



The National Response to Richard M. Nixon's Black Capitalism Initiative: The Success of Domestic Detente

Author(s): Robert E. Weems, Jr. and Lewis A. Randolph

Source: *Journal of Black Studies*, Sep., 2001, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Sep., 2001), pp. 66-83

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2668015>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Black Studies*

JSTOR

THE NATIONAL RESPONSE TO RICHARD M. NIXON'S BLACK CAPITALISM INITIATIVE

The Success of Domestic Detente

ROBERT E. WEEMS, JR.
University of Missouri–Columbia

LEWIS A. RANDOLPH
Ohio University

Richard M. Nixon viewed an uncontrolled Black Power movement as a major threat to the internal security of the United States (during the late 1960s and early 1970s). To address this situation, Nixon developed his Black capitalism initiative as a domestic version of his widely publicized foreign policy initiative of detente (which sought to “contain” the power of the Soviet Union and China). Moreover, just as Nixon and Henry Kissinger linked concessions associated with detente to Soviet and Chinese behavior modification, the Nixon presidency offered African Americans the notion of Black capitalism as an incentive to move away from the notion of “Burn Baby Burn” (Ambrose, 1989, pp. 125-126). Besides briefly examining the nuances of Nixon’s Black capitalism initiative, this article will focus on the national discourse generated by this political maneuver. The evidence suggests that although Nixon did not achieve his institutional goals (campaign promises) related to Black capitalism, he did, indeed, achieve his larger ideological goal of subverting African American radicalism.

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION AND BLACK CAPITALISM: AN OVERVIEW

Although the term *Black capitalism* represented a skillful use of political rhetoric during the 1968 campaign, Nixon, once elected, had to move beyond mere words. Unfortunately for the new president, his campaign proclamations regarding Black capitalism came back to haunt him. Because Nixon, during the campaign, had promoted Black capitalism as a major remedy for America's racial ills, expectations regarding this initiative were extremely high. Thus, when the Nixon administration's Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE) literally stumbled out of the blocks after its establishment on March 5, 1969 (by Executive Order 11458), public criticism of the program mounted (Kotlowski, 1998, p. 416).

For instance, the August 30, 1969, issue of *Business Week* featured an article titled "Black Capitalism Has A Hollow Ring," which focused on the Nixon administration's inability to back up campaign promises related to Black economic empowerment. The following testimony, given by Eastman Kodak's Walter Cooper at a summer session of the House of Representatives Small Business Committee, graphically illustrated growing disenchantment with Nixon by both Black and White businessmen. Cooper, a member of the Small Business Administration's National Advisory Council for Black Economic Development told Congress, "There is little evidence to indicate our chief executive has committed his personal attention to accelerating the delivery of his campaign promise" (p. 51).

For his part, Nixon did take his campaign pledge seriously and, along with the secretary of commerce, Maurice Stans, sought to move Black capitalism from the realm of rhetoric to reality. Among other things, beginning in fiscal year 1970, OMBE's promotion and implementation of what came to be known as minority business set-asides assisted a growing number of African American entrepreneurs (Kotlowski, 1998, pp. 430-431).

Despite OMBE's improved stature and reputation (by the early 1970s), Black capitalism as articulated by Nixon in 1968 remained a fleeting dream. As Kotlowski (1998) has astutely observed,

because of a variety of factors (including a limited number of existing and prospective entrepreneurs in the African American community), Black capitalism could never have developed into anything more than “a small program with useful but limited impact.” Moreover, had the Nixon administration “worked to build it without indulging in rhetorical flourishes, it might have achieved quicker results and allayed skepticism” (p. 429).

Notwithstanding the gulf between the rhetoric and reality of Black capitalism, because of the well-publicized attention that Nixon gave to this concept, it generated widespread discussion and analysis during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

THE NATIONAL BLACK ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE (APRIL, 1969)

The National Black Economic Development Conference (NBEDC), convened in Detroit, Michigan, from April 25th to 27th, 1969, represented one early noteworthy response to Nixon’s Black capitalism initiative. The following excerpt from the NBEDC’s promotional material reflected the diversity of opinion regarding African American economic empowerment:

Buy Black—Not The Whole Answer
 Black Capitalism—Not The Whole Answer
 Co-ops—Not The Whole Answer
 Bringing More Money Into the Black Community—Not The
 Whole Answer
 New Economic Systems Based On Black Needs . . . A Beginning

Moreover, the NBEDC, itself, featured lively discussion regarding the merits and demerits of Black capitalism and other strategies to revitalize the economic situation of African Americans.

In his keynote address, Black economist Robert S. Browne (1969), then a professor of economics at Farleigh Dickerson University, examined the various options facing African Americans in

their quest for economic development. Early on, Browne acknowledged the aims of Black nationalists in attendance, yet also noted,

I sense that this conference is not primarily to be concerned with the question of whether national sovereignty is desirable for blacks or how it can be achieved . . . Rather it seems to me, we have been brought here to discuss the more modest question of what is achievable by black people within the existing limitations of our NOT enjoying national sovereignty. (p. 4)

According to Browne (1969), the biggest obstacle African Americans faced in their quest for economic self-determination was their lack of real access to the six basic levers or sources of power in the United States: (a) huge personal wealth, (b) the top 22 major corporations, (c) the military-industrial complex, (d) the federal and state governmental apparatus, (e) the federal legislative apparatus, and (f) the crime syndicate (p. 7). Moreover, Browne lamented, “This lack of access to the instruments of power, supplemented by white America’s vicious racial prejudice toward black people, has led to our perpetual impoverishment, our self-hatred and psychological insecurity, our poor educational attainment, and our social disorganization” (p. 7). In addition, Browne soberly asserted, “*Realistically* speaking . . . I see very limited possibility of our grasping the levers of control in this society” (p. 8).

Notwithstanding his somewhat depressing assessment of African Americans’ reality, Browne (1969) did assert that Blacks could launch an effective attack on Black poverty (despite African Americans’ exclusion from the national power structure). He viewed the various “local development projects, small business programs, job training, consumer education, vocational guidance, school improvement, and other community programs” as both useful to African Americans and nonthreatening to the national power structure (which recognized that Blacks had to be placated in some way) (p. 11). Yet, Browne also warned, “Our achievement will be of limited scope and will certainly not bring into being The Black Nation” (p. 10).

Although Browne's (1969) keynote presentation offered a cautious, realistic assessment of the parameters of present and future African American economic empowerment, James Foreman's (1969) dinner speech titled "Total Control as the Only Solution for the Economic Needs of Black People" offered a contradictory, if not surreal, vision of the economic future of African Americans. By 1969, Foreman, one of the founders of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, personified the ideological shift from "We Shall Overcome" to "Black Power" that the Black freedom movement had taken (p. 1).

Early on, Foreman (1969) denounced those Blacks who supported notions of Black capitalism. Besides derisively referring to conservative supporters of Black capitalism as "Negroes," Foreman described Black nationalist supporters of Black capitalism as "black power pimps" (p. 1). He further asserted that

the people must be educated to understand that any black man or Negro who is advocating a perpetuation of capitalism inside the United States is in fact seeking not only his ultimate destruction and death but is contributing to the continuous exploitation of black people all around the world. (p. 1)

In direct variance to the options for Black people articulated by Browne (1969), Foreman (1969) went on to declare,

Only an armed, well-disciplined, black-controlled government can insure the stamping out of racism in this country. . . . We plead with black people not to be thinking about a few crumbs. . . . We say think in terms of total control of the U.S. (p. 6)

After discussing how Black people could take over America, which included Black workers sabotaging the U.S. industrial base "while the brothers fought guerilla warfare in the streets" (p. 6), Foreman (1969) used his speech to announce the future plans of the NBEDC. He began by acknowledging and thanking the, predominantly White, National Council of Churches and the Inter-religious Foundation for Community Organization, which had helped organize and sponsor the NBEDC. Significantly, the National Council

of Churches, as early as 1967, had established an Investment Committee for Ghetto Community Development with the distinct purpose of promoting (and funding) Black economic development (Investment Committee for Economic Development, 1967, pp. 1-4). Nevertheless, Foreman declared,

We [Blacks] must begin seizing power wherever we are and we must say to the planners of this conference that you are no longer in charge. . . . The conference is now the property of the people who are assembled here. (pp. 6-7)

Foreman then went on to issue what came to be known as the Black Manifesto, which demanded \$500 million in reparations from America's White churches (pp. 6-7).

Foreman (1969) offered the following rationale for the takeover of the NBEDC and for the demand for money from White American denominations:

We maintain we have a revolutionary right to do this. We have the same rights, if you will, as the Christians had in going into Africa and raping our Motherland and bringing us away from our continent of peace and into this hostile and alien environment where we have been living in perpetual warfare since 1619. (p. 7)

Among the projects that would be funded by payments from White American churches was a national Black (mass media) communications network to disseminate "revolutionary" information to African Americans and a national Black university (Walker, 1969, p. 2).

The disparity between Browne's (1969) pragmatic vision and Foreman's (1969) revolutionary vision for the economic future of African Americans reflected a similar disparity among other contemporary commentators interested in the economic plight of African Americans. Significantly, persons who promoted the theoretical notion of Black capitalism, made popular by Nixon, differed dramatically as to how they would implement Black economic empowerment in the context of the capitalist system. Similarly, critics of Nixon's Black capitalism agenda differed among themselves as to what was a viable alternative to increased Black busi-

ness ownership. Moreover, there were some observers who changed their original position regarding the merits (or demerits) of Black capitalism.

INDEPENDENT DERIVATIVES OF NIXON'S BLACK CAPITALISM INITIATIVE

One of the most ambitious attempts to clearly articulate a framework for Black capitalism was Theodore L. Cross's (1969) book *Black Capitalism: Strategy for Business in the Ghetto*. Cross, then editor and publisher of *Banker's Magazine*, proposed a massive cooperative effort between corporate America and the U.S. government to enrich underdeveloped Black urban areas. Although Cross acknowledged that urban Black America was economically and socially separated from mainstream society, he maintained that "it encompasses millions of acres of urban real estate which simply cannot be abandoned" (pp. 138-139).

According to Cross (1969), Black distrust of White businessmen represented one of the biggest impediments to the economic reconstruction of urban Black America. Nevertheless, *Black Capitalism* urged White businessmen to ignore "the propaganda of black militants" and pursue "the route of clear logic and justice: the forced injection of credit, risk capital, and entrepreneurial skills into the ghetto economy" (p. 69).

Although Cross (1969) implied that Black militancy thwarted positive economic activity in African American enclaves, others asserted the exact opposite. For instance, Roy Innis (1969), of the Congress of Racial Equality, promoted the concept of separatist economics in an important essay titled "Separatist Economics: A New Social Contract" (pp. 51-52).

Rather than allow corporate America to coordinate the economic revitalization of the Black community, Innis (1969) asserted that African Americans needed to control this process. "We are not talking about bringing white businesses into black communities, but about building economic instruments that themselves can hire blacks" (pp. 51-58).

Perhaps ironically, Innis's (1969) observations actually formed the cornerstone of U.S. Senate Bill 3876 introduced to Congress in July, 1968, as the Community Self-Determination Bill. This legislation—whose sponsors ranged from the liberal Jacob Javits of New York to the conservative John Tower of Texas (and was codrafted by representatives from the Congress of Racial Equality and associates from the Harvard University Institute of Politics)—called for the development of federally chartered community development corporations. These entities would own all businesses in affected neighborhoods and would designate a portion of business profits to help finance social services in community development corporation–run communities (Sturdivant, 1971, pp. 114-115). Despite its initial support in Congress, critics of the Community Self-Determination Bill, who asserted that it would move the nation toward apartheid, ultimately contributed to its legislative demise (Sturdivant, 1971, p. 115).

Another of the myriad independent proposals generated by Nixon's Black capitalism initiative was Dunbar S. McLaurin's Ghetto Economic Development and Industrialization Plan (GHEDIPLAN). GHEDIPLAN deviated significantly from the proposals put forward by Cross (1969) and Innis (1969). McLaurin, a Black economist based in New York City, possessed a business and professional background that included ownership of the consulting firm Ghettonomics, Incorporated (McLaurin & Tyson, 1969, pp. 126-131).

In a coauthored essay titled "The GHEDIPLAN for Economic Development" (McLaurin & Tyson, 1969), McLaurin asserted that simply infusing the ghetto with more outside capital and providing existing and prospective Black entrepreneurs with corporate professional guidance (the Cross [1969] approach) would do little to enhance the economic life of Black communities. He based this conclusion on the premise that Black entrepreneurs, unlike their White counterparts, had problems that transcended mere issues of capital and training. Because the ghetto businessman had limited access to "the outer and larger business and industrial world with its opportunities, challenges, and stimuli, [it is] as if he were in a remote, underdeveloped country" (p. 130).

To alleviate the problems associated with Black America's economic and social isolation from mainstream society, the GHEDIPLAN proposed using that same isolation as an advantage. Specifically, McLaurin urged the U.S. government to view America's Black ghettos as an underdeveloped nation. McLaurin believed that this would help resuscitate the economic life of Black America by focusing on development strategies that would allow African Americans to develop businesses and industries that could easily meld with the "outside" economy (pp. 131-132).

Besides proposing that Black America be viewed as an underdeveloped nation, the GHEDIPLAN, similar to Innis's (1969) separatist economics, called for the "local [Black] ownership of the economy and the control of its destiny" (p.132). Nevertheless, McLaurin differed from Innis in that he envisioned the GHEDIPLAN creating a Black economy "strong enough to participate in, compete with, and become an integral part of the national economy" (p.132).

Perhaps, the period's most creative proposal related to Black capitalism was Black economist Richard F. America Jr.'s (1971) call for a transfer of 10% of Fortune 500 companies to African American control. Citing historical precedents of the government stepping in to dismantle corporate monopolies based on the public interest, America asserted that it would be in the public interest to modify a situation that has resulted in "the total absence of any large Black corporations in the United States" (p. 127).

The basic motivation behind America's (1971) bold proposal was his belief that "the establishment and nurturing of [African American] small businesses, now being undertaken on an increasing scale, does not satisfy the need for [African American] economic independence and self-determination" (p. 125). Moreover, he envisioned "after about eight corporations have been transferred to Black control each year for fifteen years, the procedure would be discontinued, since by then Blacks will have achieved economic parity roughly equivalent to their proportion of the population" (p. 136).

Although America (1971) believed there existed enough African American managerial talent to run the transferred corporations,

others were not too sure. For instance, Louis L. Allen (1971), president of the Chase Manhattan Capital Corporation noted, "No one can know how to manage a large corporation without experience in doing just that. Certainly, experience in small company management is no substitute" (p. 140). In the end, America's (1971) proposal, similar to those of Cross (1969), Innis (1969), and McLaurin and Tyson, found itself relegated to the footnotes of American business history.

Despite their diverse approaches, Cross (1969), Innis (1969), McLaurin, and America (1971) believed that Black capitalism (or some derivative) represented a positive, desirable phenomenon. Conversely, some observers believed that the notion of Black capitalism was a dangerous illusion. Moreover, critics of Black capitalism, similar to its proponents, possessed differing perspectives.

CRITICS OF BLACK CAPITALISM

Although the Nixon administration actively promoted Black capitalism, economist Andrew Brimmer, the period's highest ranking African American in government service, emerged as an outspoken critic of this initiative. Moreover, Brimmer, a member of the Federal Reserve Board, articulated his viewpoint in a number of venues.

In the May 1969 issue of *Nation's Business*, Brimmer (1969) published a brief essay titled "The Trouble With Black Capitalism," which focused on racial desegregation's impact on Black business. After citing how Jim Crow racial segregation contributed to the growth of Black-owned service sector businesses (barber shops, beauty shops, hotels, and restaurants), Brimmer observed how racial desegregation, conversely, contributed to an observable decline of these same Black-owned enterprises (p. 79).

Besides seeing a bleak future for Black-owned companies in the service industry, Brimmer (1969) expressed even more doubt about Black manufacturing concerns. To dramatically illustrate his point, Brimmer noted how large apparel manufacturers were currently producing African motif clothing (which undercut the profits of

Black community-based tailors and seamstresses). Moreover, based on the perceived growing importance of the African American consumer market, Brimmer urged Black businessmen not to “count on nationally oriented manufacturing firms leaving the Negro market to Negro entrepreneurs” (p. 79).

Considering the evidence he presented, Brimmer (1969) predictably concluded his *Nation's Business* essay by asserting that “the only really promising path to equal opportunity for Negroes in business as in other aspects of economic activity lies in full participation in an integrated, national economy. It cannot be found in a backwater of separatism and segregation” (p. 79).

On July 25, 1969, Brimmer testified before the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Small Business regarding Black capitalism. Besides reiterating the information found in his *Nation's Business* article, Brimmer (1971) observed that the desegregation of the national labor force hampered Black entrepreneurs' quest to hire and retain quality Black employees (pp. 165-166).

Along with issues related to White competition, Brimmer's (1971) testimony focused on the tenuous financial situation of African American families, the cornerstone of Black capitalism's projected consumer market. He noted that African Americans, on all income levels, had more installment debt than their White counterparts. This reality, among other things, decreased the amount of Black disposable income and made them “a poorer potential consumer for additional goods and services than a family of similar income that is less encumbered by installment debt payments” (pp. 167-168).

Besides addressing Congress and the mainstream business community, Brimmer (1970) took his case against Black capitalism directly to African Americans. The August 1970 issue of *Ebony* magazine featured a Brimmer essay titled “Economic Integration and the Progress of the Negro Community” (p. 118).

For those readers unfamiliar with Brimmer (1970), he began this article by clearly articulating his credentials as an economist and his belief that “the only promising path to genuine economic progress of the Negro in America is an accelerated widening of opportunities in an integrated economy” (p. 119). For African Americans

enamored with various proposals (both government sponsored and independent) related to Black economic development, Brimmer's observations in *Ebony* were sobering to say the least. After dismissing as a "mirage" the notion of viewing Black America as a separate nation with (a then) \$35 billion in personal income that could be separately developed, Brimmer elaborated on Black America's lack of separate economic strength. He noted that although African Americans constituted nearly 11% of the U.S. population, they received approximately 6.5% of America's personal income and owned less than 2% of the country's household assets (p. 119).

Taking a definite swipe at the Nixon administration's OMBE program, Brimmer (1970) dismissed Black capitalism as a "cruel hoax" and noted that any program aimed at expanding small-scale Black-owned business "would be running against a strong national trend. In retailing, the trend is steadily toward large chain-store units in which economic efficiency is rising rapidly" (p. 121).

Brimmer (1970) closed this thought-provoking essay by reiterating the linkage between economic integration and African American progress. From his perspective, Blacks needed to get inside the U.S. corporate structure to observe and learn how substantive economic power is exercised. Thus, African Americans would hopefully be in a position "to share this power and assure that it is used for them—and not against them" (p. 121).

Whereas Brimmer denounced Black capitalism as unworkable within the framework of the capitalist system, other African American critics simply denounced capitalism (regardless of the racial appendage attached to it). Although Nixon hoped that his Black capitalism initiative would diminish the influence of Marxism in the Black community, this effort was not totally successful. In fact, besides Foreman (1969), several other important Black Marxist critics of Black capitalism emerged during Nixon's first term in office.

Robert L. Allen's (1969) important book *Black Awakening in Capitalist America*, among other things, addressed the basic issue of whether Black capitalism would benefit the entire African American community or just a relatively few Black entrepreneurs. He expressed his skepticism by noting, "Simple transference of

business ownership into black hands, either individually or collectively, is in itself no guarantee that this will benefit the total community. Blacks are capable of exploiting one another just as easily as whites” (p. 153). Although *Black Awakening in Capitalist America* decried the worth of Black business ownership, Allen alternatively offered an ambiguous and utopian (Marxist-tinged) solution to the economic plight of African Americans.

James Boggs was another prominent Black Marxist author and critic of Black capitalism. His 1970 book, *Racism and the Class Struggle*, included a chapter titled “The Myth and Irrationality of Black Capitalism.” Moreover, Boggs first presented this material as a coauthored position paper at the NBEDC on April 25, 1969 (Boggs, Johnson, & Williams, 1969, pp. 3-9).

Early on, Boggs sought to clarify contemporary African American discourse that attacked “the system.” In no uncertain terms, he made it clear that the system and capitalism were synonymous. Moreover, he asserted that “*Black underdevelopment is a product of capitalist development*” (1971, p. 151).

Considering Boggs’s antipathy toward the capitalist system, he predictably had nothing but derision for Black capitalism. Calling Black capitalism a technique “to re-enslave Black people” and “a dream and a delusion,” he noted that the Black working class was “in no mood to change from one exploiter to another just because he is of the same color” (1971, p. 152).

For his part, Boggs, besides merely reiterating Marxist dogma, did attempt to provide specific strategies on how African Americans could develop noncapitalist economic structures. In the rural South, Boggs (1971) proposed that African Americans “undertake a massive land reform movement with the aim of forcing the federal government to turn these plowed-under lands over to the millions of Blacks still in the South, to be developed by Black community organizations” (p. 157). In the urban North, where most African Americans resided, Boggs called for “a similar campaign for land reform and acquisition” based on “the principle of eminent domain” (p. 157).

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of Boggs’s (1971) non-capitalist vision for Black America was his desire to fully incorpo-

rate Black “street people” or “untouchables” into the planning and implementation of his larger goals for land reform and acquisition (p. 158). Although Boggs did not offer specific ways to accomplish this, he correctly observed that substantive African American economic development would have to include the active participation and support of all social classes within the Black community.

Earl Ofari’s (1970) book *The Myth of Black Capitalism* represented, perhaps, the period’s most strident denunciation of Black capitalism. The following introductory quotes succinctly set the stage for this work:

You show me a capitalist, I’ll show you a bloodsucker. He cannot be anything but a bloodsucker if he’s going to be a capitalist. He’s got to get it from somewhere other than himself, and that’s where he gets it—from somewhere or someone other than himself.

—Malcolm X

As long as the Man controls the water or electricity coming into your community, it does you no good to control that community. And to control the community in a capitalistic way, like the Man, is not desirable.

—H. Rap Brown

The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life.

—Karl Marx (p. 3)

Ofari (1970), using E. Franklin Frazier’s (1957) controversial study *Black Bourgeoisie* as a reference point, asserted that the call for Black capitalism, based on “a misdirected faith in the myth of Negro business,” came primarily from the Black middle and upper classes (Ofari, 1970, p. 10). Yet, despite its stridency, *The Myth of Black Capitalism* (Ofari, 1970) ultimately offered the least persuasive (Marxist-based) argument against Black capitalism. By directly associating Black business with a nefarious Black elite, Ofari exhibited a stunning unfamiliarity with census data related to Black-owned businesses in America. Historically, most Black-owned businesses have been single proprietorships operated by African Americans from a variety of economic backgrounds or classes (Hall, 1935, pp. 496-498).

AMBIVALENCE REGARDING BLACK CAPITALISM

Besides commentators who consistently endorsed or denounced the notion of Black capitalism, others publicly changed their minds about the worth of promoting African American entrepreneurship. The Reverend Jesse L. Jackson was, perhaps, the most noteworthy person in this category. In early 1969, Jackson, then National Director of the Southern Christian Leadership Council's Operation Breadbasket program based in Chicago, Illinois, issued a press release denouncing Black capitalism. The February 21, 1969, issue of *Muhammad Speaks* (the official news organ of the Nation of Islam) reprinted Jackson's declarations in an article headlined "Breadbasket Leader Rejects Black Capitalism" (Black Press International, 1969, pp. 33-34).

After describing Black capitalism as a divisive force in the African American community, Jackson contended that

the issue is not to multiply a few additional entrepreneurs or to develop a few model Black cities or to finance a few Black firms as pilot programs. But a[t] stake is the demand for the total economic development of the Black community. (Black Press International, 1969, p. 33)

He went on to assert (sounding a lot like James Boggs),

Attaching the name "Black" to capitalism is not a description, but a diversion. The term Black capitalism describes less a goal than a gimmick. We have the responsibility to expose the gimmick rather than delude Black people by justifying explanations of a false goal. (Black Press International, 1969, p. 33)

Ironically, Jackson would later use a gimmick (his Black Expo programs of 1969 to 1972) to promote Black business and Black capitalism. In fact, Jackson's Black Expo exhibitions have been described as

an annual trade fair for black businesses, both local and national, as well as a general celebration of black capitalism, complete with parties, concerts by black artists, exhibitions of black paintings and

sculpture, and other attractions associated with economic expositions. (Landess & Quinn, 1985, p. 49)

It remains unclear as to why the mercurial Jackson changed his mind about the efficacy of promoting Black capitalism.

CONCLUSION

In retrospect, the wide-ranging discussion and analysis of Black capitalism during the first Nixon administration reflected an unprecedented national interest in promoting substantive African American economic progress. Moreover, although OMBE provided only limited assistance to Black businesspeople and none of the numerous independent proposals for Black economic development came to full fruition, the period's discourse regarding Black capitalism helped Nixon accomplish his larger ideological objective of "containing" potential domestic Black radicalism. Despite the efforts of Foreman (1969), R. L. Allen (1969), Boggs (1971), and Ofari (1970), most African Americans apparently either gravitated toward the various derivatives of Black capitalism or toward Brimmer's call for complete integration into American society.

REFERENCES

- Allen, L. L. (1971). Making capitalism work in the ghettos. In R. W. Bailey (Ed.), *Black business enterprise: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 138-149). New York: Basic Books.
- Allen, R. L. (1969). *Black awakening in capitalist America: An analytical history*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Ambrose, S. E. (1989). *Nixon: The triumph of a politician* (Vol. 2). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- America, R. F. (1971). What do you people want? In R. W. Bailey (Ed.), *Black business enterprise: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 124-137). New York: Basic Books.
- Black capitalism has a hollow ring. (1969, August 30). *Business Week*, 51.
- Black Press International. (1969, February 21). Breadbasket leader rejects "Black capitalism," *Muhammad Speaks*, 8(23), 33-34.
- Boggs, J. (1970). *Racism and the class struggle*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

- Boggs, J. (1971). The myth and irrationality of Black capitalism. In R. W. Bailey (Ed.), *Black business enterprise: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 150-158). New York: Basic Books.
- Boggs, J., Johnson, C., & Williams, J. (1969, April) *The myth and irrationality of Black capitalism*. Paper presented at the National Black Economic Development Conference, Detroit, MI. (Available: Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Records of the National Council of Churches, Folder 14, Box 35, Record Group 6).
- Brimmer, A. F. (1969). Trouble With Black capitalism. *Nation's Business*, 57, 78-79.
- Brimmer, A. F. (1970). Economic integration and the progress of the Negro community. *Ebony*, 25, 118-121.
- Brimmer, A. F. (1971). Small business and economic development in the Negro community. In R. W. Bailey (Ed.), *Black business enterprise: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 164-172). New York: Basic Books.
- Browne, R. S. (1969, April). Keynote speech: The need for formulating a Black economic plan. Paper presented at the National Black Economic Development Conference, Detroit, MI. (Available: Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Records of the National Council of Churches, Folder 14, Box 35, Record Group 6).
- Cross, T. L. (1969). *Black capitalism: Strategy for business in the ghetto*. New York: Atheneum.
- Foreman, J. (1969, April). "Total control as the only solution for the economic needs of Black people. Speech presented at the National Black Economic Development Conference, Detroit, MI. (Available: Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Records of the National Council of Churches, Folder 14, Box 35, Record Group 6).
- Frazier, E. F. (1957). *Black bourgeoisie: The rise of a new middle class*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hall, C. E. (1935). *Negroes in the United States, 1920-1932*. Washington, DC: Arno.
- Innis, R. (1969). Separatist economics: A new social contract. In W. F. Haddad & G. D. Pugh (Eds.), *Black economic development* (pp. 50-59). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Investment Committee for Economic Development. (1967, December 1). *Report on the Investment Committee For Ghetto Economic Development* (Report presented to the Executive Committee of the Council). (Available: Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Records of the National Council of Churches, Folder 13, Box 35, Record Group 6).
- Kotlowski, D. (1998, Autumn). Black Power—Nixon style: The Nixon administration and minority business enterprise. *Business History Review*, 72(3), 409-445.
- Landess, T. H., & Quinn, R. M. (1985). *Jesse Jackson & the politics of race*. Ottawa, Illinois: Jameson.
- McLaurin, D. S., & Tyson, C. D. (1969). The GHEDIPLAN for economic development. In W. F. Haddad & G. D. Pugh (Eds.), *Black economic development* (pp. 126-137). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- National Black Economic Development Conference. (1969). *YOU ARE INVITED* (Invitational flyer). (Available: Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Records of the National Council of Churches, Folder 14, Box 35, Record Group 6).
- Ofari, E. (1970). *The myth of Black capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Sturdivant, F. L. (1971). The limits of Black capitalism. In R. W. Bailey (Ed.), *Black business enterprise: Historical and contemporary perspectives*. New York: Basic Books.

Walker, L. (1969, April 16). *Letter to Charles Spivey*. (Available: Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Records of the National Council of Churches, Folder 13, Box 35, Record Group 6).

Robert E. Weems, Jr., is a professor of history at the University of Missouri–Columbia. His publications include Black Business in the Black Metropolis: The Chicago Metropolitan Assurance Company, 1925–1985 (Indiana University Press, 1996) and Desegregating the Dollar: African American Consumerism in the Twentieth Century (New York University Press, 1998). He is coeditor, with Arvarh E. Strickland, of The African American Experience: An Historiographical and Bibliographical Guide (Greenwood Publishers, 2001). He and Lewis A. Randolph are coauthors of the forthcoming book Whatever Happened to Black Capitalism? The Rise and Fall of Richard M. Nixon’s Plan for Black America (which will be published by New York University Press).

Lewis A. Randolph is an associate professor in the political science department and public administration program at Ohio University. He has published in the areas of urban development; urban politics; public policy; Black politics; race, class, and gender; African American social movements; American politics; and Black political ideology. His forthcoming works include “The Ideological Origins of Richard M. Nixon’s Black Capitalism Initiative,” coauthored with Robert E. Weems, Jr., which will be published in The Review of Black Political Economy, and Black Conservatives Made in America: The Dimensions of Black Conservatism, coedited with Gayle T. Tate, which will be published by St. Martin’s Press.