Letter from Marcus Garvey to Phillip Snowdown, February 27, 1930". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[59] "Letter from Marcus Garvey to Phillip Snowdown, February 27, 1930". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[60] "Manifesto of the Honourable Marcus Garvey ". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3; "Marcus Garvey Campaign Handbill". Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[61] "Colonial Office Memo on the Status of Garvey", June 30, 1930. Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[62] "Colonial Office Memo on the Status of Garvey", June 30, 1930. Movements of Marcus Garvey. The National Archive CO 318/399/3.
[63] "William Ware, President Cincinnati UNIA Division No. 146 to Nugent Dodds, Acting Head, Criminal Division, Department of Justice", February 10, 1931. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, xliii, 442-444.
[64] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, xliii.
[65] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, xlv; "Article in the *Jamaica Times*", August 25, 1934. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 601.
[66] "Article in the *Negro* World", July 7, 1934. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 587.
[67] "Article in the *Negro* World", July 7, 1934. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 587.
[68] "Article in the *Negro* World", July 7, 1934. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 588.
[69] "Marcus Garvey to R.L. Whitney", October 10, 1934. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 608.
[70] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, xlvii.
[71] "Article in the *New York Amsterdam News*", January 30 1937. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 723.
[72] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* xlvii.
[73] Nathanial Samuel Murell, William David Spencer, and Adrian Anthony McFarlane, eds. *Chanting Down Babylon: The Rastafari Reader.* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998), 153.
[74] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[75] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[76] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[77] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[78] Nigel Bolland,, *On the March Labour Rebellions in the British Caribbean 1934-1939.* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers), 1995, 142-143.
[79] Bolland, *On the March,* 1995, 140-150.
[80] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[81] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[82] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[83] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[84] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[85] Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, n4, 309.
[86] Bolland, *On the March,* 100.
[87] W. Richards Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King Riots and Sedition in 1937* (Port of Spain: Key Caribbean Publications, 1976), 57.
[88] Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King,* 12.
[89] Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King,* 12.
[90] Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King,* 12.
[91] Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King,* 13.
[92] Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King,* 14.
[93] Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King,* 14.

[94] Jacques-Garvey, *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey,* 103.
[95] Hill and Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons,* 343-350.
[96] Hill and Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons,* 343-350.
[97] "Extract from Letter from Governor, Trinidad August 12, 1949". Uriah Butler, The National Archive. CO537/4902; "Confidential Letter to Beckett, May 25, 1949", Uriah Butler, The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[98] "Extract from Letter from Governor, Trinidad August 12, 1949". Uriah Butler, The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[99] "Extract from Trinidad Press Release, April 22, 1949", Uriah Butler, The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[100] "Secret Memo from Sir John Shaw, December 14, 1949", Uriah Butler, The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[101] "Government Report, December 20, 1948", Uriah Butler, The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[102] "Trade Union Resolutions, Jamaica, 1945", Trade Unions, Jamaica. The National Archive. CO137/851/9.
[103] "Butler Meeting Hand Bill, Friday, December 19, 1949", The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[104] "Butler Meetings", Uriah Butler, The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[105] "Government Secret Memo no. 11, May 4, 1949", The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[106] "Government Secret Memo no. 11, May 4, 1949", The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[107] Hill and Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons,* 240-241.
[108] Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King,* 27.
[109] Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King,* 19.
[110] Jacobs, ed., *Butler Versus the King,* 30.
[111] "Letter from Bustamante to The Hon. Malcolm McDonald, January 29, 1940", CO Alexander Bustamante Miscellaneous, CO137/840/5.
[112] "*The People* Newspaper, Saturday, September 3, 1949", Uriah Butler, The National Archive CO537/4902.

CHAPTER 7: DESCENDANTS OF GARVEY

"We want our own government and it must be self-government too. The niggers of this country shall rise. We do not want to go to war like a timid dog. We want revolution..."
-Alexander Bustamante, 1940[1]

On September 9, 1929 Marcus Garvey appeared before a crowd of "fellow citizens" to outline his latest plan for Afro Caribbean uplift.[2] As he stepped before the crowd in the aptly named town of Cross Roads, Garvey found himself also at a crossroads. Throughout the 1910s and early 1920s Garvey had commanded an army of tens of thousands. His every decree was meant with unparalleled enthusiasm. By the late 1920s, this was no longer the case. Government officials were optimistic his fortunes were on the wane and his followers were not nearly as numerous as they had been during the 1920s.

Even so, Garvey carried on. Never one to be dissuaded easily or to give in, Garvey reinvented himself throughout the 1920s and 1930s. However, no incarnation of the Garvey spirit and program was as compelling, complete, and as clearly outlined as the one he gave at Cross Roads on September 9, 1929. Garvey's People's Political Party was a foray into politics heretofore left untouched by UNIA influence. In this speech he painstakingly outlined a 14 point platform (which was later significantly expanded) and put forth his agenda to send 14 candidates to run for office in the upcoming general elections. These candidates representing the PPP platform were to help "bring about a better Jamaica" by addressing longstanding issues such as representation in government, minimum wages, land reform, and the improvement of infrastructure throughout the

island.[3] As each plank was introduced, Garvey was frequently interrupted by the thunderous applause of the crowd throughout his lengthy speech – many of whom were disenfranchised.

Garvey's platform addressed longstanding issues that plagued not only Jamaica but a good majority of the British Caribbean region. These 14 points were extremely relevant to the crowd gathered at Cross Roads and to the majority of working people throughout the region as Garvey addressed working conditions, minimum wages, self-government and the promotion of Jamaican owned industry.[4] Upon the conclusion of his speech, Garvey could only have been confident that his fledgling political party was ripe to recruit followers and adherents throughout the region. In fact, Amy Jacques Garvey later said that Garvey's hope was to spread the PPP not only throughout the British Caribbean, but into regions such as Haiti and the remainder of the French Caribbean.[5] Judging by the applause and enthusiasm that greeted the well-attended speech and by the public outcry that he run for office; Garvey's attempts at improving living conditions seemed to be off to splendid start.

Garvey's speech on that day and his history of successful mobilization made him a target of British colonial officials and it was not long before he was arrested and unceremoniously tossed into jail on charges of sedition. Whether justified or not, these charges stripped the PPP of any momentum it might have had and showed would be members that this new party was one that would be fought bitterly by British authorities. In remarkably short order after Garvey ascended the stage to speak in September of 1929 the PPP fell apart. Despite some promising victories early on, the opposition proved too strong for Garvey to battle. After fielding a full slate of candidates to run in the elections

of 1930, the Party found itself struggling to survive and by late 1930 it had vanished from the scene as quickly as it had emerged at the 1929 UNIA Convention.[6]

Was Garvey's PPP a last gasp at relevance from a leader quickly fading from the scene? Was Garveyism truly a moment that had passed by the start of the 1930s? This chapter argues that this was not the case. I attempt to show that Labor leaders who rose to power in the late 1930s built upon Garvey's PPP platform and earlier work throughout the world to fuel their agendas. While Garvey may have been guilty of honesty to a fault in the critiques of corrupt Jamaican judges that landed him in jail, he did not err in most of his 14 points where he enthusiastically advocated solutions for longstanding problems contributing to the persistently dire standard of living in the British Caribbean. Perhaps the reason why British authorities were so eager to see Garvey behind bars was that his program tapped so directly into the basic problems of survival on the island that they feared his impact not just as a leader of a mass movement but as a potentially unstoppable political force.

That potential never blossomed into real gains for Garvey; the 1930s were not a prosperous time for him. His PPP was undermined before it got started, his newspapers and periodicals struggled to raise enough money for publication, and by the conclusion of the decade Garvey's health was failing leading to his eventual death in 1940 in London. However, throughout the 1930s and even into the late 1940s the planks of his PPP program as well as the basic guiding principles of the UNIA continued to subtly revisit themselves upon British authorities, employers, and landowners. While the labor upheaval and the movement for independence from Britain were not solely the intellectual property of Garvey, his principles and ideas worked their way into the

programs of leaders like Uriah Butler and Alexander Bustamante as well as uplift groups such as the Negro Progress Convention on British Guiana. Across the region, African American workers, leaders, and voters were influenced either directly or indirectly by the work and foundation Garvey painstakingly laid during the previous decade. Former UNIA followers threw their lot in with a variety of labor groups and many rose to leadership position within these groups and unions. Whether officials knew it or not, the UNIA had changed the terms of negotiation between workers and employers, rich and poor, powerful and powerless. Not only did the UNIA give legitimate strategies for organizing, dealing with government authorities, and fundraising, but it offered a workable experienced constituency for leaders and movements that sought to make changes in the region with a ready made following eager to fight the forces that had oppressed them for so long.

This chapter seeks to show how the ideas and platform of Garvey offered a starting point for the reforms and rebellions of the 1930s and 1940s in the British Caribbean. Leaders, workers, and Afro-Caribbeans from all walks of life reshaped and built upon the ideas put forth by Garvey. Sometimes they were utilized with little change from their original aims, other times they were reshaped, just as Garveyites in New York City worked to fit old ideas into the rapidly evolving conditions in the region. And, while Garvey was not the only influence, the heartbeat of Garveyism beat in the background of labor negotiations, uplift groups, and political movements from Jamaica to British Guiana. This chapter seeks to pinpoint which of Garvey's ideas remained relevant and how they were used by new leaders and movements. Movement toward self-rule, wages and working conditions, land reform, improvement of colonial infrastructure, the

development of locally owned industries, the promotion of education, self-sufficiency, and race unity were issues that were addressed by Garvey in the 1920s and taken up by labor leaders and movements in sometimes strikingly similar ways. In some cases, labor leadership of the 1930s seemed to import Garveyism directly, at other times the similarities were less obvious. However, the terms of the battle between employers and employees throughout the region were at least partially determined by the struggles the UNIA had waged with British authorities, landowners, and the white power structure the decade before.

Perhaps the most celebrated, misunderstood, and heavily critiqued aspect of Garvey's program was what Tony Martin termed in 1973 "Nationhood".[7] In the original Aims and Objects of the UNIA Garvey put forth measures that promoted "the development of independent nations and communities".[8] Garvey aimed to establish a strong black nation in Africa with its own military, resources, and international respect. According to Garvey, such a nation would not only be profitable itself, but would also provide black people outside of Africa with greater strength as Garvey wrote "no race is truly free until it has a nation of its own" and "its own system of government".[9] Although at times Garvey's foes attempted to paint this program as a hopelessly impractical plan with no real legs, it showed remarkable staying power both in the 1920s and beyond.

Under Garvey's leadership the object of nationhood was primarily undertaken through an attempt to form alliances and cooperate with the leadership of the African nation of Liberia. In 1920, the UNIA entered negotiations with Liberia wherein the Liberian government would offer the UNIA "every facility for procuring lands for

business, agricultural or industrial purposes" and in return the UNIA would offer the country locally operated businesses, "do anything possible to help the Government of Liberia out of its economic plights", and eventually transfer UNIA headquarters to the African nation.[10] Initial returns seemed exceedingly positive. The UNIA's overtures were met with enthusiasm from Edwin Barclay, Liberian Secretary of State when he wrote back offering "every facility legally possible" for the UNIA to utilize for its business interests.[11]

The plans moved forward and the two sides continued negotiations on a positive note. By 1924, the initial group of UNIA volunteers were set to leave for Liberia in October. Plans were set in place for hospitals, schools, business ventures, and a variety of other internal improvements to be undertaken by the government of Liberia in cooperation with the UNIA.[12] However, as quickly as arrangements had been made between the two groups to form a cooperative mutually beneficial alliance, relations soured. Seemingly out of nowhere the Liberian government began rejecting UNIA members and quickly pulled out of the agreement to provide the UNIA with land to promote industry and agriculture in exchange for aid from the powerful group in establishing trade routes and infrastructure improvement. Garvey blamed the collapse of relations between Liberia and the UNIA on President King, whose leadership he described as "despotism", as well as on W.E.B. DuBois who had recently visited the country and was welcomed by King.[13] Relations between the two sides degraded further when Liberia agreed to offer the same plots of land slated for UNIA use to the Firestone Company for 99 years. Garvey was disgusted and declared that "again the Negro has defeated himself".[14]

Like most Garveyite measures, however, the plan to establish a strong black nation was more than capable of adapting to different contexts over time. Defeated in Liberia, jailed, deported, and facing long odds, Garvey's hopes to bring black people under self-rule did not wither away. While Garvey was never again able to muster enough support to deal with nations in Africa on an international level; his 1929 political platform subtly and cleverly worked toward these aims. In his speech at Cross Roads Garvey advocated both Jamaican representation in the British Parliament and an end to appointed governors who "ruled and governed by ignorance".[15] Garvey pointed to Canada, South Africa and Australia as British holdings that were allowed to rule themselves and asked why Jamaica was not allowed to do the same. This suggestion was met with cheers from his supporters who had gathered there.

Garvey's plan was far from a cry for independence, in fact, he assured British authorities in his speech that Jamaica "want[ed] to be a part of the British Empire".[16] However, when he requested self-rule for the Caribbean colony, he tapped into a deep current of resentment toward colonial rule. In fact, Garvey's very candidacy was a break from colonial tradition where merchants and planters were typically elected to government posts with little fanfare.[17] Garvey's plan, however conservative on the surface, gamely moved the colony toward self-rule and full scale independence even if it was a gradual approach. Garvey may also have adopted this approach to avoid drawing negative attention from British authorities who had the ability to destroy his fledgling political career.[18] If this was his approach, it appears to have been a wise one, because despite his care in stripping his platform of controversy, officials wasted no time in imprisoning Garvey for sedition based upon a later part of his speech.

Colonial officials may have won the battle when they imprisoned Garvey, but they failed to win the war. While Garvey's political career never took off, new leaders emerged buoyed by many of the same supporters who had followed Garvey's unlikely rise to power. One such leader was Alexander Bustamante who, 11 years after Garvey's speech, made a much less calculated demand for self-rule in a speech given in September 1940 in Jamaica. Bustamante passionately delivered a speech calling for Afro-Caribbean solidarity, self-rule, and threatened the white power structure with "shedding of blood" and a virtual shutdown of industry if the demands of workers were not heard.[19] Bustamante hauntingly echoed Garvey has he called for solidarity among the black working class and promised "the niggers of this country shall rise".[20] Like Garvey, Bustamante did not necessarily advocate a severing of ties with the British Empire, but he did call for "self government" with representatives drawn from the people living in the region.[21] The gist of Bustamante's speech read like it was drawn out of Garvey's newspapers and rhetoric both in his demand for the removal of foreign governors and his appeal to audiences on a racial level. While the venue, time, and speaker was very different, the audience and the message maintained many of the original tenets outlined by Garvey in 1929.

The parallels were not lost on British colonial officials. Even before Bustamante made these bold and inflammatory statements officials had already been plotting the best way to remove him from power without stirring "island wide" trouble the level of which would have been "incalculable".[22] Citing that no real labor progress could be made on the "shifting foundations" of the program outlined by a "mob leader" Jamaican officials acted quickly to imprison Bustamante just as they had imprisoned Garvey a decade

before.[23] Officials emphasized that Bustamante was not imprisoned because of the policies he was supporting as a trade union leader. They utilized World War II as a suitable cover under which to abduct him claiming that this was the only way to prevent "most serious disturbances in war time".[24]

Bustamante was not the only leader advocating for self-rule during this tumultuous period. Uriah Butler, active in Trinidad throughout the 1930s and 1940s was never afraid to take a strong stance opposite the British government. In 1936 he founded the British Empire Citizen's and Workers' Home Rule Party which was also known by a number of names throughout the 1930s and 1940s including the Workers' Home Rule Party or simply the Butler Party. Butler made self-rule the fundamental focus of the Party and of his platform. In fact, even though he was imprisoned as a threat to national security during World War II (1937-1939), his program promoting self-rule only gained momentum. By the late 1940s, Butler was overtly moving for self government in Trinidad and wrote upon his return from London that he would "chase the evils of the Crown Colony system out of our shores".[25]

While Garvey and Bustamante were more guarded in their critique of colonial rule, Uriah "Buzz" Butler, a former Garveyite, and his supporters were aggressive in their persistent critiques. Creech Jones, Colonial Office official, described the group's attacks as "little more than abuse of this government and of His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom".[26] However colonial officials chose to see Butler's attacks, those attacks tapped into a deep resentment within the colony fueling Butler's popularity and the popularity of his representatives. Butler's attacks on the Colonial Office were not isolated incidents or one small plank in a larger platform as Bustamante and Garvey's had

been, they were a central tenet in his program for worker uplift. In fact, the second point of a series of union resolutions put forth by Butler supporters stated that they demanded "the immediate transfer of power to the people of the United Country of Trinidad and Tobago".[27]

These critiques were not the ranting of a madman with a grudge to settle against the British government. They were representative of feelings throughout the colony as evidenced by the popularity and frequency of Butler meetings, primarily led by lower ranking members of the Party. On January 1, 1948 Pope Mclean presided over a Butler meeting and proclaimed that the British "Satanic Government" does "more harm than good," ignoring persistent conditions of poverty while spending money to try to silence Butler.[28] About one year later on October 1, 1949 Butler's representatives railed against British authorities for jailing, harassing, and refusing to meet with Butler, the true and accredited" representative of the people.[29]

The rumblings present in the British Caribbean objecting to longstanding misgovernment by the Colonial Office came to a head in this tumultuous period. What began as cautiously voiced displeasure at Colonial Office ignorance spread into the foundations of the Butler Home Rule Party. While British officials worked tirelessly to imprison, harass, and discredit leaders espousing the idea of home rule, it only delayed the inevitability. Marcus Garvey, Alexander Bustamante, and Uriah Butler (among others) were not masterminds bending the public at large to their wishes and personal goals. They were tapping into longstanding frustrations reaching back to emancipation. Disenfranchisement, poor representations in the court systems, and a blatant disregard for the interests of the majority left the Afro-Caribbean workers sorely wanting for

government on their terms. By 1949 the UNIA may have been just a faded, distant memory for many Afro-Caribbeans, but the fiery protests of Butler and his followers indicated that the spirit of Garveyism was alive and well throughout the region – even if it went unrecognized to the great majority of observers and even a few of the participants.

Perhaps the most obvious ways that labor leaders interests coincided with what Garvey had promoted after his deportation to Jamaica was in the areas of wages and working conditions. Prior to Garvey's conviction, trial, and subsequent deportation from the United States, he was not overly involved with working class issues. Long hours, low wages, and condemnation of exploitative agricultural practices did not dominate Garvey's speeches in the early and mid 1920s. Upon his arrival in Jamaica, however, he was forced to face these issues head on, primarily because these were the terms conflicts between the white power structure and Afro-Caribbeans were struggling. As I have attempted to demonstrate throughout this study, Garveyism was nothing if not adaptable.

In his initial 1929 PPP program, Garvey addressed issues of wages and working conditions in planks numbers two and three. The gist of these proposals was to protect Jamaican native labor against cheaper immigrant labor and to establish a basic minimum wage.[30] Garvey's minimum wage was directed at the working classes and he planned to introduce laws to "compel these Corporations to pay good wages".[31] Garvey argued that if strong minimum wage laws were enacted that it would hurt no one but "the selfish ones" and that it would bolster the economy because the working class would have more extra money and purchasing power.[32] In addition to the minimum wage, Garvey's initial plan also held provisions for those working the land. He railed against absentee landowners' massive holdings on the island and argued that they had no interest in the

Jamaican people other than to "bleed the country of what they want and the rest can go to hell."[33] In his speech, he related the story of his uncle Joseph Richards who rented a 25 acre property from a large landowner – Edward Carol Pratt. Richards diligently worked the land, employing young Marcus Garvey as a bookkeeper. He was able to make a nice living off the land and pay his bills until he was unceremoniously removed in the name of progress and greater profits for landowners.[34] Garvey argued, as the working class had for decades dating back to emancipation, that small landholdings were superior to outside owned thousand acre plantations and 1% of the population should not dominate the majority of the country's land.

These appeals to the working class were only expanded after Garvey was jailed for Sedition and effectively stymied on the political front. As Rupert Lewis points out, twelve of the planks in the expanded 26 point program related directly to workers' rights and issues.[35] In addition to his initial proposals protecting native labor and compelling corporations to pay a minimum wage, Garvey proposed an eight hour workday, a program to address unemployment, and improvements in local infrastructure and basic living conditions for the working class.[36] These reforms were a challenge to the ruling class of the island who owned corporations, land, and controlled employment. They spoke directly to the needs of the working class and promised to give them a governmental voice that would finally address these needs after decades of neglect. Workers in Jamaica and throughout the British Caribbean had by this time toiled long hours under terrible working conditions for terribly low wages since the 19th century and emancipation. Garvey was one of the earliest and boldest challenges to the status quo

and throughout the 1930s union leaders echoed the basic principles outlined in the PPP's 1929 platform.

Bustamante and most union leaders organized their fight for improved working conditions around the minimum wage law and its enforcement. While eventually a law was passed, Bustamante leveled scathing critiques at corporations who were not complying with it, ultimately taking the issue to the British Colonial Office. In a letter written to British authorities in 1940, Bustamante criticized employers for slashing "already skeleton wages, in most cases without the slightest justification".[37] Bustamante further contended that employers were using the fact that the Empire was at war to "strangle and victimize the workers" and threaten that any strike action "would be repressed by force".[38] The labor situation, portrayed as a "heart-rending and deplorable struggle to survive" by Bustamante, pivoted on the point of minimum wages which Garvey had advocated for almost a decade previous.[39]

In other cases, the fight was not over enforcing established minimum wage laws, but over enacting them at all. In 1940, the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union, numbering 70,000 workers across Jamaica, was called into action to help negotiate wages with the Shipper's Association over wages of dock workers.[40] The union used wages as its major sticking point, charging that worker's wages were "wholly inadequate for bare subsistence requirements" even without considering the increased cost of living throughout the Empire due to World War II.[41] Over and over again union leaders and representatives found themselves at odds with employers over wages, primarily those at the bottom of the economic scale.

The battle between workers and employers over wages did not stop in Jamaica. Throughout the British Caribbean, workers were increasingly fed up with wages that left them on the brink of starvation and they were negotiating with the best tools they had: strikes and labor disturbances. Wages in Trinidad were a major issue throughout the late 1930s and 1940s as lorry loaders worked to renegotiate wages from 12 to 14 cents hourly.[42] In the mid 1940s workers and employers once again battled as Uriah Butler's Home Rule Party boasted a $100,000 strike fund to support families while workers fought for better wages and working conditions.[43] On December 18 at 12 midnight 1,400 of Butler's union members made good on their promise and walked off the job reducing production at some refineries between 40%-80%.[44] In 1936, labor leaders in St. Vincent called attention to the fact that "wages are small" at a well attended meeting in Georgetown.[45] Even workers as far away as British Guiana were feeling the pinch of low wages. In a 1930 Labor memorandum the condition of the staple sugar industry "daily grow[s] from bad to worse" as the fate of the wage earner hung "in the balance."[46] Tales of strikes and of workers speaking or acting out against longstanding problems with low wages were evident throughout the region throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Garvey was hardly the first person to gripe about wages, but he set the tone for rebellion and openly defined the terms of battle in a way that later labor leaders found useful in drawing up their own battle plans.

While wages and working conditions were a central part of both Garvey's plan and those of labor unions later on, they were hardly the sole problem workers in the region faced. While industrial workers toiled away for low wages, agricultural workers faced similar situations couched in different terms. Agricultural workers were often

faced with the reality that they would never own their own land. The story of Garvey's uncle laboring in obscurity until his work no longer suited the large landholder was all too common throughout the region. Experienced agricultural workers found themselves at the mercy of less than 1% of the population who owned the majority of the land. Furthermore, many of these landowners were absentee, holding little interest in the development of the economies or infrastructures of their colonial holdings. The call of land reform taken up by Garvey in the late 1920s, was not one that was easily muffled or drowned out. Agricultural workers recognized the potential they had if they could only purchase a plot of land to work on. In a debate that originated with emancipation, agricultural workers often advocated for a reshaping of land ownership politics throughout the colonies.

Bustamante did his part to support these efforts, on a more moderate level. He was in full support of the Jamaican land settlement acts passed in hopes of settling more of the nation's land for agricultural purposes, which fell short of full scale land reform, but offered agricultural workers access to land they might otherwise never be able to acquire. However, Bustamante offered strong critiques of the program stating that in its current state the program was "a mere mockery to underfed destitute agricultural peasants."[47] Bustamante said that the program was poorly developed in that it only offered land with no roads, money, or infrastructure and that it was not practical for the average agricultural worker to take land in this state and transform it into productive agricultural soil.[48] He advocated for British intervention in these affairs and mentioned that the colonies in the Caribbean had been like a "ship without a rudder" in waiting for assistance from the metropole.[49] In short, Bustamante agreed with the land settlement

program in theory, but thought that it was not as ambitiously conceived of as it might have been in getting lands into the hands of experienced agricultural workers. While the full scale redistribution of land was never feasible due to the entrenched power structure in the British Caribbean, the basic idea of helping agricultural workers achieve land ownership was a persistent theme throughout the region.

Equally persistent was the condition of the infrastructure throughout the region. Since most of the British holdings in the Caribbean got their start as colonies built exclusively to extract resources, they were lacking in some of the basic necessities such as roads, sewer systems, parks, and schools. Marcus Garvey was an early critic of this underdevelopment and many planks of his program advocated advancing the infrastructure of Jamaica. Garvey specifically targeted coastal cities such as Morant Bay, Port Maria, and St. Ann's Bay – the town where Garvey was born. He argued that these towns were paralyzed from growth and improvement by the large landowners who owned the land bordering the city limits.[50] He stated that when merchants want to build additional facilities to improve and grow the cities that landowners "will not sell", but instead would "come right into the town and plant bananas."[51] This mindset was the same one that left the British Caribbean underdeveloped at the dawn of the 20th century, that of extraction. Garvey was conscious that the Caribbean islands had been used to make absentee landowners' wealth for centuries at the expense of the workers, native people, and residents of the region. Without the space and land to improve infrastructure in the colonies, they would be continually relegated to this role of underdeveloped exporter.

This role, pioneered by absentee planters throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, was taken up by large corporations such as the United Fruit Company in the 20th century. Beyond simply having the land to improve living conditions, there was also a need for investment. Garvey pointed out that the island of Jamaica had been left largely untouched for 50 years with some areas such as Sav-la-mar and Lucea left in "a most dilapidated condition".[52] He targeted these corporations to help develop schools, a university, a hospital, and basic necessities like docks in exchange for the massive profits they had taken out of the island.[53] He pointed out that Jamaica must mirror countries such as the United States where corporations were never allowed to simply withdraw wealth from the land and people without giving some of it back in the form of basic improvements. To a chorus of loud laughter, Garvey pointed out that the "only decent place" the United Fruit Company owned throughout the entire island of Jamaica was "their office in Harbour St."[54]

Garvey's demand that corporations and large landowners do their part to improve the region was a fundamental challenge to the social order. For centuries, the rich had made themselves richer by mining the resources and labor of the occupants of the British Caribbean. He challenged not only the wealthy landowners and corporations, but the colonial government to treat the island not as a center for extraction, but as a legitimate country with its own interests, goals, and needs. If the government was not willing to make regulations to improve the island, Garvey argued, conditions would continue to deteriorate and the people of Jamaica would always find themselves at the mercy of absentee landowners and international corporations.

This common thread was picked up later in the 1930s and into the 1940s by unions and labor leaders advocating not just for better working conditions but for improvement of the general state of the colonies in the Caribbean. Writing in 1940, Bustamante shrewdly proclaimed the colony's "great loyalty to the British throne" before he launched into a description of the terrible conditions working people faced throughout the region.[55] He spoke of overcrowded hospitals with people entering "by the thousands" suffering from maladies such as "tuberculosis, malnutrition, and poverty".[56] He painted a grim picture of the colony where people were going hungry and even lacking clothing and referred to the situation as an "unsightly disgrace".[57] Furthermore, Bustamante advocated an overhaul of government infrastructure where programs for land settlement and relief work were wholly underdeveloped. According to Bustamante, both the program for land reform and relief work were well conceived, but needed more attention, funding, and development from the British crown.

While Bustamante's pleas were not as straightforward, far-reaching, or as boldly stated as Garvey's the underlying current was the same. Bustamante echoed the undercurrent of Garvey's statements that British landowners, subjects, and international companies had utilized the Caribbean colonies to great benefit for themselves, but when the colonies found themselves in dire economic straits, these same forces were either offering little or no support for the workers who had helped them make great profits. Bustamante, like Garvey, called for the government to help develop the colonies' infrastructure specifically in terms of relief efforts. He charged that the British crown, who the people professed great loyalty to, should step in during these difficult times and help to mitigate the appalling conditions people were living in.

Conditions in Trinidad were similar to those in Jamaica. At a 1949 rally in support of Uriah Butler, Butler's followers touched on some of the same issues as Bustamante and Garvey. Chanca Maharaj, a "staunch Butlerite" according to British authorities, addressed the concerns directly.[58] He states that Trinidad was a land full of possibilities and resources, but the people "are not permitted to enjoy the privileges and benefits of it".[59] Maharaj also shrewdly pointed out that the colony produced a great deal of wealth but none of it remained in the country to help promote the construction of infrastructure and carry out local improvements.[60] These statements mirrored the ones made two decades previously by Garvey in a different part of the Empire.

Bustamante and Butler's followers were not the only ones expressing these sentiments. Overworked government laborers were also charging the local government with poorly managing issues of infrastructure, specifically on local roads.[61] They charged that a recent 50% cut in road drainage work had made the road upkeep more difficult to complete and demanded a significant pay increase if the current schedule of maintenance was to be maintained.[62] Furthermore, they indicated that the hardships "meted out to all Task Workers" were visiting them with undue stress and that these hardships should be relieved by government officials - presumably by increasing budgets, work forces, and frequency that this maintenance be performed.[63]

Ultimately, neither labor leaders nor their memberships were in the position Garvey occupied in 1929 as a candidate for public office. Because of this, they never proposed a comprehensive plan for improving the infrastructure of the British Caribbean the way Garvey had. However, their demands to the colonial government indicated that the need to establish better roads, health care, public works programs, and land settlement

programs was at the forefront of their agendas. These people echoed Garvey's sentiment that the Caribbean colonies had been exploited, after which they were relegated to the bottom of the priority list. Certainly, their conception of how infrastructure should be improved was not identical to the plan Garvey put forth. Garvey was more apt to blame landowners and look within the colony for solutions and attacked the corporations for their disinterest in improving life in the colonies that had made them so profitable. Labor leaders appealed to London and the pride of the Empire essentially imploring them to improve infrastructure lest they be embarrassed on the world stage. Despite these differences, the basic idea remained the same – the colonies were underdeveloped and help was needed to improve them, whether it was the colonial government, corporations, or landowners.

Garvey also expressed the idea of outside interests extracting resources from the colonies with little regard for their long term through his promotion of self reliance. Self-reliance and self-help were fundamental tenets of Garveyism since it was conceived of in the 1910s, but evolved a great deal over the last few decades of his life. Garvey's first encounter with self-help and self-reliance was probably when he began reading Booker T. Washington's classic autobiography *Up From Slavery* in the mid 1910s. Throughout the book Washington relates how personal responsibility and hard work can help overcome incredible odds. Washington, "born a slave on a plantation in Franklin County, Virginia", was able to utilize hard work, personal drive, and limited finances to open one of the south's first institutions of higher education – Tuskegee Institute in July of 1881.[64] Garvey so admired Washington's tenacity and philosophy that his first trip to the United States was a planned visit with the famous leader. While Washington died before the two

could meet, Washington had already made his mark on Garvey and his philosophy of hard work, self-help, and self-reliance became UNIA staples throughout the late 1910s and 1920s.

The early UNIA was built on Garvey's ardent devotion to this philosophy. He raised money through speaking tours, donations, and eventually selling stock in his business ventures including the Black Star Line, Negro Factories Corporation, and the *Negro World* newspaper. These ventures were all owned, operated, and funded by black people throughout the 1920s. During their height these businesses were a model for self-reliance and black uplift. At various times the Negro Factories Corporation operated a millenary, a women's clothes factory, a men's clothes factory, a chain of restaurants, a steam laundry, an electric laundry, a series of grocery stores, a hotel, a printing press, and a doll factory.[65] While the fortunes of these businesses waxed and waned, their very existence was an achievement and an inspiration to African Americans and black people across the globe.

However, by the late 1920s, Garvey had lost nearly his entire empire. Dogged by critiques from African American leaders such as W.E.B. DuBois, the fledgling American FBI, and its own lack of stability the UNIA business empire crumbled less than a decade after its meteoric rise to the world stage.[66] By the time Garvey emerged from jail and was deported to Jamaica, none of these businesses were at his disposal and most had incurred significant debts or ceased to operate.

Faced with the reality that he would likely never again be at the head of a successful black business conglomerate, Garvey adapted his philosophy of self help and self-reliance to the social conditions in Jamaica and the British Caribbean. He did this by

promoting the "native industries" of the region.[67] Garvey blamed "disinterested legislators" for the lack of locally produced goods in the colony.[68] He attacked the local government for failing to provide the country with protected internal industries that could help provide jobs and cheaper goods for the people. Garvey argued that by failing to promote these industries, the government had failed to serve its constituency and pledged allegiance to importers seeking profits. Garvey saw this policy as "wicked" and "heartless" and vowed to "change it, or die".[69]

The policy of promoting internal industries was one that was imported directly from the UNIA and applied to the British Caribbean. Garvey believed, like Washington, that economic success was the route to progress and respectability. The UNIA's strongest base of followers was built through stock sales and employment in the UNIA businesses. Part of Garvey's plan to revitalize Jamaica and promote infrastructure within the colony was clearly to use some of the same strategies that had made the UNIA such a phenomenon throughout the United States and beyond. In many ways, building "native industries" was akin to building self-sufficient black businesses in New York City adapted to better fit the context Garvey found himself in.

Like Garvey's other strategies this one was also taken up long after Garvey had effectively left the scene. Leaders such as Butler and his followers recognized that the dependence on imports and underdeveloped local industry left the colonies with a dim future. Again at the 1949 Butler rally, Maharaj expanded upon his point about the extraction of money from Trinidad. He critiqued the government's spending, encouraging the colonial government to invest more in local industries which would both help solve the problem of unemployment as well as produce goods that were being

imported into the colony.[70] Even government officials were forced to admit that food imports put the Caribbean colonies in a difficult spot which was exacerbated by the demands put on the Empire by World War II. In response to a letter written by Bustamante government officials commented internally that since Jamaica's food was primarily imported that the increase to the cost of living there was "probably considerable".[71]

Less than a year earlier, in a meeting in Britain in December 1948, Butler again expressed concern that while wealth was being drawn from Trinidad its workers and citizens were given little of the proceeds. Butler pleaded his case when he mentioned that "raw material was exported every year to the profit of the white man" while unemployed workers "were forced to starve."[72] Butler's words were hauntingly familiar to those of Garvey almost two decades before. He emphasized that Trinidadians were loyal to the crown, but wondered aloud why British authorities did not see fit to care for people who had worked to hard to the profit of the Empire.

Garvey and Washington's philosophies of self-reliance were also taken up by various uplift groups throughout the British Caribbean. One such group was the Negro Progress Convention centered in British Guiana. Founded in 1922 by members of labor organizations and various government officials, the group grew to espouse many of the same philosophies that Washington and later Garvey popularized throughout the world. The group, which lacked popularity and was a popular target of local newspapers, gained momentum in the 1930s seeing its membership rise from a meager 50 upon inception to over 5,000 by 1933 and even opened a juvenile program numbering nearly 100 members.[73] The group was "interested in the advancement of Negroes materially and

civilly" and sought to accomplish those aims through "self help and independence".[74] Borrowing heavily from the philosophies of Booker T. Washington, the group embraced the program of self help and sought to promote black progress through hard work and practical education.

While the Negro Progress Convention saw itself more as an offshoot of Washington than Garvey, the similarities between the aims of the UNIA and the Progress Convention were undeniable. Both Garvey and the NPC worked from the template of Washington's educational program and both saw the hope of Afro-Caribbean progress stemming from establishing a greater number of skilled black workers and through looking within for progress. The group lacked some of the confrontational fire of labor unions and Garvey, but the exchange of ideas between the two groups was undeniable. The UNIA had long been a significant force upon the political landscape in British Guiana which was home to six divisions and a chapter of the UNIA at its high point and while the UNIA was in decline the NPC was gaining membership.[75] These numbers suggest that the two groups likely shared members in the 1920s and 1930s and after the UNIA's decline Garveyites would have found a reasonably comfortable ideological home within the ranks of the NPC.

Another area where the NPC and Garveyism met fairly closely was on the idea of education. Typically, scholars have focused less on Garvey's educational philosophies and more on his business interests and racial propaganda. However, Garvey was always of the mind that education was central to black uplift. Garvey believed that black people needed both to be educated in school as well as "racially in the home".[76] Furthermore, he argued that white education systems were not adequate and were, in fact, "subversive" to

racial progress.[77] Through Afro-centric education, Garvey believed that the leaders of the future would be better equipped to lead the race.

Throughout the 1920s, the UNIA attempted to open a few schools based on Garvey's philosophies and the self-help program of Booker T. Washington. The first UNIA educational facility was Booker T. Washington University operated out of the Phyllis Wheatley Hotel on West 136th Street in New York City.[78] The facility opened in 1922 and was a training program for UNIA officers and worked on training the students in Garvey's philosophies and the UNIA Book of Laws. Four years later in 1926, the UNIA opened Liberty University in Claremont Virginia. The school was run by a graduate of Hampton (Washington's alma mater) and billed itself as a "practical high school" and was strongly supported by UNIA members throughout the United States.[79] Liberty University faced significant financial hardships, but operated for three years before finally closing down in 1929.

It was also during the early 1930s that Garvey was working in the British Caribbean to further education in the region. Garvey attacked authorities in Jamaica for not providing a facility for higher education in the colonies. Garvey met with tremendous approval from the crowd when he brought up the idea of a Jamaican university and Poly-technic. He proclaimed that the people of Jamaica "pay enough taxes to the government to build a university" and that people should not have to send their children "to far away England" when other Caribbean and Central American countries were able to establish their own facilities for higher education.[80] Garvey once again re-affirmed his commitment to Washingtonian philosophy when he also advocated for a

Poly-technic that would offer courses for people who "work in the day to study at night".[81]

By 1937, Garvey had finally achieved his goal of entering the field of education when he offered his School of African Philosophy in 1937. Announced in his *Black Man* periodical, the school was a mail order course eventually taken by 11 students of whom 10 graduated to positions within the regional offices of the UNIA.[82] The courses were conducted by Garvey himself and he proudly proclaimed that there were over 42 subjects offered and that the program "would prepare man and woman for a useful career and sure success."[83] While Garvey was not primarily known for education, it was always one of his principal aims throughout the 1920s and 1930s and he spent a great deal of time promoting and philosophizing about proper education and its value to black people across the globe.

The Negro Progress Convention had similar aims in the early 1930s as they sought to open their own school. In 1931, the group had sent two representatives, a man and a woman to the Tuskegee Institute with much fanfare.[84] The students planned to undertake a two year course of study art Tuskegee and upon their arrival were "well and happy" and sent "specimens of their work" home to the colony on a regular basis.[85] Upon their return home, these students were to be useful in helping to establish an "Educational and Industrial Institution" in celebration of the 100th anniversary of emancipation in British Guiana.[86] In order to establish the institution the NPC hoped to secure a plot of land "less than 500 acres" and get "practical help" from both the Colonial government as well as the faculty and administration of Tuskegee Institute. [87]

However, the promotion of education was not strictly the property of the NPC in British Guiana. Across the region labor leaders also began to realize that the fate of Afro-Caribbeans was at least in part tied to the promotion of education throughout the region. On the island of St. Vincent in a meeting of the St. Vincent Workingmen Cooperative in August 1936, government officials were forced to address the issue of education. In a speech clearly meant to smooth relations between the union and the government the administrator spoke in flattering terms about Vincentians calling them "as fine a people as any I have seen".[88] He attempted to bolster their spirits and calm fears about the future. One method he used was through promises of improvements to the education system. While he stopped short of critiquing what was in place, he did pledge to "improve school buildings" and "educational conditions" with the caveat that the union should "have patience" and "give (him) time" to make the changes.[89] This section of his speech was in direct response to one of the major aims of the Workingman's Association – to improve educational facilities on the island.

Butler also saw education as a central step in improving Afro-Caribbean life throughout the region. In a series of resolutions submitted to the government, Butler's group advocated the expansion of industrial education to women of Trinidad.[90] This proposal, although largely discounted by British authorities, was one operating in the self-help tradition of Garvey as well as in the tradition of UNIA organizing. Garvey was one of the first leaders to incorporate women in his movement on equal footing. Women held positions of leadership throughout the UNIA and had their own auxiliaries including the Universal African Motor Corps and Black Cross Nurses. Ula Taylor has pointed out that women in the Garvey movement, most notably Amy Jacques-Garvey, utilized the

philosophy of "community feminism" to support Garvey while working towards their own uplift within the movement.[91] Women in the Garvey movement made significant strides toward full membership, even challenging Garvey openly in the Women's Revolt of 1922".[92] Butler's attempt to include women in the skilled trades at equal pay to men was just as bold as Garvey's inclusion of powerful women in the UNIA. Garvey's decision to include women, even if it was not always on completely equal footing, helped pave the way for ideas such as those of Butler and his followers.

Most of Garvey's strategies and his ideology required significant adaptation to be useful throughout the 1930s and 1940s. However, one of Garvey's most enduring philosophies – that of racial unity remained a constant throughout the 1930s, 1940s, and beyond. In a January 1924 issue of the *Negro World*, Garvey stated that the UNIA "advocates the unity and blending of all Negroes into one strong, healthy race".[93] Garvey went on to denounce the mixing of races and said that the "Negro race is as good as any other."[94] This was the guiding philosophy of Garvey's work whether he was operating out of Jamaica, the United States, or Great Britain. While most of his plans, strategies, and ideas exhibited remarkable flexibility and adaptability this one remained constant and was the guiding force for his program throughout the 1910s, 1920s, and 1930s. Economic conditions, powerful enemies, or pending court cases might have shifted the methodologies, but racial pride and unity against a common oppressor remained the core beliefs that united Garveyites and later Afro-Caribbean laborers. Whatever were the short term goals of Garvey and his UNIA, the end result was always the promoting of the interests of black people from the United States to the Caribbean to the United States and beyond.

This compelling message was one of the top reasons for Garvey's widespread success. Garveyites, some of them underemployed or unemployed altogether, saw not only the business potential in the UNIA, but also the potential to improve the standing of the race across the globe. This message never lost its appeal, although in countries where white racism dominated the power structure, it was an increasingly dangerous philosophy to espouse throughout the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s. Many white authorities were quick to recognize the potential in mobilizing black people through race unity and sought to sabotage the movement or imprison its leader. When later leaders imported this idea from Garvey, they faced many of the same obstacles as Garvey himself faced in the early 1920s in the United States.

Bustamante found this out firsthand when he gave a passionate speech in September 1940. Previously loath to outright critique the British government, Bustamante launched into a full scale attack on the white racist power structure and promised a revolution where the blacks "would destroy [the whites]".[95] He encouraged black people to unite against the common enemy that had been exploiting them for hundreds of years. Tearing off his coat and pacing the stage, Bustamante promised bloodshed stating that "the negro blood has been shed for the past 102 years."[96] He further promised that they "would take their land and give them to the workers" and utilize guerilla warfare tactics against employers who refused to respect the Bustamante union.[97]

Bustamante's passionate language and aggressive tone earned him a spot in jail for sedition. However, considering the remote possibility that Bustamante could ever have organized a full scale civil war against the Empire on the island, it seems that

authorities were more concerned about the power of a united Afro-Caribbean race rather than Bustamante arming his union. Since Garvey pioneered this philosophy in the United States in the 1920s, white officials were wary of it. Speeches, rallies, and parades under these auspices made officials nervous and they generated pages of discussion about how they could remove Garvey without creating upheaval among his followers. British officials did likewise with Bustamante, wondering how they might remove him without creating chaos.[98] This fiery speech gave them the opportunity they needed.

Bustamante's fiery outburst was quite obviously born, at least in part, out of the philosophy of Garvey. It contained elements of self-help, self-reliance, race unity, and even nationhood. In a different time or place it is possible to imagine Bustamante giving this speech in front of an enthusiastic Liberty Hall packed with Garvey's supporters. Over ten years after Garvey's deportation and subsequent decline, his ideas were revived by a labor leader at a labor rally. The members of the audience undoubtedly included many former UNIA members or at least sympathizers. As Bustamante spoke, the shadow of Garvey was evident in the subject matter and people who listened most likely remembered Garvey fondly as Bustamante encouraged Afro-Caribbeans in attendance to combine forces and oust the white oppressors.

Butler follower, Pope McLean, expressed a similar sentiment in a speech given at a 1949 rally when he stated that Afro-Caribbeans were constantly taken advantage of by "cruel European element".[99] McLean went on to emphasize the equality of all humanity along with the persistent element of the whites that worked against fair policy.[100] Increasingly throughout the 1930s and 1940s, the struggle for racial equality and labor fairness became conflated. Of the many slogans used by the Butler Unions, "West Indies

for the West Indians" showed a blatant Garvey influence and indicated that beneath the surface of the labor rebellions was a bubbling racial conflict.

Throughout the British Caribbean in the 1930s and 1940s, workers were attempting to assert themselves against long exploitative practices. Wages were low, working conditions, terrible, homes and cities in disrepair, and employers were arguably making large profits. Marcus Garvey and the UNIA were no longer the central figures in the struggle against the white power structure. However, the work Garvey had done lived on in important ways as this chapter shows. Garvey's philosophies lived on in occasional labor slogans, in fiery speeches by Bustamante, in the words of Butler's followers, and in uplift groups throughout the region. These groups perhaps unconsciously, perhaps through the influence of former Garveyites, utilized his ideas in important ways. While these groups were not promoting a strong nation in Africa, a black owned business empire, or complete separation from whites they eventually came to advocate for independence from Britain, better jobs and wages for Afro-Caribbeans, and an end to minority rule and universal suffrage.

The philosophy of Garvey proved to be remarkably flexible and useful long after he left the British Caribbean and even after his death in 1940. Garveyites in the British Caribbean were able to fold their commitments to Garvey into labor unions. And, while these unions and uplift groups did not cut and paste the UNIA aims and objects into their speeches, there was a subtle but powerful influence on them as they spoke. Butler, Bustamante, and a host of others have since volunteered that Garvey was an important influence in laying the groundwork for what they accomplished through labor advocacy. Certainly the upheaval throughout the British Caribbean was the result of a number of

factors coalescing at once. Poor living conditions, low wages, lack of education opportunity and facilities, and wartime inflation all played a significant role in these uprisings. However, hidden in the rhetoric of labor, the cry of a striking worker, or a letter of resolutions to British colonial officials lurked the shadow of Garvey's influence and the victories he had fought and won throughout the 1920s.

Notes

---

[1] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[2] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Robert Hill, ed., *The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Papers,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), Volume 7, 328.
[3] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers*, Volume 7, 329-329.
[4] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers*, Volume 7, 329-329.
[5] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 339.
[6] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers*, Volume 7, 339.
[7] Tony Martin. *Race First: The Ideological and Organizational Struggles of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association* (Dover, Ma: The Majority Press, 1986), 45-66.
[8] Robert Hill and Barbara Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 207-208.
[9] Hill and Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons*, 211.
[10] Amy Jacques Garvey, ed., *The Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey* (Dover, Ma.: The Majority Press, 1986), 363-364.
[11] Jacques-Garvey, ed., *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, 365.
[12] Jacques-Garvey, ed., *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, 372.
[13] Jacques-Garvey, ed., *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, 380.
[14] Jacques-Garvey, ed., *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, 385.
[15] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 331.
[16] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 331.
[17] Rupert Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1988), 213.
[18] Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion*, 210-211. Lewis points out that Garvey attempted to modify his speech so that he would not inflame government critics seeking an excuse to derail his campaign. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that most of his planks were scaled down to some degree to avoid confrontation with powerful enemies.
[19] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[20] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[21] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[22] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[23] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5; "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #497". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[24] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #497". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[25] "Butler Sends Hope to Workers, March 3, 1949". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902. This seems to be some type of a news clipping saved and dated by Colonial Office officials.
[26] "Letter in Response to British Empire Workers, Peasants, and Ratepayers Union Resolutions, September 16, 1941". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.
[27] "British Empire Workers, Peasants, and Ratepayers Union Resolutions". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.
[28] "Butler Meetings". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.
[29] "Butler Meetings". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.
[30] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 332.
[31] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 332.
[32] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 332.
[33] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 333.
[34] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 333.

[35] Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion*, 211-213.
[36] Amy-Jacques-Garvey. *Garvey and Garveyism* (Collier Books, 1971).; Lewis, *Marcus Garvey, Anti-Colonial Champion*, 211-213.
[37] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[38] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[39] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[40] "Report to Lord Moyne, Secretary of State for the Colonies". Bustamante Industrial Trade Union, Jamaica. The National Archive. CO137/852/1.
[41] "Report to Lord Moyne, Secretary of State for the Colonies". Bustamante Industrial Trade Union, Jamaica. The National Archive. CO137/852/1.
[42] "Lorry Loaders Strike Report" Strikes, Trinidad. The National Archive. CO295/637/4.
[43] "Butler Union Demands Ignored". Strikes, Trinidad. The National Archive. CO295/637/4.
[44] "Colonial Office Inward Telegram #1592, December 22, 1946". Strikes, Trinidad. The National Archive. CO295/637/4.
[45]
[46] "British Commonwealth Labour Conference 1930". British Guiana Labour Union. The National Archive. CO111/687/4.
[47] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[48] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[49] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[50] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 332.
[51] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 332.
[52] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 334.
[53] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 334.
[54] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 334.
[55] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[56] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[57] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[58] "Butler Meetings". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.
[59] "Butler Meetings". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.
[60] "Butler Meetings". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.
[61] "Task Work Workers Public Works Resolutions, November 1943". Trade Unions – Jamaica. CO137/851/9.
[62] "Task Work Workers Public Works Resolutions, November 1943". Trade Unions – Jamaica. CO137/851/9.
[63] "Task Work Workers Public Works Resolutions, November 1943". Trade Unions – Jamaica. CO137/851/9.

[64] Booker T. Washington, *Up From Slavery* (New York: Airmont Books, 1967), 15,72.
[65] "Reports by Special Agent WW", "Analysis of the Black Star Line by Anselmo R. Jackson", "Article by William H. Ferris". Hill, Robert, ed. *The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Papers,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), Volume 2, lii, 220, 272-273, 471; Martin, Race First, 13, 34."Mcintosh Speech at Georgetown, 1936". Windwards Labour Organizations, The National Archive. CO321/369/13.
[66] "Article by Fred D. Powell". Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 2, 240; "Reports by Special Agent P-138". Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 3, 72.; "Confidential Informant 800 to George F. Ruch". Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 4, 73.
[67] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 334.
[68] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 334.
[69] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers,* Volume 7, 334.
[70] "Butler Meetings". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.
[71] "Government Memos". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive. CO137/840/5.
[72] "Meeting of Coloured Workers Association of Great Britain and Ireland, December 17, 1948". Uriah Butler, The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[73] "The Object of the Negro Progress Convention, August 5, 1933". Negro Progress Convention, The National Archive. CO111/711/14.
[74] "The Object of the Negro Progress Convention, August 5, 1933". Negro Progress Convention, The National Archive. CO111/711/14.
[75] Martin, *Race First*, 369.
[76] Hill and Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons,* 264.
[77] Hill and Bair, eds. *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons*, 264.
[78] Hill and Bair, eds. *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons* xlvii.
[79] Jacques-Garvey, *Garvey and Garveyism,*164. cited in Hill and Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons*, xlvii.
[80] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill and Bair, eds. *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons* Volume 7, 336.
[81] "Speech by Marcus Garvey", September 9, 1929. Hill, ed., *Garvey Papers* Volume 7, 334.
[82] Hill and Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons*, xlix.
[83] "Garvey Opens a New School of African Ideals", *Richmond Planet, 5* March 1938. cited in Hill and Bair, eds., *Marcus Garvey: Life and Lessons*, xlix.
[84] "The Object of the Negro Progress Convention, August 5, 1933". Negro Progress Convention, The National Archive. CO111/711/14.
[85] "The Object of the Negro Progress Convention, August 5, 1933". Negro Progress Convention, The National Archive. CO111/711/14.
[86] "The Object of the Negro Progress Convention, August 5, 1933". Negro Progress Convention, The National Archive. CO111/711/14.
[87] "The Object of the Negro Progress Convention, August 5, 1933". Negro Progress Convention, The National Archive. CO111/711/14.
[88] "Administrator's Speech to the St. Vincent Workingman's Cooperative Association, August 3, 1936". Windwards Labour Organizations, The National Archive. CO321/369/13.
[89] "Administrator's Speech to the St. Vincent Workingman's Cooperative Association, August 3, 1936". Windwards Labour Organizations, The National Archive. CO321/369/13.
[90] "British Empire Workers, Peasants, and Ratepayers Union Resolution 4, October 1949". Uriah Butler, The National Archive. CO537/4902.
[91] Ula Taylor, *The Veiled Garvey: The Life and Times of Amy Jacques Garvey* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 2.
[92] Taylor, *The Veiled Garvey,* 41-63.
[93] *Negro World,* Janaury 5, 1924. cited in Martin, *Race First*, 22.
[94] *Negro World,* Janaury 5, 1924. cited in Martin, *Race Firs,* 22.
[95] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[96] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5. Bustamante later reiterated that white employers

took advantage of black employers, see: "Report to Lord Moyne, Secretary of State for the Colonies". Bustamante Industrial Trade Union, Jamaica. The National Archive. CO137/852/1.

[97] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.

[98] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.

[99] "Butler Meetings". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.

[100] "Butler Meetings". Uriah Butler. The National Archive CO 537/4902.

CONCLUSION: GARVEYISM LOOKING FORWARD

"...our existence today is more pronounced and it has a great effect on Blacks as never before"-John Charles Zampty, 1975[1]

In 1971, while teaching at Western Michigan University, Jeannette Smith-Irvin assigned an oral history interview project to her students in which they were to interview an elder African American about the past. She stumbled upon a student who interviewed John Charles Zampty, a respected elder in the community and owner of an African import shop in Highland Park, Michigan.[2] Zampty was a Garveyite with a "wealth of knowledge" about Garvey and the UNIA.[3] Over the next few years, Smith-Irvin interviewed Zampty on several occasions and these interviews along with those of other Garveyites she spoke with through Zampty formed the basis for her fascinating book *Footsoldiers of the Universal Negro Improvement Association* published in 1989.

Smith-Irvin's book helped to begin to fill a void in the scholarship of the UNIA recovering the voice of the Garveyites. These interviews offered tremendous perspectives on those who were a part of the movement in the 1920s and on how they remembered it. The interviewees told stories about their interactions with Garvey, gave detailed pictures of what life was like as a UNIA member, and offered insights into the day to day operations of the organization. However, what is perhaps more relevant to my project are the views the Garveyites took on the UNIA in the 1970s, when Smith-Irvin conducted most of her interviews. Most of the Garveyites interviewed during this period, hailing from both the United States and the British Caribbean, continued to have active

roles in the movement. Zampty was an active member in Detroit; Arnold Crawford was acting high commissioner of a local UNIA branch in New York City; Thomas W. Harvey believed the UNIA plan had relevance in the late 20th century.[4] While these branches of the UNIA were clearly not as powerful as those in the 1920s or probably even the 1930s, they continued to possess committed, however limited membership bases.

The story of the *Footsoldiers* is one that fits in well with what I have argued in this study. While scholars have focused most of their attention on the 1920s, Garveyism is not a phenomenon that can be dismissed at the dawn of the Great Depression. My study seeks to begin the process of tracing Garveyism and its influence throughout the remainder of the 20th century and beyond. Speaking in the 1970s, Smith-Irvin's interviews indicate a strong basis for the survival of the movement into the 1970s. In fact, the movement is still alive today, as is evidenced by its very active website. The website offers reproductions of documents from the UNIA's rich history, updates on the happenings within the organization, a list of goals for the membership, and even a message board with posts from Africans throughout the vast African Diaspora.[5]

In this work, I have proposed a model for the tracking of post-deportation Garveyism. I have argued that while Garveyites faced challenges and attacks on a number of fronts, they endured, adapted to new situations, and continued to thrive. Just how they endured was dramatically shaped by the contexts that they were operating in. However, the underlying theme is that Garveyism was tremendously adaptable and backed by passionate and persistent leaders who were not content to see the movement fade away without a fight. In fact, as the website demonstrates, Garveyism is still supported by leaders with this same persistence and commitment.

This commitment manifested itself in different ways in the United States and the Caribbean throughout the 1930s and 1940s. American Garveyites preserved the structure of the movement operating under its name and continuing in the traditions of the movement such as publishing newspapers and holding regular meetings. The Central Division was a much clearer offshoot of the UNIA than the Garveyites who had involved themselves in the British Caribbean labor struggles. They considered themselves followers of Garvey and sought to maintain that tie as strongly as they could despite the tremendous impact of the Great Depression on their day to day lives. They worked in the African American tradition of self-help as they utilized the organization's respect in the community and significant political strength to advocate on behalf of African Americans seeking relief, representation, and unity.[6] The Central Division struggled against the local District Offices while simultaneously offering valuable events, social outlets, and tangible services to both members and nonmembers as well as weighing in on local, national, and international issues such as the invasion of Ethiopia and the Bilbo Bill.

British Caribbean Garveyites reacted much differently. While there were likely alcoves of Garveyites, more of them funneled into the labor movement gripping the region throughout the 1930s and 1940s. These Garveyites left the name behind, but carried with them the traditions of organization, fundraising, public speaking, and utilizing newspapers for the mass dissemination of information. While labor leaders had mixed feelings about how much of Garveyism they wanted to incorporate in their own struggles, the impact and the precedent set by Garvey was undoubtedly driving their movements on some level. The UNIA's success helped to set the stage for the pitched

battle waged between workers and employers that had been brewing for decades in the British Caribbean.

The question of why the groups took such divergent paths is an interesting one and the answer is most likely found in the contexts of the groups. New York Garveyites had a strong UNIA base of operations from which to build. They were living in the city where Garvey rose to power and his once strong presence there, had left a lasting impact on African American New Yorkers. They had seen the restaurants, factories, and newspapers in their neighborhoods. They had been there to hear Garvey's thunderous oratory echoing down street corners. The presence of Garvey and the former strength of the movement gave it lasting power and significance in the city. When people needed representation, they turned to the UNIA. When groups sought to form alliances, they approached the UNIA. The tradition of success and strength in the city was one of the reasons why they were able to endure.

Garveyites throughout the British Caribbean were much more spread out. While there were strongholds of Garveyism, they were rarely graced with Garvey's presence and they not witnessed his dramatic rise the way New York had. Furthermore, the population in the British Caribbean was much more spread out than the tightly packed New Yorkers. Additionally, Garvey and his followers were always closely watched by British authorities. During the 1920s, Garvey's travel was restricted and the *Negro World* banned. Under these circumstances, the movement faced difficulty in continuing its operations. While the United States government also sabotaged and infiltrated the New York UNIA, the sheer numbers, finances, and success of the group prevented it from being completely undermined. When Garveyites folded their interests into the labor

movements, they knew that the British Colonial Offices would find them a much more difficult target because the Empire sought to promote itself as progressive and friendly toward labor unions.[7] By joining up with labor unions, Garveyites were able to continue to promote many of the same interests they had under Garvey in institutions that the Colonial Offices were loathe to target openly.

The presence of Garvey must also be figured in to the reasons for such divergent paths. The loss of Garvey for the American UNIA members was the gain of the British Caribbean. After he was deported in 1927, Garvey shifted his strategy fairly dramatically. While he had centered his movement around recruitment, the promotion of business interests, and fundraising in the United States, he adopted a different strategy upon his arrival in Jamaica. Garvey himself mirrored his British Caribbean followers by attempting to combine the interests of the UNIA with a political platform. While Garvey was still very active in promoting the UNIA, he also sought to gain a wider appeal through his attempts to secure political office in Jamaica during the late 1920s and early 1930s. By promoting these interests in the political sphere, Garvey made it easy for the people to support him without pledging money to the UNIA or calling oneself a Garveyite. This strategy also made him a much more difficult target for British authorities, though they did find other ways to suppress him. Ultimately, Garveyites in the British Caribbean faced more difficult obstacles to retaining the UNIA name. There was a great deal more open hostility to the movement in the region and without strength in numbers or a real stronghold of success they found it easier to promote similar ideas under a different banner rather than face such strong opposition.

While the two groups evolved in dramatically different ways throughout the 1930s and 1940s, they were also similar in some cases. Both of the movements were involved in the process of petitioning either local or national governments for aid. The Central Division operated mostly on a local level, though they were contributors to national and international politics on occasion. They wrote hundreds of letters to the local government officials requesting relief aid on behalf of various residents of Harlem. British Caribbean labor forces also consulted the government for help, though their hope was more frequently to subvert local Colonial Office officials. Bustamante wrote to the seat of the British Empire in London and asked that more money be given to Jamaica for local improvement and aid.[8] Both groups acted in the role of liason to the government on many occasions, though in different ways and on different levels.

Garveyism has taken on great meaning for many of his supporters both in the past and in the present. Garvey has been the subject of reggae music and is seen as a prophet in the Rasta faith. Since the 1920s, Garvey's life has taken on great meaning to the people of Jamaica as well as peoples of African descent across the globe. Garveyism has been reshaped, reinvented, and adapted to fit contexts as diverse as Los Angeles, South Africa, and Guyana. Garveyism has evolved so intensely that at times it becomes difficult to identify what the essence of Garveyism and his ideas actually is. Ultimately, Garvey tapped into long unaddressed concerns and problems experienced on different levels by all peoples of the African Diaspora. In the American context, Garvey spoke against racism and promoted black business interests. In the British Caribbean he sought to address a long simmering labor negotiation that had raged on for centuries. Perhaps this is the reason why Garveyism has endured so steadfastly. Garveyism is certainly

about Garvey and his perspectives, but perhaps more importantly, it tapped into unsettled problems and taboo topics. Where other leaders were measured and cautious, Garvey was bold. Where the danger of retribution was the greatest, Garvey was never fearful to enter. In his prime, there was no issue Garvey would not tackle head on and no opponent he feared. He gave voice to the undercurrent of protest and that may be his greatest legacy. While the terms of the battle may have been ever-changing, Garvey was never afraid to say what people were thinking.

Additionally, Garveyism was tremendously successful at utilizing existing frameworks of protest and self-help. Within the United States, Garveyism successfully grafted itself onto the informal social networks that formed the hallmark of African American self-help and uplift.[9] Garveyites employed these networks rigorously to spread Garvey's philosophy, raise money for his ventures, as well as recruit more Garveyites. Garveyism was fluid and flexible and membership in the UNIA did not prevent Garveyites from being members in other groups or even as illustrated in the British Caribbean folding the movement into something more relevant as time passed.

Throughout this work, I have aimed to explore the stories of New York and British Caribbean Garveyites side by side. Through this investigation, I hope to open new comparative avenues for study. Currently, most studies on Garveyism have focused either exclusively on one branch or region and have rarely spanned across national boundaries. This work seeks to begin to evaluate Garveyism on an international level and attempt to define the movement as truly Pan African. Garveyites were active not just in the United States and British Caribbean, but also in Africa, the Spanish speaking

Caribbean, and Central America. There are still a variety of avenues available for scholars to pursue in painting Garveyism as it was, a truly international movement.

This study has aimed not only to illustrate the differences in how Garvey's philosophy was carried out in different contexts, but also to demonstrate the remarkable adaptability of the movement itself following Garvey's Deportation in the late 1920s. The Garvey movement's development, evolution, success and staying power has been far greater than the current available scholarship suggests. While some scholars such as Rupert Lewis have expanded the project of charting the Garvey movement into the 1930s, there is still significant work to be done. As Smith-Irvin's interviewees indicated in the 1970s, there is a well documented history that continues up until the present. The UNIA has continued to reshape itself throughout the 20th century and this study seeks to begin the project of evaluating that impact and considering where it fits within the broader context of the Garvey movement, African American history, and American history in general. While the movement may have declined in terms of strict numerical strength after Garvey's deportation, it undoubtedly continued to make important contributions to various communities not just in New York City, but throughout the world.

Notes

[1] Jeannette Smith-Irvin, *Footsoldiers of the Universal Negro Improvement Association (Their Own Words)* (Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1989), 51.
[2] Smith-Irvin, *Footsoldiers of the UNIA,* xiii.
[3] Smith-Irvin, *Footsoldiers of the UNIA,* xiii.
[4] Smith-Irvin, *Footsoldiers of the UNIA,* 51, 58, 34.
[5] "*Official UNIA-ACL Website*", 1998-2008. http://www.unia-acl.org/ (March 19, 2008).
[6] For examples of some of these traditions see the following studies. Paula Giddings, *When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America.* (New York: W. Morrow, 1996); Deborah Gray White, *Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves 1894-1994.* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999); Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, *Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church.* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1993);
[7] "Confidential Telegram from Jamaican Governor's Office #498". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[8] "Letter from Alexander Bustamante to The Honorable Malcolm McDonald, Rt. Hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies, January 29, 1940". Alexander Bustamante, Miscellaneous. The National Archive CO 137/840/5.
[9] These informal networks are well documented in Steven Hahn's recent study cited here. Steven Hahn, *A Nation Under Our Feet* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives

London, England
The National Archive

New York, New York
Schomburg Center

Published Primary Source Collections

Garvey, Marcus, and Tony Martin. *The poetical works of Marcus Garvey*. The New Marcus Garvey library, no. 2. Dover, Mass: Majority Press, 1983.

Hill, Robert A., and Marcus Garvey. *The Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Association papers*. 7 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Hill, Robert A., and Barbara Bair. *Marcus Garvey, life and lessons: a centennial companion to the Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Association papers*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Newspapers and Journals

Amsterdam News
Blackman
Centralist Bulletin
Crisis
Daily Gleaner
Harlem Sentinel
The Journal of Negro History
The Messenger
The Nation
The Negro History Bulletin
Negro World
New Jamaican
New York Times

Opportunity
The People Newspaper
Phylon
Survey Graphic
Time Magazine
Trinidad Guardian
Vanguard

Dissertations

Green, Larry Alfonso. "*Harlem in the Great Depression 1928-1936*" PhD. Diss., Columbia University, 1979.

Books:

Ashdown, Peter. *Garveyism in Belize*. SPEAReports, 5. [Benque Viejo del Carmen, Belize]: Published for SPEAR by Cubola Productions, 1990.

Basdeo, Sahadeo. *Labour organisation and labour reform in Trinidad, 1919-1939*. St. Augustine, Trinidad: Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, 1983.

Beckles, Hilary. *Chattel house blues: making of a democratic society in Barbados, from Clement Payne to Owen Arthur*. Kingston: I. Randle, 2004.

--------. *Great house rules: landless emancipation and workers' protest in Barbados, 1838-1938*. Kingston: I. Randle, 2004.

Bilbo, Theodore Gilmore. *Take your choice; separation or mongrelization*. Poplarville, Miss: Dream House Pub. Co, 1947.

Black, Clinton Vane de Brosse. *The story of Jamaica from prehistory to the present*. London: Collins, 1965.

Bolland, O. Nigel. *On the march: labour rebellions in the British Caribbean, 1934-39*. Kingston, Jamaica: Ian Randle Publishers, 1995.

Bolland, O. Nigel. *The politics of labour in the British Caribbean: the social origins of authoritarianism and democracy in the labour movement*. Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2001.

Burkett, Randall K. *Black redemption: churchmen speak for the Garvey movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978.

Burkett, Randall K. *Garveyism as a religious movement: the institutionalization of a Black civil religion*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1978.

Chevannes, Barry. *Rastafari: roots and ideology*. Utopianism and communitarianism. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1994.

Clarke, John Henrik. *Harlem, a community in transition*. New York: Citadel Press, 1964.

Clarke, John Henrik, and Amy Jacques Garvey. *Marcus Garvey and the vision of Africa*. New York: Random House, 1974.

Campbell, Horace. *Rasta and resistance: from Marcus Garvey to Walter Rodney*. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1987.

Cooper, Anna J., Charles C. Lemert, Esme Bhan, and Anna J. Cooper. *The voice of Anna Julia Cooper: including A voice from the South and other important essays, papers, and letters*. Legacies of social thought. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

Cooper, Frederick, Thomas C. Holt, and Rebecca J. Scott. *Beyond slavery: explorations of race, labor, and citizenship in postemancipation societies*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Cronon, Edmund David. *Black Moses: the story of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Cruse, Harold. *The crisis of the Negro intellectual*. New York: Morrow, 1967.

Dagbovie, Pero Gaglo. *The early Black history movement, Carter G. Woodson, and Lorenzo Johnston Greene*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2007.

Davis, David Brion. *The problem of slavery in Western culture*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966.

Davis, David Brion. *The problem of slavery in the age of Revolution, 1770-1823*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975.

DeCaro, Louis A. *Malcolm and the cross: the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X, and christianity*. New York and London: New York University Press, 1998.

Del Boca, Angelo. *I Gas de Mussolini*. Rome: Editori Ruiniti, 1996.

Du Bois, W. E. B., Booker T. Washington, Marcus Garvey, A. Philip Randolph, and Cary D. Wintz. *African American political thought, 1890-1930: Washington, Du Bois, Garvey, and Randolph*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1995.

Du Bois, W. E. B. *The souls of Black folk.* New York: Bantam Books, 1989.

Dubois, Laurent. *Avengers of the New World: the story of the Haitian Revolution.* Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004.

Edwards, Linda McMurry. *To keep the waters troubled: the life of Ida B. Wells.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Eisner, Gisela. *Jamaica, 1830-1930; a study in economic growth.* [Manchester, Eng.]: Manchester University Press, 1961.

Ellsworth, Scott. *Death in a promised land: the Tulsa race riot of 1921.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.

Fairclough, Adam. *Better day coming: Blacks and equality, 1890-2000.* New York: Viking, 2001.

Fax, Elton C. *Garvey: the story of a pioneer Black nationalist.* New York: Dodd, Mead, 1972.

Federal Writers' Project. *The WPA guide to New York City: the Federal Writers' Project guide to 1930s New York.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Foner, Nancy. *Status and power in rural Jamaica; a study of educational and political change.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1973.

--------. *Islands in the city: West Indian migration to New York.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Franklin, John Hope, and August Meier. *Black leaders of the twentieth century.* Blacks in the new world. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982.

Gaines, Kevin Kelly. *Uplifting the race: Black leadership, politics, and culture in the twentieth century.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Garside, W. R. *British unemployment, 1919-1939: a study in public policy.* Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Gates, Henry Louis, and Cornel West. *The African-American century: how Black Americans have shaped our country.* New York: Free Press, 2000.

Garvey, Amy Jacques. *Garvey and Garveyism.* New York: Collier Books, 1970.

Garvey, Marcus, Essien Udosen Essien-Udom, Amy Jacques Garvey, and Marcus Garvey. *More philosophy and opinions of Marcus Garvey.* Africana modern library, no. 20. London: Cass, 1977.

Garvey, Marcus, and Amy Jacques Garvey. *Philosophy and opinions of Marcus Garvey*. The American Negro, his history and literature. New York: Arno Press, 1968.

Garvey, Marcus, and Tony Martin. *Message to the people: the course of African philosophy*. The New Marcus Garvey library, no. 7. Dover, Mass: Majority Press, 1986.

Garvey, Marcus, and Tony Martin. *The poetical works of Marcus Garvey*. The New Marcus Garvey library, no. 2. Dover, Mass: Majority Press, 1983.

Giddings, Paula. *When and where I enter: the impact of Black women on race and sex in America*. New York: W. Morrow, 1984.

Gilmore, Glenda Elizabeth. *Gender and Jim Crow: women and the politics of white supremacy in North Carolina, 1896-1920*. Gender & American culture. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Gilroy, Paul. *The black Atlantic: modernity and double consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Goggin, Jacqueline Anne. *Carter G. Woodson: a life in Black history*. Southern biography series. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993.

Goveia, Elsa V. *A study on the historiography of the British West Indies to the end of the nineteenth century*, 1956.

Gutman, Herbert George. *The Black family in slavery and freedom, 1750-1925*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1976.

Greenberg, Cheryl Lynn. *"Or does it explode?": Black Harlem in the Great Depression*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Hahn, Steven. *A nation under our feet: Black political struggles in the rural South, from slavery to the great migration*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.

Halasa, Malu. *Mary McLeod Bethune*. Black Americans of achievement. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1989.

Harlan, Louis R. *Booker T. Washington: the wizard of Tuskegee, 1901-1915*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Harold, Claudrena N. *The rise and fall of the Garvey movement in the urban South, 1918-1942*. Studies in African American history and culture. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Hart, Richard. *From occupation to independence: a short history of the peoples of the English-speaking Caribbean Region.* London: Pluto Press, 1998.

--------. *Labour rebellions of the 1930s in the British Caribbean region colonies.* London: Socialist History Society, 2002.

Higginbotham, Evelyn Brooks. *Righteous discontent: the women's movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Hill, Frank, and Alexander Bustamante. *Bustamante and his letters.* Kingston, Jamaica: Kingston Publishers, 1976.

Hine, Darlene Clark, William C. Hine, and Stanley Harrold. *The African-American odyssey.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2000.

Hine, Darlene Clark, Wilma King, and Linda Reed. *"We specialize in the wholly impossible": a reader in Black women's history.* Brooklyn, N.Y.: Carlson Pub, 1995.

Hine, Darlene Clark, and Jacqueline McLeod. *Crossing boundaries: comparative history of Black people in diaspora.* Blacks in the diaspora. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.

Hine, Darlene Clark, and Kathleen Thompson. *A shining thread of hope: the history of Black women in America.* New York: Broadway Books, 1998.

Holt, Rackham. *Mary McLeod Bethune; a biography.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964.

Holt, Thomas C. *The problem of freedom: race, labor, and politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832-1938.* Johns Hopkins studies in Atlantic history and culture. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Homberger, Eric. *The historical atlas of New York City: a visual celebration of nearly 400 years of New York City's history.* A Henry Holt reference book. New York: H. Holt and Co, 1994.

Hunter, Tera W. *To 'joy my freedom: Southern Black women's lives and labors after the Civil War.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Huntley, Eric L. *Marcus Garvey: a centenary 1887-1987.* London: Friends of Bogle, 1988.

Huntley, Eric L. *Marcus Garvey: a biography.* London: Bogle-L'Ouverture, 1993.

Hurwitz, Samuel Justin, and Edith F. Hurwitz. *Jamaica; a historical portrait*. New York: Praeger, 1971.

Hutchinson, Louise Daniel. *Anna J. Cooper, a voice from the South*. Washington: Published for the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum of the Smithsonian Institution by the Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981.

Jacobs, W. Richard, and Tubal Uriah Buzz Butler. *Butler versus the King: riots and sedition in 1937*. Port of Spain, Trinidad: Key Caribbean Publications, 1976.

James, C. L. R. *The Black Jacobins; Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.

James, Winston. *Holding aloft the banner of Ethiopia: Caribbean radicalism in early twentieth-century America*. London: Verso, 1999.

Johnson, Howard, and Karl S. Watson. *The white minority in the Caribbean*. Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 1998.

Jones, Jacqueline. *Labor of love, labor of sorrow: Black women, work, and the family from slavery to the present*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.

Kelley, Robin D. G. *Hammer and hoe: Alabama Communists during the Great Depression*. The Fred W. Morrison series in Southern studies. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Kelley, Robin D. G., and Earl Lewis. *To make our world anew: a history of African Americans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Kornweibel, Theodore. *Federal surveillance of Afro-Americans, 1917-1925 the First World War, the Red Scare, and the Garvey Movement*. Frederick, Md: University Publications of America, 1985.

Levine, Lawrence W. *Black culture and black consciousness: Afro-American folk thought from slavery to freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Lewis, David L. *When Harlem was in vogue*. New York: Knopf, 1981.

--------. *The race to Fashoda: European colonialism and African resistance in the scramble for Africa*. New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1987.

--------. *W.E.B. DuBois*. New York: H. Holt, 1993.

Lewis, Gordon K. *The growth of the modern West Indies*. New York: M[onthly] R[eview] Press, 1968.

Lewis, Rupert. *Marcus Garvey: anti-colonial champion.* Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1988.

Lewis, Rupert, and Patrick E. Bryan. *Garvey, his work and impact.* African-American/Caribbean studies. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1991.

Lewis, W. Arthur, and Susan Craig. *Labour in the West Indies: the birth of a worker's movement.* London: New Beacon Books, 1977.

Lewis, Rupert, and Maureen Warner Lewis. *Garvey: Africa, Europe, the Americas.* Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1994.

Lewis, W. Arthur, and Susan Craig. *Labour in the West Indies: the birth of a worker's movement.* London: New Beacon Books, 1977.

Logan, Rayford Whittingham. *The betrayal of the Negro, from Rutherford B. Hayes to Woodrow Wilson.* New York: Collier Books, 1965.

Maglangbayan, Shawna. *Garvey, Lumumba, and Malcolm: black national-separatists.* Chicago: Third World Press, 1972.

Marable, Manning. *Race, reform, and rebellion: the second Reconstruction in black America, 1945-1990.* Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1991.

Marks, Carole. 1989. *Farewell--we're good and gone: the great Black migration.* Blacks in the diaspora. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Martin, Tony. *African fundamentalism: a literary and cultural anthology of Garvey's Harlem Renaissance.* The New Marcus Garvey library, no. 5. Dover, Mass: Majority Press, 1991.

--------. *Amy Ashwood Garvey: Pan-Africanist, feminist, and Mrs. Marcus Garvey wife no. 1, or, A tale of two Amies [sic].* The New Marcus Garvey library, no. 4. Dover, MA: Majority Press, 2007.

--------. *Literary Garveyism: Garvey, black arts, and the Harlem renaissance.* The New Marcus Garvey library, no. 1. Dover, Mass: Majority Press, 1983.

--------. *Marcus Garvey, hero: a first biography.* The New Marcus Garvey library, no. 3. Dover, Mass: Majority Press, 1983.

--------. *The Pan-African connection: from slavery to Garvey and beyond.* The new Marcus Garvey library, no. 6. Dover, Mass: Majority Press, 1984.

--------. *Race first: the ideological and organizational struggles of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association.* Contributions in Afro-American and African studies, no. 19. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1976

Mintz, Sidney Wilfred. *Caribbean transformations.* Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co, 1974.

Mintz, Sidney Wilfred, and Richard Price. *The birth of African-American culture: an anthropological perspective.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.

Moses, Wilson Jeremiah. *Classical Black nationalism: from the American Revolution to Marcus Garvey.* New York: New York University Press, 1996.

--------. *Creative conflict in African American thought: Frederick Douglass, Alexander Crummell, Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. Du Bois, and Marcus Garvey.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Murrell, Nathaniel Samuel, William David Spencer, and Adrian Anthony McFarlane. *Chanting down Babylon: the Rastafari reader.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.

Myrdal, Gunnar. *An American dilemma: the Negro problem and modern democracy.* New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Naison, Mark. *Communists in Harlem during the depression.* Blacks in the New World. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983.

O'Reilly, Kenneth, and David Gallen. *Black Americans: the FBI files.* New York: Carroll & Graf, 1994.

Osofsky, Gilbert. *Harlem; the making of a ghetto; Negro New York, 1890-1930.* New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Ottley, Roi, and William J. Weatherby. *The Negro in New York; an informal social history.* New York: New York Public Library, 1967.

Ottley, Roi. *New world a-coming.* The American Negro, his history and literature. New York: Arno Press, 1968.

Pankhurst, Richard. *Economic history of Ethiopia, 1800-1935.* Addis Ababa: Haile Sellassie I University Press, 1968.

Payne, Anthony, and Paul K. Sutton. *Modern Caribbean politics.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Renda, Mary A. *Taking Haiti: military occupation and the culture of U.S. imperialism, 1915-1940*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Rodney, Walter. *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1981.

Rolinson, Mary G. *Grassroots Garveyism: the Universal Negro Improvement Association in the rural South, 1920-1927*. The John Hope Franklin series in African American history and culture. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Scott, William R. *The sons of Sheba's race: African-Americans and the Italo-Ethiopian War, 1935-1941*. Blacks in the diaspora. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Shaw, Stephanie J. *What a woman ought to be and to do: Black professional women workers during the Jim Crow era*. Women in culture and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Sheller, Mimi. *Democracy after slavery: Black publics and peasant radicalism in Haiti and Jamaica*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000.

Sitkoff, Harvard. *A new deal for Blacks: the emergence of civil rights as a national issue*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Smith-Irvin, Jeannette. *Footsoldiers of the Universal Negro Improvement Association: their own words*. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press, 1989.

Standing, Guy. *Unemployment and female labour: a study of labour supply in Kingston, Jamaica*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.

Stein, Judith. *The world of Marcus Garvey: race and class in modern society*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986.

Stevenson, Brenda E. *Life in black and white: family and community in the slave South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Stone, Carl. *Class, race, and political behaviour in urban Jamaica*. [Mona, Jamaica]: Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies, 1973.

Taylor, Ula Y. *The veiled Garvey: the life & times of Amy Jacques Garvey*. Gender & American culture. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Thomas, Roy Darrow. *The Trinidad labour riots of 1937: perspectives 50 years later*. St. Augustine, Trinidad, Republic of Trinidad & Tobago, West Indies: Extra-Mural Studies Unit, University of the West Indies, 1987.

Thompson, Reginald William. *Black Caribbean*. London: Macdonald & Co, 1946.

Tolbert, Emory J. *The UNIA and Black Los Angeles: ideology and community in the American Garvey movement*. Afro-American culture and society, v. 3. Los Angeles: Center for Afro-American Studies, University of California, 1980.

Trotter, Joe William. *The Great migration in historical perspective: new dimensions of race, class, and gender*. Blacks in the diaspora. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Van Deburg, William L. *Modern Black nationalism: from Marcus Garvey to Louis Farrakhan*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.

Vincent, Theodore G. *Black power and the Garvey movement*. [Berkeley, Calif.]: Ramparts Press, 1971.

Walker, Clarence Earl. *Deromanticizing Black history: critical essays and reappraisals*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991.

Walker, Juliet E. K. *The history of Black business in America: capitalism, race, entrepreneurship*. Twayne's evolution of modern business series. New York: MacMillan Library Reference USA, 1998.

Washington, Booker T. *Up from slavery, an autobiography*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963.

Watkins-Owens, Irma. *Blood relations: Caribbean immigrants and the Harlem community, 1900-1930*. Blacks in the diaspora. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Watts, David. *The West Indies: patterns of development, culture, and environmental change since 1492*. Cambridge studies in historical geography, 8. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Weaver, Robert Clifton. *The Negro ghetto*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.

White, Deborah G. *Ar'n't I a woman?: female slaves in the plantation South*. New York: Norton, 1985.

--------. *Too heavy a load: Black women in defense of themselves, 1894-1994*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1999.

Williams, Eric Eustace. *Capitalism & slavery*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1961.

Wintz, Cary D. *Black culture and the Harlem Renaissance*. Houston, Tex: Rice University Press, 1988.

Wolters, Raymond. *Du Bois and his rivals*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002.

Woofter, Thomas Jackson. *Races and ethnic groups in American life*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, inc, 1933.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 02956 5656