II

STRUCTURE:

The Black Establishment

Race relations in America are relations between ruling elites. Issues are resolved, boundaries are marked off, favors are granted and pleas are denied by men of substance and power on both sides of the racial line.

Negroes and whites in America, Gunnar Myrdal observed, deal with each other, like two foreign countries, “through the medium of plenipotentiaries.” What is also true, and more to the point, is that Negroes and whites deal with each other through the medium of competing power structures.

Like two foreign countries, like hostile and suspicious strangers, Negroes and whites negotiate treaties and truces through separate but not quite equal power blocs. The white power structure has been endlessly annotated and analyzed. But little or no attention has been given to the Negro power structure as a group of self-conscious moulders and shapers of racial policy.

The importance of the Negro power structure can hardly be overemphasized. It is, in fact, a parallel government which fills the vacuum that exists between Negro citizens and the state. Plenipotentiaries of this shadow government—which we shall call the Black Establishment—have negotiated with the League of Nations
and addressed formal notes to the United Nations. During World War II, the NAACP—the offensive arm of the Establishment—negotiated with the government of England and addressed formal letters to Sir Winston Churchill.

In times of crisis—and it has always been a time of crisis for the Negro—black men ask not what their country can do for them but what the Black Establishment can do for them.

The Black Establishment, oddly enough, is not all-black. It is a group of Negroes and whites who command the power lines in the Negro community: the executive secretaries, the board chairmen (often white), the presidents (often white), and board members (Negro and white) of protest and improvement associations; the bishops of Negro denominations and the pastors of the largest and most influential churches (the two are not necessarily synonymous) the editors and publishers of major Negro newspapers and periodicals; the leading educators, business and professional men.

The key members of this group from the standpoint of racial policy are the executive officers and board of directors of the protest and improvement association and the leading editors and publishers. It helps enormously if a new departure in the Negro community is sanctioned by these structures of power. On the other hand, it is difficult, though not impossible, to carry new ground if the Black Establishment says no.

Although the power and influence of the Establishment ranges over the whole theater of Negro life, the focal points are concentrated in five cities. Washington, Atlanta, and Nashville are important as centers of ideas, programs and recruits. New York and Chicago, on the other hand, are control centers. The importance of being a New Yorker is dramatized by the board of one protest organization. Eighteen of the twenty-three national board members come from New York City and environs.

What are the prerequisites for membership in the group?

Money helps, but many moneyed men are not members, and many members are not moneyed men. As in the white world, control of a major institution—a protest group, a major business or a church—is extremely important.
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For our purposes then, an Establishment member (and we are concerned here only with the national Establishment) is a person who holds a key office (president, executive vice president, secretary, treasurer, board chairman or board membership) in a major educational, business, defense or improvement association.

These men and women are the decision makers in the Negro community. But there are men who decide for the decision makers, elites, in other words, within the elite. A member of the inner core of power holds an independent base of power and membership on the governing boards of one or more key national institutions.

How does one recognize an Establishment man?

By the boards he acquires. Here is a power profile of Channing H. Tobias, one of the least known and most powerful Negroes in recent history. Note particularly the signs of Establishment grace: membership on governing boards.

Channing H. Tobias (1882–1961), social worker, educator, national decision maker. Student secretary, International Commission of YMCA, 1911–23; Senior secretary for colored work of YMCA of USA, 1923–46; director, Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1946–52; Member, President Truman’s Civil Rights Committee, 1946–47; Alternate delegate, United Nations, 1951–52; Member, governing boards (board of directors or board of trustees) of following organizations and institutions: NAACP (chairman), Marshall Field Foundation, Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, Liberia Company, Hampton Institute, Howard University, Paine College, Palmer Memorial Institute, National Council of Churches of Christ in USA, and the Commercial State Bank and Trust Company of New York.

The important thing to note in this power profile is what sociologists call “the accumulation of advantages,” an unnecessarily obscure phrase for the admirably simple biblical rule: “To them that hath, more will be given.” What this means in terms of national Negro power is that influence in one sphere can be transferred to influence in another sphere. Prominent educators and bishops, for example, often serve on the boards of directors of
major business and protest and defense organizations. And powerful businessmen, in turn, often serve on the boards of trustees of educational and philanthropic organizations.

Contrary to the generally accepted opinion, power does not inhere in individuals. Without access to institutionalized power, individuals are powerless in both the Negro and white community. The popular error is to confuse prominence or wealth with power. These things, as we have shown, are convertible into power over racial policy. But they are not in themselves instrumentalities of national power. Some politicians, for example, hold local power. But they are not usually members of the national Establishment. Nor are politicians, as politicians (Adam Powell, Jr., excepted), fertile in raising and disposing of large issues bearing on national racial policy.

One makes a great leap into an understanding of the Establishment if one perceives why Adam Clayton Powell, Sr. was admitted to the Establishment while his son, Adam, with greater fame and greater local power, was excluded. Powell the elder sat for many, many years on Establishment boards; the son has not yet occupied a seat in the inner sanctum. Relevant here are questions of style and temperament as well as availability. Powell has, over the years, complained bitterly of Establishment "snubs." And he has discovered repeatedly that Establishment games are played by Establishment rules.

What precisely are Establishment rules?

Why, for example, are a Richmond doctor and a New York City judge more influential in shaping national racial policy than, say, Congressman William L. Dawson or Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.?

The core answer is that the doctor and the judge are members of the little-known inner core of Establishment power. Both are among the ten men and one woman who were on the NAACP board in 1943 and who were still listed twenty years later in 1963. More importantly, both were members of the executive committee of the board in 1963. The New York judge, though little known nationally, has ranged over the whole arena of Establishment power. He was a founder and incorporator of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund and he is a former member of the executive committee of the Urban League board.

Through the doctor and the judge we come to the heart of the matter: continuous service in Establishment circles. Board members in every organization come and go. The names that turn up year after year are important: they indicate centers of power and influence. More importantly, they point to the hierarchies within the hierarchy.

The governing boards of Establishment organizations change periodically, but the surface changes hide a steel core of continuity. There is, as Professor N. P. Tillman, Jr., pointed out in a study of the NAACP, an inner core of men who hold board seats for years and then, dying, hand over the torch to another core. In a study of the 186 persons elected to the board through 1954, Professor Tillman focused on "the nuclei of active minorities which dominated the Board in the two periods, 1910-29 and 1929-55." He concluded: "Between 1910 and 1929, the nucleus appears to have consisted of: John Milholland (d., 1922), Walter Sachs (1912-15), Joel Spingarn, Arthur Spingarn, William E. Walling, John H. Holmes, Mary Ovington, Oswald Villard, and W. E. B. Du Bois... All but the first carried over into the second period, both as Board members and general officers, thus providing continuity of personnel and policy. In the second period they were joined by others, predominantly Negro (5-2), namely: Louis Wright, Charles Toney, Allan Chalmers, Alfred Lewis, Channing Tobias, Theodore Spanlding, and perhaps Robert Weaver. Meanwhile, some of the holdovers died or resigned among whom only Du Bois was forced out (in 1934) for the good of the Association.''

What emerges from all this is the power of Establishment boards and the relative weakness of men, whatever their local power or influence, who do not participate in the informal give-and-take that precedes decision and the formal voting that ratifies it. The only exceptions to this are major publishers who can make their weight felt without formal entre© into board rooms.
Oftentimes, in fact, radical departures in Negro policy are cleared in advance with key publishers. Before a white administrator was named to head an Establishment agency, the appointment was cleared by long-distance calls to a handful of men across the country. But this exception proves the rule. The men who received long-distance calls were not asked to vote on the appointment (the board had already voted); they were asked to close ranks behind an Establishment faite accompli.

We return then to the major premise. Men remote from the board rooms do not vote; and men who do not vote in the small groups where one vote makes a difference do not generally count. This is not to say that national boards are the final arbiters of racial policy. The ruling boards of the Establishment are free to decide policy within certain limits prescribed by other institutions within the family of power in the Negro world. Of vast importance in this connection are Negro educational institutions. Negro educators have always exerted tremendous influence on racial policy. The nature of this influence was dramatized by the sit-ins which led to the expulsion of hundreds of students and the firing of scores of teachers.

The family of power includes not only Negro organizations but white organizations. Racial policy is subtly shaped and diluted by the expectations, priorities and fears of liberal, labor, religious, and minority groups. From this white liberal nexus, the Establishment seeks allies and donations. The most talented of these allies have definite ideas about the goals and direction of Negro policy. And it is not always possible to accept the donations without accepting the donor's program.

Among the leading organizations in this shadow cabinet of the shadow cabinet are the UAW and other liberal unions, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Committee and the American Jewish Congress, the race relations departments (under various names) of the YWCA, YMCA, the National Council of Churches, the Roman Catholic Church and the American Friends Service Committee.

Another layer of hidden power on the fringes of the Establish-
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of the Urban League. Since that time, there has always been a Baldwin on the Urban League board.

The Spingarns have made a great contribution to Negro welfare and they have held power positions commensurate with their contributions. Dr. Joel E. Spingarn, an erudite professor of English, served as treasurer and chairman of the board of the NAACP before assuming the presidency which he held from 1929 to his death in 1939. He was succeeded as president by his brother, Arthur (1878— ), and as a board member by his widow, Amy.

The Spingarns are to the NAACP what the Baldwins are to the Urban League. In other words, there has always been a Spingarn on the NAACP board. In fact, for almost fifty years, there have been two Spingarns on the NAACP board. Arthur Spingarn, the current NAACP president, was chairman of the legal committee for more than twenty years. He was also a founder, incorporator and first president of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund.

Other white men in black power in the years of the rebellion were:

Allan Knight Chalmers (1897— ), New York City, professor, Congregational minister, author, President of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund; former head of the Scottsboro Defense Committee; former co-chairman of the National Council for a Permanent PEPC; onetime member of more than thirty governing boards.

Jack Greenberg (1925— ), New York City, attorney. Executive director of NAACP Legal Defense Fund; former associate director of the Fund.

Henry Steeger (1903— ), New York City, publisher of Argosy magazine. President of National Urban League (1961-64).

Lindsay S. Kimball (1894— ), New York City foundation executive succeeded Steeger as National Urban League President, August, 1954.

Stephen Currier (1931— ), New York City, philanthropist. President of Taconic Foundation; co-chairman of Council for United Civil Rights Leadership. Organizer of fund-raising project for major civil rights organizations.
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Other influential and well-heeled whites (poor whites, like poor Negroes, are democratically excluded) shape Negro policy and exercise veto power on new issues through their positions as board members and patrons and links to the white power structure.

The counterparts of the white friends in power are Roy Wilkins (1901— ), an ex-newspaper editor who is executive secretary of the NAACP; Whitney Young, Jr. (1921— ), a former social worker and educator who is executive director of the National Urban League and co-chairman of the Council for United Civil Rights Leadership. Also influential on the national scene, though not in the limelight, are:

Frederick Douglass Patterson (1901— ), New York City, veterinarian, educator, foundation executive. President of Phelps-Stokes Fund; president of National Business League; president-emeritus of Tuskegee Institute; founder and former president of the United Negro College Fund; board of trustees, Bennett College, Bethune-Cookman College, Hampton Institute, Palmer Memorial, Southern Educational Foundation.

Ralph Johnson Bunche (1904— ), New York City, political scientist, UN official. Board of directors, NAACP; Phelps-Stokes Fund; Board of Higher Education, New York; Fund for Advancement of Education; Rockefeller Foundation; Harvard University Board of Overseers.

Stephen Gill Sportwood (1896— ), Washington, D.C., AME Zion bishop. Chairman of board of directors of NAACP.

Ralph J. Bunche, among others, has sharply criticized the role of white men in Negro affairs. In a 1940 memorandum prepared for the Myrdal study, Bunche said white men exercised a great deal of control over the selection of Negro leaders and scholars. He went on to criticize the whole philosophy of interracial liberalism. White members of interracial organizations, he wrote, usually "fix the measure of value" of the organization, deciding not merely the question of how much to ask for "but also how to ask and, indeed, whether the Negro should ask at all."

Similar attacks have come from Carter Woodson, W. E. B. Du Bois, E. Franklin Frazier and others. All echoed, in varying de-
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degrees, the charge of Jessie O. Thomas who said once that interracial cooperation often ends up with Negroes coo-ing and white people operating.

Bunche, in particular, was scathing (in the 1940 memorandum) in his criticism of interracial liberalism. Too often, Bunche said, in a criticism often repeated in the sixties, Negro board members receive their cues from white board members. In general, he concluded, concern for the opinion of white supporters and allies is a powerful factor in keeping Negro organizations respectable.

Establishment arbiters denied these criticisms in the forties and they deny them today. In their support, it should be said that some whites in the Establishment are more militant than some Negroes. Jack Greenberg, for example, is one of the more militant members of the legal wing; and Herbert Hill is perhaps the most radical member of the national staff of the NAACP. Other examples could be cited: a former National Urban League board member who championed a more militant Urban League policy at a time when the, though not all, Negro board members were opposed.

And yet, when all this is said, the fact remains that most white members of the Establishment are moderate. Whites, as a group, have served as a brake rather than as an accelerator of the Freedom Movement.

It would be a mistake, however, to blame white liberals and moderates for Establishment style. The Establishment, in its present form, is an invention of two radically different men, Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois, and it betrays the tensions of this extraordinary miscegenation between conservatism and militancy. In the first decades of the twentieth century, Booker T. Washington established an entente between “moderate” Negroes and “the better element of whites.” In this same period, Du Bois established a similar entente between “militant” Negroes and “liberal” whites. After Washington’s death, these divergent forces met at Joel Spingarn’s country home in Dutchess County, New York, and decided, in so many words, that Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois were both right and that all roads leading to the goal were equally honorable. This, of course, was no decision at all and Du Bois, perceiving this eighteen years later, left the Establishment with a blast at the ruling group.

The basic problem in L’affaire Du Bois was not program but style. To understand Establishment style we must hold two contradictory ideas at the center of our minds. The Establishment is both militant and conservative. Its pronouncements, in other words, are militant, but its actions are cautious and conciliatory.

What distinguishes the Negro power structure, above all, is its reluctance to act. This powerful group, whose tentacles extend into every area of Negro life, rarely raises new issues (FEPD, non-violence, sit-ins, mass demonstrations, don’t-buy-where-you-can’t-work came from without). Through the years, the dominant voices in the Negro power structure have been voices of caution and compromise. Through the years, the manipulators of the structure have been men too timid and too cautious to initiate and direct action.

The Establishment’s word, protest, is a mask for inaction. The deepest strain in Establishment protest is sterile and socially irrelevant. Endless debate, polite petitions, the sending of telegrams and letters, the whole ritual of mimeograph machines and typewriters: all this has been a substitute for hard analysis and risky action. The word risk: this separates the Establishment and its perennial critics, activists. The Establishment has never been willing to take serious risks. It has never been willing to jeopardize place, position and institutions in adventures for freedom. As a result, there has hovered over all Establishment activities a faint smell of gamesmanship, of pretense and posturing and evasions of reality. It was this, I think, that led Myrdal and Bunche to write two of the most mournful sentences in the whole history of leadership description and analysis.

1) Bunche: “...leadership itself is a form of escape.”

2) Myrdal: “The Negro hates the Negro role in American society, and the Negro leader, who acts out this role in public life, becomes the symbol of what the Negro hates.”

There are endless stories on the game aspect of Establishment leadership. The best one, I think, used to bring down the house on
the old vaudeville circuit. A Negro comedian, mimicking "a big Negro leader," would begin the following sentence in a stentorian voice and gradually lower his voice until at the end it was a bare whisper:

"What we colored FOLKS have got to do is to RISE UP AND STRIKE DOWN these here damned white folks."

Since the establishment of the Establishment, Negro leadership has been under constant attack. No serious student of the Negro ethos has failed to note what Drake and Cayton called "the ritual condemnation of Negro leadership." Day in and day out, from barber shop, bar and beauty shop, the cry arises: Negro leadership—the people who run things, i. e., the Negro Establishment—is no good.

A great deal of this constant and sometimes petty criticism stems from the social distance between the leadership and the masses. Students of power say that a people always get the kind of leadership they deserve. But the reverse is also true: leaders, in the long run, get the kind of followers they deserve.

The main bone of contention between the Establishment and its critics revolves around the cumbersome word—masses. Garvey (in the twenties), Bunche (in the forties), A. Philip Randolph (in the forties), E. Franklin Frazier (in the fifties), and rebellious students (in the sixties) have contended that the Establishment is a conspiracy in contempt of the masses. However that may be, it is certain that the Establishment has never solved what Du Bois called gingerly "the inner problem of contact with their own lower classes." Bunche went further and said (in the forties), that the Negro elite "knows little, if any, more about the Negro in the mass than does the average white man."

The question at issue, however, is not knowledge but use. The Establishment has never organized the masses for social contention. Down through the years, the Negro power structure has been more active in accommodating the masses to misery than in organizing them for an attack on the forces responsible for the misery. The riots of 1964 illuminated the deep chasm between Negro men of power and the Negro masses.
Over the years, Negro men of power have built up considerable good will with the white power structure. They have access to the state house and the White House and the sources of white money. And this access enables them to get small favors for the people they say they are leading.

Activists, surprisingly enough, admit the existence of this good will. But they contend that power and prestige are capital and, like capital, must be invested and risked occasionally if it is to bring a proper return.

At issue here are deep questions of power ethics. Power works the same way everywhere and men respond to power in the same way everywhere. "Ours," for example, tend to be radical; "ins" tend to be conservative. The same rule applies to organizations.

Experience suggests that reform organizations cannot stand too much success. The more a reform organization wins, the more money it collects, the more staffs it acquires, the more conservative it generally becomes.

Establishment ("in") style can best be understood in a comparison with activist ("out") style. Activists seek a showdown; the Establishment seeks an accommodation. The Establishment says it is necessary to reduce racial tensions; activists say it is necessary to raise them to the highest pitch.

Activists denounce white people; the Establishment appeals to their sense of fair play. Activists call for a revolt; the Establishment calls for a conference. Activists appeal to the masses; the Establishment appeals to "the better people." Activists march; the Establishment confers; Activists demonstrate; the Establishment negotiates. Activists demand; the Establishment resolves. Activists are radical (in the Latin sense of root); the Establishment is conservative—militantly so.

Although the Establishment resists new ideas, it contains many bold—and some radical—men. To say that the group is moribund and reactionary is to simplify a complicated process. Reactionaries have always been members of the Establishment, but so have progressives. Atlanta Life Insurance Company, for example, sponsored many forward-looking developments in Atlanta. Supreme Life financed and carried to the Supreme Court, through Earl B. Dickerson, a key restrictive covenant case.

Prominent members of the inner core have supported non-E causes and some, like Dickerson, Thurgood Marshall, Ralph Bunche, W. H. Hastie, and John H. Johnson, have made laudable efforts to move the structure in the direction of the dominant social challenge, the Negro masses. Men who see a simple black-white dichotomy between the Establishment and radicals would do well to ponder the actions of E-men during World War II. Dickerson and Hastie resigned important government positions as protest against discrimination; "radical" representatives of labor protested, but did not resign.

Other independent Establishment men include two powerful editors who continued to print news about Paul Robeson in the fifties. Equally independent was an insurance executive who disavowed the ideas of the elder Du Bois but refused to disavow the man—at a time when many "radicals" were running for cover.

But here, as elsewhere, rank has its privileges.

And here, as elsewhere, the exceptions prove the rule.

What matters in the Establishment is not the individual but the group. As a structure of power, as a self-conscious determinant of Negro policy, the Establishment moves slowly, views all new ideas and departures with suspicion, if not hostility.

Like men of power everywhere, Establishmentaries are victims of their fears and phobias. They would rather see things not happen than to see them happen. They are, in short, Hamlets who "prefer to bear those ills they have than to fly to others they know not of." And yet, like Hamlet, they can be goaded into action.

One of the most important decisions in the history of American Negroes, the mid-forties decision to attack segregation per se in the courts, was made by a handful of E-men in a Manhattan hotel room. Among the decision makers were the late Walter White, Thurgood Marshall and W. H. Hastie.

The decision made by these men and others was later ratified by a larger group. That the Establishment was able to initiate and
carry this radical new departure (until then the dominant issue in Negro life was separate-but-equal facilities) despite strong opposition from men in local power structures indicates the power and the potential of the group.

Although members sometimes meet behind closed doors and make large decisions affecting the lives and livelihoods of the Negro masses, the Establishment is not a conspiracy. Most decisions, in fact, are unconscious extensions of Establishment style, decisions that crystallize and take shape without a vote or, indeed, an articulated proposal.

Members of the Establishment are, by and large, men who look out on life from the same vantage point. As managers of men and/or material and as holders of real estate and stocks and bonds, Establishment men are moulded by the same forces and respond to events with the same style. Like their contemporaries in the white world, like men of place and power and property everywhere, they tend to fear men and issues that rock the boat.

Establishment policy is not entirely a matter of common temperament. Since the Armenia Conference of 1916—a Negro unity conference called by a white man, Joel Spingarn—the Negro power structure has been a self-conscious group composed of men of weight who make decisions with other men of weight in mind. And more: men in the inner circle know each other, see each other socially, play bridge and poker together and decide affairs of state and money over martinis and Scotch. When the late President Kennedy invited Negro leaders to the White House for the Emancipation centennial celebration, Negro guests—from North, South, East and West—greeted each other with the warmth of long-lost cousins as, indeed, many of them were. An administrative official, dimly recognizing the implications of all this, said with consternation and surprise: "Why, these people all know each other!"

The Establishment is linked not only by formal and informal ties but also by common backgrounds. Most members of the current Establishment are lineal and, according to their critics, spiritual descendants of house slaves and the free Negro elite. Not a few sprang from the black Puritan class which placed a high premium on respectability, responsibility and the middle-class values of thrift, sobriety and steadiness. Almost all of them were marked, for ill or good, by strong men and women who desperately, almost fanatically, dedicated themselves to proving—to themselves and to others—that they were not Negroes.

A common educational background also links the power structure. A significantly large percentage of top-level leadership has come from Ivy League colleges. Many more, however, came from a handful of Negro colleges which form a sub-Ivy League league. Howard University, for example, has served as a kind of postgraduate school for Harvard postgraduates. The number of Negro leaders who studied or taught at Howard (Bunche, Hastie, Thurgood Marshall, Charles E. Thompson, James Nabrit, Carl Murphy), is impressive. From these men came some of the Establishment's best thinking—pro and con. The successful legal campaign was mapped at Howard. The pioneer thinking on non-violence came largely from Howard (Mordecai Johnson, James Farmer, Howard Thurman, W. S. Nelson). And the thinking for several beyond-the-Establishment organizations (the National Negro Congress, the Negro Sanhedrin) was hammered out there.

Atlanta and Nashville have been equally important as Establishment nurseries. The Southern branch of the Ivy League consists of Atlanta University (James Weldon Johnson, Walter White), Virginia Union (Eugene Kinckle Jones), Lincoln (Thurgood Marshall), Morehouse (Martin Luther King, Jr., James Nabrit, Jr., Mordecai Johnson) and Fisk (W. E. B. Du Bois, J. Finley Wilson, Charles Wesley).

The black Puritan background, the tutelage of white Puritans in New South missionary schools and New England universities, the proving of self and race against the standards of white power, the postgraduate training in and around Howard, Fisk, Morehouse and the leadership factories of Chicago, New York, and Washington: this was the common womb from which came men imbued with a stern sense of duty and responsibility, men driven and set apart, tragically separated from their white peers who
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The process was unstoppable, the Establishment wisely joined the movement and pushed it forward.

The postwar world, which called off all bets, has shaken the Establishment to its foundation. Having fought off one challenge in the Garvey movement of the twenties, the Establishment found itself face to face with another mass-based black nationalist movement, the Nation of Islam. In the same period, there was a complete revolution in mass communication, a revolution that bewildered the Establishment and almost isolated it. In the void stepped John H. Johnson, an inventive Chicagian who rose to the top ranks of the coalition Establishment with a new kind of journalism.

There were other changes: the shifting of the center of gravity from New York to Atlanta in the wake of the Montgomery boycott and the sit-ins and the emergence of the Negro student as a social force. The net result of these changes was a new correlation of forces in which a few ragged students could make decisions and carry them out without the “advise and consent” of the Establishment in faraway New York.

Then, in the sixties, the Establishment was called upon to face a long-suppressed issue: the growing chasm between it and the masses. Urban renewal, more than any other issue, made the Negro power structure face the fact that what is good for the Negro real estate broker or the Negro millionaire is not necessarily good for the Negro laborer or the maid on relief. A variety of issues in every big city, issues revolving around poverty and middle-classness or the lack of it, has called into question the good faith of the Establishment.

It would be a mistake to conclude from all this that the Establishment is dead. Far from it. With the resiliency that has marked it for more than fifty years, the group has grafted the new onto the old. New men with new power have been accepted by the curia—but the curia has, so far, failed to ask itself the ancient questions about new wine and old bottles. These questions are pushing the new men of power in quite a different direction. A new Establishment has sprung up around the core groups of the Southern
Christian Leadership Conference, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Congress of Racial Equality and the Negro American Labor League.

The new organizations are tapping new sources of Negro and white expressiveness. Radicals, pacifists, intellectuals, rebels, non-conformists—Negro and white—are finding niches in the new organizations. Among the persons who have served on the governing boards of the new organizations are Harry Belafonte (SNCC), Ella Baker (SNCC), Rev. C. K. Steele (SCLC and CORE Advisory Committee), Howard Thurman (CORE Advisory Committee), James Baldwin (CORE Advisory Committee) and L. D. Reddick (SCLC Historian).

Interestingly though, the new men of power are weaving yet another interlocking directorate. Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, the president of the Alabama Conference of Human Rights, is secretary of SCLC. King himself and many of his aides and supporters flit in and out of CORE, the Fellowship of Reconciliation and other organizations.

An analysis of the governing boards of the old and new organizations reveals two different layers of support. With few exceptions, members of the old organizations are not members of the governing or advisory boards of the new organizations. Among the interesting exceptions are James B. Carey, Allan Knight Chalmers, Earl B. Dickerson, A. Philip Randolph, Ira De A. Reid, Walter Reuther, Hobson Reynolds, Jackie Robinson, and Bishop W. J. Walls.

The Establishment exists today as an uneasy coalition of old patriarchs, new men of power and rebels. But it still wields force as an independent power in the Negro world. Its continuing power and influence were evident in the March on Washington where Establishment men moderated and mitigated explosive forces and militant men.

The Establishment still lives, but it operates in a different climate. Establishment men grew up in a world where simple people acquiesced in the decisions of their betters. Now suddenly all that has changed. Policy is made now in the full glare of keig lights with intellectuals, students and a comedian (Dick Gregory) looking over the policy-makers' shoulders.

Having survived Marcus Garvey in the twenties, black Lenins in the thirties, and Asa Philip Randolph in the forties, the Establishment is waiting now for the next turn of the wheel. The only thing wrong with this calculation is that the name of the game has changed. The young students and, behind them, the young black nationalists are playing for keeps. When a game or historical process reaches that point, as French conservatives and American Tories discovered, Establishment men who refuse to bet lose all the time.

Almost everyone knows that the white power structure is threatened by the Negro rebellion. What is not noted often enough is that Negro men of power are also on trial, not for the decisions they made but for the decisions they did not make, not for the battles they lost but for the battles they did not fight.