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“We Americans are not just American citizens any longer”: Eslanda Robeson, World Citizenship, and the New World Review in the 1950s

“In my travels about the world I have come to realize that we are not only lumped together as Negroes - 13 million of us-, we are lumped together, in the world view, as Colored Peoples- which… includes the West Indian Negro, the African, the Chinese, the Indian, and the Malayan.”¹ These words appeared in an open letter that the anthropologist, writer, and activist Eslanda Robeson wrote to students at Fisk University in September 1943. By this time in her life, Robeson had lived on both sides of the Atlantic and travelled to countries as varied as Scotland, France, Germany, Spain, the Soviet Union, South Africa, Uganda, Egypt, the Congo, and Mexico. Born in Washington DC in 1895, Robeson took her first trip across the Atlantic in the mid 1920s to watch her husband, Paul Robeson, the artist-activist, perform in the popular play Emperor Jones. In 1928, a year after the birth of their son, the Robesons’ moved to London where they remained for eleven years before returning to the US during the Second World War. Between 1945 and 1965, the US and later the UK remained the couple’s base, but Eslanda Robeson continuously sojourned. Robeson’s travels were not simply a form of tourism; they contributed to her internationalism by expanding her identity as an African American woman. They enabled her to embrace belonging to a larger world of “colored peoples” and, to borrow a phrase from the historian Nico Slate, allowed her to become a “colored cosmopolitan” who worked to “forge a united front against racism, imperialism, and other forms of oppression” with other non-white people across the world.²
Although travelling across national borders as a black American woman in the twentieth century was rare, Robeson was one out of many. As the cost of travel declined and more shipping companies catered to the middle classes in the late nineteenth century, activists and intellectuals including, Anna Julia Cooper, Mary Church Terrell, Ida B. Wells-Barnett, Madam C. J. Walker, Katherine Dunham, Zora Neale Hurston, Louise Thompson Patterson, Thyra Edwards and Maida Springer, to name a few, all travelled internationally. Many were involved in local and national clubs and leftist activities, spoke at international feminist and race-based conferences, and even founded internationalist groups like the short-lived International Council of Women of the Darker Races of the World and the International League of Peoples of the Darker Races. But what made Robeson’s travels different from her counterparts were their vastness, the wide range of friendships she forged with leading communist, pan-African, and anti-colonial figures and the networks she created in student, anti-colonial and women’s organizations. These networks were embedded in global civil society, a capacious concept that describes a figurative and physical global community beyond the imperial or nation state.

Alongside travelling, journalism was another way in which Robeson’s identity and cosmopolitanism developed. During the 1930s and 1940s, Robeson published articles about her travels in such publications as Dorothy West’s Challenge and the Amsterdam News, both of which were part of the transnational black press. In the 1950s, Robeson gained accreditation with Claude Barnett’s Associated Negro Press and began contributing to other black newspapers like the Afro-American and the radical Freedom, established by her husband. In 1952, she was appointed to a position
with *New World Review* (1951-1985) and was responsible for reporting on the United Nations (UN), receiving an office in its press section in New York.

Over the last few years, scholarly attention has been given to Robeson’s anthropology, pan-Africanism, and progressive politics. In 2013, Barbara Ransby’s groundbreaking biography of Robeson revealed the breadth of her global travels and radicalism. This article builds on and departs from previous work on Robeson by probing in further detail the articles she wrote for *New World Review*. Due to rapid changes in world politics after 1945, especially with the rise of independence struggles in Africa and Asia and the birth of the UN, Robeson stressed the significance of journalists and journalism stating that, “It is our great responsibility…to learn as much as possible about these changes, these new countries, new peoples, new ways of life, to understand, appreciate and respect them, and to tell others about them, in preparation for living together with them in peace and progress in the world which belongs to all of us.” She understood the privileged position she held as a journalist exclaiming that she was “very happy, to be able, in some small way to participate in this work of searching out, accumulating, analyzing, and then sharing constructive information about the countries and peoples of our New World by working as a correspondent in the United Nations and writing for *New World Review*.”

Established in 1951, *New World Review* succeeded the journal *Soviet Russia Today* and was linked to the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (NCASF), an organisation of which Robeson was a member. The left-leaning *New World Review* was sympathetic to the USSR and many of its editorials expressed pro-communist,
anti-colonial, and radical views. Its editor, the activist Jessica Smith, travelled to the Soviet Union as early as 1922 and shared ties to the Communist Party. A number of black leftist and radicals who had links with Smith also contributed to *New World Review*, including George Murphy Jr., Elizabeth Moos, Shirley Graham Du Bois, Vicki Garvin, Thelma Dale Perkins, Alice Childress, Marvel Cooke, and Halois Moorhead. Robeson mixed in similar circles with many of these figures, but her position with *New World Review* was more official as she had been appointed the editorial advisor on topics relating to colonialism and African American politics. Her anthropology, international travels, and connections with emerging political leaders cemented her status as a leading authority on world politics. Robeson’s contributions to *New World Review* consisted of journalistic reporting and opinion pieces. While there was little difference between the two styles, both were inflected with Robeson’s determination to speak for the oppressed. The fact that Robeson wrote for *New World Review* alongside other black newspapers reflects her interest in reaching a larger left-wing audience.

Robeson’s interest in writing for *New World Review* was further based on her enthusiasm for the potential role of the UN in reforming the post-war world. As a representative of the anti-colonial organization, the Council on African Affairs (CAA) Robeson attended the meetings that led to the creation of the UN Charter in San Francisco in 1945: “Working in San Francisco… was for me a fantastic experience…. For I was a NOBODY, dipping into the business of the making of a NEW WORLD.” Robeson spent most of her time listening to lectures and forging new alliances. With the birth of the UN and other international organizations like the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and
Development (later the World Bank), concepts of one world and global citizenship grew in popularity. As the historian Glenda Sluga has noted, they did not signal the demise of the nation-state but rather captured the new sense of global togetherness that Robeson was keen to support and spread.\(^{17}\)

In Robeson’s mind, the UN transformed definitions of citizenship stating that “we Americans are not just American citizens any longer, - we are also World Citizens.”\(^ {18}\) Robeson’s understanding of world citizenship was not in conflict with her status as an American citizen, but rather complemented it. This chimes with the views of the political theorist Derek Heater who states that just as the “modern state has needed citizens for its legitimacy and stability, so too does the emerging global community.”\(^ {19}\) Heater contends that world citizenship “imposes the need to know about and understand world issues as well as local and national ones, and to be concerned about, even involved in, the problems facing the planet and its inhabitants, especially those most disadvantaged.”\(^ {20}\) Robeson’s extensive travels shaped her interest in knowing about freedom struggles beyond the US and instilled within her a desire to understand the shared connections between people from around the world.

While ideas about world citizenship have developed since the classical era, Sluga asserts that after the Second World War, world citizenship “stood for a conception of international politics as a sphere in which international organizations would represent the political ambitions of the world’s population for equality, progress, peace, and security, and democratic representation.”\(^ {21}\) Robeson strongly believed the UN would be the organization that fulfilled these lofty ideals.
This article argues that *New World Review* was a space for Robeson to express her vision of world citizenship that was rooted in the UN and based on mutual collaboration and cooperation between the US and USSR, a dismantling of Western hegemony at the UN, Afro-Asian solidarity, the promotion of racial and gender equality, and peace. Robeson’s vision of world citizenship was both imagined and experienced. It was imagined in the sense that many of her articles were hypothetical and speculative; it was experienced in the way in which her role as a journalist enabled her to forge local and global networks with influential diplomats, politicians and national and international organizations. The following pages focus on Robeson’s contributions in *New World Review* in the 1950s, the decade when she regularly wrote for the publication.

While making a contribution to Robeson’s understandings of world citizenship, this article also joins a growing body of scholarship that seeks to include black women within the canon of intellectual history by concentrating on the political and social thought of black women intellectuals. In a 2015 collection of essays entitled *Toward an Intellectual History of Black Women*, the editors identify what they call “intellectual history ‘black woman-style’” defined as “an approach that understands ideas as necessarily produced in dialogue with lived experience and always inflected by the social facts of race, class, and gender.”22 As a public intellectual, Robeson used the pages of *New World Review* to contribute to the development of post-war ideas about equality, rights, and peace, which was influenced by the realities of her own life. Rather than attempt objectivity in her journalism, Robeson wrote with searing forthrightness about how the intersections of race, class, and gender impacted the poor, women, and minorities.
US-USSR relations and anti-communism

One of the most prominent topics that Robeson wrote about in *New World Review* was US-Soviet Union relations and the Cold War. Eslanda and Paul Robeson first visited the communist nation in 1934 and became enamored by the USSR’s lack of racial discrimination. However, their visit was closely monitored by Soviet officials and they were presented with a predominantly positive image of the country. Soon they became influential supporters of Soviet communism, but never members of the Communist Party in the US. In *New World Review*, Eslanda Robeson repeatedly emphasized that rather than criticize the USSR, the US should copy Soviet policies. She was convinced that countries with similarly diverse populations as the USSR could employ its model of officially banning discrimination on the grounds of religion, race, and gender to foster egalitarianism. In 1951, Robeson praised the success of the multi-racial and multi-ethnic Soviet Union for exposing “white supremacy theory as pure myth and wishful thinking, supported not by facts nor science, but by organized propaganda, colonial armies, and force and violence.”²³ She informed readers that, “Women, Orientals, Jews, Moslems, peasants, national minority groups, traditionally despised and discriminated against in Old Russia, now live and work as equal Soviet citizens.”²⁴ While Robeson overlooked the fact that many in these groups continued to experience prejudice, she equated anti-Soviet Union views with “the same kind of prejudice, hatred and fear which Un-Americans have built up against the Negro people, and the colonial powers have built up against the colored peoples of Africa and Asia.”²⁵ She understood that the re-ordering of society in the Soviet Union was a key part of its success as a global leader stating that “As a Negro, as a colored person, as a woman- one of the so-called ‘backward
people’, I hail the progress of the former ‘backward’ Russian people to the present forward Soviet people; I congratulate them upon the success of their new socialist way of life which has brought them to world leadership and power in a few short years.”

Robeson’s enthusiasm for the Soviet Union’s society and culture, in relation to the treatment of women and minorities, demonstrates the significance of equality to her ideal of world citizenship. For Robeson, the equality that existed in the Soviet Union was a key factor in its rise as a super power. Given this, Robeson was convinced that the US too could strengthen its status as a superpower if it adopted equal opportunities for all.

In order for the US to borrow Soviet strategies, Robeson argued that the anti-communist hysteria during the McCarthy era must end. In August 1951, she wrote an article in support of the NCASF, when it was being prosecuted under the McCarran Act for alleged subversive activities. In “Why I am a friend of the USSR”, Robeson noted the hypocrisy of the US in ordering her to terminate her links with the organization, noting that “First let my Government be friends with me and my Negro people. First let my Government stop discriminating against, segregating and persecuting us… then and then only, will I KNOW that my Government IS my Government.” Until that time came, Robeson was firmly committed to “honestly and sincerely following my own considered judgment”, and she came to “the sober conclusion that my friendship with the Soviet Union is so well grounded that it is worth defending against great pressures.” Again, she drew on her own experiences as an African American to “respectfully offer some practical constructive advice and suggestions to my Government”, warning that the US “cannot maintain a 24-hour vigil against enemies for long without ruining our physical, mental, political,
economic, and moral health.” Here, she alluded to the negative impact of anti-communism in multiple areas of US society and believed that “The only way to prevent our destruction is to build friendship with people and with nations.” Robeson’s refusal to acquiesce to Cold War anti-communist pressure was evidenced in 1953 when the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations led by McCarthy subpoenaed her because two of her books, *Paul Robeson: Negro* (1930) and *African Journey* (1945), were in overseas libraries and this, alongside her friendships with known communists and travel to the USSR, raised suspicion. At the hearing Robeson defiantly rebuffed questions regarding her relation to the Communist Party.

Robeson also used her pen to defend other organizations linked to the UN that were targeted for their communist affiliations or political views. This was the case when the UN decided to discontinue the consultative status of the Women’s International Democratic Federation (WIDF) due to accusations of the group “being a Communist-dominated organization and of subversive activities against the United Nations.”

Founded in 1945 at the first International Women’s Congress in Paris, the WIDF promoted world peace and women’s equal rights. Robeson emphasized the significance of the WIDF at the UN, observing that “for millions of women whose countries have no representation in the United Nations- Italy, People’s China, Africa, and some of the Eastern European Democracies, the WIDF is their only link with the work of the United Nations.” The WIDF denied that they either were communist infiltrated or promoted an anti-UN propaganda campaign. Robeson stood by the WIDF’s right to criticize UN policies, especially when it was directed at pointing out crimes against women and children that had occurred during the Korean War.
Regardless of the attacks the WIDF faced, Robeson wrote that the organization “can take comfort in the fact that actually only 7 member states out of the 60 which constitute the United Nations, voted for its expulsion, and it was said that these states voted under pressure from the United States.”36 Robeson’s strong defense of the NCASF and WIDF reflected her commitment to supporting the autonomy of international organizations that were victims of anti-communism, which undermined what she saw as the futile US-USSR divisions.

Robeson was confident that the US and USSR could form cordial international relations. In a matter-of-fact way, Robeson claimed, “of course American-Soviet peaceful co-existence is possible.”37 Yet she was unsure about when this would occur, asking if it will take place, “Before or after another war?” 38 Robeson stressed the urgency of the moment believing that co-existence should be of immediate national concern arguing that “If we don’t fight each other, but find some other way to live and let live, we will have won a major victory for all of us; we will have proved ourselves civilized human beings.”39 She rebuked official US government policy towards the USSR that she interpreted as uncivilized behavior, asserting that “Many loyal American citizens deeply resent the suggestion of some of our arrogant, aggressive, corrupt, and stupid government officials that we are so lacking in brains, common sense, diplomacy, ingenuity and tact, that we must resort to armed strength alone in our relations with our world neighbors.”40 Robeson labeled their actions as “an insult to the intelligence, resourcefulness and humanity of the American people.”41 Rather than placing the focus of US-USSR relations on military action Robeson urged that diplomacy should take central focus because she believed that “We Americans, at our best, have the intelligence, resourcefulness and humanity to negotiate with
anybody.” Robeson underscored the necessity of productive negotiation as an essential part of forging world citizenship based on civil international relations.

**Asian and African influence at the UN**

Tearing down Western hegemony at the UN through the influence of emerging independent nations in Africa and Asia was an additional feature of Robeson’s vision of world citizenship. In numerous articles in *New World Review* she informed her audience about political changes occurring on both continents in order to highlight the regions’ growing importance. In 1955, for instance, Robeson reported on the Bandung conference held in Indonesia. The conference brought together leaders of twenty-nine nations from Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. The host of the conference, the first president of Indonesia, Ahmed Sukarno, described the meeting as “the first international conference of coloured peoples in the history of mankind!” The leaders convened “to promote cooperation among the nonaligned nations of the Third World; to deliberate about such common problems as colonialism and racism; and to advocate world peace.” Robeson reported that during the conference “new and world-important friendships were initiated (and)…wonderful negotiations took place on the side.” For example, Chinese political leader Chou En-lai “signed a treaty with Indonesia resolving the troublesome problem of dual citizenship for overseas Chinese; he publically offered to negotiate directly with the United States to relax tensions in the Far East.” Furthermore, attendees endorsed the strategy of non-alignment to assert their neutrality in the Cold War. Yet for Robeson, the most important result of the Bandung conference was that seventeen of the nation states that were members of the UN “pledged to reconstitute themselves as a consultative group to initiate and support all measures for peace, disarmament, self determination,
non-interference, human rights, friendly international relations and economic cooperation in the UN.” She believed that these member states would form a powerful bloc in the UN that would thwart the dominance of Europe and the US.

Later that year, Robeson noticed the changes at the UN due to the increase in the number of African and Asian states. She identified how “the formerly quiet, assured, occasionally arrogant voices of the Colonial Powers are not so confident these days; the often meek voices of the Small Nations are taking on a new courage, determination and purpose.” The new determination of the smaller nations displayed itself when the issue of the ongoing Algerian war was discussed. While France and her allies, including Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, the US, Australia and New Zealand, insisted that the UN did not have a right to discuss Algeria because it was a national matter for France, the smaller powers won the right to address the Algerian question at the tenth General Assembly. As a result, France “walked out of the General Assembly because she cannot, or will not, face a discussion of the situation in Algeria.” Robeson saw this triumph as a sign that the UN would become an organization in which newly independent nations could wield power and influence and whose success could help quicken the pace of civil rights in the US. This was a thought Robeson shared on her first visit to independent Ghana, in December 1958, when she attended the All-African People’s Conference in Accra.

The conference took place after the First Conference of Independent African States, held in the same city in April that year, and was “the first time in modern history Africans from North, East, Central, South and West Africa met in conference on African soil to discuss African Affairs.” Both conferences attempted to forward
continental unity and present a “United States of Africa.”53 With around “200
delegates from 50 organizations (trade unions and political parties) from 20
countries”, discussions at the conference “centered upon how the African people, in
unity and close co-operation, can put aside their internal differences and work
together to bring an end to Colonialism.”54 The Trinidadian-born activist George
Padmore, who had re-located to Ghana from London to work alongside the newly
elected President Kwame Nkrumah, organized the Accra conference and the
Congolese leader Patrice Lumumba served as co-chair. During the conference,
Robeson met African leaders including Lumumba, Tom Mboya, leader of the Kenya
Federation of Labour, and Hastings Banda from Nyasaland.55

Despite antagonistic behavior at the conference, that Robeson identified “was carried
on by white westerners, sometimes directly, sometimes through the few but obvious
African mouthpieces they could find,” a number of “significant Resolutions…which
the Western Press played down or buried” were passed.56 One of the resolutions
called for the formation of an “‘African Legion’ consisting of volunteers who will be
ready to protect the freedom of the African Peoples. It decided to support all fighters
for African Freedom non-violent as well as “all those who are compelled to retaliate
with violence.”57 According to Robeson, one of the most important pledges made at
the conference was “that no African State should have diplomatic relations with any
country which practices discrimination,” including the US.58 While Robeson agreed
that these resolutions would help to spread peace and support an end to racial
discrimination, she was aware of regional, linguistic, and religious tensions between
different countries that could prevent its implementation.
Additionally, Robeson expressed disappointment “over the absence of women” at the conference.\(^{59}\) In total, “there were only eight official women delegates, and only two women addressed the plenary sessions.”\(^{60}\) The two women were Martha Ouandie who “told the terrible story of French colonialism now rampant in Cameroons, and Shirley Graham Du Bois (who) read the clear, forceful, constructive message to the conference from her husband.”\(^{61}\) While Robeson had not met Ouandie before, she was close with writer and activist Graham Du Bois who she worked with in the Progressive Party and the black feminist group, the Sojourners for Truth and Justice.

Bemoaning the lack of women at the conference, Robeson stated that “a whole population cannot be properly mobilized if half of it is officially ignored.”\(^{62}\) Her insistence on informing readers about the lack of women’s representation was tied to her criticism of the masculinity inherent in the “big man” politics of African independence, which weakened claims of post-colonial equality.\(^{63}\)

Although Robeson was critical of the dominance of men in positions of leadership in newly independent countries in Asia and Africa, she still recognized their importance in challenging the western bias in and promoting equality at the UN. She wrote articles about some of the men she thought would play prominent roles in the UN, one of whom was her friend, V K Krishna Menon. Considered “one of the most important diplomats in the world,” Menon served as India’s chief delegate to the UN in the 1950s.\(^{64}\) Born in India in 1897 and raised in a middle-class family, Menon joined the Indian Nationalist Movement at a young age and campaigned for Home Rule. In the late 1920s, he moved to England to study at University College London, then the London School of Economics and Political Science, and he later read law at Inner Temple. In Britain, Menon was politically active, joining the English Fabian
Socialists and serving as secretary of the India League. In 1930s London, Menon met Eslanda and Paul Robeson. Extolling Menon’s “dignity, courage and confidence,” Robeson remarked on how his personality and politics caused tension with his western counterparts who “find it very hard to take heed, calmly, of what Mr. Menon says; and they find it much harder to agree with him.” Robeson explained the reasons behind this, saying that a few years ago Menon was “speaking from a soap box in London’s Hyde Park; Jawaharlal Nehru… was in prison, and the British … thought patronizingly, that they could afford to treat them as agitators and crackpots.” With Jawaharlal Nehru acting as Prime Minister and Menon serving as his Foreign Minister, Robeson opined that this threatened “the old type of conservative diplomat (who) finds himself more and more helpless, isolated, out of the stream of things.” What made Menon a new type of diplomat for Robeson, was not just his political views, but also that “his mind, temperament and interests are ready and eager to consider anything and everything, in all its aspects.” Robeson praised Menon for his willingness to elicit debate on a variety of issues rather than stifle it, which was a practice she also saw the leader who hosted the Bandung conference promote.

In *New World Review*, Robeson reported on Indonesian President Sukarno’s first US state visit in 1956. What she admired most about Sukarno was that his “speeches made an important contribution to the urgently needed ‘agonizing reappraisal’ of our foreign policy.” In a speech in New York, Sukarno criticized the use of atomic weapons saying, “you cannot release hydrogen bombs on populations of great cities if your aim is the liberation of mankind.” In a reference to the Cold War, he stated, “our policy is not one of neutrality … We believe we have a part to play in those
conflicts... We believe that the division of the world into two camps is not the way to the unity of mankind.” With these comments, Robeson saw Sukarno as evidence that emerging Third World leaders would re-shape global politics by shifting the power balance at the UN, demanding an end to the Cold War and colonialism and promoting peace. Sukarno embodied the outwardly looking and assertive politician who no longer acquiesced to the demands of powerful nations, but rather would take a different route aligned to Robeson’s vision of world citizenship.

In April 1959, Robeson published an article profiling new African leaders, including Nkrumah, Mboya, Banda, and Sekou Touré the President of Guinea, a group she regarded as being politically powerful. “These leaders are trying to work out a new practical system suitable to their needs”, she argued, as “they do not want to copy other systems which have been built for other circumstances and for other objectives, very different from their own. They are saying a healthy and resounding NO! to their former masters.” Robeson identified that these leaders were presenting a “new type of Black Leadership” that had not been witnessed before. She surmised that “There have always been dynamic, courageous African leaders; but the colonial powers, fearful of being driven out of Africa, have taken care over the years to imprison, exile, and even murder any leader whom they considered ‘dangerous’. Now the end of colonialism is at hand, and the African people, led by Africans, are coming into their own.” Taken together, the articles she wrote about emerging Asian and African political leaders demonstrated Robeson’s confidence that they could make the UN an inclusive international community rather than a colonial club, as critics dubbed it. Her editorials also overlapped with the significance she placed on the role that people of African descent could play in helping to end racism, and she regularly informed her
readers about the work of African Americans at the UN, namely civil servant Ralph Bunche, Reverend Archibald J. Carey Jr, Channing Tobias, and Chicago lawyer Edith Sampson.

In 1954, Robeson defended Bunche when the Loyalty Board, a body President Truman signed into law to investigate communist activities in the US, subpoenaed him to respond to accusations that he shared communist sympathies because of his previous ties to the National Negro Congress (NNC). In the 1940s, Bunche participated in the NNC before it embraced communism and was later cleared by the UN of any communist involvement. Although Robeson admired Bunche, she disliked the UN alternates, Archibald J Carey Jr, Channing Tobias, who she worked with through the CAA, and Sampson. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower appointed the three on a tokenistic basis. Most of these figures, especially Sampson, used their positions in the UN to condemn the Soviet Union and refute the notion that racial discrimination existed in the US. “It is often pathetic to hear one or another of these United States representatives boast virtuously that ‘the U.S. does not have discrimination and segregation,’” Robeson observed. In Freedom, Robeson wrote an article reprimanding Sampson, in particular, for a string of egregious statements she made about racism in the US and her attacks on Paul Robeson’s patriotism. These figures did not share Robeson’s commitment to colored cosmopolitanism or world citizenship. Instead they chose instead to express an uncritical American nationalism that deliberately overlooked the glaring inequalities and contradictions of the nation in order to negate accusations from other countries, especially the Soviet Union, that the American ideals of democracy and freedom were hollow.
Despite Robeson’s critique of prominent African Americans working at the UN, she was hopeful that the majority of African Americans would come to see the UN as a potential ally in the promotion of racial equality. In discussing recent civil rights protests in the *Afro-American*, Robeson argued that while President Eisenhower refused to condemn racism in the US South or South Africa, “Colored Americans…will be very glad to learn that …The United Nations, and many of its Members think … that race conflict anywhere, and in particular race conflict in South Africa, is a very grave danger in the world today.” She informed readers about the “Special Political Committee” meetings that UN members held in the first two weeks of January 1957. If “Colored Americans had packed the public galleries to listen to the debate” Robeson was sure that “they would have been greatly heartened by what they would have heard.” At the meeting, delegates from Africa, Asia, and socialist nations “declared flatly that unless racial discrimination was outlawed and put an end to, civil and racial war in the world might result.” Robeson’s coverage of racism and the UN dovetailed with her consistent reporting about the actions of African and Asian countries, whose independence struggles she believed would buoy African American freedom struggles. Not only in her journalism but also in her activism, Robeson consistently connected struggles abroad with domestic racial issues.

In Robeson’s opinion, African Americans were deeply invested in African politics: “Our hearts beat faster when we learn that Africans in the Gold Coast are governing themselves and that Africans in Nigeria will soon be doing likewise.” In regards to South Africa, she stated, “We hold our breath with anxiety and sympathy for Africans in South Africa who have organized with Indians and colored people there to resist Malan’s vicious policy of Apartheid.” In relation to East Africa, she commented
“We worry about Africans in Kenya who are undergoing genocide. We rejoice with Africans in Buganda who persistently demanded, and finally secured, the restoration of their Kabaka.” Robeson imbued African diasporic relations with visceral emotive significance. Her interest in the actions of Asians, Africans and African Americans at the UN also connected to her attempts to cultivate wider coalitions across racial and geographic differences to promote Afro-Asian solidarity. China and India were two countries, Robeson was familiar with due to her travels and friendships, that became the focus of her attempts to foster multi-racial cooperation.

**Afro-Asian solidarity**

Robeson’s editorials on China were enhanced by her experiences of having travelled throughout the country in 1949 when she was invited to attend the Asian Women’s Federation meeting in Beijing as a representative of the CAA, Congress of American Women, and the Progressive Party. Her visit allowed her to learn about and support struggles for Chinese freedom and link them with those black Africans, Americans, and West Indians waged. Robeson, for instance, informed readers about how Chinese men and women had won the fight to repossess their land and drive “the foreigners and the feudal lords off the mainland of China to Formosa, and set up their own Central Peoples Government.” She argued that these actions had consequences for black Americans: “Every Negro who has listened ad nauseum to talk about Freedom and Democracy, and got none of it; every Negro who has finally come to the conclusion, as the Asian and African people did, that next time he hears the slogans FREEDOM and DEMOCRACY he too will take them literally.” Despite the similarities between African American and Chinese freedom struggles against
oppression, Robeson overlooked the differences in order to emphasize Afro-Asian solidarity.

Furthermore, the conference provided Robeson with an opportunity to observe how women’s rights had evolved in China. She “met, talked with, listened to, travelled with, and briefly lived with 165 Delegates representing 14 Asian countries, and 33 Observers representing Africa, Europe and the Americas.” The conference served as “an experience of a lifetime” for Robeson because it ‘gave us a new feeling about women, about the importance of the role we women have to play in this new and changing world.’ One of the most politically influential women in China who Robeson met was Madame Sun Yat-sen, also known as Soong Ching-ling, Vice President of the People’s Republic of China, President of the Chinese People’s Relief Administration and the second wife of Sun Yat-sen, the leader of the 1911 revolution. Robeson admired Soong Ching-ling and described her as the “World Woman Number One” because of “her deep sense of being not only one of the 250 million women of China, one of the 500 million people of China, but also one of and one with the billions of women and people of the world.” Robeson observed that Ching-ling “had much to tell, but much to ask, because her deep concern for her own people is bound up with a deep concern for the people of the world.” Soong Ching-ling’s interest with women across the world, given her relative privilege, embodied Robeson’s world citizenship. Soong Ching-ling came to represent, for Robeson, the ideal activist who had empathy and compassion for women who did not share her status. Robeson’s fondness for Soong Ching-ling is evidence of her commitment to the importance of interracial and international female friendship that strengthened Afro-Asian unity.
Through creating personal bonds with women, Robeson was actively practicing the ideals she wanted to spread.

In addition to articles highlighting the similarity in Afro-Asian freedom struggles, Robeson also used the *New World Review* to discuss the lack of Chinese representation at the UN. Robeson bemoaned the fact that, “When considering problems of the Far East and world problems such as disarmament, atomic energy, education, the status women and the welfare of children, UN members are denied the benefit of wisdom and experience of the representatives of one quarter of the world’s population.”96 Instead, at the UN the leader of Formosa, Chiang Kai-shek, was granted representation rather than the PRC. 97 While the UN and the US chose not to politically recognize the legitimacy of the People’s Republic of China, Robeson praised the communist led Chinese government for carrying out “important political, social and economic reforms… (that) has radically improved the condition of the Chinese people.”98 Robeson informed readers about the attempts by representatives from Asia and Africa to have Chinese representation by quoting from Menon, who stated that, “So far as the presence of China itself is concerned…I think that the best authority on this matter is the present Secretary of State (John Foster Dulles). He said, in 1950, ‘I have now come to believe that the United Nations will best serve the cause of peace if its Assembly is representative of what the world actually is, and not merely representative of the parts we like.’”99 Robeson shared Menon’s view and hoped to see China and other excluded countries represented at the UN. She believed this would ease political tensions that existed due to the actions of states that refused to adhere to the UN Charter, which undermined Robeson’s vision of world citizenship.
UN Tensions and Peace

1956 witnessed the addition of sixteen new countries entering the UN. With this increase, Robeson observed that the “The World Family, over-anxious to placate certain member states who seem to be its favorite sons… over-extends or ignores some of the basic meaning of the Family Rules, the United Nations Charter.” For instance, Robeson reported on the ongoing friction between France and the UN Trust Territory over the French Cameroons in West Africa. During the Scramble for Africa, the French Cameroons were seized and became a protectorate of Germany, but during the First World War Belgian and French troops occupied it. In 1922, the League of Nations mandated it to Britain and France. Under the UN, the area became a Trust Territory overseen by the Trusteeship Council. In the mid-1950s, local unrest and violence against French rule in the area increased. Although “hundreds of petitions from the Camerouns have flooded the UN, France so far has made no report, no comments… and has merely said in answer to pressing questions, that the petitions come from ‘communist organizations’” Robeson noted. While the tactic of labeling any opposition to French rule as communist agitation was politically effective, Robeson reminded her readers that, “whether the inhabitants are Communists, Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, Nationalists or whatever- they are nevertheless wards of the Council” and in need of assistance.

Robeson was also critical more broadly of the system of Trusteeship arguing that “a colonial power can not or will not prepare a people under its domination for freedom, unless it is regularly checked and prodded and challenged.” While the majority of the UN member states supported the independence movements of areas that were
under Trusteeship, Robeson argued that the “behavior of the colonial powers – their
timidity in advancing independence on the one hand, and their arrogance in trying to
suppress it on the other- is recognized as both a moral and legal violation of the
Charter.”\(^{105}\) She stressed that “The colonial powers must be helped to face the
inevitable: that the hundreds of millions of non-self-governing peoples in the world
are going to achieve independence in the foreseeable future, with or without the help
of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Council.”\(^{106}\) This statement reveals
Robeson’s confidence that independence would be the result of the actions from
below through the mass mobilization of men and women. Having observed successful
independence movements in Africa and Asia, Robeson believed that the future of
countries depended on grassroots activism and she wanted international organizations
like the UN to support them.

Although the UN was fraught with internal rivalries based on colonialism and neo-
colonialism, Robeson also trusted that the organization would foster world peace,
which was another feature of her understanding of world citizenship. “I am
convinced”, she wrote “that we will achieve peace and friendship, because it is a
natural, normal human state of being, because the vast majority of the human family
need and want it desperately, and because so many people in so many places have
already organized to work and fight for it.”\(^{107}\) Her hopefulness was based on her
experience of seeing the “development of organizations and projects dedicated to
promote friendship and cooperation between all American citizens, and to secure and
protect their rights under our Constitution.”\(^{108}\) These groups included “The Civil
Rights Congress, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the Committee for the
Protection of the Foreign Born, the National Association for the Advancement of
Colored People, the National Urban League, the Southern Welfare Conference, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the American Jewish Congress, some of the trade unions.”

Robeson also mentioned that she had “lived to see the establishment and development of organizations and projects to promote and increase understanding and cooperation and friendship between the people of our own country and the peoples of other nations: the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, the Council on African Affairs, the India League, the China Welfare Appeal, the Good Neighbor Policy, the International Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs – to mention only a few.” However, she signaled a sober warning not to see these organizations as signs of progress but rather as “precedents only, as indications of what can and must be done.” The faith Robeson placed in the organizations she listed revealed the extent to which she believed that world peace was an ideal that ordinary citizens could play a role in through their participation in global civil society. It is telling that the organizations she listed were predominantly internationalist, interracial, and included the collaboration of both men and women, which illustrates the extent to which gender equality was another important feature of Robeson’s vision of world citizenship.

**Women at the UN**

Gender issues came to dominate Robeson’s articles in *New World Review* through her consistent reporting on the role of women at the UN. Robeson was well aware that the media overlooked women’s contribution to the UN, lamenting “that our general press pays too little attention to the activities, and important contributions, of the women at
the United Nations”, and she sought to change this because “these delegates represent women throughout the world and they deal with vital matters.” In 1954, she informed readers about the UN’s eighth annual session of the Commission on the Status of Women. The commission consisted of women from the Dominican Republic, Byelorussia (Belorusia), Haiti, France, Cuba, USSR, UK, Poland, Iran, Venezuela, Formosa, Lebanon, Pakistan, Burma, and the US. The Commission passed many resolutions, including two “on the principle of equal pay for equal work for men and women workers.” Although the Commission was intended as a forum for women, two men, Patrick Attlee from Britain and Aleksander Bozovic from Yugoslavia, attempted to disrupt activities. However, Robeson commended Faina Novikova from Byelorussia who “verbally spanked” Atlee “and put him in his place as a mere man in the Women’s Commission.”

During the session, the Commission also “announced that the International Convention on the Political Rights on Women had received its sixth ratification, and would therefore come into force on July 7th, 1954.” Robeson reported that the Convention stated that women shall be allowed to “vote in all elections on equal terms with men; that they shall be eligible for election to publically elected bodies; and that they shall be entitled to hold public office and to exercise all public functions.” Nevertheless, only six countries had at that point ratified the Convention consisting of the Dominican Republic, China, Greece, Bulgaria, Sweden, and Cuba. The Commission on the Status of Women also recommended to “non-governmental organizations that they continue to emphasize the importance of expanding opportunities for women in public service at the national level as a means of encouraging their participation in international civil service.” Robeson added
that she wanted to see women in all areas of leadership in international politics, not just in commissions focused on women, stating that she and “women of the world look forward to the time when women, appointed by their governments, will sit, side-by-side with men, in the top policy-making bodies of the United Nations- in the Security, Trusteeship, and Economic and Social councils.” Robeson’s point demonstrated the lack of female representation at the upper echelons of the UN, an issue she constantly criticized. She challenged gendered segregation at the UN believing that if women worked alongside men in other influential divisions at the UN then women’s concerns could be more adequately addressed beyond the Women’s Commission.

In 1958, Robeson updated readers on the twelfth General Assembly recording that “there were 36 women representatives from 27 Nations … 12 of the women were full delegates, and 24 were alternates.” Most of the women who attended the General Assembly held prominent positions in their country, including Golda Meir, Foreign Minister of Israel; Ulla Lindstrom, the Minister of State for Sweden; Georgette Ciselet, the Belgian Senator; Z V Mironova, the Deputy Mayor of Moscow; Angie Brooks, the Assistant Attorney General of Liberia; Laili Roesad, the Deputy Chief of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia; Gloria Addae, the Research Economist of the Ministry of Trade and Development of Ghana; Taki Fujitathe, President of the League of Women Voters of Japan; and Tarkenshwar Sinha, an Indian activist.

Still, Robeson stressed the need to have more women at the UN believing that men’s dominance explained “why some of its important discussions continue to be unrealistic, impractical and futile.” Robeson expressed that, “Women, with the day-to-day direct working responsibility for the children, the family, the home, and the
budget are inclined to be, often forced to be, much more down-to-earth and common sensical than men.” Robeson drew on the strategy of appealing to women’s difference from men through their roles as mothers and wives to show the value of their skills in the political arena.

At the UN, Robeson forged friendships and networks with some of the organizations’ leading women, notably with the Indian diplomat Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Nehru’s sister, whom she met in London in 1938. Pandit shared similar interests with her brother and in the 1940s, while imprisoned for her political views, her two daughters Nayantara (Tara) and Chandralekha (Lekha) studied at Wellesley College in Massachusetts and stayed with the Robeson family at their home in Connecticut. Between 1946 and 1968, she acted as head of the Indian delegation to the UN and later served as the first woman president of the UN General Assembly. At the UN, Robeson and Pandit regularly met to discuss politics. Robeson’s ties to Pandit were similar to her interracial friendship with Ching-ling and were part of her attempt to foster Afro-Asian solidarity and colored cosmopolitanism. Robeson’s articles on women at the UN demonstrate how her perspective of world citizenship was one in which women would exercise equal rights with men in the international arena. Although she was ambivalent about using the label of “feminist” to describe herself, due to its association with white middle class women, she certainly subscribed to its tenants.

Robeson’s articles in *New World Review* were a space to assert her vision of world citizenship. This vision consisted of an end to the Cold War as well as western dominance at the UN through the active participation of African and Asian countries,
peace, and the promotion of racial and gender equality. Robeson’s idealistic vision of world citizenship was one in which she imagined the future of a more cosmopolitan, connected, equal, and peace-driven world. She tried to practice this imagined ideal through her travels and relationships with high profile politicians and leaders. Yet Robeson consciously overlooked national differences in her comparisons with different countries; indeed, they were not significant barriers to the creation of and her commitment to practicing world citizenship.

The ideas Robeson expressed in *New World Review* demonstrate the breadth of her intellectual ideas “black woman-style.” What was distinct about Robeson’s style was how inclusive and ambitious her notion of world citizenship was, which was closely based on the intersections of race, gender and class and rooted in empathy. Examining Robeson’s journalism, shows how her ideas were grounded in notions of collaboration over that of conflict. While it is difficult to measure concretely the impact of Robeson’s writings on readers, it can be assumed that she along with the other black American writers in *New World Review* expanded the journals discussions about international affairs through a racialized, gendered and diasporic lens.

Although she certainly admired and put her faith in the UN, Robeson grappled with the complexity and challenges facing the “world family” as she preferred to call it, which would fall short of promoting world citizenship. Nevertheless, Robeson’s articles demonstrate her firm faith that despite the many difficulties within the UN, it and ordinary citizens could actively promote world citizenship and feel and act as part of a global community, which she believed would lead to a more fair and equal world for all.
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