DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 737 UD 006 330

By-Sexton, Patricia Cayo

Class Struggles in the Schools.

Pub Date 66

Note-11p.; Article published in The Urban School Crisis, by League for Industrial Democracy/United Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, New York, 1966.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.65

Descriptors-Acculturation, Board of Education Role, Bureaucracy, *Conflict, Cultural Factors, Educational Change, *Educational Equality, Educational Finance, Educational Innovation, Freedom Organizations, Government Role, Minority Groups, Political Power, Race, *Social Class, *Social Differences, Social Structure, Socioeconomic Status, *Urban Education

Identifiers-Chicago, Illinois, New York City

The major issue in urban education is class conflict. The polarity of the "haves" and "have-nots" limits the schools' services to the latter group because of the generally moderate stance of most liberal school board members and their insufficient zeal in pressing the grievances of the have-nots. Bureaucratic resistance and the role of conservatives in paring school budgets are further obstructions. This kind of class conflict also permeates congressional and state aid to education. Documentary evidence of conditions in Chicago and New York City schools corroborate the statement that the class conflict is reflected in school inequalities and class-biased training. Ethnic roles are also interconnected with class roles, with the Jewish community often acting as the "swing" group on polarized issues. A new and difficult problem for urban schools is the massive task of racial acculturation. Breakthroughs may possibly come through political pressures, increased civil rights activity, amalgamation of lower-class groups, Federal aid programs and voluntary and private efforts. Increased college opportunities, instructional innovations, unionization of teachers, and decentralization may also improve the educational quality of urban schools. (NH)

THE URBAN SCHOOL CRISIS

An Anthology of Essays

Maurice R. Berube
Nathan Glazer
Paul Goodman
Christopher Jencks
Jeremy Larner
Patricia Cayo Sexton

with an Introduction by
Irving Howe

League for Industrial Democracy / United Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
New York, 1966

2

CLASS STRUGGLES IN THE SCHOOLS

by Patricia Cayo Sexton

To talk about urban education is to talk about an old fallen phrase in such disrepute during two postwar decades that it has hidden out from scholarly journals like a furtive sex criminal. The phrase "class struggle" now appears in black tie and softened aliases as "slum and suburb," "inequalities," problems of the "disadvantaged," of the "culturally deprived," of "integration." However Americanized or blurred the new image may appear, the basic fact seems simple enough: a remarkable "class struggle" now rattles our nation's schools and the scene of sharpest conflict is the city. Southern cities—and New York—were the scenes of first eruptions, but now almost every northern city, and many suburbs, are feeling the new tremors.

A high-ranking official in New Rochelle, New York put it in these words: "It's not just race in our schools . . . it's class warfare!" Class conflict, of course, is not the only issue in city schools. There is ethnic conflict and the special status of Negroes—and of Puerto Ricans and other identifiable groups—at the bottom end of the ladder and the special Rickover pressure-cooked conformism and prestige-college frenzy at the upper end.[1] Nor are the sides in the conflict always clearly formed. But, usually, when the chaff and wheat are separated, what is left is the "haves" in one pile and "have-nots" in another, with some impurities in each—middle-class white "liberals," for example, who support some Negro demands and white have-nots who oppose them.

Other major urban school issues exist—finances, bureaucracy, and the unionization of teachers, among others—and may seem, on the surface, unrelated to class conflict. At second glance, the shortage of school funds can be seen as a product of the antitax ideology of haves. The behemoth bureaucracies may be seen everywhere as more accessible to and influenced by haves, and the decentralization of administration—to which New York's Superintendent Gross and others have devoted themselves—may be seen

1. Rickover supporters in the Council on Basic Education voice some misgivings about the Admiral's program to restrict higher education to an elite.

as a partial response to the growing arousal of have-not groups. The unionization of city teachers may be seen as a response to the hitherto rather rigid conservative control of school systems and the new thrust of liberalism in the cities and the schools, released by have-not votes and agitation as well as a defense against the difficult conditions in have-not schools.[2]

Levels of Conflict

The class struggle in the schools and the struggle for power which is part of it are carried on at many levels. In some cases, it seems least visible under the spotlight—on the school boards. Through liberal and have-not activity, some city school boards are now composed of middle-class moderates who are more inclined to represent the educational interests of have-nots than were their more conservative predecessors. Some big-city boards, as New York's, seem exemplary public servants, superior in purpose and competence to higher political bodies. Their efforts on behalf of have-nots are limited by several personal as well as external characteristics: they are haves, a quality that usually though not invariably limits zeal and identity with have-nots; they are moderates in contrast to those leading the more militant have-not groups. Among the limits set by school systems are: (1) the traditional conservative reluctance of boards to interfere in the operations of the bureaucracy; (2) the inertia and resistance of the bureaucracy to pressure from the board; (3) the usual tendency to become defensive of "their system" and to take criticisms of the system as personal affronts; (4) influences from middle-class interests which are usually more insistent and weighty than have-not pressure; (5) interference from outside groups—such as the unprecedented threat of the Northcentral Association to withdraw accreditation from the Chicago schools if the school board insisted on a step which forced Superintendent Willis into further desegregation. The external limits on the situation, however, seem more determining: (1) the difficulty of the job to be done, (2) the lack of sufficient money to do the job.

Services to have-nots within the city system, therefore, are limited by these conservative factors: (1) the moderate position of most liberal board members and the insufficiency of zeal or identification to drive home the grievances of have-nots; (2) conservatism and resistance within the bureaucracy; (3) conservative influence which acts to shut off funds to the schools.

In the movement of the class struggle from one end of the continuum, where a small elite holds total power, to the other extreme, where have-nots share proportionate influence, there are many points of compromise, and public officials tend to pursue ever more liberal ends and means. The white liberals who sit on some city boards may begin to push for more rapid change or may be replaced soon by representatives who will.

---

2. In New York and Chicago especially, the popular political issues of "bossism" and "machine politics" have been referred to the school arena. In New York, 110 Livingston Street (the Board of Education headquarters) has appeared to many as the school equivalent of "city hall," the one place you "can't beat" and with which you often cannot even communicate. Now a proposal is being considered to divide the city schools into several fairly autonomous geographic units in order to scatter the shots at "city hall" and provide easier access.

The claim that the city and its school system are so constrained by outside conservatism, especially at the state level, that they can do little seems largely true, though partially exaggerated. Too often outside interference is made an excuse for inertia. City schools have not given adequate service to have-nots largely because the have-nots were underrepresented in decision-making positions. As cities go, New York's school board seems unusually enlightened, appointed as it is by a relatively responsive mayor and served by two unusually alert citizen groups—the Public Education Association and the United Parents Association. Yet a nine-member board includes only one Negro and no Puerto Rican, although these groups together compose 40 per cent of the city's public school enrollment. Nor is there any blue-collar worker or person of modest means or position on the board, but, then, such individuals are rare specimens on city boards. One trade unionist, himself a university graduate and member of a professional union, sits on the board. Of some 777 top officials in the system —board members, superintendents, and principals—it appears that only six are Negroes, 0.8 per cent of the total.[3]

Although it is sometimes asserted that the interest-group identity of board members does not affect their decision-making, what may be more nearly the case, given present knowledge of group dynamics, is that the group interests of the lone have-not representative may be submerged in a board's moderate consensus.

Perhaps the "equality lag" within city systems may be more directly attributable to deficiencies in have-not organization than to lack of good faith among liberals and board members. Many cities could nearly be "possessed" by Negroes who approach a majority in some cases, but Negroes do not vote their numerical strength and may be evicted from the city limits by urban renewal before they catch up with their potential. Nor do labor unions use their full authority in school affairs. A major weakness of have-nots is their limited understanding of power, who has it and how to get it; they also lack the time, money, and organization often needed to purchase it.[4]

Beyond the City Limits

Local class conflict seems only a dim reflection of a larger conflict. The main drama of class conflict and thrust of conservatism are seen in full dimension in a larger arena—at the federal and state levels. The national scene cannot be ignored in any consideration of the city school situation. Only at this level does there appear a possibility of releasing the funds needed to support high-quality education and the high-level job opportunity that goes with it. The claim that federal aid to education is the *only* school issue and that other concerns are simply distractions is given

3. Daniel Griffiths and Others, *Teacher Mobility in New York City* (New York, 1963).

4. Banfield and Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 282: "Organized labor—even if it includes in its ranks the majority of all the adult citizens in the community—is generally regarded as a 'special interest' which must be 'represented'; businessmen, on the other hand, are often regarded, not as 'representing business' as a 'special interest,' but as serving the community as a whole. Businessmen, in Peter Clark's term, often are viewed as 'symbols of civic legitimacy.' Labor leaders rarely have this symbolic quality, but must contend with whatever stigma attaches to being from a lower-class background and associated with a special-interest group. . . . Labor is handicapped not only by having imputed to it less civic virtue but also by a shortage of money and organizational skills."

substantial support by any cursory study of city school budgets and revenue limitations.[5]

Nationally, the conflict seems shaped by at least two major factors:

(1) The congressional system is biased against have-nots and their representatives. The bias results from at least two forms of conservative manipulation: (a) manipulation of rural and small-town interests, North and South, and, through them, congressional apportionment and votes; (b) the additional manipulation of southern rural conservatism—which is given unusual congressional power by the committee seniority system—through the exchange of votes on the race issue.

The superior effective power of haves at this top level serves to block federal legislation in general but specifically those measures that might ensure rapid economic growth through federal expenditures, full employment. and the extension of power to have-nots—measures that would give significant relief to the city's distress. More directly relevant, it has blocked any substantial aid to urban areas and held up the transfer of political power from rural to urban areas.[6]

Moreover, largely by the manipulation of conflicting religious interests, this coalition has prevented the passage of the federal aid that seems indispensable to urban schools. At the same time, it has continued, through extension programs, copious aid to rural education.

(2) Seriously deprived have-nots have failed to enter their full power into the political arena.

The State

If direct federal aid seems distant and the aid formula unlikely to provide much assistance to the cities, fiscal aid from the state may be closer at hand, depending upon how quickly reapportionment will be enforced in the states. New York City received $197 in school aid for each student in its public schools in 1961–1962, while the average in the rest of the state was $314. Miami, Florida paid $47 million in state taxes in one recent year and got back only $1.5 million in grants-in-aid. With sympathetic legislatures, cities may be able to call on other revenues, including an income tax on suburbanites working in the city such as has been adopted in Philadelphia and Detroit.

Inequalities

The consequences of local, state, and national class conflict are seen in the school inequalities and class-biased training given to children even within the most liberal city systems. Only in the past few years has the concern of some unionists, academicians, liberals, and many Negroes brought the full range of inequities to public attention. The "spoils" of the city school, limited as they are by outside controls, are usually divided ac-

5. This seems to suggest that social scientists could much more profitably study the political mechanisms by which such aid could be released rather than the often esoteric and "academic" studies of culture, personality, and the like which now tend overly to occupy many who are concerned with have-nots.

6. The assumption that a proper apportioning of representatives, giving a proper share to the city's suburban areas, will result in an accretion of power to haves may not be warranted inasmuch as have-nots are also being rapidly suburbanized yet, contrary to expectation, seem to be maintaining their political identity.

cording to the crude formula "them as has gets." Only now in some cities is there any insistence on the more radical "compensatory" formula—"to each according to need."

Documentary evidence about class inequalities, past and present, is now weighty. My own study of one large city school system, *Education and Income,* describes the various forms of class inequities with one system.[7] I will refer here only to a few facts about Chicago and New York (not the cities of my study). In 1955, following Dr. Kenneth Clark's demand for attention to Negro schools, an "outside" study found that Negro and Puerto Rican schools in New York City were generally inferior to "Other" schools.[8] In a group of Negro and Puerto Rican schools (the B Group), 50.3 per cent of teachers were on tenure, compared to 78.2 per cent in the "Other" group (the *Y* Group); 18.1 per cent in the *X* group and only 8.3 per cent in the *Y* group were "permanent substitutes." On the average, facilities in Group *X* schools were older, less adequate, and more poorly maintained than *Y* schools. The costs of operating *Y* schools were higher than costs in *X* schools. Though the New York Board of Education now claims that Negro and Puerto Rican schools are equal or superior to "Other" schools, Dr. Kenneth Clark still says Harlem schools reflect "a consistent pattern of criminal neglect."

In the absence of cost-accounting, comparative expenditures in have and have-not schools in New York cannot be checked. Certainly efforts are being made by New York schools to provide better education for deprived minorities, especially in "certain" schools where extra services tend to be overconcentrated, but the schools still do not seem to approach full equality, and the cost estimates do not measure the *full* cost of education —the differences in nursery and kindergarten education, the last two years of high school missed by the low-income dropout, and the costs of higher education—not to mention the low-quality and segregated "ability" tracks into which have-not children are often placed.

Though New York permitted an outside study of school inequalities in 1954, the Chicago Superintendent of Schools, Benjamin Willis, has only in the past year agreed to a three-man study committee of which he will be a member. In 1962 John E. Coons, Northwestern University law professor, prepared for the United States Commission on Civil Rights a report on segregated schools in Chicago.[9] Ten schools in each of three groups were selected—white, integrated, Negro—and the findings were as follows:

1961–1962	White	Integrated	Negro
Number of pupils per classrooms	30.95	34.95	46.8
Appropriation per pupil	$342	$320	$269
Number of uncertified teachers	12%	23%	27%
Average number of books per pupil	5.0	3.5	2.5

In 1963 a *Handbook of Chicago School Segregation* claimed that 1961 appropriations for school operating expenses were almost 25 per cent greater per pupil in white than in Negro schools, that teacher salaries were 18

7. Patricia Cayo Sexton, *Education and Income* (New York: Viking Press, 1961).
8. *The Status of the Public School Education of Negro and Puerto Rican Children in New York City,* October, 1955.
9. John E. Coons, *Civil Rights USA, Chicago,* 1962, A Report to the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

per cent higher, that nonteaching operating expenses—clerical and maintenance, salaries, supplies, textbooks—were 50 per cent higher, and that only 3 per cent of Chicago's Negro population finishes college.[10]

The reluctance of Chicago schools to move as far as New York on the race issue seems to derive from at least these sources: (1) the centralization of power in the Chicago system, parallel to the centralization of civic power in the person of the mayor; (2) the praise of Dr. Conant—probably the most influential person in American education—for Mr. Willis and the Chicago method and his concurrent criticism of the New York method; (3) the presence in New York of large numbers of unusually concerned and articulate white middle-class liberals; (4) the inordinate influence in Chicago schools and civic affairs of State Street, tax-conscious financial interests; (5) the past failures of have-not organization in Chicago.

An example of influential conservatism in relation to have-nots and the schools is seen in this passage from the Chicago *Tribune*: "Let's Throw the Slobs out of School."[11]

"The ignoramuses have had their chance. It is time to make them responsible for their actions. . . . Sweep through the school house with a fiery broom. Remove the deadwood, the troublemakers, the no-goods, the thugs. . . .

[The teacher can tell on the first day] which students are the dissatisfied, the misfits, the illitearate [*sic*], undeserving, *non compos* nincompoops.

We have become the victims of the great transcendental fraud, a deceit put upon us by a generation of psychiatrists, guidance counselors, and psychologists, none of whom spends any more time in the classroom dealing with these apes than he has to."

Despite the fact that median income in Chicago is higher than in New York, Chicago in one recent year spent $410 per pupil while New York spent $761.52.[12]

Inequalities and the compensatory formula now being advocated—reverse inequality—produce only one kind of conflict, one which may be more easily resolved than other disputes because it involves simply the redistribution of money. The "concept" of equality itself seems far less susceptible to change—the notion that, with proper attention, the abilities of have-not children may prove roughly equal to those of haves and that, therefore, they should not be separated, sent off at an early age on different tracks, or given disproportionate access to higher education.

In New York City, fiscal inequality, segregation, and the "concept" of inequality resulted in the following racial distribution of recent graduating classes in New York's special high schools for "gifted children" drawn from the whole city:

---

10. *Handbook of Chicago School Segregation,* 1963, compiled and edited by the Education Committee, Coordinating Council of Community Organizations, August 1963.

11. Reprint from *Chicago Tribune Magazine,* "Let's Throw the Slobs out of School," as it appears in *Human Events,* September 21, 1963, a weekly magazine distributed to social-studies classes in schools throughout the nation.

12. While 21.3 per cent of Chicago's population have incomes over $10,000 annually, only 18.5 per cent of New Yorkers are in this category. In Chicago, 26.3 per cent of whites are in this bracket and only 8.7 per cent of Negroes; at the same time, 9.9 per cent of Negroes have incomes less than $3,000 per year.

	Negroes	Puerto Ricans	Others
Bronx High School of Science	14	2	863
Stuyvesant High School	23	2	629
High School of Music and Art	45	12	638
Brooklyn Technical School	22	6	907

In one recent year, Negroes and Puerto Ricans were about 14 per cent of the graduating class in the city's academic high schools and about 50 per cent in the city's vocational high schools. In the vocational schools, Negroes and Puerto Ricans tend to be heavily concentrated in inferior manual trade schools and seriously underrepresented in the technical schools. For example, in a class of 361 in the aviation school (a high-level technical school), 26 were Negroes, 51 were Puerto Ricans, 284 were "Others." In the class at the New York printing school, 4 were Negroes, 16 were Puerto Ricans, and 183 were "Others." At the Clara Barton school for hospital workers, Negroes were a clear majority. Vocational schools have been "tightening standards" recently and sending minorities to "academic" schools where, if neglected, they may be no better off.

Class and Ethnic Roles

Within the city itself, at least these elements seem to have some separate, though often overlapping, identity: (1) Negroes; (2) labor unions; (3) white have-nots; (4) white liberals; (5) the Jewish community; (6) the Catholic community; (7) business organizations and their allies in city silk-stocking areas.

The roles and activities of these groups in relation to the schools have never been adequately defined, but impressionistic observation seems to indicate the following outlines: The main white support for civil rights in the past several decades has unquestionably come from the leadership within the labor and Jewish communities—with some major assists from middle-class liberal and church groups, particularly in the last several years. The rank-and-file within the labor-union and Jewish communities, more personally threatened by Negroes, have tended to lag some distance behind on civil rights.[13]

In the schools, the class and ethnic lines are distinct, even though less clearly drawn than in the larger community. Some political allies of Negroes have been largely outside the school conflict: unions and large numbers of white have-nots, notably the Poles, Italians, and Irish who have tended to use parochial schools. Some feel it is fortunate that these have-not groups have tended to be outside the public school controversy; others feel that the parochial-public school separation has worked hardships on the public schools and delayed a crisis that would, in the long run, be beneficial to the public schools. Union leaders have been less involved in the schools than in other political affairs because of what seems to be a rather basic

13. On general political and economic issues, class lines seem quite clearly drawn: Negroes, unions, white have-nots, and a preponderance of the Jewish community appear on the have-not side, and the organized business, middle-class, and upper-class groups on the have side. Strangely, perhaps, and to some large extent understandably, Negroes chose two groups closest to them politically for their first-line offense: unions and the Jewish community. Both were vulnerable, having made continuing proclamations, accompanied by considerable effort, on behalf of equality and brotherhood, yet having done much less than their best to provide equality for Negroes within their own jurisdictions.

alienation from the schools and frequently because of their own parochial background. They have, however, supported school expansion, improvement, financing, and their organized political power, as in New York, has given important direct assistance to the schools and to the claims of Negroes on the schools.

The organized business community has traditionally opposed tax increases for public education, the leadership in these groups usually residing in the suburbs where they have provided ample funds for good schools. Powerful real-estate groups have opposed property taxes as well as school and housing integration. The "swing" group has been the Jewish community and, to some extent, the white liberal. The Jewish community, even middle and upper income, has consistently given solid support to the public schools,[14] but its own heavy stress on education and the fact that it is one of the largest remaining white middle-class groups within many cities have produced some ambivalence in its role and some conflict in unexpected places. The confrontation of these two allies in the city public schools is a source of growing distress to both groups. Because the Jewish community has tended to remain in the city and to use the public schools, it is generally contiguous, geographically and empathically, with the Negro community and located in the middle of the integration cross fire.[15] Negroes point to Jewish predominance in the "better" high schools, the top "ability" groups, the free city colleges, and in public school administration. In many of the "integrating" areas of the city, the two groups have joined in open conflict, though in other areas they have integrated without friction. Thus, the Jewish community, because it has not fled like others from the city, often finds itself in the same situation as the labor movement with regard to Negroes: competition within a family of mutual interest for a scarcity of opportunities—in the schools in one case and in the job market in the other.[16] Perhaps for this reason, among others, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union has been a particularly sensitive target.[17]

Acculturation and Integration

The urban schools now confront the most difficult task they have attempted. Never before has a major *racial* minority been integrated into a

---

14. In Detroit, a recent school-tax election was won, informed observers report, by majorities rolled up in the Negro and Jewish precincts.

15. If the Jewish community is represented in the schools in proportion to its numbers in the population (one quarter of the New York population), then together with Negroes and Puerto Ricans (40 per cent) it would represent at least 65 per cent of public school enrollments.

16. On the nine-man New York City school board, three representatives are traditionally selected for each of the three religious communities: Catholic, Protestant, Jewish. Though the Jewish community is represented by three board members, plus a Jewish-Unitarian superintendent of schools, the Negro and Puerto Rican communities, who constitute 40 per cent of the public school population, have only one representative (a Negro) on the board.

17. The Negro struggle seems to have an interacting effect on other have-not groups. In Detroit, the civil-rights movement is supported by the auto workers' union. In battle-torn Chicago, where the class struggle appears in its more primitive form, unembellished by righteous platitudes, the school board seems to have had two lone dissenters on equality and class issues: a steelworker representative (the only unionist on the board) and a Negro (another Negro member has consistently voted with the moreconservative majority). The civil-rights drive, however, comes at a time when white workers feel insecure about jobs and their place in society and fear Negro competition in an already glutted job market. In areas of the nation where white have-nots are not organized (as in the South) and therefore do not have this broad view, racial conflict among have-nots is maximum.

nation's school or society. In fact, such integration within a dominantly non-Latin European population is unprecedented in history, the Soviets having settled their racial affairs by geographic separation.

The urban school, whose heavy job has always been the acculturation of immigrant and foreign-speaking ethnic groups, is now taking its first large bite of racial acculturation, as a giant reptile tries to swallow a whole animal. The city is accustomed to educating the immigrant: In New York City in 1960, 48.6 per cent of the population was either foreign-born or had at least one foreign-born parent; in Chicago, the figure was 35.9; in Detroit, 32.2; in San Francisco, 43.5. But the Negro group is unique in these respects: (1) it is the largest "immigrant" group of low-income, public-school-using Protestants (many other recent immigrations having skirted the public schools); (2) it is the first large racial minority to come to the city schools and the first large group with non-Western origins; (3) it has had a unique history of educational and social deprivation.

The active demand of Negro parents for integration perhaps cannot be fully appeased. Negro—and Puerto Rican—students are approaching a majority in many city public schools and any demand for total, one-for-one integration—which few would make—may be impossible in view of the increasing shortage of white public school students. Rather large-scale integration seems possible, however, as New York City is now beginning to demonstrate. Perhaps the issue will finally be settled by integrated urban renewal, or by setting up superschools and superservices in Negro areas—such as the Amidon school in Washington, D. C.—that will attract white students into Negro areas. Mainly, the urban school integration movement has served the latent function of calling attention to Negro education and arousing concern over the quality of Negro schools. The hope is held by many that, if Negro schools are improved, Negroes will not be so eager to integrate.

Among the newer racial demands in urban schools are: (1) compensatory treatment to balance past inequities; (2) "reverse" integration of schools and the bussing of whites into Negro schools in order to "equalize" sacrifice (in New York, the demand has been for compulsory bussing of both groups; on this most controversial point, Dr. Kenneth Clark has objected that Harlem schools are not fit either for Negroes or for whites and that bussing should be "out" only); (3) heterogeneous grouping to scatter Negroes throughout the school population in any given school, rather than segregating them into slow-moving, homogeneous "ability" groups. In New York City and elsewhere, homogeneous grouping has proceeded so far that children in some places are "ability grouped" in kindergarten, based on whether or not they have been to nursery school; these groups, starting almost in the cradle, tend to perpetuate themselves throughout the child's school life.

Some Ways Out

In this author's view, major break-throughs in urban education may come via any or all of the numerous possible routes.

Outside the school, the possibilities include: (1) a political breakthrough of have-nots at the congressional and state legislative levels; (2)

increasing civil-rights activity and pressure; (3) organization of have-nots at the following levels: political community, ethnic (civil rights), on the job (union), out of a job (unemployed); (4) federal aid programs—either through direct federal aid or around this bottleneck and through special funds, job retraining, Health, Education, and Welfare funds, urban-renewal domestic peace corps, vocational education; (5) massive infusions of voluntary aid to the schools and assistance from private foundations.

Inside the schools, the break-through might come from such sources as: (1) massive enlargement of college opportunities through the introduction of new funds or new methods of teaching; (2) technological innovation in public school, especially educational television; (3) the unionization of teachers and the arousal of the professional group with the greatest stake in improved schools (organized teachers, it has been demonstrated in New York City, can have an electric effect on the schools, attracting qualified teachers through improved salaries and working conditions, reduced class size, improved curriculum, and quality of school administration and instruction); (4) decentralization of city school systems to encourage greater participation of have-nots and clearer and closer channels of communication.[18]

Recent months have seen a spectacular burst of citizen interest in the schools, perhaps unparalleled by anything in the history of public education. Women's clubs, youth groups, civil-rights organizations, settlement houses, churches, local government, private funds, and foundations have taken up "tutorials" in deprived areas, and the more imaginative and energetic groups have moved out from there into community organization. The intrusion of nonschool groups into the learning process has injected some new excited spirit into the institutional drabness.

Accompanying this new citizen concern with the "disadvantaged" is a new wave of interest among educators, writers, and scholars in the problems of poverty and equality, a current that has in recent months washed over previous concentration on the "gifted" and almost swept the word out of the educator's vocabulary.

Another source of backdoor assistance to the schools will be the decongestion of cities—a desperate need of New York especially—by: (1) the natural attrition of a suburban-bound, affluent population, and a Negro population pushing ever outward; (2) the forced decentralization of urban renewal, thinning out populations and bringing back into central areas a more taxable balance of middle and lower income groups. Renewal, intelligently, humanely, and artfully carried on, has the potential, of course, to remake urban life—by decentralizing, rebuilding, rehabilitating, and creating a truly heterogeneous class and ethnic community.

18. In New York, the new community school boards, serving as advisory groups, have already geometrically increased the flow of new ideas, spirit, and activity into the schools from the local communities and cleared the clogged lines of communication.