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Background. In 1978 a majority of Americans live in metropolitan areas. Mechanization of farming methods that rendered large farm labor reserves unnecessary, centralization of industrial and commercial activities, increased national economic interdependence, oppression and lack of opportunity for black Americans in the South, and a large, primarily European, immigrant population have all contributed to the United States' rural-to-urban transformation. Older Northeastern and Middle Western cities such as New York City, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, St. Louis, Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburg, and Chicago first realized dramatic population growth and economic activity as a result of these forces. The years immediately after the Civil War, World War I, and during and after World War II, were particularly significant periods for urban growth.¹

Today, however, these same cities are rapidly losing population, industry, and retail trade to the burgeoning suburban and exurban areas that surround them. Our once great and vibrant metropolises have become, quite
literally, an endangered species. The cancerous growth of blight and deterioration in some of these cities worsens yearly, and the present stop-gap measures for arresting the spread of decay are largely ineffectual. At the present time, unfortunately, there is no Marshall Plan-type national commitment to save our cities. They seem to survive almost in spite of the political mentality of Washington, D. C., and most state capitals.²

Many interrelated developments have contributed to this tragic situation, and some of them bear the stamp of official government approval. Most important among them, however, are: the advent of cheaply-produced automobiles and the introduction of credit financing to buy them, federally subsidized transportation and highway systems (linking city to suburbs), federally subsidized mortgages, tax credits on mortgage interest payments and insurance, the need for open space for horizontal and continuous industrial production methods, and the development of instantaneous communication systems and networks.³

Even in the Southwest and Far West, where central city growth has continued well into the 1970's, suburban residential and industrial developments also flourish. Dallas, Houston, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, and Denver⁴ are all engulfed by suburban sprawl. Suburban America now attracts more industry, commercial interests,
and new residents to our metropolitan centers than do our once preeminent central cities.\(^5\)

This national phenomenon of rural-to-city-to-suburban migration has meant that most of the metropolitan areas in the U. S. now face many of the same "urban" problems and exhibit a characteristic sameness, regardless of their location, overall size, or age. For example, except for a few of the "growth" cities of the Southwest and Far West, our central cities continue yearly to lose thousands of working professional and skilled middle-class residents to the nearby suburbs (in spite of the recent and fledgling return-to-the-city movement). And, generally, in their place, have come poor, unskilled, uneducated, and often dispossessed rural Americans. With this loss of middle-class residents, the central cities' tax base diminishes and revenue sources fade, but the demands for and costs of social services drastically escalates. Police, welfare, health, and education facilities are strained enormously by this change of clientele as well as by the accompanying demands of unionized city employees for increased wages and fringe benefits.\(^6\)

Metropolitan areas are likewise fragmented and divided along racial, ethnic, and socio-economic class lines. Particularly distressing is the residential segregation that separates black and white Americans. Residential segregation not only inhibits spontaneous,
open, and warm neighborly relations between black and white Americans, but it ensures that numerous public and private facilities in our metropolitan areas will be highly segregated as well. The clientele of schools, churches, hospitals, stores, libraries, movie theaters, and parks is largely determined by the racial composition of the neighborhoods they serve. Racial segregation is a pervasive and invidious obstacle to racial equality and portends serious problems, if unattended, for the future of the urban America.⁷

As might be expected, suburbanization and the subsequent changes in the demographic makeup of our central cities are now having a profound effect upon the political scene in urban America. Black Americans and Spanish-surnamed Americans are elected increasingly to political offices in central city governments, and central city constituencies are providing the power base for minorities to secure state and federal political offices.

Yet, the political strength and influence of the suburbs in our nation's state houses and the U. S. Congress has never been more pronounced. With each new census and subsequent reapportionment, suburban America acquires added political representation at the state and national level.⁸ The suburbs, meanwhile, remain predominately white, middle-class, and relatively affluent, while the core cities are very often broke, highly
dependent upon state and federal government largesse, and increasingly little more that reserves for America's poor and minority groups. Unfortunately, the differences between the cities and suburbs over values and priorities seem to be growing, and, at times, they appear insuperable. Warnings however, are constantly being sounded that these differences must be resolved, and that the future of America's metropolitan areas depends upon imaginative and bold cooperative ventures between the cities and suburbs.9

In recent years, the public school systems of urban America have been deeply embroiled in controversy and conflict and subject to a wide-range of criticisms. Integration and desegregation plans, teachers' strikes, classroom violence, cries of soft and permissive, or irrelevant, education, parent and student protests, and demands for decentralized or community-controlled schools have all erupted from the public school scene. The schools, likewise, have become centers for political activity and patronage handouts, with board members, teachers, administrators, students, and community groups all having had a hand, at one time or another, in attempting to preserve or change the status quo in the schools.

While each group endeavors to strengthen its control and bargaining position over policy decisions, finances, and similar problem areas in the schools, an often all too predictable conflict arises over institutional goals
and priorities. Central to this conflict is the broad disagreement that exists over the fundamental issue of just what is the purpose and role of public education in our society. For example, should public schools serve as state "socializing" agencies and impart what are ascribed to be the larger society's values and aspirations (if, indeed, a consensus can be reached on this point) or should they tailor their programs and curricula to those of a more immediate community, or both? Furthermore, should public school systems' attendance boundaries conform to and coincide with the patchwork of fragmented and balkanized political entities that cover most all of our metropolitan areas, or should they be more inclusive and far-reaching and combine numerous political jurisdictions?

Need for the Study. With the majority of the nation's population residing in metropolitan centers, it is paramount that educators acquire a greater understanding and knowledge of the trends, movements, and workings of these centers, especially as they relate to public education. Without this background, public educators seem less than prepared to make educational policy decisions and equally ill-suited for classroom assignments. Although urban-oriented classes, seminars, and field experiences (particularly those concerned with the overwhelming problems of inner-city schools) have been
introduced over the past decade in many teacher education institutions, these offerings generally have failed to provide students with a fundamental grasp of the issues and problems of education from a metropolitan-wide perspective. Furthermore, these courses generally have failed to familiarize students with the literature of other academic disciplines (notably political science, sociology, and economics) that examine urban-related phenomena directly affecting public education. The findings and conclusions from these disciplines are of significant value to educators as they grapple with the problems and issues facing them in the schools. Three ERIC searches and reviews of numerous curricula at colleges of education, plus reviews of the Social Science and Humanities Index to American Doctoral Dissertations identify no prior work that conceptualizes a metropolitan studies curriculum for teacher education.  

While most of the nation's job opportunities and cultural and educational activities are found in metropolitan regions, it is in these same regions that we find most of the nation's domestic problems--racial and class inequities and conflict, overcrowding, overloads on public services and utilities, energy shortages, political corruption, consumer waste, and human despair. A concerted national effort is needed just to contend with these problems, let alone solve them and to transform
metropolitan regions into more democratic and humane places to live. Urban-suburban cooperation and a rethinking and redesign of political and social organizations on a metropolitan-wide basis is needed before the above aims can be accomplished. Against this recognition of need, this study contributes to raising the consciousness of educators to the importance of metropolitanism as a concept for, and an approach to, solving city/suburban problems, especially those related to public education.

**Purpose of the Study.** This study proposes to develop a conceptual framework for an interdisciplinary metropolitan studies curriculum for pre-service and in-service teacher education. Curricula generated within such a framework can serve as a "foundational" base for various programs and activities to provide teachers-to-be and those in service a fuller understanding of the most critical of the political, social, economic, and cultural dimensions of public education in metropolitan regions.

**Nature of the Study and Mode of Inquiry.** The scope of the urban research ranges from demographic studies, to sociological and anthropological treatments, to economic, historical, and political analyses. Much of this interdisciplinary literature can serve as a foundation for a reconceptualization of metropolitan-based teacher education curricula. Overarching, wide-sweeping "conceptual referents" can be drawn from these disciplines, and
they, in turn, can provide the context for such efforts. Such an interdisciplinary approach has been adopted by numerous universities to study an array of contemporary human problems and public issues. Harvard University, for example, uses the resources and expertise of a number of academic disciplines to study national policy making, and it offers interdisciplinary graduate degrees in public policy.

These interdisciplinary efforts serve as exemplars of curriculum development in higher education that might be generated from the conceptual framework to be created in this investigation.

The mode of inquiry for the investigation might best be described as a philosophical mode of inquiry involving both analysis and synthesis. A modified content analysis, or conceptual analysis, broadly conceived, is utilized to identify the most relevant concepts crucial to an understanding of metropolitanism in the several related disciplines. From this analysis, a new theoretical framework will be synthesized.

In this sense the effort qualifies as an example of qualitative research as contrasted with traditional quantitative research. Or, it may also be viewed as an example of Robert Merton's "middle range" theorizing, in that it identifies concepts from several disciplines, creates a new synthesis among them, and then projects
practical operations that derive from such a synthesis. Many observers of the study of education in 1978 assert that the greatest need to bridge the so-called theory-practice gap is such middle range theorizing. Clearly, if a more adequate knowledge base is to be generated this need must be met.

The final test of the adequacy of middle range theorizing is not that it meets the canons of empirical investigations--namely, that it results in laws that permit the investigator to control the data and predict results. Rather, the basic criterion of adequacy is whether or not the proposed theory, or in this study, the conceptual framework, raises fresh sets of questions which may then undergo rigorous research in actual field settings. If this second long-range effort, which is beyond the scope of this single investigation, is carried out, and if new insights are discovered, then it may be asserted that the study has contributed to what Thomas Kuhn, has termed a "paradigm shift." Such is the intent of the effort.

Moreover, in the 1978 Charles W. Hunt Lecture at the American Association of Teacher Education Conference, the eminent scholar Lawrence Cremin emphasized the need to view teacher education in four basic components. His research into the history of the field clearly demonstrates the validity of this four-fold division. These
components as he explicates them are: the general education or liberal education component; the special scholarship or depth in a single field component; the professional knowledge component; and the clinical studies component.

The investigation undertaken here sharply focuses on a reconceptualized knowledge base for both the professional knowledge component and, in turn, for the clinical component. Cremin asserts that many current efforts to redo teacher education have not attended adequately to the content of either of these. His position supports fully, therefore, the major thrust of this study.

Organization of the Study. The report of the study is organized into six chapters. Chapter II develops a number of perspectives from a review of the literature for examining metropolitan areas as units of analysis. It also sketches the urbanization of public education in the United States. Distinctions are drawn between metropolitan areas as political, social, economic, or historical entities.

Chapter III explicates Harold Lasswell's classic theory of "who gets who gets what, when, and how." It also analyzes social science literature which generates concepts related to "input-output" evaluations of political, economic, and social systems in metropolitan
regions. Some of these "cause and effect" relationships in public schools are documented.

Chapter IV serves as a case study to sketch the growth and development of the Greater St. Louis Metropolitan Area. Selected physical and demographic characteristics of the area are examined, as are its housing patterns, employment conditions, urban renewal efforts, and racial composition, because of their political and economic complicity and resulting social implications. Relationships between these variables and their subsequent effects on educational conditions in the Metropolitan St. Louis Area are explored in this chapter.

Chapter V presents the conceptual framework generated from the interdisciplinary concepts and the case study of metropolitan St. Louis. Education is set, thereby, within a context of political, economic, and social systems. A range of questions regarding the issues and problems associated with public education in metropolitan areas is raised within this framework. These suggest the substantive content of a metropolitan studies component in both pre-service and in-service teacher education. The chapter, itself, is divided into two parts.

Chapter VI includes warranted generalizations from the study and makes recommendations for further research in educational theory and practice efforts.


10. Robert J. Havinghurst is perhaps the first noted educator to advocate a metropolitan approach to public education. His early insistence that issues and problems in public education must be examined and solved on an area-wide basis, and not from a central city v. the suburbs perspective, has helped immeasurably to develop a public consciousness of what he has often called the "unperceived community," the metropolitan area. See

CHAPTER II
METROPOLITAN AREAS, URBANIZATION, AND PUBLIC EDUCATION: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction. A substantial literature examines the phenomena of urbanization in the United States and studies metropolitan areas as a unit of analysis. Efforts through the years by social philosophers, historians, and social scientists to order and classify the plethora of movements, trends, events, processes, adaptations, behaviors, and activities of individuals, groups, and institutions within urban milieus assume a variety of research strategies and biases. This chapter delimits a portion of that literature and particularly addresses those studies that provide data related to public education within metropolitan settings. This chapter serves, therefore, as a backdrop for the entire study.

Its purposes are three fold: first, to describe the most critical of the current and overriding issues and problems indigenous to metropolitan areas in the United States as reported in the literature; second, to review research that documents various aspects of urbanization and the growth of metropolitan regions, and, finally, to
examine the status, role, and function of public education within the context of this rural-to-urban transition.

The Metropolitan Area: A Unit of Analysis. The concept of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), was introduced by the Census Bureau in 1949. It was educed from the Bureau's recognition that the often arbitrary political boundaries of urban places do not necessarily fit coterminously with the socio-economic entity represented by the central, or core, cities, satellite cities, suburban communities, and adjacent unincorporated or rural areas. The need existed, therefore, to have a statistical representation of such an emerging geographic and socio-economic unit.¹

Only recently, however, have the various communities of metropolitan regions (often socially and economically dissimilar and politically balkanized) begun to consider some of their mutual problems on an area-wide basis (such as the delivery of physical and social services) and to talk of solving them through cooperative regional approaches.² While this trend hardly abates the political squabbling in metropolitan areas, the transcending and complex nature of certain urban problems has forced both central city politicians and suburban office-holders to shed some of their self-imposed political isolation and parochialism.
This sometimes new-found spirit of cooperation in heavily populated urban centers is based most generally upon survival instincts, the "work together or perish separately" adage. And while metropolitan-wide cooperation augers well as the most persuasive and creative approach to the dilemmas and issues confronting our highly urbanized regions, developing citizen awareness of living in and having responsibility to an entire metropolitan area (as opposed to just one's community or neighborhood of residence), and then realigning metropolitan political structures to meet area-wide problems, has been an exasperating and difficult task. 3

Meanwhile, experiments continue in urban centers with newly-created administrative and governing structures that have metropolitan-wide authority over such things as sewerage disposal, water supplies, highway planning, public and private housing developments, airport location, and the preservation of open space. Public education, 4 law enforcement, 5 and health care, 6 are also being studied from an area-wide perspective. Metropolitan centralization (and inter-governmental cooperation), as the argument runs, insures economies of scale, maximizes fiscal resources, and insures improved and more efficient community services.

This move toward "metropolitanism," however, is generally opposed by advocates of decentralized government. They contend that good government, responsive to
differentiated needs and capable of guaranteeing equitable public policies, is not as likely through large governing and administrative units. Governmental decentralization, which provides citizens with greater access to and control over public officials and office bureaucrats, is the best approach for meeting people's needs. These critics argue that numerous entities within metropolitan regions often have vastly different needs and interests, and decentralized governing units or districts are the best arrangement for meeting these needs and interests and for encouraging citizen involvement in civic affairs.\textsuperscript{7}

Some observers, however, do not see the concepts of centralization and decentralization as necessarily in conflict. They suggest that governing arrangements can be devised which incorporate positive aspects of both concepts. One sponsor of this approach, the Committee for Economic Development (CED), suggests that it is not so much "functions" that need to be divided among governmental units, but rather control and authority over functions. Using this approach, says the Committee, makes it possible to solicit some degree of decentralization over most all governmental functions, while still requiring that some services (e.g., sewage, solid waste disposal, and mass-transit systems) be administered on an area-wide basis.\textsuperscript{8}
In practice, though, a metropolitan area is more than simply geographical and administrative units to be arranged for the delivery of physical and social services. The history of a region assumes a special importance of its own and must not be ignored in metro-planning schemes. Long associations and relationships among individuals and groups, competition and conflict between neighborhoods and special interests, and vast ethnic and racial differences over life style and values can undermine even the simplest of metropolitan-wide planning ventures, unless they are acknowledged and attended to.

The remainder of the chapter reviews some of the earlier studies that have examined the phenomenon of urbanization in the United States. Their relationship to the "realities" of metropolitan areas, today, is explored. It is especially from the urban history literature that it is possible to trace the development of the urban scholar's perspectives on the study of cities and urban regions and the status and function of public education in such settings.

**Historical Perspectives on Urbanization.** Until the second quarter of the twentieth century, American cities had been relatively understudied or ignored by most American historians. The forces that created them, the factors and variables that sustained them (or figured
into their demise), and their contributions to the social, political, economic, and cultural development of the United States, too often escaped a thoroughgoing analysis. Although American historians had never completely ignored urban history as an area of study, there was little formal interest in cities until the initial publication of volumes in the famous *History of American Life* series in the early 1930's. This watershed study aspired to write a social history of the United States, and the editors of the project focused on urban life as a crucial variable in the social history of America.⁹

Since this classic publication, historians have written more frequently about the general phenomenon of urbanization and the American city.¹⁰ Some of these studies have simply addressed the city as the primary unit of analysis, but others have loosely focused on the economic relationships between the city and the surrounding countryside.¹¹ Other studies have viewed the city as a "conceptual entity" and have drawn upon special themes to examine urbanization and the American city. For example, ethnic and minority groups in cities,¹² cities' migration and residential patterns,¹³ religion in the metropolis,¹⁴ urban immigration,¹⁵ housing and slum conditions,¹⁶ municipal reforms,¹⁷ and health care and sanitation facilities in cities¹⁸ have all been treated in depth. These narrowly-drawn studies provide a rich pastiche and
vital knowledge and understanding of urban life in America. Without them, our sophistication of urban culture would be significantly lacking. But these studies do not examine the more encompassing forces responsible for America's transition from an agrarian-based nation to an urban and industrial/technological society. And they do not address the resultant changes in our country's cultural, political, social, and economic institutions.19

Historians soon followed, however, who examined urban culture as it related to changing conditions in the labor market, the development of machines and technology in urban society, and the emergence of new family and work patterns in urban life. They specified economic arrangements, social relationships, and political structures that were indigenous to the American city and its regions. Furthermore, their research led scholars in other disciplines to clarifying cities and metropolitan areas as specific units of analysis with their own particular dynamics and behaviors.

Sam Bass Warner, Jr., typifies the historians who more recently have attempted to provide a comprehensive or panoramic examination of urban America. Warner premises his latest work, The Urban Wilderness, by stating that Americans have no sense of an urban history. He argues that Americans living in urban areas hold to a
few civic and ethnic myths and traditions and a few family and neighborhood remembrances but lack a genuine consciousness of their past and are not at all aware that their present actions greatly determine their future. As individuals and groups in our cities confront pressing daily problems, they tend to operate in a vacuum. They do not have an historical context from which to judge their actions. Whether those involved be from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, neighborhood and private interest groups, or citizen advisory groups, Warner claims the same myopic view persists. He contends that without this historical perspective as to how cities grew and developed, urban Americans will "...hammer against today's crises without any means to choose their targets to fit the trends which they must confront, work with, or avoid." 20

Bass studies cities from an approach that he contends reveals the lessons of the past as they reflect upon contemporary city issues. He holds the development of American cities up to three rather sacred and espoused ideals of American society: open competition, community, and innovation. 21 Then, throughout The Urban Wilderness, he chronicles the often unfulfilled promise of these ideals in the American city, and he speaks critically of cities' sometimes callous disregard for them. He cites zoning laws and restrictive ordinances that have been and
are now being used to perpetuate racial segregation, health care services and facilities which have been and are now generally unavailable for many city residents, and a continuous preoccupation with business and economic expansion at the expense of social and community benefits, as examples of the retreat from these ideals.

Warner provides a vivid account of the evolution of America's urban areas into interlocking and interdependent social and economic systems by framing America's urban problems within a metropolitan-wide setting. He says that metropolitan regions must be more directed and managed toward social equality and community betterment if they are to avoid increasing woes, social stress, and political instability. In conclusion, Bass forecasts that the hope of urban America "...lies in a public recognition of the interconnections of everyday urban life, and from that recognition to commit the nation to a deep and long-sustained effort to rework its physical and institutional structure." And to do this, "...democratic national and regional planning..." must be adopted!

Lewis Mumford, one of the most perceptive observers of urban culture, also decries the inattention in cities to peoples' social needs. He considers urban regions as units of analysis with an organic form, delimited in terms of time and space. Like Bass, Mumford is perplexed by a preoccupation in cities with ill-planned physical and
industrial expansion that takes place at the expense of the social order and development of urban communities. In his masterful classic *The Culture of Cities*, Mumford casts the city as one of man's noblest creations. However, he finds in many cities, especially in Western civilization, "...the systemic frustration of those social and cooperative endeavors which modern thought has made possible. Metropolitan civilization, with its resourceful technical ingenuity and its delicately articulated physical organization, has failed through its very structure to distribute the benefits that it potentially commands." 27

To recognize Mumford's central criticism of cities: i.e., they are overly materialistic and exploitive and lack a "...coherent social knowledge or orderly social effort...," 28 is to understand his ideas and expressions for remaking cities as a symbol of art and order and as man's basic cultural nucleus. He has synthesized a vast range of knowledge (the development of science and technology, the creation and dissemination of art and literature, the advances in the biological and social sciences, and concepts in city planning, architecture, and engineering) and has calculated its impact upon urban culture and its potential for revitalizing urban communities.
Mumford seeks a more balanced and sustaining accommodation between people's increasingly scientific, objective, rational, technocratic environment and impulses and their instinctual, naturalistic, and artistic endeavors and predilections. For Mumford, it is when these seemingly contradictory elements are reconciled that people can best live and evolve into an organic unity with their surroundings and then build exciting and dynamic socially creative urban cultures. His testament follows that the "...culture of cities is ultimately the culture of life in its higher social manifestations." 29

To achieve this crucial balance, Mumford emphasizes devising structures and arrangements within communities and neighborhoods that are "...within the scope and interest of a pre-adolescent child: such that daily life can have unity and significance for him, as a representation of the larger social whole..." 30 Thus the city becomes "...the chief instrument of education: the wider school of the young and the university of the adult, whilst the factory, the meeting hall, the political committee, the scientific society, become, as it were, auxiliaries of the school. And under such conditions, an important result must follow: the processes and activities of the school will tend to set a mold for the social process as a whole." 31
Mumford emphatically assigns the school a crucial place in the revitalization of urban culture. He reminds us that while the church was the social nucleus of the medieval city and the factory served the same function in the paleotechnic economy, the school (and the dwelling house) are the social/community nucleus in a biotechnic economy. He agrees with John Dewey's child/society-centered focus in education, and also with his analysis that education and politics are inextricably interrelated. Mumford contends that public education's main interest should be to "...effectuate through collective means and processes, a better political society." He speaks prophetically of the tasks that schools must confront in the biotechnic age. No longer, he says, as was the case in the paleotechnic era, should the schools' primary task be to make the population "...responsive to print, skilled in arithmetic, and docile to external stimula." Instead, schools should develop strategies and proposals that insure community survival, develop communities' capacity to control their destinies, promote personal and communal growth, and reorder practical and instrumental activities for an uncertain yet hopeful future. Mumford, in short, sees schools as the one institution in society most indispensable to a neighborhood or community.

Mumford's criticisms of the social absent-mindedness of most urban planning developments in our cities and his
carefully studied views on the pivotal role and function for schools in contemporary urban society, stand as a valuable criterion for adjudging both the past and present efforts of cities and their schools in meeting the civic needs of their constituents. Unfortunately, he does not sufficiently develop his proposition that education and politics are interrelated. Do educational policies determine and/or influence societal behaviors and outcomes? Do political systems (through their interest groups, ideologies, behaviors, and processes) determine and/or influence the goals and activities of educational facilities? Can schools be consciously politicized? If so, for what ends: to promote social awareness and change? to reinforce the status quo? Are schools' policies and operating procedures dependent upon, independent of, the dictates of socio-economic and political arrangements? Mumford regretably does not address these and related questions.

......

In the next section of this study, however, various works are surveyed that do analyze a number of these points, and they provide an historical perspective on the role and function of schools within urban settings in the United States.

Public Education and Urbanization. Although the first common schools in this country predate the more
turbulent years of urbanization in the United States, public education's greatest development parallels those periods of the country's most intense and rapid industrialization and urbanization. Prominent educators, such as Horace Mann and Henry Barnard (who witnessed much of the early industrialization and urbanization of the Northeast a generation before the Civil War), believed that public schools were crucial institutions for alleviating human exploitation, incivility, and injustice in society and for promoting educational, social, economic, and political equality. This notion was both novel and threatening, since America's first schools hardly reflected this philosophy. They were, instead, primarily elitist enterprises, attended by the sons of the nation's landed and white parentage. In short, there was little support for universal schooling.

The state of Massachusetts (Mann was to become secretary of its Board of Education in 1837), however, along with several other northeastern states, began expanding educational opportunities to more of its youth. A number of political scholars who were Mann's contemporaries approved of this trend and expressed the importance of this movement to the future of America's political system. They argued that an educated citizenry was an indispensable element to a viable national democracy. Thus the notion of some common or basic education for
young Americans, particularly in urban areas, steadily became an established policy.\textsuperscript{37}

Following the Civil War and early into the twentieth century, urbanization increased rapidly, and millions of rural Americans, displaced by increasingly mechanized agricultural machinery and often exploitive landowners, trekked to the cities, especially in the Northeast and Middle West, in search of work and new opportunities. During this same period, waves of immigrants from southern and eastern European countries, as well as thousands of Jews from Russia, settled into these same cities and further swelled their population.

With the rapid inundation of foreign groups to American cities, universal or common schooling took on new proportions and a special urgency. Educators and politicians were among the first to cite these foreign groups' lack of understanding and attachment to American values, culture, and democratic traditions, and they envisioned public education as the main instrument for "socializing" or "Americanizing" these people. By the last quarter of the nineteenth century, most of the states with urban populations had mandated some form of compulsory education. Regular attendance was stressed and schools' curricula emphasized literacy, moral training, hygienic practices, patriotism, and citizenship training. These were the staples of education for immigrant urban
youth, and their parents often attended night sessions for the same educational rations.38

The First World War brought immigration to the United States to a near standstill and also aroused anti-alien or -foreign sentiments among many Americans. Intense lobbying efforts in Congress led to passage of restrictive quota systems on immigration. The second Immigration Quota Act, passed in 1924, dramatically curtailed the number of foreigners entering America, and urban schools gradually turned away from their socializing function.39

In the Depression years that soon followed, public education's function and role was altered by the changing economic and social conditions of the country. Some educators from the progressive education movement (George S. Counts, perhaps the most articulate and outspoken among these) began heralding schools as the major institution for restoring or rejuvenating community life in America. They called upon schools to be at the vanguard for social reforms. Progressive Education was no longer to be defined just in terms of a child-centered, experiential, or an individual needs philosophy. Public education, as a force for community/social improvement and reform, became a much debated and controversial notion, but the community school concept steadily gained staunch supporters. The difficult assignment of restoring community life in America and pursuing social reforms
was viewed as both an urban and a rural necessity. However, the task took on special significance in the country's teeming cities.40

For the most part, the community schools of the 1930's did not adhere to Dewey's notion of creating and developing within schools a microcosm of communities with activities, experiences, and behaviors that reflected the life of the broader society. Rather, many "progressive" educators during this period thought it was unnecessary to simulate the concept of "community" within school walls (they regarded the existence of community life in America--while much distressed--a given), and wanted schools, instead, to utilize the "total community" as an educational resource, engage in social activism and criticism, study the existing needs and problems of communities, and develop proposals and projects to meet or alleviate these obstacles.41

Numerous scholars familiar with public education and educational practices over these years of steady industrialization and urbanization, as American cities became teeming centers of cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity, disagree with the view that the schools functioned as a positive socializing institution and as an equalizing force in the society. They feverishly dispute the claim that impoverished urban minorities, by attending public school, could acquire skills for economic rewards,
social and cultural acceptance, and political training for
democratic living. Some of these "revisionist" are equally
skeptical of the motives of many of the early school
reformers and politicians that pressed for mass public
education in the United States.

Michael B. Katz, Colin Greer, and Joel Spring flatly reject the contention that mass compulsory public
education evolved from a genuine desire to shape America
into a more egalitarian society. Rather, they view mass
compulsory schooling as an instrument for insuring some
measure of social and political control over the large,
diverse urban populations. Schooling was not for any
ennobling or educative purpose, they contend.

It is Katz who most persuasively defines the relation­
ship between social class, social structure, and education
during these periods of intense urbanization and social
instability in the United States. He argues that schools
served foremost to perpetuate an entrenched socio­
economic and political order in this country and, with
the bureaucratization and institutionalization of education,
the control of schools (especially large city systems) was
heisted from the neighborhoods and communities the schools
purported to serve and placed them, instead, in the hands
of school personnel (primarily administrators and central
office personnel) who had no overriding concern in the
schools except their own self-interest and protection.
Katz credits this turn of events with stifling community participation in school affairs and encouraging administrative policies and procedures within the schools that emphasized efficiency, smoothness, order, and indoctrination. Moreover, according to Katz, these developments were designed to strengthen the position of the social, economic, and political elites in the United States—all having a strong concern for the maintenance of domestic order. Academic standards and educational considerations supposedly were treated as matters of only peripheral importance. 45

Meanwhile, argues Katz (as do Spring and Greer), vocational education programs and testing procedures were established under the guise of expanded educational opportunity for the poor and working classes in American cities. But instead of creating real opportunities for these people, the vocational programs and testing procedures became tools for credentialling American youth according to race and class biases and then for channelling them into an "exploitive capitalistic" society, a society that placed utmost priority on product, specialized and interchangeable personnel with certified expertise, and work-oriented behavior characteristics that would insure operating predictability and productivity levels. Con­ forming, passive, and acceptive behaviors were stressed
in the schools, since the business and industrial world beyond schools would demand these traits.\textsuperscript{46}

Katz, Spring, and Greer maintain that the past patterns and traditions of bureaucratization and institutionalization in public education (initially begun in the mid-nineteenth century and securely established by the second decade of the twentieth century), today, prevent the very poor, particularly black Americans, from realizing substantial benefits from society through public education. To this dictum, there are only exceptions! Moreover, they contend, the schools consciously and expeditiously go about reinforcing social class distinctions as well as supporting the dominant economic and political alignments within society.

To substantiate their positions, however, these historians impute near conspiritorial motives to school officials and politicians. But the weight of the evidence, while at times compelling, does not fully support their claim that these parties knowingly developed schools' programs and policies to insure social control over the large and diverse ethnic and racial populations swelling American cities. In their determined effort to expose schools as exclusionary, racist, excessively bureaucratic, and class confirming (rather than as egalitarian forces and a guarantors of social mobility), Katz, Spring, and Greer have selected
and interpreted historical materials to fit their a priori assumptions about public education. Rather than gathering historical data to test their assumptions and propositions about the economic, social, and political function of schools in urban society, they have, instead, simply arranged the data to reinforce what they already held to be self-evident.47

Still, these historians focus dramatically on the necessity to reexamine critically what schools claim to have done and now purport to do, as well as how they actually operate and relate to the social, economic, and political spheres of our society. They provide us with a challenging perspective for examining the schooling process and educative experiences, especially in those periods when America was changing rapidly from an agrarian-based nation to an urban and industrially oriented society, a society that has become characterized by its highly pluralistic and diverse urban populations, its interdependent economic networks, and its vested urban social and political interests. Quite clearly, their criticisms force us to take a more penetrating look at the actual role and function performed by our schools in contemporary society.

The connection between the past and the present is drawn sharply by Mary Herrick in her The Chicago Schools. This thoroughly documented case study examines the public
school system of American's second largest city during a progression of sixty years, a time that saw Chicago transformed from a frontier town to a world metropolis.

The author, a teacher herself for forty-five years in the Chicago schools, contends that confusion and disagreement have always existed over the goals and functions of the city's schools. For some, the schools exist primarily to insure that Chicago's children learn to read, write, and figure numerically. Others stress, however, that the schools should serve a custodial function by "keeping kids off the streets" and out of trouble until they are old enough to secure a position in the labor force. And there are those who want Chicago's schools operating as a training ground to prepare students for a specific vocation or position in society. Still, some individuals and groups want the schools to promote and perpetuate a particular racial and ethnic identity or cultural heritage. Finally, there are people who want to hold the public schools responsible for training children to conform to prevailing and acceptable community beliefs and customs.49

Herrick's book raises many difficult questions regarding these positions. Among them: what are acceptable beliefs and customs? what is meant by "community"? who defines and judges arbitrary standards such as "acceptable," "non-acceptable"? if school
policies run counter to entrenched local traditions and customs, is the resolution of conflict to be defined and resolved within a political, social and/or educational context? Who are the political brokers and social elites, and how do they control and/or influence school-related decisions?

A major theme of Herrick's work is that, historically, the policies and practices adopted by Chicago's public schools have been determined within parameters reflecting the city's extant political culture and social milieu. Furthermore, she contends that this relationship continues, today, between these same realms. Herrick argues that because of this arrangement the Chicago school system has never in its history adhered to a single, unifying, and overriding purpose to give it a "...logical sequence..." or a "...permanent direction..." through its years of dynamic growth and pressing crises. Moreover, those individuals and groups without a political base have only infrequently been instrumental in initiating reforms within Chicago's schools. Meanwhile, the politically calculated decisions of Chicago's Board of Education and the school system's top administrators (in deference to the dictates of ward bosses, precinct captains, aldermen, and mayors) have held sway and determined throughout much of the city's history just what happens in its schools.
Herrick shows, though, that once disenfranchised individuals and community groups acquire a political base, they can become an impetus for change and reforms within Chicago's massive public education system. She cites the successful efforts of labor groups in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, and the work of pressure groups within the city's black population, today, to initiate substantial educational changes and to affect many school-related matters.52

Herrick's treatment of Chicago's schools, from the devastating fire of 1871 to the end of the nineteenth century (a period of rapid urbanization), examines this relationship between political influence, social status, and public education policy-making. She shows that, during this period of tremendous population growth and expanding industrial activity, Chicago experienced conflicts and divisions among racial and ethnic groups and labor and business interests. These conflicts and divisions eventually surfaced within the city's public schools. The debates over compulsory school laws, ethnic control policies, vocational education curricula, and teacher training procedures were shaped more by political and social consideration than by an overriding regard for quality education for Chicago's school-age children.53

Summary. Urbanization has brought lasting changes in American society, changes that dramatically manifest
themselves in the everyday lives of urban dwellers. The evolving industrial and technological forces that first precipitated the urbanization process in the United States attenuated established loyalties, attachments, and relationships by transforming or dissolving old societal ties and institutions and creating new ones. Concentrated populations, altered time and space relationships between residence and workplace, new land uses, and a production and profit-oriented economy helped to create new social values and structures. These, in turn, altered family and community life and, of course, public education.

During these periods of intense urbanization, the new urban arrivals were pitiously neglected. There was a large unconsciousness to human values and individual needs. Physical, cultural, and communal amenities for these inhabitants were supplanted by an insensate national mentality that revered industrial growth, business expansion, and entrepreneurship. Adequate housing, welfare systems, health care delivery services, and sanitation facilities were virtually nonexistent for the newly arrived city dwellers. A preoccupation with expanding economic enterprises precluded serious public attention or governmental planning for these most basic human considerations.

Still, public education and compulsory schooling drew life from the urbanization phenomenon, especially
as racial, ethnic, and social divisiveness threatened the stability of American cities. But just what the role and purpose of schools was to be was hotly disputed. Presently, the controversy continues over the "correct" role and function of schools in urban society. Some would use public education to reinforce existing political arrangements and socio-economic class distinctions. Others want public education to provide political access and social and economic mobility and opportunity for the disadvantaged and disenfranchised. All appear to agree that schools should teach basic academic skills.

2. Mass-transit systems and sewage treatment and disposal plants were among the first public services organized and operated on a metropolitan-wide basis with cooperation among numerous political jurisdictions. Establishment of authorities and special purpose districts, such as The Port of New York Authority and The St. Louis Metropolitan Sewerage District, are examples of these arrangements. For an incisive discussion of special districts, see Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, The Problem of Special Districts in American Government (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964). Also, refer to John C. Bollens, Special District Government in the United States (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957).

3. Minnesota's Twin Cities Metropolitan Council is one of the more hopeful models for unifying and directing an entire urban area.

   However, the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council for the Metropolitan St. Louis area (tentatively slated to be dissolved, along with the Bi-State Development Corporation, into the newly proposed St. Louis Area Council of Governments) exemplifies those agencies that thus far show only a limited potential for providing solutions and planning guidance on an area-wide basis. See Joseph F. Zimmerman, Metropolitan Governance and The Twin Cities Model, paper presented at the National Conference of Government, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 28, 1972; Gerald Meyer, "Minneapolis-St. Paul Area Working for Growth," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 24, 1973, p. 18; Wyn N. Hoadley, "Metropolitan Councils: The St. Louis Experience," National Civic Review, Vol. 50, No. 2 (February, 1971), pp. 79-85, and Henry J. Schmandt, Paul G. Steinbecker, and George D. Wendell, Metropolitan Reform in St. Louis: A Case Study (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961).

   Other approaches to metropolitan government (the city-county consolidation of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee; the Miami-Dade County, Florida metropolitan reorganization, and "metro" federalism in Canada—encompassing Toronto and surrounding suburban communities) are covered in Leonard E. Goodall, The American Metropolis (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 79-127. Metropolitan government reforms are also discussed in Charles W. Harris, Council of Governments and the Central City (Detroit: Metropolitan Fund,


editors of the History of American Life series, also wrote one of the 13 volumes in the series, the influential *The Rise of the American City*. This inquiry centered on the period from 1878-1898. While it was not exclusively a study of cities, Schlesinger did use the growth of cities as the unifying theme of this twenty year period. He documented the population movement of this era and provided an account of the pattern of life in American cities. According to Glaab, Schlesinger’s volume was the most authoritative in the series, because of the new research it evoked. See Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., and David Ryan Fox (eds.), *A History of American Life*, 13 vols. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1927-48). Pertinent sections of Schlesinger’s volume (New York: Macmillan Company, 1933) are "The Lure of the City," pp. 53-77 and "The Urban World," pp. 78-120.

Some studies on urbanization and American cities predate Schlesinger’s volume, but they are generally impressionistic and lack an analytical framework. However, a very perceptive treatment of urbanization as a complex and an interrelated process is Adna F. Weber, *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Macmillan, 1899).


19 Professor Charles N. Glaab's work is an invaluable guide to the literature of urban history. Extensive citations are available in his excellent bibliographic survey; see Glaab, *The Historian*, pp. 53-80.


21 Ibid., p. 5, provides a definition of these terms.

22 Ibid., especially pp. 18, 28-29, 31-33.

23 Ibid., especially pp. 246-266.

24 Ibid. Chapters 7 and 8 "Coping with the Urban Environment" and "The Neglect of Everyday Life," respectively, are valuable treatments of this theme. In Roy Lubove, *Twentieth Century Pittsburgh: Government, Business, and Environmental Change* (New York, London, Sydney, and Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969), the same problem is examined. Lubove shows in his study of Pittsburgh that even when urban reforms are initiated, business and professional class interests can often dominate the reform activities. Furthermore, the interests and goals of these groups often conflict with
those of neighborhood-centered, issue-oriented organizations.

25 Warner, The Urban Wilderness, p. 266.

26 Ibid., p. 276. With this final note, however, Bass fails his readers (or must write another book). What organizational strategies and governing structures are needed to bring about more "democratic" and pluralist national and regional planning? What of the pratfalls and the co-optive and erosive status quo political alignments and interests that prevent (or make extremely difficult) political participation by heretofore disenfranchised individuals and groups? Furthermore, are urban political and social systems by-products (dependent variables) of economic systems (independent variables), or, is the reverse to be assumed? Bass does not address these questions, and he provides us with no outline or plan of action.


28 Ibid.

29 Ibid., p. 492. In The Culture of Cities, Mumford foresaw and emphasized the city and its "regions" as being symbiotically linked and ultimately bound by interdependent relationships. This regional interpretation of urban areas represents an expansive physical and demographic unit of analysis and is an enlargement of the metropolitan focus for conceptualizing urban areas. Economies of scale, the economics of distribution and location, communication linkages, social and political alignments, and the impact of cultural dissemination figure into the study of this concept. Through broad-based regional planning efforts, posits Mumford, comes the impetus for social betterment in urban communities. See especially Chapter V "The Regional Framework of Civilization," and Chapter VI "The Politics of Regional Development."

30 Ibid., p. 473.

31 Ibid., p. 474.

32 Ibid., pp. 471-96. Paleotechnic and biotechnic, terms originally developed by Sir Patrick Geddes, teacher and mentor of Mumford, are used frequently by Mumford in The Culture of Cities. The paleotechnic economy was an iron and coal economy that was dominant between
1850-1890. The steam engine, steamship, railroad, Bessemer converter, and automatic devices in spinning and weaving were important inventions in this era. A biotechnic economy refers to an economy that embraces the application of the biological sciences to technology, and technology is oriented to enhance the culture of life. Preeminent in the biotechnic economy are the biological and social arts. See Lewis Mumford, *Technics and Civilization* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1934) for a more elaborate definition of these terms.


36 Ibid., pp. 476-477. Mumford, in *The Culture of Cities*, synthesizes a vast sweep of the extant knowledge regarding urbanization. He brilliantly weaves an interpretative account of past and emerging urban civilizations, develops concepts on the organic nature of urban settlement, and provides challenging, insightful proposals for directing human activities toward more socially-oriented urban cultures. Since publication of this eclectic work over thirty-five years ago, Mumford has expanded considerably his thinking about the processes of urbanization and urban culture. Refer, for example, to Lewis Mumford, *City Development: Studies in Disintegration and Renewal* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1961), and Lewis Mumford, *The Urban Prospect* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1968).

37 A concise and interesting account of the lives and educational philosophies of Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, especially as they relate to social reforms, is Merle Curti, *The Social Ideas of American Educators* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), Chapter III "Education and Social Reform: Horace Mann" and Chapter IV "Henry Barnard" (hereafter cited as Social Ideas). Also, see pp. 96-100, for an account of the abysmal slum housing and factory conditions of New York City, Boston, and other areas of the Northeast and the influence on American educators of Pestalozzi's and Fellenberg's humanitarian devotion to education as a means of remedying the conditions of the poor and disenfranchised.

(The South was noticeably slow in espousing universal schooling for both whites and blacks; in the
North, however, blacks faired little better, hardly being extended the same educational opportunities available to whites.)

38 Henry J. Perkinson, The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education 1865-1965 (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 62-88 (hereafter cited as The Imperfect Panacea). With the growth of cities came fears for the stability of society, and widespread efforts were undertaken to secure effective compulsory education laws. New York's compulsory education law, passed in 1874, was enforced initially only in New York City and Brooklyn; the first Maryland law was applied only to Baltimore and heavily populated Allegheny county, and Missouri school attendance regulations were applied to youth from eight to fourteen, but only in cities with a population over 500,000 (St. Louis obviously being the target in mind).

An early account of compulsory school attendance's relationship to urban employment is Forest C. Ensign, Compulsory School Attendance and Child Labor (Iowa City: Athens Press, 1921).


While George Counts and John Dewey differed over the capacity of public schools to affect social change (Dewey was somewhat less inclined than Counts to emphasize the schools' potential political clout), they both shared a profound concern for the hapless conditions of millions of new urban residents rendered socially and culturally isolated, economically exploited, and politically
disenfranchised or manipulated because of their class, ethnic, or racial status. Still, education's importance in ameliorating these conditions was stressed by both men; the disagreement was more over emphasis. Refer to George S. Counts, *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* (New York: The John Day Co., 1932) and John Dewey, *The School and Society*, revised edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945).


45 Katz, *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools*, especially Chapter II.

School officialdom's adaptation of business practices and techniques to schools' operation (e.g., planning separate from performance), is described perceptively in Raymond E. Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962). Callahan views this activity as a ploy by educators to gain respectability and stature in a society increasingly dominated by business and industrial interests, but he stops short of suggesting, as does Katz, that this action was consciously used by educators as a means for social control.

46 In particular, Spring's *Education and the Corporate State* turns on the assumption that schools operate in a capitalist society at the behest of economic entrepreneurs and their social and political counterparts.

Greer is at his best in *The Great School Legend* describing how the sorting and selecting out process within schools creates a maligned educational meritocracy by insidiously using tracking and testing to slot students into curricula and programs along social and racial class
lines. This exclusionary device initially channeled immigrants into dead-end, class confirming educational programs, and, more recently, it has been used to perpetuate the inferior educational position of blacks, poor whites, and Spanish-surnamed Americans in contemporary society.

47 A less "conspiratorial" view of the motives and policies behind the development of urban public school systems is Carl M. Kaestle, The Evolution of an Urban Public School System: New York City, 1750-1850 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973) (cited hereafter as New York City). While Kaestle states that the creation of New York City's public school system "...was an institutional response to the threat of social fragmentation arising from population growth, poverty, and immigration...," he maintains that the primary emphasis or intent of the public school system was not for purposes of social control over the increasingly large ethnic and non-Protestant populations residing in New York City (p. viii-ix).


49 Ibid., pp. 381-382.

50 Ibid., p. 381.

51 Ibid., especially Part III "Struggle to Defend Instructional Services from Political Exploitation," pp. 193-300.

52 Ibid., pp. 383-384. Groups within Chicago's educational establishment also have had successes changing school policies. The old Chicago Teachers Federation (now the Chicago Teachers Union) recognized that the city's political machinery could be used for promoting their self-interest. By solidifying their ranks, backing supportive political candidates and slates, and entering into coalitions with labor and citizen groups, Chicago's teachers have become a viable and influential force in school and city politics. See Chapter V "The Teachers Take Aim Against a Sea of Troubles," pp. 93-111 and Chapter XIII "A Citizens Committee and a Teachers Union Oppose the Board," pp. 233-257.
CHAPTER III
METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS, POLITICS,
AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

Introduction. Chapter II concluded with a review of the development of public education during periods of intense urbanization in the United States. The inter-relationship and functioning of political, social, and economic variables was credited with substantially influencing the operation and policies of urban public schools.

This pervasively critical theme extends into this chapter, especially as it relates to the impact of political activities on public school affairs. Initially, though, four theories are introduced that inquire into the nature of metropolitan problems. These theories, drawn primarily from research studies in political science and sociology (anthropological, economic, and demographic studies are also utilized), set the context for an investigation into the politics of public education. The subsequent analysis, outlining the political processes affecting "who gets what, when, and how"\(^1\) from public education, and which shape the role and purpose of urban
schools, marks the major focus of this chapter. Attention is specifically directed to the political nature of the decentralization/community control issue confronting numerous urban school systems.

**Metropolitan Problems and their Causes: Four Classes of Theories.** Especially over the past decade there has emerged a substantial literature in the social sciences that focuses on the "urban crisis." Numerous studies from this literature document the physical decay and blighting of old central city areas, the flight of middle class residents to outlying suburban areas, the in-migration of the poor and minority groups to the cities, the racial and socio-economic segregation of metropolitan areas, and the eroding revenues and strained public services of many of the nation's older cities.

Meanwhile, various classes of theories have been advanced to explain the nature of urban problems. While these categories should not be considered either inclusive or mutually exclusive, the classifications are helpful for analytical purposes, particularly for directing our attention to the interrelationship of political, social, economic, and demographic variables to specific school-related problems: e.g., segregated school facilities, school/community conflict, as well as other pervasive urban problems—such as housing abandonment and neighborhood change—which, in turn, affect the
institutional life of schools. The four categories can be arranged as follows:

(1) Institutional Theories. The focus here is on the policies (or absence of policies) of both public and private institutions to explain urban problems. The policies of federal, state, and local governing bodies and jurisdictions as well as those of banks and other lending institutions, private corporations, and developers and entrepreneurs have been examined most extensively. Specific government policies— affecting real estate tax incentives, zoning restrictions, code enforcement, interstate highway development, F.H.A. and V.A. mortgage programs—are most often singled out for precipitating the residential and business decline in the central cities, promoting racial and social segregation in metropolitan areas, and insuring nearly exclusive middle-class access to suburban areas, whose rapid growth was enhanced initially by these same policies.

Policy decisions in the private sector— such as selective bank loans, withdrawal of mortgage credits and insurance, "red-lining," "steering," "block-busting," discriminatory employment practices and hiring procedures, and industrial relocation from core city areas to sites at the periphery of cities— are also blamed for hastening the demise of business and residential life in central city areas and creating isolated and highly concentrated
pockets of poverty and adverse social conditions in our metropolitan regions.  

(2) Racial Theories. Especially over the past twenty years, with the civil rights struggle and racial conflict and violence often centered in urban areas, a voluminous literature has developed that identifies racism as the deciding cause of cities' problems as well as a pernicious threat to the future stability of entire metropolitan regions. At both a personal and an institutional level, racism is credited with creating and perpetuating urban ghettos, reinforcing educational inequities, and denying employment opportunities to racial minorities. Domestic problems, slum housing conditions, disparities in public/social services, neighborhood change and abandonment, school violence, and the closing and relocation of cities' commercial and retail establishments are explained by racial theories.

This view gained legitimacy and received widespread public debate with the release some years back of the Kerner Commission Report and followed by the Urban Coalition's One Year Later. The insidious impact of racism on the future growth of metropolitan America was also starkly revealed in the population projections prepared by Hodge and Houser for the National Commission on Urban Problems when they indicated that by 1985
...three-fourths of all non-whites in metropolitan areas would still be residing in central cities and only a fourth in the suburbs. In contrast...seven-tenths of the whites would be residents of suburban rings...The projects vividly portray the geographic fulfillment of the fears expressed by the President's Commission on Civil Disorders—that American society is becoming an apartheid society. If the geographic separation of white and non-white population occurs as projected, America by 1985 would be well on the road towards a society characterized by racial stratification along social and economic lines as well as geographic separation.7

(3) Social Class Theories. Theories of this genre generally state that class differences (resulting in conflict and segregation) place an inevitable strain on community/neighborhood relationships and account for the problems of our cities and metropolitan areas. Income, education, occupation, life-style, residence, goal orientation, attitudes and values are the variables typically used to differentiate individuals and groups along class lines. Hostilities and distrust among urban residents, reputedly drawn along class lines, often involve differences over the priorities and issues facing urban areas; e.g., urban renewal projects, school desegregation proposals, law enforcement, educational programs, highway routes, and the location of public multi-family housing developments.8 And often these social class antagonisms are perpetuated by public policies that seem to reward one class or another and
do little to resolve the social class inequities of urban life.  

(4) Distribution of Power Theories. The geneses of urban problems increasingly are being explained in political terms. Some of these theories hold that, within the public domain, individual and group self-interests are protected by substantial access to and control over political decision-making processes. Without having political "input"—voter strength, appointment powers, access to politicians and the press, control over disbursement of public monies—individuals and groups cannot fully define and articulate their self-interest and then develop and implement policies that ensure social and economic benefits.

It follows that some groups in the metropolis (government bureaucrats, corporate business interests, labor unions, "the white middle class") have inordinate advantages in the political decision-making and are systematically and deliberately using public and private policies for their benefit while remaining indifferent to the needs of less influential groups residing within the metropolis. Furthermore, until these disenfranchised and powerless groups (blacks, Spanish-surnamed Americans, the aged, and poor urban dwellers, for example) gain access to and influence over urban political processes, they will continue to realize few social and economic
benefits. For them, this disparity in political clout inevitably means, among other things, high rates of unemployment, educational inequities, inadequate housing, and the absence of health care services—all of which are debilitating to the legitimate personal aspirations of these groups. 10

Two distinct schools of thought have shaped the "power" literature: the elitist and the pluralist schools. The elitist contend that "upper class" governing elites (perhaps a big-city mayor and his political machine, a group of business executives, a prominent and wealthy family) exercise hegemony over all the major political decisions of a community. Their "power elite" status enables them to control a disportionate amount of community resources and to use public and private institutions primarily for their benefit and self-interest. 11

In contrast, the pluralists school holds that there is no one governing elite that determines all the major political decisions of a community, but that the most influential and powerful community decision-makers vary according to the policies or issues in question (for example, those pertaining to public education, urban renewal, industrial development, zoning changes). A leader and power influence in one issue or policy area is not necessarily assumed to be prominent or influential in another or all other areas. Furthermore, these leaders
with political clout are not thought to come from a single, and homogeneous stratum of the community.  

None of the distribution of power theories envisions political systems as simply a set of bureaucratic and administrative procedures. Rather, the systems "potentially" function as an ongoing and dynamic competition among numerous political actors (political parties, government bureaucrats, community organizations) that ultimately determine the allocation of values and resources within urban political systems. Conflict among competing interests is a crucial (and inevitable) element of the urban political milieu.

To a large extent in these theories, interest coalitions and group cleavages can arise from either shared interests or problems, an unequal distribution of resources, discriminatory public and private policies, or thwarted personal/community aspirations. Social and economic remedies, if they are to be had, are gained through political organization and activity. This mobilization of "political clout" for specific ends--e.g., the election of favored politicians, advantageous government policies, institutional reforms--supposedly represents democratic traditions at their best. Unfortunately, in urban politics the inclusion of heretofore disenfranchised groups to positions of decision-making influence is not always easily accomplished.
Limitations of the Theories. The most obvious shortcoming of the four theories is their failure to include or specify numerous variables (geographic constraints, spatial properties, changing technologies, and urban design) that relate to and affect the social, political, economic, and cultural life of a metropolis. Furthermore, these same theories only incidentally inquire into the "political culture" of metropolitan areas, particularly the effect of "political culture" on the "open" or "closed" nature of urban political systems and citizens' perceptions of and attitudes toward political organizations and activities. Thus, the particularistic theories that explore these variables make a significant contribution to the general body of urban research. Without them, urban life seems less understandable and explainable.

Education and Politics: The Issues of School Decentralization/Community Control. Some of the issues, activities, and processes that form the political environment of schools require examination to understand their impact upon the institutional life of schools. The four general theories explicated above, despite their limitations, provide a valuable backdrop for this discussion, since they give us a variety of perspectives from which to examine the charge that schools are directly influenced by this environment and subsequently are often used to
reinforce or maintain racial and social class divisions and inequities in society.

Because the community control/decentralization controversy in public education so decisively turns on the issue of political control over the schools, it justifiably will be included in our discussions here. Meanwhile, we proceed under the assumption that the institutional life of schools (their very role and purpose) is substantially shaped and determined by the political activities and organization of those with a vested interest in the schools--students, teachers, community groups, and state legislatures.

Accompanying the fervor and debate over accountability in public education is the related controversy over restructuring large urban school systems. Very often decentralization of these school systems, and the subsequent extent of community participation in and/or control over school decision-making, is at the heart of the matter. This is especially the case in some central cities areas where minority group populations are increasingly articulate and insistent in their demands for incremental to sweeping changes in the operation and governance of the schools their children must attend. These voices often charge schools with channelling minority group children into curriculum, grade tracks, and school programs that demean or ignore their cultural
and racial heritage and which fail to teach their children basic learning skills.

Whether it is due to our cities' segregated housing patterns along racial and socio-economic lines, the discouraging progress toward integrated education (over twenty years have elapsed since the "separate-but-equal" doctrine was overturned by the Supreme Court in the landmark Brown vs. The Topeka, Kansas, Board of Education case), or a belief that the clients of schools should directly control educational policy, the decentralization advocates maintain that schools are most responsive to student and community needs when primary decision-making controls over the schools come from the communities the schools are designated to serve.¹⁹

Still, these community interests frequently meet opposition from central boards of education, teacher organizations, central office administrators, state legislatures, and departments of education. The conflict very directly threatens the self-interests of these parties, and it raises the question of who can best (or should) determine the values, priorities, and goals of schools. And central to this conflict are a number of highly charged questions involving public education's role and purpose in our society. Should schools attempt to assimilate diverse student populations into conforming and pre-arranged school curriculum and programs? Should
schools reflect the larger society's values and aspirations (whatever they are perceived to be) or those of an immediate community? Or both? Should public schools be expected to provide specified trained manpower needs for our society? What is the role of schools in the socialization and politicization of children? For what, and to whom, should schools and educators be held "accountable"? And if held "accountable," to what degree, using what criteria and measures of evaluation?

Because schools function as political sub-systems within a larger urban political environment, the decentralization/community control struggle is especially pertinent, since it reveals a network of political activities and processes that dramatically affect the allocation of values (social services, physical resources, public policies, decision-making controls) in urban schools. Initially, though, we must examine the political involvement of educators in big-city school systems in order to provide some perspective on the community control movement.

A History of Administrative Dominance. Over the past several decades large urban school systems have become increasingly bureaucratic, specialized according to functions, and greatly dependent upon educators' "professional expertise" in formulating school policies. Insular central office administrative staffs often have formulated the day-to-day operations and long-range plans of schools
without the active participation of the schools' students, teachers, and surrounding community. The school "professionals" have determined virtually all school-related decisions; e.g., new school sites, staff needs, curriculum choices, budget priorities, and discipline procedures.21 Traditionally, these school "professionals" have called attention to past episodes of gross political bungling in school-related matters (for example, politically expedient involvement in the hiring, firing, and promotion of school personnel, corrupt financial dealings) to stymie political as well as nonpartisan community involvement in school decision-making.22 Furthermore, individuals and groups wanting to exert decision-making influence in school-related matters, and not merely content with membership on advisory boards or attending the public sessions of boards of education, have been excluded from policy decisions through school officials' successful pitch that these interests lack the necessary expertise in and knowledge of school affairs to become part of the decision-making process.23 In short, the concept of public accountability and community involvement in public education has been noticeably lacking through the years in many of the nation's largest urban school systems. The development of hierarchial, bureaucratic structures for the administration of public school systems—and the often accompanying ideological rationales
of "professionalism" and education separate from politics—has, in effect, considerably isolated city schools from community scrutiny.

Big city boards of education, whether elected or appointed, have lost a large share of the influence and control they once held over school policy. Boards in more recent times have often relied almost exclusively upon the knowledge and expertise of these educationists and very often have rubber stamped the "politically safe" proposals and policies presented by superintendents and their subordinates. David Rogers, in his study of New York City's public school bureaucracy, refers to the school system there as a "...model of bureaucratic pathology..." He specifically charges the system's upper echelon bureaucrats with undermining desegregation efforts in the City, and at a time when courageous and farsighted leadership was most needed to deal with this explosive issue.

The Politicization of Teachers. While administrative dominance over educational policy has waned considerably throughout the country over the past several years, classroom teachers have begun to wield increasing influence in school affairs. Collective bargaining victories by teachers have encouraged this trend, and teacher unionization in general has greatly politicized public education.

The collective bargaining victory by New York City's United Federation of Teachers (UFT), an American
Federation of Teachers affiliate, after two strikes in two years, 1960-1962, stands as the major turning point for teachers in their struggle to gain political influence in school affairs. The UFT negotiators initially concentrated on gaining substantial salary increases for the Union membership as well as securing better working conditions and a binding grievance procedure that would protect teachers' job security and put an end to blatant teacher harassment by administrators and the board of education. But, today, the UFT goes beyond these basic concerns and is very much involved in curriculum matters, budget priorities, and school staffing needs. It vigorously defends its political involvement to protect teachers' self-interest, which it says will ultimately help to improve public education in New York City.

The impressive UFT victories, coupled with growing teacher dissatisfaction and militancy throughout the country, contributed significantly to the hefty gains in national AFT membership in the mid to late 1960's and early 1970's. AFT support climbed to one hundred and twelve thousand dues paying members in 1965 from the approximately sixty thousand members enrolled in 1960. In 1973, the Union claimed approximately four hundred thousand AFT-affiliated teachers.

Although the AFT is the bargaining agent for less than 15 per cent of the nation's public school teachers,
its heavily urban-based membership enables it to exert considerable political influence over school policies and other political issues affecting teacher self-interest in numerous large cities and predominately urban states. While representing teachers in New York City, the AFT is also the collective bargaining agent for teachers in Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Boston, New Orleans, Pittsburg, and St. Louis. Priorities and policies are now determined in union school systems with an eye toward teachers' political clout. Union sanctioned teachers' strikes and political organizing are indeed indigenous to the urban school scene. And political involvement is a national as well as state and local priority of the AFT.

The AFT's chief rival for power is the National Education Association (NEA), the nation's largest organized teacher group. It enrolls over a million and one-half of the country's approximately three million teachers. The NEA's position on collective bargaining and teacher political action strongly resembles the AFT's. For some years, however, the NEA publically abhorred the AFT's union affiliation and its collective bargaining approach to teacher-board negotiations. While the NEA still rejects the AFT's union association, it now approves "work stoppages" and sanctions strikes to arrive at collective bargaining agreements.
In part, the NEA's change in philosophy and tactics came about as a result of the AFT's contract successes for improved economic benefits and working conditions for teachers. The NEA obviously wanted to retain its old members and likewise appear attractive to new and/or unaffiliated teachers seeking membership in an organized teacher group. It also appears the NEA had reached the conclusion (arrived at sometime earlier by the AFT) that both teachers' self-interest and quality public school programs are most likely realized by greater teacher involvement in and influence over school affairs and educational issues.33

Although the general membership of the NEA is more white, suburban, and rural than the AFT's, it still legitimately can claim a big-city constituency and to be deeply involved with the problems and issues confronting urban education.34 Furthermore, as teachers' concerns and problems have become more similar in nature and the urban/suburban/rural and white/black distinctions have become more blurred, a national merger of the AFT and the NEA looms as a distant yet distinct possibility. Attacks on teacher tenure, faculty cutbacks and dismissals, frozen school budgets, and accountability and performance contracting proposals have all been instrumental in getting teachers to transcend many of their philosophical and organizational differences and to work together to
protect and expand teachers' economic gains, working conditions, and their role in school affairs. The potential political impact that a united national teachers' organization could have in determining educational priorities, teacher welfare, and overall political responsiveness to the schools is indeed awesome.35

Still, some discontented politicians and community groups contend that teachers' political activities are primarily self-serving (concerned too often with salary increases, fringe benefits, working conditions) and are not generally directed toward upgrading education in the public schools. Inner-city neighborhoods at times have stridently denounced teacher groups, along with school administrators and boards of education, for being hostile or openly opposed to their reform proposals for improving the educational programs available to their children.36

**New York City and Community Control.** Clearly, one of the most embattled teacher groups over the past decade has been New York City's UFT, Local #2.37 And no issue has so openly and bitterly divided the UFT and New York community groups as the "community control" (or more correctly, the **decentralization**) proposals and plans for the city's public schools.

The most celebrated and divisive of the UFT-community confrontations took place in the fall of 1968 in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville experimental community school
district of the City. It quickly became the precursor and the focus of a national debate over the issue of community control in urban public schools.\textsuperscript{38}

Three major items fueled the heated struggle in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district: 1) the insistent demands by predominately black and Puerto Rican neighborhood groups for "broadly defined" community controls over the schools their children were to attend 2) the UFT's determination to maintain its city-wide bargaining position, and 3) the inability of city officials to resolve the differences within the two positions while still retaining the central boards overall authority for school policy-making. The seemingly insurmountable differences between these two positions exasperated the conflict to the point of physical violence and, for the most part, negated any sort of workable compromise between the warring parties.\textsuperscript{39}

In 1969, the New York State Assembly (the only State governing body legally empowered to reorganize the New York City school system)\textsuperscript{40} drafted and approved legislation that was to ameliorate the volatile situation presented by the crisis in the New York City school system. The legislation unfortunately represented an uneasy compromise between the clamorous demands of neighborhood groups for extensive control over the schools and the UFT's rigid position to protect its city-wide bargaining power and
contractual agreements with the central board of education. 41

In short, the 1969 legislation (with several adjustments to it in 1971) is responsible for the presently aligned thirty-two "semi-autonomous" school districts in the five boroughs of New York City. Each district has a popularly elected governing board that controls a number of school expenditures—only, however, after the overall budget for the schools in a district has been adopted by the city's central board of education. According to the legislation, teachers are to be hired by the local boards, but teacher candidates are chosen from an approved qualifying list subject to the UFT-Central Board contractual agreements on inter-district transfers. Likewise, the local boards have some discretion in hiring administrative personnel (e.g., building principals), and they are empowered to recommend and implement a variety of curriculum changes within the elementary and junior high schools of a local district. No longer would all schools of the city's public school system be lock-stepped into a standard and inflexible curriculum drawn up by central office personnel. Additionally, the chief administrative officer of the New York public school system would be designated as the Chancellor and the position would be filled by the Central Board. 42
While the 1969 law strips the Central Board of some of its influence and authority over school affairs, it certainly does not grant far-reaching powers to the local districts. For example, the city's public high schools are not even covered under the decentralization sections of the 1969 law; they remain firmly under the control of the Central Board. Furthermore, the local boards are not allowed to deviate from state attendance provisions or state credentialling, licensing, and accrediting requirements. The local boards also must adhere to all UFT-Central Board contractual agreements. Finally, the Chancellor and the Central Board still plan and oversee a wide-range of policies and objectives for New York City's public school system. These, of course, are either initiated by or subject to the dictates of the State Board of Regents, legislative statutes, or judicial rulings. The local boards have hardly carved out a substantial power base within the New York City public school system as a result of the 1969 law.

Although the UFT publically supports the concept and reality of a decentralization law (it certainly lends its support to favored candidates for the local boards), the Union remains reserved in its enthusiasm for the local governing boards. Any proposals for granting additional powers to the thirty-two local boards, especially if they would strip the Union in any way of its city-wide bargaining
powers and its controls over teacher transfers, promotions, and supervision, have been vigorously resisted and lobbied against by the UFT.

It is precisely because community groups in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district attacked these very items of teacher control (and sought through political action and legislation to have them wrested from the Union) that the UFT strongly opposed many of the early draft proposals for decentralization and community controls within the New York City public school system. Simply put, the UFT's foremost concern has been, and is now, job security for its membership. And the decentralization/community control movement (with the subsequent attempts to dilute the city-wide bargaining rights of the Union) has been interpreted by the city's teachers as a direct threat to their job security.

As a result, the UFT has actively involved itself in the community elections, especially in efforts to defeat candidates that are openly hostile or indifferent to the Union and its interests. Pro-UFT candidates are strongly supported by the teachers in the local district election contests. This course of action has been crucial for the UFT, says Federation president Albert Shanker, because '...in the 1970's, bargaining is not enough to protect teacher interests; political action is the answer.' 45

... . . . . . . . . . .
Despite the enormous publicity focused on the New York City struggles, other urban centers such as Boston, Washington, D. C., Chicago, St. Louis, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Oakland have experienced similar unrest, and demands for school reforms in these cities have been nearly as intense as those in New York. While the shrill militant calls for community control have waned considerably over the past several years, big-city school systems too often remain largely unresponsive and disdainful of the constituents they are supposed to serve.

National attention centered on a number of federal government sponsored neighborhood-centered institutions and services during the years of Lyndon Johnson's presidency, especially the Model Cities demonstration projects. These projects went beyond mere involvement in the public schools to include neighborhood-based programs with police departments, public aid facilities, and health care services. Unfortunately, nearly all of these projects were dismantled or funding was sharply curtailed during the Nixon and Ford administrations. It remains to be seen if the Carter administration revives the Model Cities concept.

"Real" community control in our large cities over public institutions and services--especially schools--remains largely illusory. Even when there is the appearance of a high degree of involvement in school
matters, the more cynical view is that this represents little more than the "safety valve" approach to government-sponsored reform. A far cry from the exhorted call of "power to the people."  

Two Governance Models. While there is an uncertain future for the community control/decentralization movement in urban school systems, the subject still deserves special attention and study, since it directly focuses on most of the competing interests that make up the political environment of urban public school systems and which are instrumental in determining the objectives and priorities of these systems.

Some proponents of urban school reform think big city school systems can best serve children when there is genuine "community control" over specified units within the larger school system. That is, all of the schools within the boundaries of a particularly defined area of a city, be it delineated by racial, ethnic, historic, socio-economic, or purely geographical considerations, would be governed by the citizens (through their elected school officials) living within the prescribed area. All decisions, in effect, regarding overall school policy and priorities, and such items as financial appropriations and budgeting, hiring and firing of school personnel, curriculum changes, and student discipline procedures, would be made by these citizen representatives.
Community control advocates contend that city-wide boards of education, central office personnel, and the teachers' unions and associations--the parties presently dominating school affairs in large cities--would have to assume supportive, consultive, and advisory roles and relinquish much of their power to the community governing boards. These same advocates reject as dismal failures a number of other plans that have been suggested for upgrading the schools; e.g., compensatory educational programs, integration, model systems (showcase/experimental-type schools), and parallel or competing systems. 47

Another of the plans for urban school reform also calls for breaking big-city school systems into smaller administrative and governing units, and likewise encourages greater citizen participation and involvement in the schools, but it fails to grant actual community control over the schools within the decentralized units. While there still would be elected local boards, they would have primarily an advisory and monitoring status. However, these local boards could be influential in shaping school policies if they could show they enjoyed broad and enthusiastic community support.

According to this plan, for example, there would be joint committees of teachers, administrators, central board members, and community board members to work on curriculum priorities, academic programs and standards,
testing and evaluation plans, and student discipline procedures that would meet the varying needs of the numerous decentralized school districts. In a similar manner, representatives of these same groups would also review the local school districts' budget needs and make appropriate recommendations. Furthermore, they would serve on committees to screen applicants seeking positions in the local districts. These parties involved in school affairs supposedly would engage in "consensus-type" decision-making.

Although this plan for school reform entails a vigorous role for community boards, it does not, in fact, reshape the decision-making processes that determine school policies in most big-city systems. It is actually a status quo plan, since the local boards, by having merely an advisory or monitoring role in school affairs, still remain without the necessary statutory or institutionalized political powers that are crucial for translating local community concerns into school policy. While the community boards ostensibly have political clout within the school system because of their potential ability to rally community support, that capacity for political influence remains at best transitory, and, generally, merely illusory. Practically speaking, these local boards face the nearly impossible task of
keeping community support mobilized in their behalf on a day-to-day basis.49

In spite of advisory councils' limited political influence, their recommendations could, at times, be difficult for politicians and school personnel to ignore. If, for example, the central board of education and the school bureaucracy of a big-city system faced the (court ordered) task of having to redraw school district boundaries to meet federal desegregation guidelines, the feelings of the local advisory councils would most certainly have to be incorporated, to some degree, into the plan for compliance. Advisory councils could also generate enough community support to force school officials to rescind past decisions regarding curriculum priorities, textbook selection, grading and evaluation procedures, and student suspension and expulsion cases and, in turn, develop new approaches to these items.

Still, advisory councils' potential influence over school affairs remains limited, and many city and state power brokers are likely only to pay lip-service to their proposals. Their "advisory" status simply does not invest them with contractually binding grievance and arbitration rights in disputes arising over school issues. Thus their ability to affect school policies rests primarily upon their savvy in publicizing issues, events, and conditions within the schools and then rallying community
groups behind their positions on these matters. Advisory council's influence, therefore, will most likely be transitory and short-lived, since highly charged community backing is difficult to sustain on a long-term basis.50

The current political environment of urban school systems could be altered if autonomously governing decentralized school districts were ever set up. And this political realignment could lead to a long-range reordering of school policies and priorities, mainly because the most enduring "instruments of power"—statutory and judicial legitimacy—would be accorded the elected community boards under this plan. In other words, the community-elected boards would be legally empowered to make binding decisions affecting the schools they were entrusted to serve; a tool the advisory councils obviously lack.

If local governing boards assumed a wide range of controls over school affairs, they would upset the existing power structure of large school systems. These new voices would, in many cases, represent heretofore disenfranchised groups in the arena of school politics, and they would be likely to make uncomfortable demands on the schools. But the old voices—central office personnel, teachers organizations, and city-wide elected boards of education—are fighting for political self-preservation and appear wary of dealing with yet another group of interests at
negotiation sessions. Their intense lobbying efforts have played a major role in the defeat of strong community-control plans that have come before state legislatures for a vote. As the sage suggests: The more things change, the more things stay the same.

The Control Dilemma: Implications and Prospects.
The pressing issues now confronting urban public education cannot be easily separated from the political arena. The politicization of community organizations, teachers, student groups, administrative councils, and school boards demonstrates these parties' awareness that their respective interests and goals within the schools are related to, function within, and are subsumed by, the larger political framework and processes of city, state, and federal politics. Thus, in large measure, who gets what, when, and how from the school rests upon these parties' competition for scarce resources and favorable policies.51

The seemingly "local" school issues generally have the greatest effect on state and federal policies toward education—primarily because these issues are actually shared by a great many school districts state- or nationwide, and they very often become the focus of a national debate. State and federal statutes have been passed and judicial ruling have been handed down, for example, in response to many "local" struggles over school funding
sources and formulas,\textsuperscript{52} busing,\textsuperscript{53} desegregation and integration plans,\textsuperscript{54} and curriculum priorities.\textsuperscript{55} Since these issues are quite frequently politically charged, elected public officials at the state and federal level certainly consider the political strengths and weaknesses of the competing interests to these issues before finally committing themselves to a course of action. While this approach to educational policy-making is at times short-sighted and self-serving, it is, of course, "the way things are done." Community-control advocates obviously understand this, and it is little wonder that they are clamoring for more than merely advisory status in school affairs. The struggle for control of urban public education has by no means been laid to rest.

**Summary.** The four classes of theories delineated earlier in this chapter serve as a context for generalizations on the political nature of urban schools and also provide a backdrop for a projection of the more effective role and purpose of urban public schools.

The four classes of theories: racial, social class, institutional, and distribution of power, can be valuable referents for most inquiries and studies into the present status of and long-range prospects for public education in metropolitan areas, because the processes and events indigenous to and surrounding the institutional life of
urban schools converge repeatedly with the basic assumptions undergirding these theories.

For example, the theories that identify racial problems as the cause of America's urban crisis are especially pertinent to any examination of what has happened, what is now happening, and what will happen in our big-city school systems and suburban counterparts. Too often the race issue, for more than a century an omnipresent factor in the life of American education, has been tragically ignored or avoided by educators and politicians alike. Fortunately, a spate of research over the past several decades into the "failures" of ghetto schools,56 desegregation and integration plans,57 and the racial isolation and inequities of public education,58 has focused sharply on the pervasive and invidious effects of racial prejudice in our public school systems. This research has indeed led to a national consciousness raising on the race issue.

But in the mid-1970's when the white-hot fires of ghetto tenements and the rage and despair of the poor are nearly forgotten, the race issue deserves no less attention and concern in any effort to improve the quality of public education in metropolitan areas. Whether it is the adoption of curricula and the selection of textbooks and supplemental materials, the screening and hiring of school personnel, or the relationship of
schools to the community, a strong regard for racial sensitivity is imperative in urban settings. Assuredly, the future of urban schools is directly related to the extent this nation demonstrates resolve and dispatch in eliminating social, economic, and political inequities that are racially motivated.

The legacy of gross and deliberate racial injustices is difficult to correct and put to rest. Only in 1954 did the United States Supreme Court reverse its shameful "separate-but-equal doctrine" that both legitimized and perpetuated racial isolation and inequality in public education. Unfortunately, our major cities, today, are as segregated and divided as they were over twenty years ago, and the gap between affluent suburbs and impoverished inner-city residents has not been appreciably closed. When educators fail to address the race issue in their studies and proposals for urban education, they deplorably ignore one of the most salient and volatile issues confronting American society and public education.

The social class theories also raise perplexing questions regarding the role and purpose of our schools. Will our schools, for example, reinforce class prejudices and biases through their curricula, staff selection, and treatment of students, or will they consciously and actively seek ways to eliminate class distinctions in the schools? These theories suggest policy alternatives,
curriculum changes, and school/community programs that could be constructive in alleviating class prejudices in our schools.

Also, the theories that conceptualize urban problems as institutional in nature should likewise figure heavily in any discussion of public education in urban America. These theories point up the weaknesses of rigid and bureaucraticized public institutions, especially big-city school systems. They remind us that these school systems, as presently organized and administered, are mainly perpetuating the political and economic self-interest of existing power groups within the schools. Teachers, administrative personnel, and central boards of education are faulted for being locked into traditional practices and methods that fail to meet the urgent and pressing demands now being made on the schools. Thus our public schools stand indictable for lacking the necessary institutional flexibility and resolve to handle the problems they face daily in urban settings. Imaginative, streamlined, and service-oriented public schools must replace the lethargic and self-interest oriented institutions that we have currently.

The community control movement can, of course, be justifiably viewed as a direct challenge to the institutional status quo in public education. And while this is but one approach for making schools more
responsive to their constituents, the community control movement has particular appeal to disenfranchised and powerless inner-city neighborhoods that have never practiced control and influence over public institutions. In a similar vein, however, vouchers and performance contracts have been suggested as reform measures to open up the insular and protective bureaucracies that control public education. In spite of the obvious differences in these three plans, they all attack the "closedness" of the schools and attempt to insure quality education for the children attending the schools.

The politics of education has been adequately documented in this study. Who gets what, when, and how, in and from the schools, does not occur through happenstance or by accident. The distribution of power theories, therefore, are especially applicable to studies that purport to examine the operation and function of schools. They suggest various power relationships and coalitions that affect and determine how schools are run. People concerned with schools--with their curricula, classroom activities, and instructional methods and strategies--cannot ignore the crucial role that politics play in setting priorities and establishing policies for public education.

There is no doubt but that the ever-increasing politicization of public education beholds an uncertain
future for the public schools in society. The often referred to roles, purposes, and outcomes of public education are being scrutinized, debated, and challenged by individuals and groups with a strong interest in the schools. These parties pose many perplexing questions for public education; among them, is the socialization of children toward a prescribed, national, racial, ethnic, or religious mold a legitimate or ethical undertaking for the schools; should children's cognitive and intellectual development be the primary concern of the schools; should academic standards be directed toward personal, community, state, or national levels?

The rapid and extensive urbanization of this country—especially the phenomena of metropolitanism—has left the American people with a number of hard choices to make about their school—and their nation's—future. The political struggles that are so strikingly evident in the controversies over busing, neighborhood schools, freedom of choice plans, and metropolitan school districts reflect the glaring lack of unanimity as to the choice(s) to be made. However, it is in these struggles that unrelenting and intimidating political power seem to carry the day.

It is hardly overstating the case that public education in metropolitan areas faces unsettled times, especially as the following and rather probable conditions and events shape up in America's metropolitan centers:
1) the majority of old central cities eventually become politically controlled by blacks and other minorities; 2) suburban politicians (now with more representatives in the U. S. Congress and some state legislatures than the old central cities) use their newly gained political strength to control government agencies—such as H.E.W. and H.U.D.—pass legislation, and set appropriations that short change and ignore the critical needs of the central cities and their schools; 3) the teaching, supervisory, and administrative personnel in inner-city schools become nearly all-black or exclusively drawn from minority populations, and the suburban educational systems attract predominately white staffs; 4) there is a merger of the AFT and NEA; 5) teacher groups, through their political strength, gain control of the credentialing and certification standards and requirements of their profession; 6) students and parents organize—even union-ize—and demand that the schools teach prescribed courses, skills, and values; 7) funding for public education change dramatically from the local personal property tax base to primarily state and federal support sources—and with attending stringent qualifications and controls; and 8) metropolitan and inter-district school mergers and reorganization plans gain acceptance and sanction in the courts.
There is no evidence that political advocacy and militancy are going to disappear from the public education scene. The general level of awareness and sophistication among individuals and groups seeking changes and reforms in public education (and the society in general) has far surpassed what might be termed a "timidity" or "innocence" stage. The parties struggling for control and influence over public education are not in a patient mood. Lessons of history reveal that success in gaining control and influence over decision-making processes, the allocation of societal values, and the securing of those things individuals and groups perceive to be in their self-interest, comes primarily to those who are organized, can successfully use established political mechanisms for influence and reform (e.g., lobbying, working for the election of favored candidates, initiating law suits), view conflict (e.g., strikes, boycotts, demonstrations, propaganda, violence) as not only legitimate but necessary, and are willing, having once gained political advantages and clout, to fight tenaciously to maintain their gains.  

In Chapter IV, the Metropolitan St. Louis Area becomes a case study to bring further focus to this work. A profile of public education in the city of St. Louis and St. Louis County is broadly sketched and then placed
within a context of the prevailing demographic, political, social, and economic variables that exist in this metropolitan region. How these variables affect the racial and socio-economic composition and funding levels of schools in the city of St. Louis and St. Louis County is examined.
See Harold Lasswell, Politics: Who Gets What, When, How (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1958). Among Lasswell's many interests in politics is his concern for the "consumers' benefits" from and evaluation of government/institutional policies and activities as well as the self-interest orientation of politics. We hold a similar concern in this examination of education in the metropolis, especially as it keys on various client groups' support for and opposition to schools' policies.

The graduate seminars in urban politics of Professor Dennis Judd, Washington University, St. Louis, have been helpful in the conceptualization of this section of the study.


An earlier study, now a social science classic, that foresaw racism as the central domestic problem in America, is Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma, 2 Vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944). Also, see T. J. Woofter, Jr., Negro Problems in Cities (Garden City: Doubleday and Doran, 1928).


Charles A. Valentine, Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1968) (cited hereafter as Culture and Poverty) markedly illustrates this point. In his criticism of government policies designed to reduce societal inequality, Valentine contends that these efforts have aimed at changing the 'culture of poverty' rather than changing the conditions of being poor. He doubts that there is a 'culture of poverty' that primarily perpetuates socio-economic inequality, and he believes that as long as policies "...focus on changing the supposed customs and values of the poor--rather than an altering the economic and political structure of the nation--it will have little effect on poverty." pp. 155-156.


A third possibility worth investigating, according to Murray S. Stedman, Jr., is that power in a particular urban area could "...reside in territorially organized neighborhood groups." Murray S. Stedman, Jr., Urban Politics (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1972), pp. 193-196.

13 The nature of the conflict, of course, can be viewed as legitimate or illegitimate, depending on the perceptions and disposition of the parties involved. Conflict may simply mean a testily fought aldermanic or mayoral election contest, or it could entail violence and protest behavior. See Peter K. Eisinger, "The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities," American Political Science Review, Vol. 67, No. 1 (March 1973), pp. 11-28, for an analysis of this latter form of conflict.

14 For example, as new groups have sought access to positions of decision-making influence in some urban school districts, they have met stern resistance from already entrenched school groups with a near monopoly over school affairs. (This struggle is documented more thoroughly in the next section of this chapter.)


17 Daniel J. Elazer, Cities of the Prairie: The Metropolitan Frontier and American Politics (New York: Basic Books, 1970), and Scott Greer, Metropolitics: A
Considerable controversy exists, of course, over the assumptions and premises regarding the effects and influences of schools. Recent debate has centered over the premise that the quality of schooling one receives is related to potential economic earnings and the alleviation of societal inequities. In this regard, see Christopher Jencks et al., *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1972), and "On Inequality: A Discussion of Christopher Jencks' Book," AFT-Quest Consortium Yearbook 1973 (Washington, D. C.: American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, 1973), pp. 63-89.

Differences of opinion have always existed over the role and purpose of public education, especially in the urban centers (as noted in Chapter II, pp. 16-29). Jefferson, Mann, and Dewey stressed the connection between schools and viable democratic societies—the necessity of schools educating to insure an enlightened citizenry. No mention by them of education's importance for increased earnings and job success. Meanwhile, the current career/vocational emphasis in our schools seems to place great importance on schools' relationship to the job market and the attending matter of economic success in the society.

Community control advocates have ideas about the proper role and purpose of schools in their communities; among them: to insure mastery of basic academic skills, to encourage racial and ethnic pride and understanding, and to impart skills for economic and political survival. The point worth noting here, however, is not the merits of these ideas, but rather the charge that the present governance structure of numerous urban school systems serves as an obstacle to their realization.


in the Metropolis (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970).


Gittell and Hollander contend that the educational "professionals" have argued with public interests that they are best qualified to make school policy. The ideological rationale of professionalism has been used in the effort to legitimize the vested interests of school "professionals." These schools officials have claimed the schools to be above politics and charge political interference when politicized community interests and public officials criticize the schools or attempt to involve themselves in educational policy decisions (Six Urban School Districts, pp. 196-197).

For a vivid account of political involvement and exploitation in school affairs, see Herrick, The Chicago Schools, pp. 163-176 and 209-302.

In many of the first schools in the U. S., the power to establish, control, and manage these institutions rested with lay committees. These committees raised revenues, hired and fired teachers, decided on textbooks and school programs, and examined pupils.

However, as the American society became increasingly more complex and schooling became free, public, and compulsory, these school boards or committees and school superintendents and their subordinates began to battle for control over policy decisions in public education. While not winning the battle completely, superintendents and their administrative staffs grabbed a substantial amount of power and influence from the school boards or lay committees and have dominated school policy throughout much of the twentieth century. See Frank W. Lutz and Joseph J. Azzarelli, eds., Struggle for Power in Education (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966).
Superintendents and administrative personnel gained increased controls over educational decision-making as school systems became increasingly bureaucratic. A thoroughly documented account of the bureaucratization of a large urban school system is Kaestle, New York City, Chapter Six, "The Systematization of Schooling," pp. 159-184. His analysis traces the development of the hierarchial structure of the bureaucracy and the standardization of school programs.

There are noteworthy exceptions to this charge. For a number of years, for example, Donald L. Schafly, as president of the board of education in St. Louis, was very much in charge, establishing educational priorities and determining school policies. The board was hardly a rubber stamp for administrators. Still, the St. Louis board of education under the behest of Schafly, cannot be cited for encouraging community voices in school affairs. On this point, see Gittell and Hollander, Six Urban School Districts, pp. 157-160. Refer also to "School Board Lobby Criticized As Fight To Retain Status Quo," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 1, 1972, pp. 1 and 48.

Rogers, 110 Livingston Street, especially Chapter Eight, "The Professional Bureaucracy," pp. 266-323.

Ibid., p. 322.


Also, see Agreement Between the Board of Education of the City School District of the City of New York and United Federation of Teachers Local 2, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO (effective Sept. 9, 1972-Sept. 9, 1975).


At the 1974 Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT) State Convention, Robert M. Healey, IFT President and AFT national Vice-president, proclaimed that the IFT and AFT were "...chiefly concerned with the issues of governance, organization, and political activity." See Illinois Federation of Teachers Convention, "President's Report," Belleville, Ill., March 29-31, 1974, p. 1. (Mimeographed).


34. The NEA represents teachers in Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Denver, Indianapolis, and Columbus, Ohio.

35. State and local mergers between the AFT and the NEA already have occurred in New York State, Florida, Los Angeles, and New Orleans. A proposed national merger of the two organizations was aborted in early 1974 as the NEA ostensibly broke off talks claiming that the AFT was adamant in its position to require all teachers to be AFL-CIO affiliated. This point supposedly remains the major obstacle to merger. See Larry Sibelman, "Merger--the inevitable is inevitable," American Teacher, Vol. 58, No. 8 (April, 1974), pp. 4 and 5, for an account of the prospects and potential for teachers through a merger of the AFT and the NEA.


37. Rogers, 110 Livingston Street, pp. 192-201, substantiates this contention.


Ibid., pp. 119-122.


A plan put forward in 1971 by the State Board of Regents that would have created the post of a New York City Education Commissioner (appointed by the Mayor) to replace and assume the duties of the then interim Central Board of Education and the School Chancellor, met with stern opposition from parent and community groups. An overriding complaint of this plan was that it would vest too much control over school affairs in the hands of one person. See Leonard Buder, "Regents Urge City Schools Be Put Under the Mayor," New York Times, October 30, 1971, p. 10E.

Some critics of the 1969 decentralization law claim that, even with the introduction of local governing boards, there has not been any significant redistribution of power in the city's public school system. In R. Sakolsky, "The Myth of Government-Sponsored..."
Revolution: A Case Study of Institutional Safety Valves," Education and Urban Society, Vol. 5, No. 3 (May, 1973), pp. 321-344, for example, the author contends that the majority of the state legislators voting on the decentralization bill intended for the proposed local boards to function primarily to dilute community tensions and the demands for broad community controls over the schools—the boards, in effect, would serve as "safety valve" institutions. The legislators, however, only began stressing the local boards' "safety valve" function when they saw, to their surprise, that the Ocean Hill-Brownsville governing board "...originally conceived, designed, and slated to function as a safety-valve institution, did an about-face, reoriented itself, and began to become involved in 'realistic' conflict with the vested interest groups. It ceased to play its assigned role as a safety-valve institution and sought instead to engineer a redistribution of power in educational decision-making," p. 339.

44 Albert Shanker, "Tuesday's Crucial School Board Elections," New York Times, April 29, 1973, p. 11E. Shanker, President of the UFT and the AFT, stresses that, since the 1969 decentralization law went into effect, voter turnout for the local board elections has been disappointingly low. He charges, furthermore, that, in some of the decentralized districts, the local boards have turned the schools into "...arenas of political extremism, racism, and patronage." However, Shanker also acknowledges that "...some of those who sit on community school boards earnestly want to help children..."


that can resist dictation from the laity. Increasingly, it is national power which will determine the direction of the educational system, not community control." p. 356.


Cronin's argument is simply that an enlarged state role in the affairs of big-city school systems is a more appropriate response to their problems than creating, within large school systems, a multitude of local boards having broadly defined powers over the schools in their area.

Barbaro reasons that community control over school affairs in large cities, especially with sizable minority populations, may become an unnecessary strategy, since numerous big cities are becoming more and more black-controlled; and the schools, many times a subunit of the larger political system of the city itself, will not confront the wall of indifference they now face in cities still controlled politically by whites.

The community control argument is forcefully presented in Charles V. Hamilton, "Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 38, No. 4 (Fall, 1968), pp. 669-684. Hamilton states that community control would not be used just to improve the effectiveness of schools, but that it would become a force for introducing new models of education that stress new educational priorities, such as Afro-American culture.

Also see Nicolaus Mills, "Community Schools: Irish, Italians, and Jews," Society, Vol. 11, No. 3 (March/April, 1974), pp. 76-84. Mills says that recent demands for community control, especially by black and Puerto Rican parents, should not be viewed as new and unreasonable claims but rather as an extension of similar but earlier claims voiced by other urban minorities.


Supportive of this conclusion is Dale Mann, Political Representation and Urban School Advisory Councils," Teachers College Record, Vol. 75, No. 3
Mann concludes that advisory councils (or, for that matter, elected community boards with only advisory "powers"), have no status as a continuing political force in the decision-making processes that determine school policy.

49 See James S. Coleman, Community Conflict (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957). Coleman asserts that, even when there is a very transient population within a given area, the feeling or sense of community can and often does emerge, especially in a crisis situation—a bond of commonality or mutual interest develops in a direct response to a shared concern or perceived threat. Usually, however, after the immediacy of the crisis incident or situation is past, the sense or feeling of community disappears.


Both the NEA and the AFT have called for increased parent and student involvement in school affairs. The AFT says this involvement could be contractually guaranteed through collective bargaining. Refer to "Accountability and 'accountability,'" American Teacher, Vol. 55, No. 5 (January, 1971), p. 30.


What is held to be "quality education" is, quite naturally, a matter of personal judgment. Acquisition of reading, writing, and computation skills, however, is generally thought to be "basic" to any quality education program. The public schools, of course, are entrusted with the task of imparting these skills to children. Still, it is in these basic areas of learning that schools often are charged with failure.

See William A. Gamson, "Violence and Political Power: The Meek Don't Make It.," Psychology Today, Vol. 8, No. 2 (July, 1974), pp. 35-42. Gamson studied fifty-three challenging groups agitating for social change within the American system and arrived at success outcomes for the groups—success being defined by two summary measures, 1) whether established power holders came to accept the group as a valid representative of legitimate interests, 2) whether the group gained new advantages for its constituents and beneficiaries and accomplished its goals.

The American Federation of Teachers, examined from 1916-1937, was among the fifty-three groups studied, and it was, according to Gamson, fully successful under both measures.
CHAPTER IV

THE METROPOLITAN ST. LOUIS AREA:
A PROFILE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION AND URBAN PROCESSES

Introduction. Public education in metropolitan St. Louis, as in all the major urban centers of the United States, represents a study of perplexing contrasts. For example, within the St. Louis region there are solidly financed school districts, claiming impressive educational successes and academic excellence, nearby to heavily debt-ridden districts beset by high student dropout rates and depressingly low academic standards. Likewise, public schools in the St. Louis area tend to have either a nearly all-white or all-black student enrollment; there are only a few "stable," integrated schools in the area.

Furthermore, school-related items such as faculty recruitment and hiring practices, the range and nature of educational programs, and the discipline and security measures employed by school officials, also vary considerably between and within numerous of the school districts in metropolitan St. Louis. In sum, the problems faced, the priorities chosen, and the constituencies to be
served, are often significantly different among the many St. Louis area public schools.

This chapter examines some of these differences (particularly in schools' racial and social class makeup and funding levels) and relates them to an array of political, economic, social, and demographic forces that affect the life of schools in metropolitan St. Louis. Such forces very often appear to be beyond the immediate control or jurisdiction of public school officials.

Physical and demographic characteristics of the St. Louis region, such as its housing patterns, history of racial segregation, employment opportunities, and selected urban renewal and development programs, are specifically studied because of their political and economic relationships to and social implications for the area's public schools.

A Profile of the St. Louis Metropolitan Region. The St. Louis metropolitan region is the eleventh largest SMSA in the United States. In 1970, nearly 2.4 million people lived in the area that encompasses the city of St. Louis and eight outlying counties on both sides of the Mississippi River: St. Louis, St. Charles, Franklin, and Jefferson in Missouri and St. Clair, Madison, Monroe, and Clinton in Illinois. Well over one-half of the region's population reside in the city of St. Louis.
(approximately 622,000) and St. Louis County (approximately 952,000). 

But the city of St. Louis, for years the preeminent leader of the metropolitan area, has suffered substantial population losses since 1950. Between 1950 and 1960 St. Louis ranked first among the nation's largest cities in lost population, approximately 107,000 in number. Meanwhile, in the same decade, the county's population rose dramatically, from 406,000 in 1950 to 703,532 in 1960. This heavy movement of people out of the City, and the subsequent in-migration to the County, continued unabated throughout the 1960's and the trend continues into the 1970's. (See Tables I and II, Appendix A).

The majority of people leaving the City since 1950 have been white residents. However, the city's black population has steadily increased during the years between 1950-1970. Presently, blacks make up nearly 41 per cent of the city population. This figure contrasts sharply with St. Louis's 1950 census figures when only approximately 18 per cent of the city's population of 856,796 was black. (See Table II, Appendix A) In St. Louis County, blacks still account for only a light percentage of the current total population. (See Table II, Appendix A)

Population losses in the City had really begun in the 1930-40 period, as St. Louis's population dropped from 821,960 in 1930 to 816,048 in 1940. Still, the
city's black population grew over 15 per cent, to 108,765, during this same decade.² (Also see Tables I and II, Appendix A) City population losses were reversed temporarily in the 1940's when thousands of migrants came to St. Louis seeking employment in war-time industries.

The urban to suburban population shift and the accompanying change in the racial composition of the city of St. Louis, closely resemble the in- and out-migration trends and racial patterns that developed in other Middle Western and Eastern metropolitan areas toward the close of World War II. New York, Chicago, and Detroit are among those aging American cities over the past twenty-five to thirty years to have lost thousands of white residents to the outlying suburban areas. Their numbers have been replaced, in large measure, by blacks or other minority groups generally much less affluent and educated than the whites departing from the city.

Moreover, these same cities share with St. Louis a wide range of problems often labeled as the "urban crisis" or the "crisis of the central cities"; e.g., physical deterioration, the break-up of traditionally close-knit neighborhoods, diminishing tax bases and revenue sources, housing and building abandonment, high unemployment, an increasingly poor and minority group population needing expensive social services, and an embattled and debt-ridden public school system. These older American cities
that once could claim the majority of this country's urban population, and which were the nation's hub of industrial and commercial activity, have lost, to varying degrees, their central and preeminent position in urban America as the country's metropolitan areas have become more decentralized, sprawling, and suburban.\(^3\)

The gradual shift and dispersal of retail, commercial, and industrial activities to the suburbs in metropolitan St. Louis has also weakened the city's status and influence within the SMSA. In the 1960-1970 period, the city of St. Louis suffered a 15 per cent decline in employment while the number of available jobs nearly doubled in the surrounding county/suburban areas. Thus the city's share of jobs in the SMSA shrank from 61 per cent to 43 per cent during this period.\(^4\)

The overall demise of the City and the increased vitality of the suburbs became strikingly apparent in the latter half of the 1960's as St. Louis's earnings increased only in the government and service sectors. In all other areas of the city's economy, there was a marked decline. Even within the service sector, city employment gains were less than those registered in the suburban ring.\(^5\)

A number of factors that are decidedly advantageous to the suburbs have largely created this situation, and they continue to make the economic prospects very attractive for many suburban areas. First, large,
readily available, and sparsely population tracts of land in the suburban ring compare more favorably than St. Louis's dense and congested boundaries as new sites for the development of industrial parks and mixed commercial/retail shopping areas. Second, most potential suburban development sites are removed from high crime areas (now synonymous with many city locations, regardless of the accuracy to the assertion) and are closer to the region's most affluent markets and consumers. Third, suburban business and industrial locations (as opposed to many city sites) are generally closer to the residences of the best trained and most highly educated people in the metropolitan area.\(^6\)

Although the same factors and conditions that retard population and economic growth in the city of St. Louis exist in the older metropolitan areas in the United States, St. Louis's shrinking population and economic difficulties are generally more severe than they are for most large American cities. Especially telling of St. Louis's lost vitality has been the staggering rate of housing and building abandonment within various sections of the City, particularly on its near north side. Even a substantial number of the recently constructed houses in the Montgomery-Hyde Park neighborhoods of the near north side (through the St. Louis Model Cities Program) have already been abandoned and returned to federal ownership.\(^7\)
City-wide there are approximately 2,200 vacant and vandalized buildings, given St. Louis the dubious distinction of being one of America's most abandoned cities.  

Chronic unemployment for many St. Louisans further underscores the city's woes. In 1967, the St. Louis central city had the highest annual unemployment rate for blacks of all the fourteen largest poverty areas in the entire United States. In 1970, total black unemployment stood at nearly 10 per cent in the central city, while metropolitan-wide unemployment for whites was just around 4 per cent. Today, with nation-wide unemployment greatly increased, particularly in the inner-city, St. Louis is even more strapped than many of its urban counterparts.

Other indices further reveal the city's economic plight and the extremely disadvantaged condition of many of its residents. For example, of the 149,755 families residing in St. Louis in 1970, 21,492, or 14.4 per cent of them, had 1969 incomes that were below the federal government's low-income (poverty) level. This meant 122,827 persons in the City (which includes those from the poverty-level families as well as unrelated individuals) were considered to be below the government's low-income level. Of this number, 77,743, or 63.3 per cent, were black. Moreover, persons below the low-income level represented 20.1 per cent of all persons living in the
City, as compared to just 10.9 per cent for the St. Louis SMSA as a whole. ¹⁰

Furthermore, the median income of black families living in St. Louis in 1969 was only $6,528. Yet, for all families living in the City in the same year, it was $8,173. This figure represented only 68 per cent of the median income of all families in the entire St. Louis SMSA. But in 1959 this figure accounted for approximately 79 per cent of the total SMSA family income. ¹¹

Meanwhile, the number of relatively high-income families in the City has declined sharply in recent years. Around 11 per cent of the families living in the City in 1959 had incomes double the city's median income. But by 1969, only 4 per cent had such incomes. Predictably then, between 1959 and 1969, the proportion of low-income families increased nearly 5 per cent in St. Louis. ¹²

Moreover, approximately sixty-one thousand persons in St. Louis received Aid to Dependent Children in 1970. But in the more populous and affluent County, only around five thousand persons were getting such aid. ¹³ In the same year, nearly fourteen thousand city residents were receiving Old Age Assistance, but in St. Louis County the number was less than four thousand. ¹⁴

Also starkly revealing of the festering human conditions in St. Louis is the city's high infant mortality rate; twenty-seven deaths per one thousand live births.
By comparison, the rate of infant deaths in St. Louis County is sixteen per one thousand live births.\textsuperscript{15}

And generally the overall quality of residential dwellings in St. Louis is poor. Of the City's nearly 238,650 housing units, over fifty-nine thousand are considered as "sub-standard." In the County, though, sub-standard housing units are considerably fewer; approximately 18,700 of the County's 291,650 housing units are listed as sub-standard dwellings.\textsuperscript{16}

As one might anticipate from the foregoing picture of St. Louis, the level of educational attainment for most city residents is relatively low. Of the city's population twenty-five years old and over, 46 per cent have a grade school education or less and just over 33 per cent are high school graduates. Less than 12 per cent have ever been to college. However, for the entire SMSA only approximately 37 per cent of the population has a grade school education or less, while 48 per cent are high school graduates, and nearly 19 per cent have completed one or more years of college—obviously a large majority of the area's college graduates live in St. Louis County. The median number of school years completed by persons twenty-five years old or over in the City is 9.6 years, as compared to 11.7 years for the SMSA as a whole.\textsuperscript{17}
Meanwhile, St. Louis' resident population grows increasingly older, being decidedly older than the resident population of the SMSA as a whole. Almost 15 per cent of the city's population in 1970 was sixty-five years or over, while for the region only around 10 per cent of the population was sixty-five years or older. Median age for city residents was 31.9 years and 28.5 years for the SMSA. 18

For a sizable number of St. Louisans, the general quality of life available to them in the City is indeed abysmal; limited incomes, sub-standard housing, few job opportunities, and a gloomy picture for anything much better, perpetuate a hand-to-mouth existence within a grim setting of physical blight and decay. By comparison, however, the majority of St. Louis County residents enjoy a standard of living superior to that of a large segment of the city's population. Whether city-to-county individual/family incomes, housing conditions, levels of education, health and mortality statistics, rate of employment, or business and industrial growth are compared, the majority of county residents fare much better in real and potential benefits and opportunities than their city counterparts.

By no means, though, should the image of the St. Louis metropolitan area be one simply of county affluence and city squalor. Such an outlook is a gross oversimplification
and a crude stereotype, and it too readily embraces an anti-city attitude that invites writhing forecasts of the city's impending doom as well as ill-tempered and disdainful comments that "St. Louis is not worth saving."

While the city of St. Louis does face an array of severe problems and has only limited resources at hand to solve them, there are numerous projects and developments planned or already underway within various parts of the City that belie the gloomy forecasts of the city's collapse. The city's downtown business area, for example, is presently undergoing somewhat of a building boom with over four hundred million dollars in new building construction near completion or already planned for the area. This surge follows an earlier wave of building and renewal in the 1960's (capped by The Jefferson Expansion Memorial with its soaring Gateway Arch) that dramatically helped reverse the stagnating and decaying conditions of the city's central business district. Spiraling banking and corporate headquarters, an expansive convention center, additional hotel and restaurant facilities, and an ambitious entertainment and tourist center, are among the prominent additions to St. Louis's downtown hub. Expected benefits from this revival are job opportunities for many St. Louis area residents and large infusions of "new" money (revenue) into the city's faltering economy.
The city's Board of Aldermen has also approved two large redevelopment plans for the city's central west end. One is a nine-year forty-three million dollars project initiated by Washington University and centered around its medical school complex. Approximately 1,500 new housing units, expanded retail and commercial districts, and extensive rehabilitation of existing residential structures are prominent features of the redevelopment plan.20

The other plan, which covers an area known as Maryland Plaza, and which is adjacent to the Washington University Redevelopment Plan, is the creation of former St. Louis mayor Alfonso J. Cervantes. The plan's design calls for providing the already exclusive but fading Maryland Plaza shopping district with a greater diversity of retail trade and shopping allurements to attract more local shoppers as well as tourists to the area. Among the many features included in the design are plans for rehabilitating apartments in the Fairmont Hotel, which stands squarely within the project area. This project will hopefully upgrade even further the residential attractiveness of the immediate area.21

Other projects throughout the City seem to demonstrate that St. Louis can reverse its downward spiral. These projects show, assert St. Louis loyalists, that the City has a potential for new markets and a strong economic base,
and that its leadership has the foresight and determination to provide the best in amenities and public services for its citizens. Furthermore, these projects supposedly show the city's commitment to save already viable neighborhoods and its concern for drawing people back to the City.  

Meanwhile, contrasting evidence abounds to refute the superficial image of "carefree" living in St. Louis County. Some of the county's older and/or inner-most suburban communities (e.g., University City, Maplewood, Webster Groves, Wellston, Normandy, Kirkwood) presently face blighted and deteriorating conditions and, in some cases, property abandonment. Numerous other county neighborhoods also have undergone dramatic changes over the past several years as sizable numbers of white residents have left these neighborhoods only to be replaced primarily by incoming black families.

Because of poor planning and development schemes in St. Louis County, as well as a burgeoning crime rate, traffic congestion, financially troubled school systems, and racially changing neighborhoods, many county residents and public officials now face problems and dilemmas that in the past would have been considered as inner-city or exclusively "urban" worries. Many St. Louis County residents now realize that the geographical boundaries of
the city of St. Louis are not the end point of community problems, blight, decay, and deterioration.\textsuperscript{24} Perhaps, in part, because the county's problems are mounting, and they are now very often synonymous with those of the City, there recently has been greater city/county cooperation and region-wide metropolitan planning. There is seemingly less acrimony, isolation, and rivalry among the two major political and economic forces of the Region. The political and business leadership in both the City and the County has finally arrived at the inescapable conclusion that the St. Louis area's survival and future growth rests heavily upon the success of the member communities in pooling their resources and talents into cooperative ventures (rather than in competition) that will attract new businesses, industry, and commercial developments.\textsuperscript{25}

Public Education and Racial Segregation in Metropolitan St. Louis. Public schools in the City and the County have been directly affected by the patterns of residential and business development (or abandonment) that have occurred throughout the metropolitan St. Louis area. The schools, through their student populations and the neighborhoods and communities they serve, mirror the demographic and socio-economic profile of the entire St. Louis region. The political, social, and economic forces that have largely shaped the residential patterns of St. Louis and
St. Louis County have indeed left their impact upon the current status and condition of public education in the area. Most telling is the influence these forces have had in creating and perpetuating the area's racially segregated schools plus the vast funding inequities that exist among many of the school districts of the Region. In the City, for example, (according to 1972-1973 figures) over 72 per cent of the public schools had student populations that were 95 per cent or more of one race. Just nine of the 170 public schools were integrated at a ratio that reflected the over-all number of black and white students in the city's public schools. Only three of the city's high schools and six elementary schools had a racial mix that was within 10 per cent of the black-white ratio for the city school district as a whole. (Generally, reference is made to the city's white south side and black north side.)

The manner of assigning teachers to the city's schools also perpetuates the racial isolation and separateness so characteristic of public education in St. Louis. Approximately 54 per cent of the city public school teachers are black, but only nineteen schools have faculties that are integrated to within 10 per cent of the racial mix for teachers as a whole in the city's schools.
Moreover, some critics charge that school officials and the city's board of education are attempting to maintain a dual school system in St. Louis through their use of site selection practices for new school building construction. New school facilities, they contend, are very often built in overcrowded and predominately all-white or all-black areas of the City instead of following a policy of busing any overflow of students at one school to an under-utilized school in another section of the City (that very often would be serving students primarily of another race). By not adopting this policy the Board has missed an opportunity to save the school district valuable funds as well as a rare chance to promote greater integration within the city's schools.\textsuperscript{28}

The school district's busing exchange program merely underscores the low priority given to the desegregation of the city's public schools. Of the twenty-one exchanges between schools in 1972-1973, eleven were from black schools to black schools, two from white to white schools, four from black to integrated schools, and four from black to white schools. None involved white to integrated or white to black school exchanges. Hardly a start toward even limited integration of the city's schools.\textsuperscript{29}

In response to integrationists' criticisms in the past, numerous school officials and board members have
contended that if policies were adopted to make each of the city's schools reflect the system's overall racial mix (within 10 per cent), "white flight" from the City would only accelerate, and unnecessarily jeopardize the stability of the traditionally close-knit and stable neighborhoods still left in the City. These same school officials and board members consistently stress that the highly segregated housing patterns in the City are the real cause of racially segregated schools. And because this situation exists and is largely beyond their power to correct, only limited measures can be used by them to promote school integration and to overcome the isolating effects of segregated living patterns. They also contend that there is very little community interest in integrating the schools. They say this as they remind critics that over one-half of the school district's administrators are black, and, for a number of years, there has been black representation on the city's board of education.  

Racial segregation, of course, prevails also in the suburban school districts of St. Louis County and mainly because of the County's highly segregated residential patterns. Most suburban school districts have almost exclusively all-black or all-white enrollments. In the school districts with a minority residential population, a pattern generally persists for the schools within the district (especially at the elementary level) to have
either a predominately black or white student enrollment. This situation reflects the segregated housing patterns within the districts as well as the districts' adherence to a neighborhood school policy. \(^31\)

In February of 1973, a number of county districts with "racially imbalanced" schools were ordered by United States District Judge John H. Pratt to submit desegregation plans to the Civil Rights Office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Maplewood/Richmond Heights, Kirkwood, Berkeley, Webster Groves, University City, Normandy, and Ritenour school districts were all involved in the court-ordered action that defined "racial disproportion" as a 20 per cent deviation in any one school from a district's overall racial percentages. Districts with schools racially imbalanced because of discriminatory action would have to be desegregated, or they would face losing federal funds, according to the court order. \(^32\)

The origins of segregation in each of these districts are not entirely similar and thus the responses and counter-arguments to the court order have been, and will continue to be, varied from district to district. For instance, in the Maplewood/Richmond Heights school district (where up to 1954 a separate all-black system was maintained within the regular school district), prior discriminatory action is easy to document. School
officials there realize this predicament and face the prospect of busing students and/or closing and merging schools to achieve integration in those schools deemed "racially disproportionate" by the court order.  

However, for University City (which never had a dual system for blacks), the desegregation order might not be applicable. It is very possible that University City school officials will contend, in response to the court order, that housing patterns alone have determined the racial composition of the district's schools—not prior discrimination or the gerrymandering of school boundaries to get distinctly black and white schools—and that residential patterns are essentially out of their control. 

Enrollment in the University City school district in 1974 was well over 60 per cent black. Four of its eight elementary schools were more than 85 per cent black and three ranged from 40-55 per cent black. One school, Flynn Park, was only about 10 per cent black. Under Judge Pratt's definition of racially imbalanced schools, five of the district's elementary schools are racially imbalanced—Flynn Park and the four schools with black enrollments of over 85 per cent: Daniel Boone, Nathaniel Hawthorne, University Forest, and Pershing. Still, the University City schools could escape reorganization
since evidence of "prior discrimination" seems to be the court order's focus in determining if desegregation is required.

**Three District Merger.** Perhaps the most publicized and controversial desegregation case in St. Louis County involves three north county school districts: Ferguson-Florissant, Berkeley, and Kinloch.\(^{36}\) In this case, and separate from Judge Pratt's ruling, United States District Court Judge James H. Meredith ordered on January 9, 1975, a consolidation of the three school systems into one large district having a combined student population of around twenty-three thousand. Under the Judge's order, Kinloch, a poor and nearly all-black school district, would be annexed into the larger, more affluent, and predominately white Ferguson-Florissant school district, as would be the Berkeley school district, with a black student population of approximately 40 per cent.\(^{37}\)

Opposition to the court order has been intense, particularly from the Ferguson-Florissant and Berkeley communities. Racial fears and anxieties in these communities have especially heightened resistance to the three-district merger. Some residents and organizations in these two communities contend that a merger with the Kinloch schools will mean sacrificing the quality of education in the new district's schools and also bring unneeded racial unrest to the schools and surrounding
community, particularly at those schools designated to receive bused Kinloch students. "White flight" from the Berkeley and Ferguson-Florissant areas would also be very likely, fear some of the merger opponents, particularly in Berkeley, which already is approaching a 50 per cent black population and which is precariously close to "tipping" to a predominately black community.38

Berkeley residents likewise have been critical of the plan, because they contend their relatively low assessed tax rate would be substantially raised under the revised tax rate that Judge Meredith has established for the new district. Meanwhile, the Ferguson-Florissant opposition claims that their school district should not be included in the desegregation order in the first place, since they are not responsible for creating the segregation and racial isolation in the Kinloch school district.39

Kinloch citizens also have expressed caution and dismay over various aspects of the planned merger. They contend that Kinloch students would bear the brunt of the busing required by the merger (busing out of and not into Kinloch would be the general rule under the court order), and that the Kinloch community would lose citizen controls over their schools. In fact, the new district's court established six-member board of education would be controlled by Ferguson-Florissant's designated four members; the Berkeley and Kinloch communities would have only one
member each. Judge Meredith noted in his remarks that, because the Ferguson-Florissant school district had the burden of planning for the merger, it therefore should have a clear working majority on the board. Furthermore, these same citizens feel that Kinloch's faculty and staff would be significantly reduced by the merger and relegated in influence and authority in the newly created district. 40

At this writing, there is no final resolution or disposition of the merger dispute. It seems doubtful, therefore, that the merger could be implemented in time for the opening of the 1975-1976 school year. On one hand, exhaustive and time consuming court appeals have just begun (quite possibly they could drag on through the summer of 1975) and, on the other, school officials need time for meticulous planning if the merger is to be a success. 41 Still, this case is highly significant for the St. Louis area, since, for the first time in the Region, education issues and school problems are being defined and resolved by the courts through a multi-district approach. 42 It is most probably a portend of things to come.

While numerous suburban school systems in metropolitan St. Louis are presently faced with the task of desegregating their schools, others obviously are not. Too few blacks or other minority populations live within and around the boundaries of some suburban St. Louis
County school districts to make racial imbalance and racial percentages within these districts a meaningful issue. For example, the unincorporated residential areas and incorporated suburban communities that fall within two of the county's largest school districts, Lindberg and Parkway, are almost exclusively all-white. The Lindberg schools, serving a large stretch of suburbia directly south of the City, and the Parkway schools, which draw their students from the western most regions of St. Louis County, are 98.9 per cent and 98.4 per cent white, respectively. Except for the remote possibility of a merged city-county school district, that would entail extensive busing to achieve integrated schools throughout the metropolitan area, it is highly unlikely that the educators, parents, and children of nearly all-white school districts like Lindberg and Parkway will have to deal personally with the desegregation issue, at least for a very long time. A number of factors are in part responsible for creating this situation (the racial exclusiveness of neighborhoods), and they are the focus of our next section.

**Tools of Segregation.** The racial and socio-economic profile of the St. Louis County schools is greatly affected by factors external to the schools' day-to-day operation. These factors significantly influence the place of residence of all people moving into and within the County,
but they are especially critical for blacks in determining the housing and schooling choices available to them within the County.

"Blockbusting" and "Steering." These practices have been very instrumental in determining St. Louis area residents' housing choices, and, as a consequence, the racial makeup of the region's schools. In years past, St. Louis area real estate dealers manipulated the area's housing market almost at will through these tactics. In fact, blockbusting and steering were used to such an extent that there was virtually a dual housing market in the County and the City, one for blacks and one for whites. One finds in St. Louis County (much like in the city of St. Louis) that boundaries have been informally fixed, neighborhoods earmarked, and locations targeted as the residential areas generally available to blacks and whites. There are, today, very few stable, racially mixed neighborhoods and communities in the County or the City.

Housing manipulation that is engineered through blockbusting and steering tactics basically involves real estate dealers in the insidious practice of instigating and then profiting from neighborhood change--white to black--and playing upon people's racial fears and anxieties to accomplish this end. This can be realized in the following manner. A prospective black home owner is looking for alternatives to overcrowded and blighted
inner-city housing. He or she eventually buys a house (usually above the market price) in a white neighborhood—slated "to go"—where the real estate dealer transacting the sale has holdings or listings. The real estate dealer then uses a number of ploys that hasten the process of "white flight." Among these are the selective placement of other black families in the neighborhood, the harassment of white residents in the area to sell their properties (at a price below market value) before "they take over," the posting of highly conspicuous for sale signs, and the steering of as many blacks as possible into the area to view homes that are for sale.

As aforementioned, whites generally leave these changing areas by selling to real estate companies at a substantial loss, while the entering blacks usually pay an above market price for their new housing. This one white-to-black transaction is a highly profitable setup for realtors, but the neighborhood's change from white to black does not always complete the lucrative process for the real estate speculator.

Unfortunately, the new black home owners have often been fraudulently and/or deceptively financed by or through the real estate interest they originally did business with. The "balloon note" tactic is frequently used. This involves deferring carrying charges, closing costs, points to the lender, and interest payments for the first
few mortgage installments and then have them all come due at once on a later monthly payment. The new home owner, perhaps unable to meet the unexpected "balloon" payment, would be forced to default. The real estate dealer would again own the property outright and then could initiate the same process again with another prospective black home owner.44

For years, political leaders in the County and the City have maintained a stony silence and hands-off policy toward these practices. Seldom have they spoken out against their abusive and discriminatory uses. Even now with "open housing" federally mandated, St. Louis area white political leaders are cautious about making specific remarks that might be interpreted as active support for open housing in neighborhoods and communities of the Region that systematically deny housing to blacks.45

Unfortunately, the end results of these practices are felt directly or indirectly by nearly everyone in the St. Louis area. Blockbusting and steering very often needlessly set in motion an inexorable process toward neighborhood deterioration, one that ultimately puts a drain on community-wide revenues and public services. These failed neighborhoods also take on disproportionate numbers of families dependent upon public support and greatly in need of high cost municipal services. Furthermore, these targeted neighborhoods and communities very
often lose the majority of their middle-class population and soon experience declining property values and an eroding tax base.

While a racially manipulated housing market can very often mean the demise of metropolitan neighborhoods, this fate is not always stoically accepted without a fight. Vocal and concerted citizen outrage and relentless public pressure aimed at exploitive real estate interests can very often be an effective tool for bringing an end to these unethical practices. Likewise, loophole free and strictly enforced anti-solicitation, steering, and housing ordinances—that prevent unscrupulous and speculative real estate companies from profiting off racially changing communities—can be highly effective curbs against these practices. Equally important are stiff occupancy permit requirements that require home and apartment owners keep their properties properly maintained before they can be rented or sold.

Citizen groups in racially changing areas are also beginning to fight the practice by banks and savings and loans associations of "redlining" their neighborhoods and communities. Redlining—the practice by banks and savings and loans associations of cutting off mortgage, home improvement, and business loans to credit-worthy neighborhoods—can mean disaster for most urban neighborhoods, since without the availability of conventional financing,
the self-fulfilling prophecy of deterioration and blight soon becomes reality. Community action groups are beginning to exert direct pressure on the banks and savings and loan associations that practice redlining. They are organizing neighborhood residents in the redlined areas to threaten these institutions with removal of their savings' deposits if they do not begin reinvesting and making loans in the neighborhoods where they live.

This assertive tactic, labelled "greenlining," calls for neighborhood residents to invest their savings only in banks and savings and loan associations that agree to reinvest in their neighborhoods. Specific dollar amounts for reinvestment are set on the basis of the ratio of savings to loans that a financial institution has in a specific community.  

The debasing and vile remarks that charge "the niggers have ruined the neighborhoods and the schools" are assertions of ignorance. This inflammatory rhetoric is ill-founded, self-serving, and ignores the real culprits of urban deterioration who quite knowingly profit from the calculated demise of neighborhoods through the process of racial change.

Neighborhood Deterioration and School Funding Inequities. The deterioration of neighborhoods and the subsequent decline in property values caused by real estate and lending institutions unscrupulous manipulation
of an area's housing market, are severely damaging to the financial health of some metropolitan St. Louis school districts, since in the state of Missouri, it is the local property assessment/valuation tax that provides schools with their major sources of revenue. The uses of redlining, steering, and blockbusting swiftly bring about declining property values, which soon show up in terms of fewer available dollars for the coffers of school district treasuries. Quality education programs usually suffer as a result. Black children in the city of St. Louis and St. Louis County are usually the first to be short-changed under such a funding arrangement, since it is their parents who have been forced to rent or buy in neighborhoods and communities with a poor housing stock and declining property values. 47

In other respects, Missouri's aid-to-education formula works a special hardship on the educational aspirations of the state's blacks and the poor in general, especially in St. Louis and Missouri's other metropolitan centers. Under the state's aid formula, a school district's size (based on average daily attendance, ada), and the effort and success of a district's taxpayers to win approval of school tax increases, are the two main factors used in computing the major portion of the state's contribution to school district budgets. However, in using the ada figures to determine the state's share to
local school districts, it is the school districts with disproportionate numbers of poor and disadvantaged youngsters (the St. Louis public schools now primarily serve these children) that are callously short-changed, since their students' absence and truancy rates are generally higher that those of the more affluent school systems in the suburbs and the rural areas of the state. 48

Furthermore, it has become extremely difficult to get St. Louis voters to approve school tax increases, since a sizable number of the city's residents are either aged and without children, are on welfare, have only a fixed or subsistence income, or, if they have children, they are sent to private or parochial schools. As a consequence, voters are reluctant to approve school tax increases that do not, in their view, directly benefit them or their children. 49

**Restrictive Land-Use Policies and Exclusionary Zoning.**

Restrictive land-use policies and exclusionary zoning regulations are also commonly used devices for segregating people along racial and class lines in the St. Louis area and in other metropolitan regions throughout the country. Just as redlining, blockbusting and steering affect schools' status and condition, these devices likewise significantly affect the type and quality of public education available to the neighborhoods and communities of a metropolitan region. Unfortunately,
black families and the poor in general are again the oppressed victims of these devices.

Basically these land-use policies and zoning regulations work hand-in-hand in the following manner. Most new suburban municipalities surrounding the older central city areas are being developed according to low-density land-use plans that call very often for high cost, large lot, single-family dwellings. These plans allow for very little construction of low to moderately priced single family units with small lot requirements. Above all, moderate, and low-cost multi-family dwellings are expressly excluded in these land-use plans and their related zoning requirements. The intended and subsequent effect of this type of land development is, of course, to prevent the less affluent minority families in central city areas (who very often are most anxious to leave blighted and deteriorated city neighborhoods) from finding housing choices in the suburbs. The planned exclusion of low- and moderately-priced housing units in the suburban ring has become one of the most insidious means of perpetuating racial and socio-economic segregation in urban America.

Rather than assisting the older core cities and aging inner-belt suburbs in the formidable task of housing and educating the poor, these affluent suburbs have, through their use of restrictive land-use policies and exclusionary zoning, turned disdainfully away from what
should be a shared metropolitan concern and responsibility. Even limited access for poor and minority group families to livable residential environments beyond the core cities is most difficult because of these land-use policies and zoning restrictions.

School choices, meanwhile, remain critically dependent upon a family's opportunities for housing choices. But it is strikingly evident what these housing "choices" are for the majority of the urban poor, especially poor blacks. They generally are locked into blighted city neighborhoods (often caused by redlining, blockbusting and steering tactics) with no prospect of ever buying into the high-cost suburban housing market that is perpetuated by restrictive, low-density land-use plans and exclusionary zoning ordinances. Thus an often chaotic big-city public school system is their only educational "choice."

Housing and school choices simply do not exist beyond the ghetto.

These exclusionary and restrictive housing development plans that have erected a wall around the nation's cities and prevent poor and minority group residents from living in developing suburban areas where education and job opportunities are often better, now face stern legal challenges in various sections of the Country. Class action suits have been initiated by numerous individuals who are frustrated by their unsuccessful
attempts to find housing within their means in suburban areas. They have made defendants of numerous suburban municipalities by linking these communities' restrictive and exclusionary housing plans to basic constitutional considerations; e.g., does a person's constitutional right to travel include freedom to choose one's community of residence; can municipalities' zoning and land-use practices constitutionally deny children equal educational opportunities; are minority workers' constitutional rights abrogated if they are denied access to the expanding suburban job market because of exclusionary land-use and zoning policies? (These same suburban communities provide high-income commuters with a market of expensive homes while relying on established transportation corridors for access to executive and professional jobs in the central cities.)

The National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing and the New Jersey branch of the American Civil Liberties Union have involved themselves in a legal suit raising these very constitutional issues. They represent minority group clients who have sued twenty-three suburban municipalities in Middlesex County, New Jersey, an area just outside of New York City. The plaintiffs (the Urban League of Greater New Brunswick and seven black, Spanish, and white individuals who are seeking available and affordable housing in suburban Middlesex)
have charged in their suit that they have been denied equal educational opportunities and access to job opportunities in Middlesex County because of the defendants' restrictive and exclusionary zoning and land-use practices. This important watershed litigation squarely attacks the constitutionality of these two overtly discriminatory practices that help to perpetuate racial concentration, school inequities, and unemployment in the central cities.  

While final disposition of this case is still pending, it is important to note here that the plaintiffs have taken a decisive step toward ending race and class biases in the suburbs.

**The Black Jack Case.** In St. Louis County a similar although not identical legal challenge to suburban zoning powers came to the courts for disposition. In June of 1971, the U. S. Justice Department filed a suit against the community of Black Jack—a nearly all-white north St. Louis County suburb—because of a zoning ordinance it had passed that banned construction of new apartments in Black Jack, especially the building of a federally subsidized townhouse apartment complex (Park View Heights); which was specifically designed for families with incomes from $5,500 to $10,000.  

The case, however, really has its beginning in 1970, when religious and community groups, primarily the Inter-Religious Center for Urban Affairs, sponsored the Park View
project. Black Jack, at the time, was an unincorporated section of north St. Louis County. It was not too long after the announcement of the intended project that Black Jack was hastily incorporated, and one of the first official acts of its newly formed municipal government was to enact a zoning ordinance banning new apartment developments. Advocates of the Park View Heights project immediately charged that the restrictive zoning ordinance was racially motivated, and they soon filed suit in Federal District Court challenging Black Jack's action. The Justice Department's suit followed in 1971 and, since that time, has overshadowed the earlier private suit filed by the Park View Heights sponsors. The Government's suit basically asked for the same legal remedy desired by the Park View sponsors—that Black Jack's ordinance barring construction of the new apartments be declared illegal.52

In December of 1974, a three-judge panel of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit declared Black Jack's ordinance banning apartment complexes to be discriminatory and invalid, and it ordered the case back to the U. S. District Court. The lower court was instructed to issue an injunction against enforcement of the ordinance. The lawsuit by the plaintiffs had earlier been dismissed by U. S. District Court Judge James H. Meredith who also heard the arguments to
the Ferguson-Florissant/Berkeley/Kinloch school desegregation and merger case.  

The Appeals Court judges found decisive evidence that the ordinance was racially motivated, and that it was but one of numerous tactics used to keep blacks confined to low-income housing in the city of St. Louis and to prevent racial and socio-economic integration of developing outlying suburban areas of St. Louis County. The judges noted that opposition to building the Park View Heights project was repeatedly expressed in racial terms by the people found to be leaders of the incorporation movement, by the individuals circulating petitions, and even by the zoning commissioners.

The Appeals Court judges took further exception with the central arguments of Black Jack's attorney. Black Jack's counsel contended that the zoning ordinance prohibiting the Park View Heights apartment complex was passed because a) it would prevent further traffic problems; b) it would prevent overcrowding in the school serving the apartment complex, and c) it would prevent real estate and property devaluation of nearby and adjacent single-family dwellings.

As to the traffic issue, the judges remarked that the City had not opposed construction of a large, nearby shopping center that meant a very heavy volume of traffic for the area. And in refuting the school overcrowding
issue, the judges relied on information from the St. Louis County Planning Department, which stated that the school district serving Black Jack had one child for every five families in apartments, but from each single family residence they had approximately three children. Moreover, the judges found no evidence that the schools serving Black Jack were already overcrowded. Finally, the judges relied on expert testimony presented in the lower court arguments to show that construction of the Park View Heights apartments would not be likely to cause real estate and property devaluation of the adjacent and nearby single-family dwellings.56

The Federal Government's Role. In spite of the Justice Department's active role in the Black Jack case, federal government policies very often have actually encouraged city-suburban, black-white polarization in metropolitan areas, and they have helped to perpetuate the economic, housing, and educational inequities suffered by many urban minorities. Just as zoning and land-use policies and redlining, steering, and blockbusting have been used to segregate our metropolitan areas, federal government policies have also been used for the same purpose. Some of these policies and actions by the Federal Government are briefly examined below.

Since the mid-1940's, the Federal Government's F.H.A. and V.A. financed housing programs have been used to
prevent black families from living in the suburbs. During this period, however, these government-subsidized home loan programs enabled thousands of white families to purchase moderately-priced suburban homes that otherwise would have been beyond their financial means. Quite simply, the programs were very often systematically denied to blacks and other minorities.

The massive federally-funded highway programs of the 1950's and the 1960's were also instrumental in maintaining racial and socio-economic segregation in metropolitan areas. They helped dramatically to facilitate the movement of jobs and housing away from the central cities and out to the suburbs. At the same time, these highways made it convenient and tolerable enough for white suburbanites to work in the city and enjoy its cultural amenities and still motor home to their insular outlying communities. Blame for the exclusionary racial housing patterns in suburbia obviously falls in part on these programs.

Meanwhile, during the post-war 1940's, the 1950's, and the early 1960's, the Federal Government allowed racial prejudices and economic privilege to determine almost exclusively who got what home, in what neighborhood, and who could secure mortgage financing from banks and other lending institutions. During these same years there was little if any federal monitoring of segregated housing patterns and discriminatory lending practices.
The practices of white real estate firms to prevent housing integration—such as steering and blockbusting, denying black real estate agents and brokers admission to white-controlled real estate boards, and of tightly controlling home and apartment listings—were likewise ignored by the Federal Government.

Generally speaking throughout the late 1940's, the 1950's, and the early 1960's, the home building industry made little effort on its own to market housing on a non-discriminatory basis, and it was not prodded to do so by the Federal Government. Moreover, corporate and business leaders were not required by Federal agencies or statutes to consider the impact that site location for new plants and offices would have toward increasing or decreasing the critically high minority unemployment rates in most central city areas.

Although the Federal Government has officially acknowledged the "urban crisis" since the mid-1960's—e.g., city-suburban polarization, vast economic inequities resulting from racial and social class prejudices, and the pernicious effects of housing segregation—it still falls far short in its commitment to our urban centers. Both the Department of Justice and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for example, have often been slow to enforce the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and
1968, particularly those sections specifically written to promote fair housing.

Likewise, Congress has yet to enact legislation creating metropolitan housing and community development agencies which could develop strategies for integrated housing in metropolitan areas and which could be empowered to override various local ordinances and regulations (such as large lot zoning ordinances, minimum square footage requirements, and building codes) which presently encourage housing segregation in the United States. Congress has not enacted imaginative legislation that would reward people wanting to live in racially and socio-economically mixed neighborhoods and who are willing to purchase homes in such areas. Property tax abatements, income tax deductions, and direct payments are inducements that Congress could approve to encourage residential integration.57

There is little indication, however, of a forthcoming congressional or executive office commitment to make the suburbs more accessible to racial minorities and the socio-economically disadvantaged. Although the Federal Government now uses affirmative hiring plans to get minorities into the home building and construction trades, especially to work on government-funded or-subsidized projects being built in suburban areas, there still is
only slight movement toward finding housing for minority residents in these same areas where the expanding job markets exist.

Still, private interests that seek to develop housing opportunities for minorities in the suburbs (such as the Inter-religious Center for Urban Affairs that sponsored the Park View Heights apartment complex project in Black Jack, Missouri) are using the state and federal courts to invalidate suburban municipalities' discriminatory zoning and housing practices. The outcome of the Black Jack case clearly established new legal precedent favoring the parties battling against restrictive and exclusionary residential patterns. A valuable tool for countering the "closedness" of suburbia has thus been provided by the courts.

But a highly visible commitment must be forthcoming from the President and the Congress to make open housing and integrated living patterns in suburbia a reality. For the nation's bicentennial celebration, there might well have been a natural time for politicians to show their determination to "open up" America to all Americans. The political risks, unfortunately, are obviously quite ominous for the local, state, and federal politicians who might dare "meddle" with the housing status quo that so decisively separates and isolates most Americans along racial and socio-economic lines.
The issues of race and poverty, inextricably a part of the housing dilemma, do not draw the media and governmental attention and concern that they so urgently deserve. Moreover, many of the civil rights-related programs and activities initiated during the 1960's, and which focused on these very issues, were later either curtailed or eliminated. It remains to be seen just how vigorously the Carter administration will push on such issues. Obviously, there will not be an overnight change in America's segregated living patterns regardless of which political party is in power in Washington.

**St. Louis Area Developments.** Housing segregation in metropolitan St. Louis works a heavy burden on the area's black residents and the poor in general. Blacks in the St. Louis region have seen time and time again how social prejudices and governmental policies have been used to contain them in segregated and isolated residential enclaves and to deny them access to and opportunities for improved job and educational status. While some of the barriers to open housing have been removed or are currently under attack (for example, steering and blockbusting practices), St. Louis area blacks, regardless of their income level, still confront imposing and discouraging obstacles when seeking improved housing opportunities.59

Gary Tobin shows that although the black population in the city of St. Louis has risen most dramatically since
World War II, the present day residential patterns had already become obvious by the beginning of the Civil War, were substantially formed by 1890, and were firmly entrenched by 1920. He also notes that over the past twenty years, ghetto formation and expansion has been most pronounced in the north, west, and central west sections of the City, and that the black movement out of the City has generally followed this northwestern residential corridor on into contiguous suburban communities. The suburbs within this northwest corridor (such as University City, Wellston, Berkeley, and Normandy) have absorbed the majority of black families finding suburban housing in the Region, while south suburban St. Louis County communities (such as Affton, Lemay, and Mehlville) have been virtually untouched by blacks' entry into suburbia.

Tobin further contends that the city's urban renewal projects and highway construction have worked significantly to contain the city's black population in residential enclaves. He cites the destruction and clearing of Mill Creek Valley (formerly a residential area for blacks that was immediately west of the city's central business district) and the building of Highway 40 through the Mill Creek area as plans used to "...obstruct Black movements to the south, leaving the northwesterly corridor as the only possible direction for expansion." Interstate
routes 55 and 44 (the latter sometimes referred to as St. Louis's own version of the Berlin Wall) are to the south of Highway 40, stretching east to west across the City, and they likewise serve as formidable barriers to black movement into south St. Louis and south St. Louis County. 63

The Disputed City Plan. In the neighborhoods of St. Louis's heavily black northside, residents are gravely concerned that local policies will destroy black neighborhoods and limit even more the housing choices available to black families. They point apprehensively to sections of a proposed comprehensive city plan for St. Louis (prepared by Team Four, Inc., a St. Louis-based consulting firm under contract to the City) that calls for the City to provide only "minimal" public services to rapidly changing areas of the City where blighting and decay are already in advanced stages. 64

By providing an area with only minimal services, as the plan's rationale goes, the targeted neighborhoods would "empty out" more quickly and be left to die a "natural death." Then, when the neighborhoods became vacated and abandoned, the City would buy the deteriorated properties and unused real estate and tie together large parcels of land for either public or private development; preferably private, though, since public funds for urban development are, today, in very short supply. Through
the city's use of tax abatement incentives and liberal zoning and redevelopment options, investors would hope­fully then take a chance on developing these abandoned city areas and, in the process, create new job opportuni­ties and much needed tax revenues for the city of St. Louis.65

The section of the City considered by most observers to be slated for only minimal public services is an area roughly bounded by Twentieth Street, Delmar and Natural Bridge and the city limits. Approximately 166,000 people, mostly black, live within this area.66

Leaders of St. Louis's black community, fearing a black sell-out, have mobilized politically to oppose the city's adoption of the Team Four, Inc., plan. Sensing institutionalization of a policy of intentional neglect to black neighborhoods (long thought by many blacks as already an informal or unwritten policy of the City), northside neighborhood associations and civil rights groups have joined together in condemning the plan. This coali­tion asserts that the Team Four, Inc., plan is but another of a long series of devices used to remove blacks, especially poor blacks, from areas that ultimately are to be used for the benefit of whites, particularly the white business community. Black leaders contend that if the plan is implemented many sound and stable northside neighborhoods will be callously sacrificed for exploitive
white interests, and St. Louis's black community will have precious little to gain, yet much to lose, from the plan.67

Because of the outcry from blacks and a recognition among white city politicians of their considerable political clout, the original Team Four, Inc., comprehensive city plan has undergone numerous revisions—most of them aimed at mollifying black criticisms of the plan. In the first draft, for example, the City was divided into three rather rigidly defined areas of classification: conservation, maintenance and improvement, and rehabilitation and reconstruction. According to the interpretation given this draft by some parties, city services would be curtailed in the rehabilitation and reconstruction areas until such time that the "abandonment process" was complete and the areas were suitable for and conducive to redevelopment.

Nearly all of this extensive northside area which is home for a majority of St. Louis's black population was first designated as a reconstruction and rehabilitation area. Under the revised plans, however, Team Four's maps and plans reflect the black criticism by recognizing and pointing to strong northside neighborhoods that need only maintenance and improvements. Supposedly these neighborhoods will not be included with the more obvious areas appropriately marked as suitable only for reconstruction. Still, the original plan's primary rationale— to provide
only minimal public services to rapidly deteriorating areas—has not been changed in the revised drafts, and it is highly unlikely that it will be scrapped in any future versions of a comprehensive city plan that would be adopted by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen.68

The Plan's Effect on Public Education in the City. The future of public education in north St. Louis is directly linked to the comprehensive city plans that are adopted by the city's political leaders. If, for example, the plans call for minimizing public services throughout the city's northside neighborhoods, then the expected acceleration of blight, decay, and abandonment in the area seems assured (even the area's presently "stable" neighborhoods would enter a stage of decline). Unfortunately, the area's most affluent and educated families would probably be the first to leave. Even now there is a substantial black middle-class exodus from north St. Louis neighborhoods. These families are mainly settling in the older, inner suburbs that rim the City on its northern and western boundaries. The grim results of this departure are likely to mean even less community support for northside public schools—something that these departing middle class residents so loyally and persistently gave the schools through the years.

If middle class out-migration from the northside becomes a stampede, the schools in the area are likely to
become the exclusive preserve of St. Louis's most deeply impoverished and hopeless residents, very often desperately in need of services and facilities that are far beyond the scope or means of the public schools to provide. All too soon, the schools become mere "holding pens" for the young.

And in an all too predictable pattern in the life of American cities, a number of developments are most likely to follow (they have, in fact, already begun to unfold in north St. Louis). One by one, schools would be closed as the neighborhoods served by the schools become vacated and eventually abandoned. The economically trapped residents--generally the last to leave an area, and often squeezed out of their residences only after eviction notices and condemnation orders have forced their removal--would be left to scramble for the scarce housing still available in the area.

The schools left open in the area would soon become overcrowded because of the consolidation of students. They would be hopelessly understaffed, in short supply of resources and supplies, and inadequately funded to handle the array of social, emotional, physical, and learning problems that many children would bring to the schools. Furthermore, these same schools would generally be without a solid core of neighborhoods and community support, since the neighborhoods of the area would be highly transient,
because of the economic and political forces at work to ensure their death. As a residential center for blacks in the city of St. Louis, the northside would eventually cease to exist.

Even if a comprehensive city plan for the City calls only for highly selective withdrawal of public services from northside neighborhoods, the public schools there would still seem to be obvious losers, and for basically the same reason that they would suffer under a plan that calls for widespread and indiscriminate withdrawal of public services: middle-class blacks would undoubtedly continue to desert the City for more desirable housing and improved educational opportunities in the northwest suburbs. It is highly doubtful that the majority of northside black families who enjoy financial mobility and have available housing choices beyond the city's northside would choose to stay in their old neighborhoods, especially with the inevitability of heavily blighted and abandoned properties closing in all about them. It would be of only slight comfort to them to have full use of public services if their neighborhoods were to become embattled enclaves, always surrounded by a hostile environment. Furthermore, it is not likely that the City would maintain these services very long (such as frequent bus service, high level police and fire protection, and strict code enforcement) for such a small and
isolated residential population. Instead, there would probably be a steady curtailment of public services to these now stable northside neighborhoods.

**Summary.** At the outset of this chapter and at various points throughout, references have been made to glaring differences that exist among St. Louis area school systems, and even among the various schools of a single school system. Some schools, we observed, are relatively affluent and have nearly all-white student populations while others are nearly all-black and are desperately poor. Still, some of the schools are all-white and broke, while a few are racially integrated and are quite capable of financing and implementing quality academic programs for their students.

The differences that exist among schools, especially with regard to their racial and socio-economic composition and funding levels, have hardly developed "by chance." The two preceding chapters emphasized political, economic, and demographic forces that have largely shaped and perpetuated these differences and are a major factor in determining the general quality of education available to the children of a given neighborhood or community within a metropolitan area.

The school problems facing educators and community leaders in metropolitan St. Louis, particularly related to and resulting from highly segregated school patterns
and wide disparities in funding levels, are equally common to the other large metropolitan regions of the Country. Nearly the same political, socio-economic, and demographic factors that shaped these problems in the St. Louis area are likewise responsible for the complex interplay of events and conditions that have created similar situations in Boston, Chicago, Louisville, Kansas City, and Detroit. The historical context and individuals involved vary from area to area, but the underlying causes of these school problems are almost always uniformly the same.

The priority and degree of urgency given to these problems by St. Louis area educators, politicians, and community leaders will figure significantly in deciding the area's overall health and prosperity. Metropolitan St. Louis will lose much needed infusions of new investment capital as well as new business and commercial interests if, for example, its public school systems have a reputation for public indifference and negligible community support.

Fortunately, in metropolitan St. Louis, there is an active, skilled, and well-organized group that studies and publicizes the state's and region's most pressing educational issues. The St. Louis-based Conference on Education (formerly known as the White House Conference on Education) has for 21 years informed parents, the educational community, federal and private funding
agencies, and the Missouri legislature on subjects as diverse as tax assessments for education, child care development, and school mergers. In spite of the Conference on Education's unique national stature—no other metropolitan region in the country has such a group preparing research on local educational problems—most of the communities of the St. Louis region remain indifferent if not hostile to most suggested metropolitan-wide approaches to educational problems. There should be parent initiated city/county delegations now meeting to assess the St. Louis region's educational strengths and weaknesses as well as working on co-operative and shared ventured among school districts. Agendas should be drawn up for approaching and solving the area's public school dilemmas, but not before alternatives are presented to the public for debate and scrutiny. There is very little evidence of activity in this regard.

There is no question but that city/county co-operation will be difficult to effect (even inter-district co-operation in the County presents serious problems), since a legacy of city/county enmity and rivalry and petty squabbling among the area's many suburban political jurisdictions and governmental units permeates the region's political scene. However, this highly balkanized area has come together on some occasions to resolve problems of regional significance; e.g., creation of a
metropolitan sewer district, levying of a metropolitan St. Louis zoo-museum tax, and the development of an area-wide mass public transportation system. The area's public school problems deserve no less attention. And in light of recent state and federal court decisions that define or interpret solutions to public school problems from a metropolitan or multi-district approach (e.g., the Louisville-Jefferson County court-ordered school district merger, the three-district merger in St. Louis County, and court suits on the order of Serrano v. Priest that attack school funding inequities), these cooperative exchanges seem inevitable anyway.

City/county delegations could be developing proposals and seeking public and legislative approval for new state-assisted and metropolitan-wide funding formulas that establish at least a minimum financial parity among the districts of the St. Louis area and which bring additional monies to those schools with the greatest financial needs (because, for example, of their students' special learning problems or abilities). These delegations could, with the assistance of community groups and school officials, also be working on inter-district and city/county transition plans and programs in the event of future court ordered mergers of schools or school districts. They could likewise bring together students, community groups, and school officials to plan for inter- and intra-district
sharing of community resources and personnel as well as search out foundation money and state and federal funds to underwrite metropolitan-based approaches to public education.

Since these delegations, as envisioned here, would be made up of student and community representatives, school personnel, political leaders, land-use experts, urban planners, business and labor leaders, lawyers, and university personnel, they have the potential to develop vanguard solutions to school-related problems. Land-use experts and demographers, for example, could assist school officials in selecting new school sites that are based on anticipated shifts or growth of the population in the Region. Likewise, architects and planners could help community groups and school officials design new schools or rehabilitate old school structures for a greater integration with, and a more solid relationship to, the neighborhoods and communities the schools are supposed to serve.

Clearly, St. Louis area leaders and citizens cannot continue to think that the region's educational inequities and racial and social-class problems can be ignored or avoided or that their lives will not be affected by these problems. School personnel, public officials, and citizens alike in the Ferguson-Florissant, Berkeley, and
Kinloch communities know all too well that these problems cannot be resisted.

We have repeatedly emphasized in this chapter the relationship between a family's housing choices (or lack thereof) and the quality of public education generally available to their children. St. Louis families that send their children to the city's public schools are acutely aware of the declining quality of education available to them. Because of overcrowded classrooms in some of the city's schools, severe budget restrictions, few school improvements, scarcity of resources and supplies, staff reductions (teachers, counselors, and social workers especially), elimination of numerous extra-curricular activities, cutbacks in school/community programs, and an ever growing and disproportionate number of poor and educationally disadvantaged youngsters entering the schools, the situation is critical for the St. Louis public school system. And there is little relief in sight.

Some of the suburban districts surrounding the City are likewise suffering from similar problems, although to a lesser degree, and are experiencing a period of public unwillingness, or inability, to support the schools' increased budget needs.

Unfortunately, whether it be in the city of St. Louis or in St. Louis County, it is the people living in the
poor and run-down neighborhoods of the Area that most often must contend with inadequate school facilities and poor educational programs. This relationship between neighborhood affluence and school quality is a difficult one to undo, since housing choices for the poor are more and more concentrated in deteriorated and blighted core city neighborhoods. Meanwhile, most of the suburban communities surrounding the core cities do not want housing built for the poor within their corporate limits. As a result, the poor, and especially the black poor (victims of both racial and class prejudice and discrimination), are very often prisoners of geography, forced to live within compressed inner-city neighborhoods where quality schools and educational programs simply do not exist.

The suburban communities surrounding St. Louis and other aging and debt-ridden central cities have a moral obligation to help house and educate our trapped urban poor. The cities cannot be expected to do these things alone. The suggested educational task force for metropolitan St. Louis should focus pointedly on the responsibility the area's suburbs have to the region's poorest residents.
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CHAPTER V
A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR METROPOLITAN
STUDIES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Introduction. A primary aim in this chapter is to generate a conceptual framework for metropolitan studies components in pre-service and in-service teacher education programs. Such a framework is made up of "conceptual referents" from the materials of the preceding four chapters. It serves as a foundational base for an array of study areas and research/policy inquiries dealing with educational problems in urban areas; functioning, thereby, as underpinnings for an interdisciplinary approach to studying a wide range of urban-related phenomena in teacher education.

The development of specific curricular modules based on this framework is beyond the scope of this investigation. However, prototypical examples that illustrate how certain of these referents might be incorporated into a particular phase or area of a teacher education program are included. This chapter, then, is in two parts: the first, a listing of the conceptual referents that constitute the framework; and second, a discussion of how they might function more fully in both pre-service and
in-service components of teacher education programs. Each referent is here stated as a warranted generalization based on the preceding analysis reported in Chapters II-IV.

**Major Conceptual Referents.**

1. Education policies and political action are interrelated.

2. Heightened awareness of relationships between schooling and politics involves affective as well as cognitive experiences.

3. An understanding of court actions in cases involving education is basic to insights into the problems and issues of public schools in metropolitan regions.

4. The politicization of public education involves differences over the role and purpose of public education in society.

5. Political decisions set in motion demographic changes which in turn affect the racial and social-class composition of schools.

6. Suburban land-use policies play a significant role in the continued segregation of poor and minority group children in central city schools.

7. Political decisions that encourage integrated residential patterns are essential before racial and social-class isolation in metropolitan school systems can be eliminated.
8. Children's attitudes and values toward schools and learning are affected by their political environment.

9. Teachers' classroom activities and approaches to education carry implicit and/or explicit political messages.

10. Children's socio-economic status and school experiences are interrelated and are largely politically determined.

11. The ideals of a "just" political society can and should be advanced through public education.

12. The success or failure of schools' academic programs and socializing experiences must be gauged in part by their efforts to promote the ideals of a "just" political society.

13. Improved public schools can be a vital force in community renewal efforts.

14. Successful educational planning depends on an understanding of the dynamics of community stability and disintegration.

15. Schools assume new functions and roles as the neighborhoods and communities they serve react and adapt to changing social and political conditions.

16. Community/school cooperation is a stabilizing force in urban neighborhood life.

17. Schools' academic priorities and educational responsibilities are shaped by the social and political values and expectations of the communities served.
18. The quality of life in urban regions is ultimately enhanced through metropolitan-based educational and community planning.

19. Citizen participation in public education can be encouraged through school curricula that integrates academic studies with community-oriented projects.

20. Community support for schools can be increased through an awareness of and sensitivity to the cultural values and socializing experiences of children and their parents.

**Politics and Education: The Enduring Linkage.**

Because politics play such a pivotal role in defining the nature, scope, organization, and priorities of public education in the United States, it seems particularly important that teachers-to-be and teachers in service study many of the relationships and connectives between public education and political processes. Unfortunately, this area has been generally ignored or only sketchily treated in most teacher education programs. While some schools of education have more recently devoted greater attention to the study of education and politics, it has been academics from other disciplines, notably political science, who have demonstrated this to be a legitimate and productive area of study. Cremin's 1978 AACTE lecture underscores this fact.
Besides the obvious influence of politics in determining school funding formulas and desegregation plans, political maneuvering and trade-offs likewise affect teachers' collective bargaining rights, the latitude teachers, parents, and students have in determining schools' policies, what freedoms and responsibilities are attached to teacher tenure laws, and a score of other school-related matters. School personnel, whether conscious of the fact or not, work in highly political environments.

But this absence of political education in teacher preparatory programs is not surprising, since teachers, historically, have exercised very little control over their own professional studies. However, the parties, which in the past influenced the nature of teachers' professional curricula (e.g., state legislatures, state departments of education, and N.C.A.T.E.), showed little enthusiasm for teachers studying politics and education. This stance clearly appears motivated by self-interest—preservation of the status quo.

Recently, though, both the AFT and the NEA have pushed, if gently, for a voice in the restructuring of teacher education programs and for controls over the certification and licensure of teachers. Both organizations have come to recognize that for teaching truly to be a profession, then teachers themselves must determine
who can enter the profession (based upon universal standards), what preparation and training are required for it, and what rules and standards of conduct and performance are to guide its membership. These two dominant teacher groups see that medical doctors, dentists, and lawyers enjoy these professional controls—gained through political organization and influence—and are determined that teacher be accorded similar checks on their profession.  

The AFT and NEA's drive for influence over the professional education of teachers could lead more teacher education programs to include studies of education and politics. The urban-based AFT seems the most likely of the two organizations to back such programs, since the group throughout its history has stressed political action and the vote as essential to teachers' fights for respectability and economic security.  However, it probably would be naive to assume that teachers would press for the broad-range studies into the politics of education that characterize those projected in this chapter. Their concerns would tend to be narrower and more self-interest motivated. Very likely, their primary interest would be in examining political activities and strategies that would help teachers secure self-serving programs and benefits in the present public school setting.

Yet, it is difficult to fault completely the AFT and the NEA for being drawn to such a focus in teacher
education programs. Teachers obviously feel under fire and threatened in the wake of proliferating teacher accountability schemes, staff cutbacks, budget retrenchment, and attacks on tenure laws. Teachers also face eroding public confidence in their ability to educate. More and more, it seems, they get a disproportionate share of the blame for the failures and shortcomings of our public school systems.

Also, arguments have been mounted against a general study of education and politics in teacher education programs. One such position asserts that students might be "overly politicized" by such a study. Yet another is that important, existing areas of teacher education might be slighted or dropped. Some critics simply contend that success in an urban classroom depends very little on a teacher's "political education."

Our proposed approach to studying politics and education in metropolitan areas is basically two-fold; on one hand, we identify and examine political processes, trends, and arrangements that are independent of (external to) the life of schools but which directly affect their operation, policies, and overall stature; and on the other, we examine the schools, themselves, as political sub-systems (subsumed by more encompassing state and national political systems and processes) having their own interest groups, decision-makers, and policy disputes.
The matter of "who gets what, when, and how" from the schools is important in this latter regard. Drawing relationships between politics beyond the schools and indigenous school politics is a natural outgrowth of this approach.

Individuals headed for teaching assignments in metropolitan regions (whether it be to an affluent suburb or an inner-city school) would benefit from this two-level approach, since it calls on them to consider the political interests and operations that influence the general educational climate and condition of schools throughout an entire urban area. Teachers-to-be would then come to their school positions knowing that the vast disparities in the scope and quality of schools' academic programs and the wide differences in their racial and socio-economic composition do not simply occur through happenstance or come about by chance. Instead, they would be cognizant of the political considerations that shaped these items.

For example, the study of metropolitan St. Louis, clearly demonstrates that the area's public schools are directly affected by politically inspired trade-offs and power grabs that determine where people can and will live in the Region. These trade-offs and power grabs materialize as restrictive zoning ordinances, redlining, racial steering, blockbusting, and discriminatory or
poorly enforced local, state, and federal housing policies. Moreover, it is also clear that these practices are allowed to continue to dictate where people live in the area, or they are terminated—depending, to a large degree, on the political savvy and muscle of those individuals and groups most adversely affected by these practices.\textsuperscript{6}

It is obvious that St. Louis area blacks suffer most under the yoke of these politically expedient and racially biased practices. No other group has been as restricted in its housing choices. However, as blacks' local political strength has increased (as well as their state and national political power and visibility), some of the obstacles limiting their housing choices have been removed.\textsuperscript{7} This crucial link between political power and institutional/societal change cannot be overstated. Groups that are powerless politically very often are confronted by governmental indifference and neglect.\textsuperscript{8}

Restrictive housing choices for St. Louis area blacks and for urban blacks in general have obviously meant limited educational choices for their children. Race, residence, and school are inextricably linked in urban America! A person's means and opportunity to live where he or she pleases largely determines the quality of public education available to them. And race and income, also closely linked, have been and continue to be the key
factors controlling for the "freedom"—or lack thereof—to live where one pleases. ⁹

To be white and affluent generally ensures choice, but to be black and poor means literally no choice. Naturally there is a large segment of the American population that fits neither of these categories. Millions of white Americans, for example, live at a subsistence level, while hundreds of thousands of black Americans are solidly middle class. Still, an individual who is white and poor often has more available housing and schooling choices than many urban blacks who are better off economically. Upward mobility, "making it in America," is still largely genetically determined. ¹⁰

Where people can or cannot live in urban America has become an emotional and highly politicized issue in many quarters over the past several years. Legal battles—that raise fundamental constitutional questions—rage over who can live where and under what conditions.¹¹ Very often federal and state housing statutes and antidiscrimination legislation collide with restrictive or exclusionary local zoning and building requirements or with the slow- or no-growth residential plans being adopted by some suburban communities.¹²

Moreover, the battle to integrate suburbia is often viewed from diametrically opposed perspectives. For some individuals it is "fortress" suburban America noblely
resisting the assault and seige of "those unfit minions" who inhabit the nation's central cities and who now clamor to move into outlying suburban communities. Of course, as the rallying cry goes, "they cannot be let in; they'll only ruin what is left of the good life in suburbia." Others, however, see the scene quite another way: out and out racial and class prejudices masquerading under the guise of home-rule, local control, protection of property values, and planned growth policies; a not so subtle plan to keep many suburban communities as they are--predominantly white, socio-economically homogeneous, and a world removed from urban strife and social responsibility. These same critics argue that housing the urban poor should be a metropolitan-wide concern, not just the responsibility of our central cities. They contend, justifiably, that the cities already are burdened with problems they have neither the capacity nor resources to solve, and that they should not have to shoulder this immense social and economic undertaking alone.

Fortunately, the battle lines are not always drawn this sharply. Some suburban communities have made a genuine effort to provide low-cost or subsidized single-family and multi-family dwellings for the poor. But a recent Supreme Court decision (not available for discussion in Chapter IV) seems likely to encourage scores of suburban communities--that presently are under fire to
provide such housing—to dig in and resist even more and dare the pressuring parties to draw them into litigation.

The decision comes from a recent case involving the Chicago suburb of Arlington Heights and its refusal to alter its zoning laws to permit construction of a federally subsidized low-income multi-family housing development, a group of 190 townhouse units. The case actually began in 1970 when the Chicago area's Metropolitan Housing Development Corporation (MHDC) leased fifteen acres in Arlington Heights from a Roman Catholic religious order and then publicly stated its intention to build a low-income housing development on the site.  

In short order, Arlington Heights zoning officials said they would not grant a variance in the zoning law on the fifteen acre tract (from single family to multi-family), a necessary first step for the project's beginning. They stipulated a variance of this sort was not compatible with the community's master plan and was not in the community's best interest. Rezoning, they reasoned, would unfairly lower the value of homeowners' property surrounding the fifteen acres, since these buyers built on the homesites assuming the town's master plan would be followed.

The MHDC then sued Arlington Heights in U. S. District Court in Chicago, charging that its zoning decision was racially discriminatory. MHDC lost its case in District
Court but subsequently appealed the decision to the Federal Appeals Court in Chicago, which overturned the District Court's decision. Arlington Heights then appealed the Appellate Court's ruling to the U. S. Supreme Court. On January 11, 1977, the nation's highest court reversed the Appeals Court decision.\(^\text{15}\)

Justice Powell, writing for the majority in the 5-3 opinion, noted that predominately white communities do not have to make special adjustments or allowances in their zoning laws to permit or encourage racial integration in housing, unless it has been proven that they purposely engaged in racial discrimination. Plaintiffs would have to show the defendant's intent to discriminate, and not just that some official action by them had the effect of creating or perpetuating racial discrimination, before the Court could grant relief.\(^\text{16}\)

The Supreme Court's ruling almost immediately sent both shockwaves of indignation and sighs of relief throughout the country. In some quarters, the court's action was regarded as a shameful retreat from its earlier vanguard civil rights decision. But others were heralding the decision as a blow to big government intrusion into strictly local matters. Regardless, of one's feelings about the case, further legal tests surrounding zoning/housing activities in the suburbs are bound to continue. The politically sensitive issue of
residential integration in the suburbs is by no means settled, notwithstanding the Arlington Heights decision.

However, the decision does seem to say to Arlington Heights and other like-minded suburbs across the land, that on at least one point, the Court is clear: long-range zoning decisions can now be made by local governing bodies without them fearing they will be overturned later because of charges of racial discrimination.\(^{17}\)

The NAACP fears, too, that the Arlington Heights ruling virtually voids the previously discussed 1975 Black Jack decision handed down by the U. S. Appeals Court in St. Louis. In that case, the Court held that the Black Jack zoning law barring low-cost multi-family dwellings was unconstitutional, because its effect or result was racially discriminatory. It is much easier to establish and prove effect or result, say NAACP officials, that it is to document intent or motive.\(^{18}\)

Meanwhile, some legal observers think the Arlington Heights decision simply represents yet another example of the Supreme Court's increasingly conservative mood and its reluctance "to set" public policy. They say the MHDC still might be able to build the low-cost housing development in Arlington Heights, since the court outlined another legal avenue for the plaintiffs in its opinion. While rejecting the MHDC's contention that the effect of Arlington Height's zoning law was a violation of the
plaintiff's constitutional rights to 'due process' and 'equal protection of the laws' under the Fourteenth Amendment, the Court said it was possible that the zoning law was in violation of the plaintiff's constitutional rights under the 1968 Fair Housing Act. And on this very issue, the Court remanded the case to the Seventh Circuit Appeals Court in Chicago for further consideration.\(^{19}\)

Many black Americans and other urban minorities appear to be justifiably apprehensive about the Supreme Court's conservative drift. The court's refusal to approve city-suburban busing plans in metropolitan Detroit and Richmond, its go-slow approach to busing in Dayton, plus its posture on low-income housing in the Arlington Heights case, must indicate to many of them that they cannot depend on the judicial branch for relief as they so often did throughout the 1960's under the Warren Court.\(^{20}\)

Congress also seems to be turning in an equally "conservative" direction. Government-sponsored low-income housing developments have recently been curtailed and, at this writing, the U. S. Congress has before it an ill-disguised anti-busing amendment--the Senate has already approved the measure--that is tacked on to an appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). The amendment would prohibit HEW from withholding federal money to school districts that refuse HEW orders to bus students to achieve desegregation.\(^{21}\)
Regardless of the amendment's eventual outcome in the House or its fate at President Carter's desk, the amendment's early success in the Senate is a clear signal of a change of heart on Capital Hill regarding affirmative civil rights enforcement in public education. The amendment, in effect, allows school districts to defy government decree without fear of penalties. Congress more and more appears to be listening to the nervous school officials and boards of education in predominately white communities (or those that are changing racially but are still white-controlled) that have said no to mandated desegregation orders. The amendment's sponsor, Senator Thomas Eagleton of Missouri, must know the safest side of the political fence these days--both St. Louis and Kansas City are faced with federal desegregation orders.\textsuperscript{22}

Furthermore, media, citizen, and government preoccupation with the nation's sputtering economy, energy problems, \textit{et al} has diverted attention and concern from the interrelated housing/education issue that festers upon urban America. But it cannot be assumed that the wide differences which now separate affluent suburban schools and decaying inner-city schools can stand indefinitely without becoming social dynamite and inviting domestic chaos. It is equally irrational to think that blacks and other urban minorities can forever be denied housing opportunities that their white counterparts take
for granted without grave social consequences. We can hope that these dilemmas will somehow resolve themselves through "free market" mechanisms, private enterprise, or a pull-yourself-up-by-the-bootstraps approach, but their track record is not convincing, to date, in improving the housing and education opportunities for blacks and other poor urban minorities.²³

Since political manipulation of the nation's housing markets has such a large bearing on where and under what conditions most children will be educated, it is likely worth asking teachers-to-be if they are now aware or were, as elementary or secondary school students, of the importance their own family's residence(s) had played in their schooling. Are they able to relate their all-white or all-black or integrated neighborhood and community experiences to similar or alien ones at school? Are they able to say that their childhood, adolescent, and early adult exposures and "view of life" at school and in their neighborhoods gave them the breadth of ethnic, racial, and class experiences with which to appreciate and understand the weave of political processes, social complexities, human diversity and cruel paradoxes that typify urban life? Are they able to focus on a time or a point in their lives when they saw or thought they saw how "the system" worked in urban America? Are they able to say they have thought about or were already aware of political events and
processes dictating public policies? Are they able to remember feeling identified or labelled as a have, a have-not, a ghetto kid, a suburbanite, or a kid from a bad neighborhood? Are they able to remember moving from one neighborhood to another and knowing the reasons why?

These are, of course, questions designed to probe the affective realm of human experience. As such, they could be helpful in drawing a host of personal accounts and recollections from students which might provide a revealing autobiographical context for their current perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes about conditions and events in metropolitan areas, especially in the schools. While many of their responses might likely be hedged or negated by a "I don't know," "I'm not sure," or "What does it matter?," it is hard to imagine that a class of future teachers would not be required to probe more deeply into their value positions by such questions, particularly if the class was a microcosm of a typical metropolitan area.

But from value clarification based on such probing questions come the makings of further inquires into the politics of education. What, for example, are the national implications and ramifications of the Serrano case, in which the California Supreme Court ruled that the State of California's 100-year old system of financing schools through local property taxes was unconstitutional? Will all state legislatures, in the states that now rely
heavily on local property taxes to fund public schools, have to enact substitute measures? Is a parent's, and a student's, constitutional guarantee to equal protection under the law violated because educational opportunities are based on the taxable wealth of the school district in which they reside? Can it really be determined how much the residents of a school district care about education unless they live in a district with a large tax base? How will states distribute public funds for education without a local property tax system? Will student and community needs or political influence in the legislature win out in the selection of alternative measures? Can there ever be a system devised that approaches delivering equality in educational opportunities for all American youth when there are such wide disparities in Americans' income levels? Is it realistic to assume that presently well-healed school districts—with their generally attendant political access and clout (for instance, the Beverly Hills community)—can be forced to share their wealth with poorer school districts? What would be the most equitable and fair method of financing a states' public schools—through a sales tax or a revision of school district boundaries? Will local communities lose currently held controls over education-related matters (curriculum priorities, textbook selection, program offerings) if the local property tax becomes the dinosaur
of school financing and is replaced by some kind of state-wide system? How will teachers' influence and authority in local and state school politics be changed or altered by a revision of public school funding arrangements? Might the federal government become involved in the financing controversy by making "block" grants available to school districts and by curtailing its "categorical" aid programs?²⁴

Teachers in pre-service education and those involved in effective in-service programs can only speculate as to how state legislatures and courts and the federal government will ultimately handle the political and constitutional questions that spring from the Serrano case. Still, there should be opportunities in teacher education programs to raise and explore the issues that surround the politics of housing and the related cases that attack the financing methods in public education. Their link to more encompassing concerns in American society is obvious, and future educators should become a part of the debate that focuses on these concerns. Young educators, for instance, could key on the question: Will the abolishment of local property taxes to finance public education necessarily mean continuance of a trend toward big-government usurpation of grass-roots controls over public institutions? Or: What are the political and social costs implicit in mandating equality of opportunity in education?
Are state governments and the federal government merely a lawsuit removed from having to decree and legislate equality of opportunity in health care, police and fire protection, street and sewer maintenance, and public transportation facilities? Are we close to legislative and judicial limits or definitions being placed on "opportunity" and "equality"? Can social equality be judicially mandated or be institutionalized and realized as a matter of public policy?

As elusive and problematic as answers to these questions seem to be, the questions still persist and beg debate, since they are directly related to conditions--present and future--in metropolitan school systems. What teacher, for example, is not going to have his or her classroom plans and activities affected or determined by the students' environmental circumstances as well as their attitudes and values toward social and political institutions, authorities, and traditions? What building administrator, academic supervisor, or department head will be able to make sound educational policies and judgments without keeping these same items in mind? Moreover, all public school personnel go about the task of "educating" at their own peril if they fail to acknowledge and deal with their students' sometimes hostile, sometimes prying, sometimes astute remarks about their own
lives beyond the schools or about the lives of other kids in other neighborhoods and schools.

Likewise, teachers and administrators risk misinterpreting many student behaviors if they fail to understand that these behaviors are very often projections of experiences and conditions beyond the schools that have shaped the students' political concepts and general view of life. For example, when a student appears to disdain all attempts to learn, refuses to co-operate with or heed school procedures and rules, and is very often truant, might not this be a student's way of saying (as opposed to merely a display of insolent behavior), "Now, look, you can't fool or control me; with or without schools, my life can be little changed; I'm no better or worse off for being here; my friends are my only refuge; this place doesn't respect me, so why should I respect it? Only kids with connections and pull get anyplace."

Teachers and administrators, moreover, are analyzed by their students and very often must face chiding and candid remarks about where they live, where their own children attend school, and why they are working or teaching were they are. Presentation and mastery of the "basics"—a watchword of the 1970's—can remain a still-born function of the schools if teachers do not first address themselves to the "toolbox," the "baggage," the "prior agenda" of perceptions and beliefs that students
bring into classes regarding themselves and others. There is ample evidence to support the fact that students respond to teachers, to print, and to classroom activities in general with greater enthusiasm and seriousness when they feel that their teachers and administrators are earnestly sensitive to their experiences. Likewise, students are quite capable of callously devasting the poor teacher that fails to regard their world beyond the school.

The politics of metropolitan areas determine the level of social equality in these same areas. And while many elementary and secondary school-age children are not mature enough to understand this relationship, many of them can speak in discerning details of their experiences in, say, "good" and "bad" schools and neighborhoods, which so poignantly address the consequences of this relationship. When teachers are asked the reasons for these differences among schools and neighborhoods, it seems they must attempt to answer inquiring students with something more than racial or class clichés or a civics book explanation of politics in American society.

Professor Jack Kirkland is particularly concerned that "...blacks are about to embark upon a modern 'trail of tears'..."25' in American cities; a metaphor that captures the bent of the present approach to urban center redevelopment and its subsequent removal of blacks (and
other poor central city dwellers) from blighted and decayed inner-city locations that once again have become choice parcels of real estate for downtown convention centers, luxury apartments, sports and entertainment complexes, and return-to-the-city neighborhoods for middle- and upper-income whites. Kirkland singles out blacks' often impotent political voice and unstable economic position in the metropolis as causes for this situation, but he argues even more strongly that it is our local, state, and national institutions' absence of a policy or guiding principle of social justice that perpetuates the plight of blacks and other poor people in our nation's cities.26

If Kirkland is correct that an "economic conspiracy" is behind the forced removal of blacks and the poor from central city locations—very often through the use of eminent domain statutes—27, then a cruel yet institutionalized plan of urban homelessness seems perpetrated upon these people. They are uprooted from downtown locations and left to scurry for the scarce, remaining housing stock just beyond the core city redevelopment areas. Most of these dispossessed individuals are unable to find housing in these areas and those that do must resign themselves to live in generally more deplorable and crowded tenement conditions than they left. But most of those finding a place to live in these areas will
accept this fate, since the construction and availability of both federally subsidized and privately financed low-cost housing developments for the poor in metropolitan regions does not keep space with the acute need for such dwellings. Moreover, the Supreme Court's recent decision in the Arlington Heights case seems unlikely to encourage the growth of such developments in the suburbs. As a result, the urban poor, and especially the black poor, have, quite literally, no place to go.

Meanwhile, public school teachers and administrators are directly confronted by the consequences of these politically cued moves in our metropolitan centers. And the housing/education issue at its highest and most profound level becomes a moral and ethical dilemma. Whether teachers and administrators work in the crowded inner-city schools that play host to the children of the urban dispossessed profiled just above, the crowded classrooms of burgeoning new suburban schools, or the many schools with dwindling enrollments that dot both city and suburb, they must ask themselves what role they are playing as educators and citizens in perpetuating or challenging the political status quo that allows for the wide and inequitable disparities in housing, educational, and job opportunities in America's urban centers. For example, are they working through their local, state, and national organizations to publicize and correct the
unfair and unjust conditions in our schools and society? Are they fighting for educational reforms and programs that bring quality learning experiences and academic competence to their students? Are they standing up in their own neighborhoods and communities to protest zoning ordinances, lot usage requirements, banks' lending practices, and racially or class motivated political decisions that stymie open housing, accommodations for low-income residents, minority employment opportunities, and area-wide involvement in and solutions to regional problems? Are teachers and administrators seeking ways to increase cooperation and respect among community voices, boards of education, student groups, and themselves in the resolution of school-related problems?

Teachers and administrators frequently have come to define their interests and self-benefit apart from each other and separate from the communities they are supposed to serve. This is indeed a sad state of affairs for public education although hardly a new wrinkle in the history of public education. Debilitating disputes over goals and priorities and the very purpose of the schools have split these parties and too often undermined what should have been alliances of shared concern for the resolution of major problems in public education. Unfortunately, in the 1970's, this divisiveness seems stridently pronounced among teachers, administrators,
boards of education, community groups, and students. The mood of these parties is frequently distrustful, suspicious, and accusatory. Local, state, and national politicos are intensely lobbied and hustled for special consideration and favors by these groups and often with little regard for the overall health of public education.

While diversity and controversy have generally been regarded as healthy attributes in American's public schools, the zealous political infighting and lack of unifying purpose that so characterize the public education scene, today, threatens to be its undoing. The control issue—"who gets what, when, and how" from public education—has become the overriding concern and topic of debate among these parties. What is not being adequately considered in these circles is the broader set of questions that addresses the political origins and prevailing structures that inhibit educational opportunities for millions of school-age children. How these parties, through their political actions and pronouncements, are either perpetuating or attacking these lost opportunities, is too little examined.

Schools of education—in their teacher education programs, their educational administration courses, and their community and other in-service activities—could confront these kinds of questions if their leadership were such that faculties and the wider university
communities were led to face directly such issues. Such leadership might be forthcoming with the prodding and encouragement of a supportive faculty.28

In sum, politics dictates much of what happens in the life of schools, and the hodge-podge of interest groups, decision-makers, ideologies, organizational strategies, and elections that make up this enterprise are largely responsible for the significance and extent of public education experiences for millions of school-age children. Teachers and administrators, as both professionals and private citizens, are a part of the political processes that daily determine where children will attend school, what conditions and policies will prevail in the schools, and who decides what is worth knowing and learning. But they are hardly the dominating force on the public education scene. In fact, as this investigation has demonstrated, they are often responding with other groups to conditions that exist in the schools but which have their genesis or were set in motion by political decisions and activities supposedly beyond the realm of the schools. The politics of housing and the systematic denial of social justice to blacks and other urban minorities in our metropolitan areas are cases in point.

If future public school personnel are to understand more fully the politically permeated environment and
context of their future schools, their professional organizations, and the positions they will someday hold, they must be immersed in the literature of local, state, and national politics that addresses the conflicts and processes with implications for and relationships to public education. (Our real hope is that some teachers-to-be and administrators-to-be will have had personal experiences with these elements already, and they will be able to adjudge for themselves the quality of this literature and then pass their assessments on to their fellow classmates.)

The Community and Social Realm of Schools. The public schools have not held to one overriding or unifying ideal, cause, or purpose throughout their years. Rather they have mirrored or responded to society's constantly changing nature and needs, and generally as perceived and interpreted by those individuals and groups in the Nation with greatest political and social force or moral weight. As noted in Chapter II, early common school advocates such as Mann and Barnard saw education for the masses as a means to stamp out the incivilities, injustices, and oppression that smothered their lives—notwithstanding the criticisms of Katz, Greer, and Spring. Later, educators, public officials, and "established Americans" viewed the public schools as a tool to
socialize, assimilate, and control the teeming waves of immigrants newly arrived to American cities.

During and after the Depression, schools were often thought to have a vital role in reestablishing the lost sense of community life in American society. To some individuals and groups, as Mary Herrick points out in her historical study of Chicago's public school system, the schools were to prepare students for vocations or positions in the society or to instruct them about specific ethnic and cultural values and traditions. The current emphasis in the schools on career awareness and preparation and "basic skills" mastery is but another response by the public schools to social and political influences. Over the years, public school educators can be relatively assured that society is somewhat unsure of what it wants or expects from them and the schools. Even if we dare generalize that society, today, expects the schools to uphold traditional and universal values and to transmit an "accepted" body of extant knowledge thought important to a civilization, as well as to offer experiences to children that promote national unity and uncover potentially useful knowledge to society, we perhaps hazard overstatement.

With such uncertainty over the purposes and goals of public education, it seems a rather cautious note to insist that teacher education institutions look to more
than just the ebbs and flows of social and political influence and opinion as they "prepare" young educators for positions in the public schools. While their institutional survival dictates some attention to the educational marketplace—e.g., preparing reading and vocational specialists and the like for the schools—they must also search out transcending and long-term approaches that address the larger questions of how schools can best serve a society.

A good starting point for this inquiry can be Lewis Mumford's evocation that schools, today, must be assigned a crucial role in the revitalization of urban life and culture, much like the church was the social nucleus of the medieval city, and the factory was the center of much social activity in the iron and coal economies of industrialized nations during the mid- to late-nineteenth century. Mumford's assertion that public education's main concern should be to effectuate a better political society; a society that, in Mumford's words, "...insures community survival, nurtures and develops communities' capacity to control their destinies, promotes personal and communal growth, and reorders human activities for the uncertain future." gives us a focus with which to compare our own judgments and beliefs about schools' role and purpose in society as well as a highly personalized and idealized agenda with which to measure the
priority and utility (to society) of presently discernible objectives and goals being pursued in and by our public schools.

While Mumford's regard for schools in society is couched in language that is very often broad and generalized if not ambiguous—what, for example, are the possible interpretations of phrases such as "control their destinies" or "reorder human activities"—he still spells out with enough specifics his vision for schools in society. Clearly, his stand that schools' primary task, today, should not be to make the population "...responsive to print, skilled in arithmetic, and docile to external stimula..." but rather should help to perfect the ideal political society (that he earlier elaborated), leaves little doubt as to Mumford's philosophical approach to and practical applications for education in urban society.30

At some point, students of education should examine their own school experiences and attempt to define or outline how the institutions they attended went about "educating." Did they attend to Mumford's agenda in any conscious or deliberate fashion? Did they pursue program goals or objectives for the students and the community they served that were contrary to Mumford's concerns for public education? Did these same schools have thoughtful and articulate teachers, administrators, community
representatives, or board members that worked for institutional goals and objectives that corresponded with the interests and needs of their students and the community served? What were these needs and interests and were they met? How do they differ or agree with Mumford's perceptions of the role of schools in a society?

Teachers should also confront "value dilemmas" (however subject to change or re-evaluation their responses might be), such as: What would they do or risk undertaking in a public school setting to affect changes in curriculum, student activities, community attitudes and participation, or teaching approaches to realize Mumford's or their own goals for schools in society? Do they have personal goals, objectives, and standards in public education that they are willing to be criticized for? Are they willing to be dismissed from their jobs for them? These are not to be taken as dwaddling questions or parlor games for education students, since the very essence of their awareness and affirmation of both personal and professional ethics demands that they respond to these and similar questions with utmost frankness and thoughtfulness. It is not uncommon to find that first year, or untenured, teachers unashamedly admit that they will do whatever a school district demands in order to keep their job—even if it means foregoing membership in a professional teachers' organization or
union, not teaching certain ideas or events, or having reading lists censored. Self-preservation, survival, having a job, is all that counts for them.

Unfortunately, teacher passivity, docility, and harrassment have always been with us and will no doubt continue, in spite of the political clout now exercised by teacher groups as well as the courageous and lonely individual stands taken by some public school teachers. But the alarming retrenchment and cut-backs in staff and funding in many public school systems could have a deadening and suffocating effect on teachers' eagerness and opportunity to experiment as educators and to raise pressing social issues that confront public education in general or their own school systems specifically. It is indeed rare to find teachers who are not overwhelmed by an immediate concern for financial security and anxious over the year-to-year uncertainty of whether or not that will have a job.

Still, this is an urgent time for our metropolitan centers, especially their public school systems, and society (and its leaders) must remove its social blinders, stop its shoulder shrugging, and ask itself some very uncomfortable questions about what it is willing to do or can do to alleviate the social injustices and community disintegration that permeates urban regions. It must also ask what it will do to make public education
institutions beacons for social equality and community renewal. Teachers, in particular, must take time to address these painful questions, regardless of their pressing concerns for their precarious economic position in the society, since how these questions are ultimately resolved will likely have a more devastating and far-reaching impact on their personal and professional life than any of their present preoccupations.

Recent events and prevailing demographic trends acutely underscore this observation. For instance, the extensive looting and pillage that accompanied New York City's latest power blackout should remind even the most indifferent and callous cynics that the cores of our cities are still as steeped in fatalism, rage, and despair as ever. Moreover, the riot-torn and torched ghettos of the 1960's have not disappeared from the domestic scene—the urban poor continue to concentrate in these areas—and their seemingly intractable problems persist as stubbornly as before.31

Unfortunately, the teachers and administrative personnel assigned to the schools in these areas must often assume little more than caretaker roles—along with the police, social workers, and welfare bureaucracies—with teaching and educating being piteously impossible so much of the time. And under presently funded and administrated government urban policies, these central
city enclaves of poverty and hopelessness stand little chance of undergoing wide-spread renewal. As a consequence, the teachers in these wastelands of human concern stand very little chance of ever working in schools that resemble much beyond holding pens.  

The urban crises of social injustice and community disintegration are not strictly central city dilemmas. Nor is the problem of inferior and hostile public school environments simply confined to our nation's ghettos. Many of the older suburbs that ring the central cities encounter the very same conditions, and even some of the suburban communities with post-World War II incorporation dates, are faced with these same insidious circumstances.  

No longer are student violence, the "battered teacher," high truancy and dropout rates, and drug- and alcohol-related problems synonymous only with the poor, minority-filled schools of the inner-city. Instead these problems (indicative of social and political malaise and the severe failures of family and community life) have stretched onto the turf of new, affluent suburban communities and exurban towns, supposedly worlds removed from their reach.  

If Mumford is correct that "social absent-mindedness" typifies most planning developments in our urban regions, and that the forces of economic materialism and exploitation largely determine their very shape and liveability, it is certainly important for future public school
educators to examine the role schools have played and continue to play in subordinating themselves to these influences. However, it is equally pertinent for them to look for examples of educators and schools attempting to buck these forces and to make the schools, as Mumford envisioned them, the one institution in society most indispensable to a neighborhood or community—a crucial force in the revitalization of urban culture. Thus it becomes important to examine urban planning concepts and economic considerations in the foundational studies of teacher education programs, since these factors help to point up society's dominating social values and its expectations for public education in an urban culture!

What if, as Robert L. Heilbroner claims, our economic system is in an inevitable state of decline and must give way, if the social order is to be preserved without oppression and coercion, to new monetary and fiscal policies, labor, management, and productivity arrangements, and fresh approaches to ordering and using human and physical resources that are more socially directed. Where do our schools and educators "fit in" during the transition from one system to another? Can the schools adjust, make changes in their orientation and function, that at least anticipate or complement newly emergent economic structures and altered social and community expectations, without the support of the entrenched
political and social elites and interest groups that have a large stake in perpetuating the existing economic system—capitalism, as we have come to define it? What are public school educators to do as "expected" transmitters of traditional cultural and institutional values when the prevailing political, economic and social systems have become destructive or insensitive to the basic physical, social, and psychic needs of a large segment of society—for example, the need for shelter, health care services, artistic freedom and expression, and communities free from physical danger? Defend them? Question them? Avoid discussing them? Will teachers' political influence, their political coalitions and alliances, and their social and economic security in the society be strengthened, weakened, or remain static with a new economic order? How will, should, or can schools change their curriculum priorities, student activities, and community involvement in anticipation of broad economic changes in the society? Will Mumford's vision—that cities be remade as a symbol of art and order and as man's basic cultural nucleus—be realized under the presently structured capitalist economic system? Or must capitalism, as we generally know it, give way completely to some other economic form before his noble dream for our cities becomes a reality? Can fine tuning and minor adjustments in our present
government, business, and labor policies render drastic economic changes unnecessary? If not, then what?

Furthermore, what are the most important considerations and priorities attached to the urban community development proposals that are adopted by metropolitan planning commissions and local communities? Can regard for a developer's profits, a neighborhood's stability, or certain individuals' property values be singled out? What importance do political, community, and education leaders give to the integration of public school facilities with neighborhood life and the activities of public and private social service agencies? Do the guidelines and requirements of federal and state community block and categorical grants encourage or discourage a meshing of the expertise and resources of private businesses and commercial interests in a metropolitan area with its supportive public services (such as police and fire protection, welfare assistance, and health care facilities) and its public education institutions? Is inter- as well as intra-school district participation possible in these types of ventures through government funding? For example, might government seed money become available to assist a number of metropolitan school systems that are willing to work together with area hospitals, out-patient clinics, nursing homes, and medical processing laboratories to establish challenging programs that stimulate an interest
in and provide academic preparation for the biological sciences and health-related careers. (The possibilities are great for bringing together students from across the racial and class lines of a metropolitan area to study in education settings that stress the public schools' integration with community institutions and resources.)

Clearly, inquiries into the above prototypical questions and issues will bring a needed focus to student educators' thinking about the relationship between schools and community life and will encourage them to explore further the potentialities of this relationship.

Culture and Values in Metropolitan Regions. Metropolitan areas reveal a plethora of individual life styles and experiences. Extremes in material wealth, political influence, and social access separate and distinguish people in these centers as do their various customs, beliefs, values, language, and moral codes. To a great extent, these factors determine a "way of life"—in other words, an individual's culture. This is in contrast to most conventional anthropological concepts of culture which define it as "...socially standardized (italics added) ways of seeing and thinking about the world; of understanding relationships among people, things, and events; of establishing preferences and purposes; of carrying out actions and pursuing goals."
Schools are assumed to play an important role in the cultural development of an individual, especially in the acquisition and formation of societal values. In fact, American society has assigned the public schools a central role in the large and perhaps impossible task of transmitting those societal values regarded most important to the Nation. While family influences, peer association, ethnic and religious traditions, and daily experiences are generally regarded as the major determinants of personal values, it is the public schools that are expected to articulate, explain, and defend the sanctity and worth of the nation's political institutions, economic system, and social policies.

A number of questions crucial to the professional life of teacher educators and public school personnel are generated from this foundational base. How, for example, are the nation's values and standards of conduct and behavior determined and shaped in contemporary society? Why are they exaulted and emulated? For what purposes are they used? Are they really worth striving for? What are the rewards and benefits to the individual for so doing? What consequences await the individual in society who openly rejects or questions the larger society's "institutionalized" values and standards? How can teachers best handle classroom situations when their students' personal, family, neighborhood, and peer values
are obviously in conflict with or hostile to society's (thus the schools') most cherished beliefs and attitudes? How can teacher educators best prepare young teachers for the "culture shock"--to students' values and standards of conduct and behavior--that perhaps awaits them in their public school assignments? These questions are only identified here. Extensive experimentation with them in teacher education programs are necessary as next steps.

Clearly, an extension of these foundational ideas into actual programs for teacher preparation underscores Loren Eisely's observation that "...there are other truths than those contained in laboratory burners, on blackboards, or in test tubes."\(^{39}\) In this statement, Eisely illuminates educators' crucial role in nurturing young student minds. He is especially concerned that teachers be attuned to their students' sensitive and vulnerable hearts. Eisely perceives of the heart and mind in a delicate symbiosis, working in a complex and mysterious union to form a person's unique interpretation of experiences and thus the values that will guide them through their life.\(^{40}\)

While Eisely eloquently lodges his concern for both the minds and hearts of students, his pleading is hardly a novel one to seasoned educators. Perceptive and compassionate public school teachers very much appreciate the wisdom of this observation and would perhaps suggest
that the "destruction of the hearts and minds of children" is most generally in the first instance an affliction of the heart. Unfortunately, this axiom seems more neglected than examined in most teacher education programs. And particularly lacking is a component or phase to these programs that address the influence of political, social, and economic factors in shaping the lives of children.

We know, for example, that there are both "winners" and "losers" in the daily life of any large metropolitan center. Extenuating biological deficiencies and physical impairments sometime cruelly slot individuals for one or the other of these categories, but far and away the best explanation of why most people either "make it" or "fail" in urban America revolves around the manner in which political decisions, social movements, and economic policies affect their lives.

Jacob W. Getzels has studied value and cultural differences in urban society and has shown their importance for teacher education programs. He explains that it is typical in public schools for teachers to ascribe to "...an achievement ethic, with consequent high valuation on the future, deferred gratification, and symbolic commitment to success." In other words, "...anyone can get to the top if he tries hard enough...the future, not
the present, is what counts...study geometry now to
become an engineer later."^2

Getzels thinks these values well serve some schools,
particularly when they are the same values of the families
in which many of the school children are raised. Problems
arise for schools and teachers, however, when a sizable
number of students do not honor or share these values.
Because some children come from families that have
primarily experienced a "...survival or subsistence
ethic, with consequent high valuation on the present
rather than the future, on immediate rather than deferred
gratification, on concrete rather than symbolic commit-
ment..."^3 their teachers' and their schools' values very
often seem inconsistent with or inconsequential to their
lives. This clash over values produces hostile behaviors
and attitudes toward teachers and their classroom assign-
ments as well as schools' rules and standards of conduct.
Teachers and administrators in turn often react negatively
to these students when they appear, say, physically
aggressive or intellectually apathetic. But what is even
more unfortunate is that teachers seldom know little else
to do. They often have never before experienced such a
conflict over values, and generally there is little in
their teacher education programs to prepare them for
problems of this nature.
Usually it is the aforementioned "loser's" kid which acts out these supposed alien values and anti-social behaviors in the schools and who most often is labelled a failure or disruptive by teachers. Meanwhile, although not always the case, it is the "winner's" kid who is at ease with schools' values, who is a model of good behavior, and who often excels in school activities. The difficult task for teachers is to recognize a certain legitimacy to, or at least special circumstances for, the values and cultural traits of all students, while still involving children in challenging academic work that equips them with both learning skills and a vision to see and adapt to an ever-changing world.

Urban-based teachers must think beyond their own school experiences as well as racial and class stereotypes when they work with and evaluate students. They must also transcend the pressures of their own school and room assignments and think in terms of the political, social, and economic dynamics that affect public education throughout an entire metropolitan region. Whether the teacher is in a minority-filled inner-city school, an integrated neighborhood school, or an affluent, all-white suburban school, an area-wide perspective on educational problems and issues seems imperative.

For without this more encompassing perspective, it is much too easy for teachers--like anyone else--to pander
to the many unsettling myths, distortions, and misconceptions about life in urban settings, that even Presidents and nationally regarded political leaders are remiss to expound from time to time. Teachers, it is hoped, will reach a more sophisticated understanding of the links between their students' and their parents' attitudes toward schools and learning and their experiences with political, social, and economic institutions in the metropolis.

Teachers, too, will need to examine these institutions (especially the schools) for their impact on the lives of urban dwellers, and work as best they can to eliminate their most oppressive features. With class prejudices, racial hostilities, city-suburban antagonisms, exclusionary zoning policies, redlining practices, and anti-work and anti-family welfare systems directly undermining the hopes of millions in our metropolitan regions, it is indeed an understatement to declare that new approaches are needed to enhance the quality of life in urban America. In this regard, Eisely's dictum of concern for both the mind and heart takes on very practical applications.

Getzels asserts that teachers must be attuned and sensitive to the scope and breadth of life styles and experiences in metropolitan regions. And he wisely submits that teacher training institutions should make it their business to assume a commanding role in this
Placing student educators and teachers in numerous pre- and in-service school/community settings in metropolitan areas—so they can observe and work with students and parents from a variety of socio-economic and cultural backgrounds—should be for them a top priority, as should studies of the sociology of urban communities.

Getzels fears, however, that most teacher education programs are only marginally concerned with these matters and operate as if teaching eighth grade in Chicago's Woodlawn section was the same as teaching eighth grade in suburban Winnetka—professional preparation would be the same (whatever it is) for teachers headed to either of the two communities. Getzels reasons it only makes good sense (if educators are to have better chances for success in their respective classrooms) for teacher education programs to include studies and experiences that enable teachers to work effectively in both of these strikingly different communities.45

This is especially sound advice, today, when teachers generally are not in a position to dictate where they would like to teach, with what types of students, and under what conditions. The grim education job market says they must go where the few available positions are if they intend to teach. Quite simply, teachers with a metropolitan-wide perspective on education are likely to be better prepared for the uncertain conditions of their
eventual teaching assignment(s). Moreover, they will probably more astutely recognize the effects of political, social, economic, and demographic forces on the public schools in urban regions. In sum, they will be equipped to handle the frustrating and unending challenges that await them as urban public school educators.

**Summary.** The foregoing discourse has clarified a number of prototypical pre- and in-service applications of the conceptual referents delineated in the first part of the chapter. The major thrust of the chapter has been to outline something of a "working agenda" for a professional education curriculum that addresses the needs of teachers headed for or already in public school assignments in metropolitan areas—whether they be in inner-city or suburban neighborhoods. A specific aim in this effort has been to underscore the importance of studying the relationships among political, social, and economic forces and processes and the problems and issues of public education in metropolitan America. The success of this undertaking rests ultimately on the soundness of the groundwork laid in the earlier chapters. Next steps clearly involve extending these reconceptualized foundational ideas into practical programs in a number of institutions.
Refer to pp. 13-23 of Chapter III for a review of this now substantial literature. Thomas A. Eliot's "Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics" (cited on p. 15 of Chapter III) was one of the earliest and more influential pieces calling for a serious analysis of the "politics of education."

2 AFT President Albert Shanker recently told teacher educators at the 29th annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education that the AFT was willing to work with the AACTE and other college education groups to improve the quality of teacher education programs and to work for the passage of major legislation that would expand educational opportunities to Americans. This news came somewhat as a surprise to many AACTE members who had come to regard Shanker and the AFT as a threat to their existence as teacher educators. See "Shanker Urges Cooperation in Teacher Education Goals," American Teacher, Vol. 61, No. 7 (March, 1977), p. 22.

But the AFT and the NEA are also accused of opposing suggested reforms in teacher education (the competency-based movement, for example) and of mounting powerful lobbies to prevent changes in certification procedures. Critics charge that they treat teacher training and certification procedures as little more than a "standard for establishing and increasing salaries" and show little interest in changing the present arrangements. Refer to Robert R. Spillane and Dorothy Levenson, "Teacher Training: A Question of Control, Not Content," Educational Digest, Vol. 41, No. 9 (May, 1976), pp. 32-35.


4 It is worth noting that some colleges of education already offer courses in educational administration that provide public school administrators with case studies and expertise in collective bargaining negotiations. A necessary phase of their "professional studies," we assume?

5 One of the landmark studies of national political culture and values (and their relationships to societal institutions and democratic processes) is Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown, and Co., 1965). While this work has both its defenders and critics, it stands already as somewhat of a classic in political science literature,
and it remains a valuable source of insight into the effects of a society's political environment on its public institutions.

Another original treatment of individual and institutional "freedom" within political systems is Henry S. Kariel, Open Systems: Arenas for Political Action (Itaska, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1968). Kariel states that "...if, then, we are concerned with widening the range of our experiences, with making the most of our lives, our basic concern must be with injecting politics—political procedures and political areas—into closed systems. To put this differently, our concern must be with converting nonpolitical systems into political ones." p. 7.


6 Refer especially to pp. 24-51 of Chapter IV.

7 Ibid.

8 There is no book about urban America, scholarly, erudite, or statistically loaded, that outpaces in sheer force and detail the plight of the powerless (and the steamroller tactics of the powerful), as that of Mike Royko, Boss: Richard J. Daley of Chicago (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1971).


10 Even though increased income levels for blacks often mean greater opportunities for residential mobility, this is not always the case. While certainly illegal, discriminatory lending practices still exist, which severely restrict the availability of mortgage and home financing money for many black Americans. Banks, of course, deny that a person's race is ever a reason for refusing to grant a loan. Perhaps so. But when banks, as a matter of policy, do not grant loans in certain areas of a city (these are generally black neighborhoods or those becoming so), they are, in effect, engaging in overt racial discrimination.

Also see Anthony Downs, Who Are The Urban Poor?, Supplementary Paper Number 26 (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1970), particularly Section Six,

For example, The Black Jack, Missouri and Middlesex County, New Jersey, cases examined in Chapter IV, pp. 31-38.


Refer to the Black Jack decision in Chapter IV, pp. 35-38.

Robert Adams, "Glimmer of Light in Court's Housing Decision," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 16, 1977, p. 3B.

Curt Matthews, "Court Ends Session and Hopes of Many," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 3, 1977, pp. 1D and 10D.


While we can hardly overstate the importance of housing opportunities and their relationship to educational opportunities, we are certainly not implying that better housing necessarily guarantees changes in reading and math scores or a change in educational and occupational aspirations. This would, at best, be a tenuous relationship to draw. We are more concerned here with raising the larger issue of inequality of opportunity in


26 Ibid.

27 Ibid.

28 It is worth remembering, however, that schools of education are among those institutions with a vested interest in the presently structured and operated public school enterprise. And few institutions are anxious to relinquish their position in the pecking order.

29 Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities*, pp. 476-477. Refer also to Chapter Two of this work for an elaboration of these points, particularly pages 12-16. It should go without saying that Mumford recognizes the importance of a literate and academically skilled populace to any democratic society or culture. He is simply saying that schools should integrate this function with the larger goal of perfecting a just political society.

30 Ibid.


32 In explaining possible links between the declining standard achievement scores of students in the St. Louis public school system and socio-economic factors, Stephen M. Daescher, director of the St. Louis public schools' division of evaluation, points to the growing number of families in the City receiving welfare. He notes that, in 1977, 46 per cent of the St. Louis population
received Aid to Dependent Children, as against 22 per cent of the City in 1970. Refer to J. Pulitzer, "City Test Scores Drop," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 18, 1977, pp. 1 and 12A.

Suburban blight and neighborhood decay is discussed in Chapter IV of this study, pp. 13-15.


Mumford, The Culture of Cities, p. 300.

Valentine, Culture and Poverty, p. 3.


Ibid.

Ibid.

The president of the Sierra Club, J. William Futrell, recently urged environmental groups to shift their focus from rural and wilderness concerns to the problems besetting the nation's metropolitan regions, especially the inner-city areas. See Edward H. Kohn, "Conservationist Calls for Focus On Inner-City," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, August 8, 1977, p. 5A.

CHAPTER VI
GENERALIZATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An array of political, social, and economic forces that affect metropolitan areas have been identified and analyzed in this study, especially those which contribute to the demise of the nation's central cities and encourage the extensive racial and social-class segregation of urban America.

The study demonstrated that the status of most metropolitan school systems is heavily influenced by these forces. Inner city schools, for example, are strapped by staggering financial woes, crumbling physical facilities, and the overwhelming crush of a socially neglected and poverty-ridden clientele—as are all central city services and institutions. Meanwhile, black and white children, whether in cities or suburbs, infrequently sit in the same classrooms, and the children of affluent parents rarely go to the schools available to poverty and welfare families. In short, the general social and physical environment of schools, as well as their educational priorities and academic expectations, is shaped by these forces' reign over contemporary urban life.
It is crucial, then, for teacher education programs to examine the political, social, and economic context of public education. This reconceptualized component of every teacher education program should confront the perplexing racial and social-class issues that menace the nation's metropolitan regions, particularly as they affect teaching and learning conditions in the schools and the opportunity for a quality public school education. These programs, at both pre- and in-service levels, must probe the diverse and complicated nature of urban life. They should imbue teachers and administrators with insights into the many relationships between political, socio-economic, and demographic processes and the day-to-day life and operation of metropolitan school systems.

Without this reconceptualized background, educators are denied the all-important ingredient of perspective. Teachers need not labor needlessly under the weight of false notions and naive assumptions regarding the nature and organization of urban society and where public education fits into that mosaic. Nor should they be misled as to what they can expect to accomplish in the schools.

Urban historians, political scientists, sociologists, and economists all point to the inter-locking and symbiotic nature of metropolitan regions. They state that their organic, anatomical-like features are such that
the heart (the core city) and the limbs (the suburbs) are dependent upon and supportive of one another. Thus, neglect of or abuse to either the heart or the limbs is destructive and defeating to the well-being of the whole body (the metropolitan region).

Unfortunately, urban America's heart, if one may continue the metaphor, shows signs of severe neglect and abuse; it is faltering and in dire need of resuscitation. It has taken prolonged and incalculable blows, and more than basic first-aid measures are necessary for full-recovery. And, perhaps, for the most wounded of all central city institutions—the public schools—the remedies and cures will exact a measure of sacrifice and sensitivity from the healthy of American society.

We refer here to the many affluent suburban communities that surround the aging metropolises. Clearly, they must contribute to any serious effort to improve the nation's inner-city school systems. Their political officials and educational leaders must begin thinking of the future of entire metropolitan regions (and not just the narrow interests of their individual constituencies) as they develop and set policies and lobby and vote for legislation affecting public education. They must support and speak for a larger community and resist pandering to the interests that attempt to ignore the cities' problems. They must quietly, yet firmly, spread the word that
"shared responsibility"—for the education, housing, health, and employment needs of the nation's urban poor—is an idea whose time is long overdue. In sum, the cities, alone, can no longer shoulder this nearly impossible task; the suburbs must regard their own turf as truly a part of the public domain.

Of course, grave and immediate risks await the politicians and educators that support this idea, especially policies and programs that promote city-suburban school cooperation and residential integration. Entrenched opposition certainly awaits them, and election defeat or job dismissal could follow as a result of their stand. But public school teachers and administrators must shed their status quo mentality if a reconceptualization of the foundations of education is to serve as a genuine rationale for action. They must close ranks, drop their frequent antagonisms toward one another, and actively support the concept of "shared responsibility." As individuals, and as members of unions and professional associations, they must unequivocally align themselves on the side of social justice and quality educational opportunities for all Americans. This calls for a use of whatever organizational resources can be mustered to meld these ideals into practical programs. Public school personnel, from such a value perspective, cannot be non-committal or non-political on these issues. Their
professional standing and the interests of their own neighborhoods and communities are not best served by such a stance.

Metropolitan-oriented teacher education programs can be highly valuable in familiarizing educators with urban issues, and they can underwrite teachers with the background necessary to formulate policies that are regional in scope, with linkages to other educational systems, and connected to the resources of other area-wide institutions, agencies, and services; in other words, policies that broaden, rather than restrict, the possible learning experiences of individual school constituencies.

The need for urban educators with a "metro-perspective" cannot here be overdrawn. Merely consider the following: In spite of the much touted return-to-rural-America-movement, only a trickle of the nation's population is involved in this trek. The United States is now, and will continue to be, primarily a nation of large populous metropolitan regions. The suburbs, furthermore, (once upon a time a world removed from the troubles and upheavals of the central cities) are slowly but surely trapped by the inevitable judgment of American's apartheid-like residential and educational structures: they cannot be justified and maintained indefinitely without disruptive social consequences befalling most Americans. The belief system that can affirm "due process" and "equal
opportunity," while at the same time uphold restrictive
land-use measures and exclusionary property rights' arguments— at the expense of so many in society--is more and more an indefensible and corrupt social anachronism.

Because of these realities, it is only a matter of time until the nation's metropolitan public school systems undergo a number of fundamental changes. While they undoubtedly will be evolutionary in nature, the changes eventually will transform the presently balkanized, "city-state" confederation of suburban-city school districts, into a system that more closely resembles a republic of social and political entities. Multi-distinct mergers and inter-district cooperation will someday be commonplace. Attendance patterns, funding arrangements, and curriculum decisions will be revised in an attempt to undo the more blatant educational inequities which now exist among metropolitan school systems. Astute, urban-wise, politically involved educators will be vitally needed during these transition years.

Meanwhile, urban leaders and government representatives are attempting to draft a national urban policy. At this writing, the conferees to the National League of Cities Convention in San Francisco are debating the federal, state, and local government commitments and responsibilities of such a policy. From the Conferences' White House representatives (such as Secretary of Housing
and Urban Development, Patricia R. Harris), to the attending mayors and municipal officials of both large cities and suburban communities, there is general agreement on three seemingly simple yet crucial points regarding urban ills: (a) the problems of the central cities and the suburbs are closely related, (b) they cannot be either considered or solved in isolation, and (c) the entity known as the metropolitan region must become the focus for planning, development, and rebuilding efforts in the nation's urban centers.

Of course, the inevitable rub comes among the cities and suburbs when the scarce resources and dollars of federal, state, and local government agencies are finally distributed and sacrifices are exacted from specific neighborhoods and communities. Determining where need is greatest and most critical, and who has done the most for themselves and others, ultimately presents the largest problem for a national urban policy. Regretfully, or, perhaps, inevitably, a hybrid or combination of the "half-a-loaf" and "let's-muddle-through" approaches will likely continue, poignantly visible to remind us of both our failed social vision and the harsh realities of urban politics.

Secretary Harris and the other conferees suffer few illusions over the difficulties in arriving at a consensus on a national urban policy. Putting aside for now the
questions of how the federal, state, and local financial pies are to be divided, and which metropolitan regions are most deserving of aid and assistance, Secretary Harris regards racism as the major stumbling block and challenge to an effective urban policy. She is certainly not alone in this assessment. Too many Americans, unfortunately, still think in terms of "us" and "them" where race is the perceived issue—ala the Allan Bakke case.

Because the nation's urban public school systems are certain to be considered in the formulation and adoption of any national urban policy, educators must also recognize the threat of racism (and social-class prejudice) to the long-term health and stability of public education in metropolitan regions. The success of pupil and teacher integration plans, of inter-district and multi-district school mergers, for example, depends not only on a national resolve to eliminate personal and institutional racism in the United States, but also on educators' ability to provide wise counsel and calming, courageous leadership during these changes.

Metropolitan-oriented teacher education programs can be invaluable under these circumstances by concentrating on the theories and concepts of urban political processes, social change, and cultural differences. This focus can benefit public school teachers and administrators, whether involved in building site selections,
desegregation plans, community school liaison efforts, staff recruiting, in-service programs, pre-school screening and diagnostic programs, tutorial and counselling sessions, or classroom activities. In sum, educators bring insights and expertise to these tasks otherwise unlikely without a knowledge of the literature of "metropolitanism."

An agenda for just such a study has been established in this research. Its interdisciplinary thrust—an analysis and synthesis of urban-related historical materials and social science literature and data—provides numerous exemplars of curriculum development for teacher education programs in higher education. It narrows the theory-practice gap which, in general, marks the study of education and teacher education programs in particular. The prototypical course designs and redirected field experiences, as noted in the preceding chapter, suggest some basic first steps. In effect, the agenda proposes a reconceptualization of the foundations component of teacher education.

Research over an extended period of time is required to "test out" the ideas generated in this investigation. Such research is beyond the scope of this undertaking, but many "take hold" points have been identified. In effect, a good beginning has been made.
APPENDIX A
## Table 1

St. Louis Population: Increases/Decreases, 1900-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>St. Louis Population</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>575,238</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>687,029</td>
<td>+ 111,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>772,897</td>
<td>+ 85,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>821,960</td>
<td>+ 49,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>816,048</td>
<td>- 5,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>856,796</td>
<td>+ 40,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>750,026</td>
<td>- 106,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>622,236</td>
<td>- 127,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census
Table 2
St. Louis County Population:
Increases/Decreases, 1900-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>St. Louis County Population</th>
<th>Population Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>50,040</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>82,417</td>
<td>+ 32,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>100,737</td>
<td>+ 18,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>211,593</td>
<td>+ 110,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>274,230</td>
<td>+ 62,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>406,349</td>
<td>+ 132,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>703,532</td>
<td>+ 297,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>951,671</td>
<td>+ 248,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census
Table 3

Black/White Population in St. Louis, 1900-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>St. Louis Population</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>575,238</td>
<td>35,516</td>
<td>539,385</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>687,029</td>
<td>43,960</td>
<td>642,488</td>
<td>+ 8,444; + 103,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>772,897</td>
<td>69,854</td>
<td>702,615</td>
<td>+ 25,894; + 60,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>821,960</td>
<td>93,580</td>
<td>726,879</td>
<td>+ 23,726; + 24,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>816,048</td>
<td>108,765</td>
<td>706,794</td>
<td>+ 15,185; - 20,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>856,796</td>
<td>153,766</td>
<td>702,348</td>
<td>+ 45,001; - 4,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>750,026</td>
<td>214,377</td>
<td>534,202</td>
<td>+ 60,611; - 168,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>622,236</td>
<td>254,191</td>
<td>368,045 (approx.)</td>
<td>+ 39,814; - 166,157 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census
Table 4

Black/White Population in St. Louis County, 1900-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>St. Louis County Population</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black, White Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>50,040</td>
<td>3,526</td>
<td>46,511</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>82,417</td>
<td>4,253</td>
<td>78,146</td>
<td>+ 727; + 31,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>100,737</td>
<td>4,729</td>
<td>95,988</td>
<td>+ 476; + 17,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>211,593</td>
<td>9,645</td>
<td>201,791</td>
<td>+ 4,916; + 105,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>274,230</td>
<td>12,309</td>
<td>261,840</td>
<td>+ 2,664; + 60,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>406,349</td>
<td>16,819</td>
<td>389,336</td>
<td>+ 4,510; + 127,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>703,532</td>
<td>19,007</td>
<td>683,515</td>
<td>+ 2,188; + 294,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>951,671</td>
<td>45,495</td>
<td>906,176 (approx.)</td>
<td>+ 26,488; + 212,525 (approx.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census
Figure 1. Metropolitan St. Louis Area
Figure 2. Location of Major Highways in St. Louis SMSA
Figure 3. "Black" St. Louis--Area Bounded by Delmar Blvd., 20th Street, Natural Bridge, and City Limits
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