RICE UNIVERSITY

EDUCATION IN URBAN AREAS:
THE COMMUNITY AS THE CLASSROOM

by

JAMES M. WAITE

A THESIS SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARCHITECTURE

Thesis Director's signature:

Houston, Texas
May 1972
ABSTRACT

EDUCATION IN URBAN AREAS:
THE COMMUNITY AS THE CLASSROOM

James Waite

The present educational system can be characterized as emphasizing preparation—to prepare the young for adult life—and as being organized for institutional efficiency. The model for the present organization is one of mass production—for education was subject to pressures from business and industrial groups to adopt their management practices in the early part of this century. The school system concentrates its resources (facilities and materials) and workers (teachers) in strategic locations, and brings children (raw materials) to these locations for processing on a regular and systematic basis.

The present spatial organization of educational facilities—a localized one—is so organized to get the school as close to home as possible. The schools, supposedly, fit into some organization of the city. In a system with a 6-3-3 organization, the elementary school
is thought to be the social and recreational center of
the "neighborhood" unit and the junior high and high
school fit into a "community" which is a more complex
social area made up of two or more neighborhoods.

Two consequences of the present organization of
education are the lack of social mix and the separation of
education from the rest of life. Children go to school
for the most part with children from similar backgrounds.
In a diverse and pluralistic society, interaction of
diverse groups is essential for individual fulfillment.
Education is separate or isolated from other significant
aspects of our lives. The present system assumes that,
for the most part, children learn only in school and not
outside; it exposes students to a narrow range of other
students, teachers, and experiences; and it, therefore, has
little effect on students' lives. The task for the educa-
tional system is to organize the resources of the commu-
nity—its people, activities, and facilities into the edu-
cational process. This will require a new organization and
a re-thinking of the distribution of educational facilities.

The proposal, here, in the context of a polycentric
organization of a metropolitan area, will be a spatial
organization for an educational system which uses the whole community as its classroom. The proposal consists of two kinds of facilities: homebases and special learning centers. The homebase, which relates primarily to the residential distribution, should be seen (1) as an attempt to increase the availability of educational facilities, and (2) as providing a constant in an educational system in which students are moving throughout the city, and one which offers many options. The special learning centers are that part of the system which relates to the distribution of activities in commerce, government, industry, etc. They are (1) to serve as a bridge to the community to provide "real-life" contacts in specialized areas, (2) to bring people with special skills or knowledge into the educational system, (3) to provide continuing education for all people, and (4) provide special educational programs. The implications of this proposal are that education can become a generator of city form and activities, and that it can help to create "community," or establish common commitments and increase an individual's sense of relatedness, within the urban agglomeration.
This study was partially supported by a National Endowment for the Arts Graduate Thesis Fellowship Grant.
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1. THE PRESENT ORGANIZATION

Over a span of about one hundred years the American school system evolved from a single school, with one classroom and one teacher serving a variety of students, to complex systems with various levels of schools and with layers of administration designed to funnel resources down to the schools.

Education in the United States means "formal schooling." The educative functions in this country have been allocated to a single and separate institution—the school. The public school system today has assumed the educational role that in earlier times was performed by the family, the church, and other community organizations. In fact, American society today is still in the process of transferring some educational functions from other institutions to the school; e.g., vocational training, rehabilitation of the disadvantaged, early childhood training, and homemaking.¹
Underlying the establishment of a separate institution for education and its present organization as well, is the very purpose of education. Education is seen as preparation. "The establishment of formal schooling is commonly justified on the ground that we need a specialized institution to prepare children and youth for life as productive adults. . . . We get an education now so that at some later time we can earn money, vote intelligently, raise children, serve our country, and the like." With the establishment of formal schooling came a specialized profession: professional educators. The consequences of establishing a separate institution for education are important and will be presented in section 2.

The organization of education in the United States even though being institutionally separate and publicly sponsored (much criticism is directed at the educational system for being a public monopoly) could have taken many forms. It could, for instance, have become more or less a coordinating agency which simply directed students to a variety of learning experiences; experiences provided by the existing political, economic, religious, and
other cultural institutions. Schools might have become "supplementary agencies" somewhat like branch libraries distributed locally. But this is not the way education has been organized.

Education in the United States has been accused of being organized chiefly for institutional efficiency. The present organization has been characterized as simulating our industrialized society and the model has been one of "mass production." The educational system assembles large "masses of students (raw materials) to be processed by teachers (workers) in a centrally located school (factory). . . ."³

The school system concentrates the educational resources (schools and instructional tools) in strategic locations around the city, according to the distribution of the residential population, and assembles the students at these locations for processing on a "regular and systematic basis." Teachers are also brought to these locations and are organized by age levels and subject areas which correspond to levels into which the students are organized. The students assembled at these locations are then broken down into more manageable units; teacher-centered classrooms.⁴
This kind of organization has been typical throughout the industrialized era. In pre-industrialized societies education was much less institutionalized and much less a separate activity. What characterized pre-industrial education was that it looked to the past. The skills that a young boy would need in his future were simply the skills that his father needed. Skills were transmitted to the young by their parents and religious institutions, and by the community, through apprenticeships; teaching and learning were dispersed throughout the community.

With industrialization, though, skills were needed that neither the family nor the church could provide. Mass education and an organization that simulated the rest of society was the answer. The task was "to pre-adapt children for a new world—a world of repetitive indoor toil, smoke, noise, machines, crowded living conditions, collective discipline, a world in which time was to be regulated not by the cycle of sun and moon, but by the factory whistle and by the clock." Certain characteristics of modern education such as "the regimentation, lack of individualization, the rigid system of seating,
grouping, grading, and marking, the authoritarian role of the teacher" have drawn heavy criticism from Silberman, Holt, Goodman, and other educational reformers, but it is exactly those characteristics that made mass education so effective in adapting the young to industrial society.6 Completing their education, young people "emerged into adult society whose structure of jobs, roles, and institutions resembled that of the school itself. . .the child lived as well as learned a way of life modeled after the one he would lead in the future."7

Whether or not these practices were useful to an industrialized society, and they undoubtedly were, the fact that the educational system adopted such practices is not difficult to understand. From around 1910 to 1930 the educational establishment was subject to great pressures from business and industrial groups to adopt the management techniques employed in business and industry. The concerns of those groups was for "efficiency" in education; efficiency measured in cost per student. According to Callahan the response of the educational system to the pressures from business and industry can be seen in many aspects of the educational system.
"Efficiency procedures were applied to classroom learning and to teachers, to the program of studies, to the organization of the schools, to administrative functions, and to entire school systems." 8

The administrative hierarchy, for funneling resources down through the system and for establishing lines of authority for all concerned--students, parents, teachers, principals, superintendent, and school board; the organization of knowledge into disciplines such as math, English, social studies, etc.; the organization of activities into departments (the division of labor)--teaching (with its many subdivisions), administration, guidance, etc.; the organization of students into classrooms of equal size with uniform and rigid time schedules and seating systems; the authoritarian role of the teacher and the emphasis on control; the standardized program with the same data base (textbooks, materials, etc.) and set of experiences (standard lessons) for everyone; and finally the monitorial system, the whole idea of assembling large numbers of students at one school with similar schools placed strategically around the city according to the distribution of the residential population,
are all grounded on business and industrial assumptions. It is true that there have been many deviations from the mass production model; e.g., team teaching, modular scheduling, programmed instruction, field trips, the informal classroom (gives the student the freedom to organize his own learning experiences), etc., but these are changes within the "school" and within the over-all assumption that education is necessarily preparation and therefore separate from other activities.

THE PRESENT DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS

The mass production model says that the educational resources should be placed strategically around the city according to where people live. The pattern of distribution depends on the particular organization for instruction in the district. There are various organizations in use; 8-4 (8 primary and 4 secondary), 6-3-3 (6 elementary, 3 junior high and 3 high school) or k6-3-3 (includes kindergarten), 6-2-4, 4-4-4, 6-3-3-2, and 4-4-4-4. The 8-4 and 6-3-3 plans are the most common. The 8-4 plan is the traditional plan in this country and is usually found
now in rural areas. This plan appeared when it was decided that the eight-year grammar school would not be adequate educational preparation for American society, so a four-year high school was added to the plan. The 6-3-3 plan appeared as a result of dissatisfaction with the 8-4 plan. It was believed that a transition was needed between the two levels of the 8-4 plan, and thus the junior high school and the 6-3-3 plan was born. The 6-3-3 plan is found primarily in urban areas. In 1949 70 percent of the school districts in cities with a population of 100,000 or greater were organized with the 6-3-3 or 6-3-3-2 plan. The 6-3-3-2 plan combines a two-year junior college with the 6-3-3 plan.

Over the years standards were established that affected the frequency of distribution. Two such sets of standards involve the size of schools and their distance from the student's home.

Desirable Sizes of Schools

- Elementary school (K-6) .... 200-700 students
- Junior high school ........ 300-900 students
- High school .............. 400-1500 students
These standards are not universally accepted. The National Council on Schoolhouse Construction in 1964 recommended that elementary schools with a student enrollment of over 500 and a high school with an enrollment of over 1000 would produce disadvantages that would outweigh advantages of economy of operation. It was generally believed, though, that schools should be large enough to have at least one class per grade level.

Maximum Distances from Home to School¹²

- elementary school (K-6) .......... 3/4 mi.
- junior high school ............... 1-1/2 mi.
- high school ...................... 2 mi.

These maximum distances also have not been universally accepted. Other sources give 1/2 mile for an elementary school and 3 miles for a high school. The important point, however, is that it was felt that the school (especially the elementary school) should be as close to home as possible.
Fig. 1.1
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TWO MODELS FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS
Table I:

Percentage of Total Enrollment in Each Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grade</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.1\textsuperscript{14} and Fig. 1.2\textsuperscript{15} are two models for the distribution of educational facilities in a district with a 6-3-3 plan. Fig. 1 has a 16:4:1 ratio of elementary to junior high to high school and Fig. 2 has a ratio of 10:2:1. Table 1 shows, for the nation as a whole, the percentage of the total 1964 public school enrollment in each grade level. Assuming a hypothetical school district with an enrollment of 100,000, which according to 1964 statistics would correspond to a total population of about 500,000,\textsuperscript{16} the enrollment in our hypothetical district would be 57,500 in elementary, 23,200 in junior high, and 19,300 in high school. A 10:2:1 ratio as in Fig. 1.2 could conceivably produce 150 elementary schools, 30 junior high schools, and 15 high schools. This would then produce average enrollments of 380 for an elementary school, 770 for a junior high, and 1280 for a high school, and these are all within the desired ranges on page 8.
If treated similarly, the model in Fig. 1.1 also works, although it produces small elementary schools and large high schools. No large district, however, would conform perfectly to any particular model. School districts for example may not be organized strictly to one plan. The Houston Independent School District has predominantly a 6-3-3 plan but contains some schools that are combined elementary and junior high schools and others that are combined junior high and high schools. The important point is not the particular ratio but how the organization of schools fits into some organization of the city.

The lowest level of the 6-3-3 organization, the elementary school, is generally considered to be the neighborhood school. The neighborhood is thought of as the basic unit of the larger community and the elementary school its nucleus. The neighborhood school theoretically serves as the social and recreational center of the neighborhood, and its goals are "parental involvement, close geographical location, student friendships both in school and in the neighborhood, teacher interaction in the community, local and political economic control, responsiveness to pupil needs, and even
efficiency due to close supervision by the immediate public consumers."\textsuperscript{18}

The neighborhood, it is said, should be bounded by arterial streets along which the local commercial and business concerns should be placed. The elementary school, though, is to be located centrally in the neighborhood, away from the busy streets and away from the shopping areas to eliminate possible discipline problems. The school should also be related to parks or playfields.\textsuperscript{19}

Whereas the elementary school is part of the neighborhood unit, the basic into which the junior high and high school fit is a "community." A community is "two or more neighborhoods with common interests and close proximity." The relationship of these two levels to the home is not as close as it is with the elementary school; they are thought to serve larger and more complex social areas.\textsuperscript{20}

Although there are other factors which determine the location of school facilities (traffic patterns, available land, zoning, geographic characteristics of the area, etc.), the primary consideration is where people live, or more precisely, where the students live. To locate
facilities, then, the distribution of students, and future students, must be known. The distribution of students can be recorded, by age, on a map of the district. Growth projections and changes in the distribution of the population can be recorded, and when a new educational facility is planned, its location is largely determined by attempting to include as many of the students as possible within the particular radius for that level of school; e.g., 3/4 mile for an elementary school (see Fig. 1.3).
2. CONSEQUENCES AND AN ALTERNATIVE

Two major consequences of the present organization are the lack of social mix and the separation of education from the rest of life.

2.1. THE LACK OF SOCIAL MIX

For the most part, children in the United States go to school with children from similar socioeconomic backgrounds. I have mentioned in the first section that the primary consideration for the distribution of educational facilities is where the students live, and that the schools supposedly fit into some basic organizational units of the city—"neighborhoods" and "communities."

The obvious consequence of tying a student to a locale is that if the neighborhood or community happens to be all or largely non-white, then the students in that area attend a school that is all or largely non-white. In 1968, a study of high schools (700) in the 45 largest cities by the National Association of Secondary
School Principals found that from 1960 there had been a 30 per cent increase in the number of high schools with a black enrollment greater than 61 per cent. The study showed that only 8 per cent of the high schools in those cities had enrollments where either blacks or whites constituted between 21 and 60 per cent of the total enrollment. Almost 20 per cent of the high schools in this group had an enrollment that was more than 80 per cent black.\(^1\)

This problem has been an increasing one for the central cities of large metropolitan areas. Central cities have come to be populated increasingly by the poor and non-white. Two factors have combined to produce this: an increase in the non-white population and a loss in the white population. From 1960-70, ten of the central cities in the twenty-five largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) had an increase in its black population of 40 per cent or more. Nineteen central cities in those same twenty-five SMSA's had an absolute decline in white population. Eight of those nineteen central cities had a net loss of 20 per cent or more. In all cases, the central cities in the twenty-five
largest SMSA's had a larger percentage of non-whites in 1970 than they had in 1960. In 1970, nine of those central cities had a population that was more than 33 1/3 per cent non-white and five of those were more than 40 per cent non-white. The most extreme example is Washington, D. C., which, in 1970, was 72.3 per cent non-white.²

The public school enrollment in central cities likewise is becoming increasingly non-white. Non-whites actually constitute a larger percentage of the public school enrollment than they do of the total population. Washington, D. C., for example, has a public school enrollment that is more than 93 per cent non-white.³ The population of Houston is 25.7 per cent black, but blacks constitute 37.7 per cent of the enrollment in the Houston Independent School District.⁴ Despite the fact that non-whites tend to drop out of school before whites do, they constitute a relative higher percentage of the school enrollment than of the total population; due partly to the practice of white families sending their children to parochial or other private schools.
What about the "neighborhood school," and attaching the student to a locale? First of all, one of the problems with tying the distribution of schools to residential patterns is that residential patterns change, and as the population becomes more mobile they will change more rapidly. The changing patterns are partly a result of advances in technology. Dutch architect N. J. Habraken has said that "a town is always composed of some areas which are new, some of which are old and the standard of our dwelling depends on where we happen to live. . . ." He describes a continuous game of "musical chairs" in which the population is constantly moving to be in the "best housing, among the latest ideas, devices, and amenities."

Peter Rossi has also discussed the residential mobility of the population. His study of why families move focused on the voluntary decisions of people to move. Involuntary decisions he defined as those that were forced on a family (e.g., by condemning a building) or those that were related to perhaps changes in jobs or marital status. Rossi says that housing can either satisfy, frustrate, or over-fulfill a particular family's needs.
Voluntary decisions (three out of five in Rossi's study were of this type) to move, then, would be based on desires to bring a family's housing more in line with its needs. Families go through a life cycle of growth (raising children) and decline (children leaving home, death), so its housing needs change over time. Rossi found that the need for more space, in the growth part of the cycle, was by far the most important factor in decisions to move. Besides decisions based on life cycle growth and decline, there are those that relate to social needs or desires--to bring housing in line with social needs. As children grow older and spend more time outside the home, the quality of the surrounding area becomes more important to the family (who will the child be playing with, what school will he go to). In addition, as a family moves up the social ladder, it wants to be in a location that fits with the family's social aspirations. At any rate, the problem for the school system is one of adapting to continually changing residential patterns.

The neighborhood has been thought of as the basic unit of the larger community and the elementary school its nucleus. The very concept of neighborhoods applied
to large cities has been questioned. One concept of an ideal neighborhood is a self-contained community of about 7000 persons which is large enough to populate an elementary school, and support a convenience shopping center and a community center. The neighborhood concept was an attempt to apply the social organization of a small town to the city. In a small town, a person who went to main street (which is the small town counterpart of the large city convenience shopping center) would run into friends, people he worked with, went to school or church with, or other people with whom he had dealings. A whole network of cross-connections was possible. A large city, however, does not work that way. A large city offers diversity; a wide range of choices. People pick and choose from the city as a whole for their jobs, friends, services, entertainment, goods, etc. This is not to say that "neighborhoods" do not exist, but as long as neighborhoods are thought of as self-contained units and modeled after small towns, they will be meaningless in a large city.

Robert Primack has said, regarding the neighborhood school, that:
1. It never happened
2. if it happened, its significance has been misinterpreted
3. and even if we interpret it correctly, it is now irrelevant. 8

He said that the neighborhood concept, or localism, made sense when society had some "geographic stability and limits, when the future had a high degree of structure and certainty, and the value system and major institutions were largely unquestioned." 9 This is hardly true of American society today and is even becoming less so. "For the rural society and early industrial capitalism it (the neighborhood school) was marginally functional, but for the new urbanism, the new technology, the new internationalism, the neighborhood school is an anachronism." 10

But the neighborhood school is still considered sacrosanct by many people, and in fact, in the last few years there have been demands from new sources (minorities) for the neighborhood school in a new form--the community school. The community school is a product of the local control controversy. Some people believe that the way for blacks, for instance, to get effective education is for them to get complete control over their
own school or schools. According to Primack, though, "there are no studies of any respectable standing which correlate the political unit of control with the geographical unit or show the desirability of oppressed minority control of education as a means for successful educational experiences." He in fact says that there is slight evidence to the contrary. The Japanese and Jews, who both experienced a certain amount of prejudice, rarely ever had control over their schools, yet both groups were very successful in the educational system.  

This is not an argument against local control, but simply a suggestion that the answer to minority education does not necessarily lie in minority control of their own schools. The Coleman Commission Report (1966), for instance, stated that the family background of an individual student had a great effect on his achievement. Any attempt to improve the education of minorities will have to deal with that problem or its success will be something less than complete.  

Indeed, it would seem that the ultimate in local control is where an individual has control over his education; where the student is offered many options and
the individual is given more responsibility for his own learning. These two things, more options and greater responsibility for students, are important. Many believe that they cannot be achieved in the present context of "school," and that education must go beyond the walls of the school. But this will be discussed later.

"The American educational system as it now operates is turning out seriously unequal citizens." Clark has said that "our urban schools are spawning hundreds of thousands of functional illiterates who are incapable of playing a constructive role in society. . . ." The record of the public schools has improved substantially since World War II, as far as the disadvantaged are concerned, but there is still much room for improvement. Many central city schools are still failing their minority students, and as a result, many students are still being kept from participating in the social, political, and economic life of the larger community.

The failure of the educational system to fully close the gap between the disadvantaged and the white majority prompted the implementation of massive and expensive remedial or compensatory educational programs during the
1960's. These were attempts to counter the effects of deprivation on the disadvantaged. From 1965-68 the United States spent over three billion dollars on approximately six million disadvantaged children under the Title I program. This has been the largest and most expensive compensatory program ever attempted and the results of the program have been disappointing. According to Ivan Illich, the disadvantaged have fallen even further behind their middle-class counterparts. While there have been disappointments in existing programs, the theory of compensatory education is not necessarily invalidated. The programs have been implemented on a mass basis, whereas in the past, the success of compensatory programs (the tutor for the low achieving child from a rich family) depended on a close relationship between the tutor and tutored, and also on tailoring the program to the individual.

The Coleman Commission documented the record of the American public school system concerning the educational achievement of disadvantaged groups. The Commission set out to test some 570,000 students, and collect information on some 60,000 teachers and some 4000 schools in all
50 states. It measured skills necessary in American society for getting a job and for job and social mobility. The skills measured were in reading, writing, calculating, and problem solving. The study showed that Indian Americans, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Blacks on the average all scored distinctly lower on the tests than the average white student. This difference between the white majority and the ethnic/racial groups was found at all grade levels.17

The Commission began its study with the presumption that (1) school facilities were not comparable for blacks and whites and (2) that the quality of schools determined a student's level of achievement. This was generally believed prior to the study. The study showed, however, that there were not great differences in the quality of schools for blacks and whites.18 Christopher Jencks did some further analysis on the data from the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey (EEOS—the Coleman Commission survey) and his conclusions support those of the Coleman Commission. He found little racial bias (and little social bias as well—this was not discussed by the Coleman Commission) in the allocation of school
resources, and he also found that, after accounting for race and family background, school policies and resources were not strongly related to achievement.  

Two other conclusions of the Coleman Report were that achievement was related to (1) a student's sense of control over the environment, or over one's destiny, and (2) a student's family and community background. On family background, the report said that if the educational system's influence is the same for blacks and whites, and if it strongly influences the home environment, then both groups will perform the same. If the educational system's influence is weak, then the two groups will perform differently, as a result of the differing influences of the home environment; the home environment of the white majority being more highly motivating than the home environment of blacks. In essence, the Coleman Report said that "the relative intensity of the convergent school influences and the divergent out-of-school influences determine the effectiveness of the educational system." The educational system's effectiveness will be determined by the intensity with which it influences individuals and the responsibility for creating academic
and behavioral achievement "rests with the educational institution, not with the child."\textsuperscript{21}

One of the strongest pieces of evidence for the importance of family background is the fact that in the first grade, black children are already significantly behind white children in verbal skills.\textsuperscript{22} That the family background of a student is important for his achievement in school has never really been doubted. Marshall Smith, in his reappraisal of the EEOS data found some error in calculations and he says that the mistake actually produced an underestimate of the importance of family background. Smith's analysis, however, does not confirm the Coleman Commission's conclusions on the decreasing importance of family background from grades 6-12. He says that the Commission's findings are not necessarily wrong, but cannot be supported by the data.\textsuperscript{23}

On the question of integration, it was found that racial composition has only a slight relationship to verbal achievement after school quality, social class composition, and student's family background have been accounted for. The racial composition of classrooms within schools is related to the verbal achievement of
black students, even after taking into account the other factors. The effect, though, is not great—but neither is it negligible.\textsuperscript{24}

The Coleman Commission studied the effects of racial composition but did not look at the effects of social composition on educational achievement. Jencks tried to determine the effects of the latter. He found a strong relation between social composition and achievement, after accounting for race and family background. He was limited in that the EEOS data was not ideal for studying this relationship, and the conclusions are still somewhat speculative. For instance, the question remains are the fellow students of an individual from a lower-class family who attends a middle-class school what influence his achievement, or is it that the family that sends him there is more achievement oriented and more supportive than another poor family whose child attends a lower class school?\textsuperscript{25} Commenting on Jancks' findings, Mosteller and Moynihan have said, regarding socioeconomic integration, that "we don't know that integration will boost the achievement of disadvantaged children, but all EEOS evidence and the bulk of other evidence suggests that it will help somewhat."\textsuperscript{26}
The implications of the Coleman Report and the further analysis of the EEOS data are that closing the disadvantaged--white majority achievement gap will require giving attention to the socioeconomic condition of the individual disadvantaged family. Neither upgrading school facilities nor integration, either alone or together, will close the gap. Even in a racially integrated school, blacks will not rise to the achievement levels of whites if there is a difference in socioeconomic levels of the two groups. According to Jencks, the most fruitful attempts would be to change the way in which lower-class parents dealt with their children at home. Financial programs, such as income maintenance, family allowances, employment training, etc. might be as important, if not more so, as integration.

But integration (socioeconomic) might have some positive effects on educational achievement, and there is still another consideration: to look at the question of integration in terms of diversity and connection.

Diversity, here, means "individual and group differences that result from human uniqueness and cultural pluralism." Integration is not for the purposes of assimilation or acculturation, but should be seen as
interaction of, or establishing connections between, diverse groups. This country has been operating under the notion of the "melting pot," but according to Glazer and Moynihan, the melting pot never occurred. Glazer and Moynihan studied the blacks, Jews, Puerto Ricans, Italians, and Irish in New York City and found that, even though the group cultures changed over time, group consciousness, solidarity, and distinctiveness still existed in the third generation.31 Nor should the melting pot have occurred, because as Kenneth Keniston has said, "human diversity and variety must not only be tolerated, but rejoiced in, applauded, and encouraged."32

To encourage individual uniqueness and a sense of one's own worth is to encourage diversity—without diversity, individual potential is not fulfilled.

Social diversity has a double connection to individual fulfillment: not only is a diverse society a pre-condition for human wholeness, it is its consequence—the kind of society whole men and women choose to live in. . . . The goals of human fulfillment and social diversity require each other.33

There presently is not much interaction between diverse elements in our society. "We are constantly
brain-washed into accepting the middle-class mainstream that predominates American thinking. When a group such as the blacks in America are not permitted to join the mainstream they see it as their cultural heritage being denied—they are angered and their sense of identity is lost. Human potential cannot be truly fulfilled if there is no interaction between diverse elements in a society. "Sameness, homogeneity, and the assimilation of diversity into one main body of culture, stultifies society and stunts the growth of human potential. We have to learn to interact without overwhelming, with bilingualism, black history, and other cultural values. These are simultaneous and different, and we can live with both."

Therefore, it is important in American society to, on the one hand, encourage and enhance diversity, and at the same time foster and facilitate the interaction of diverse groups. Social mix, or socioeconomic integration, in this sense is essential.
2.2. THE SEPARATION OF EDUCATION FROM THE REST OF LIFE

Newman and Oliver wrote that the establishment of a single and separate institution for education was based on the view that the purpose of education was to prepare the young for adult life. Education is not an end in itself but rather a means to some other ends. It implies closure. Education is begun in kindergarten and is terminated with graduation from high school or college; the student then is ready for "real life."

But schools are concerned primarily with mental-emotional growth. By confining education to a certain period of life the system in effect says that mental emotional growth occurs only within a certain segment of our lifetime; that there is a period in which one is growing and in which one has matured. This is not the case. According to Newman and Oliver "adulthood, far from being a period of stable maturity, is no more than a continuing process of mental-emotional growth (and biological change) presenting conflicts and problems of adjustment as stormy and challenging as growth during childhood and adolescence." The question, then, is if
mental-emotional development occurs throughout life, why limit education to only the first part of life?

The tendency of formal schooling to isolate children during a period of preparation for adulthood has produced a rigid system of age-grading which has as one effect a fractionation of the human career. This tends to hinder the development of meaningful relationships among generations and cultivates a fragmented, rather than continuous concept of self. The prevailing conception that children can learn only from, rather than with, adults and the forced submission of youth to the rule of adults amplifies the conflict between generations and encourages a posture of dependency, a sense of powerlessness that may carry over from youth to adulthood.²

The educational system has little effect on student behavior outside of school precisely because it is separate from the life outside. It is isolated from the "problems, dilemmas, choices, and phenomena encountered beyond school walls. . . .there is a sense of unreality inherent in living in two discontinuous worlds, if one is to take both seriously."³

There have been some modern educational reforms, such as the development of simulation techniques, which are attempts to make education more relevant by trying to bring real life situations into the classroom. But
these reforms just like the reforms of earlier progressives, who tried to match work in school with the work outside, are still within "instructional contexts" and are "therefore detached from actual and significant concerns." ⁴

By confining learning to "a box," separated from the larger community, education has created a "refuge in which students do not need to explore but only accept." ⁵ What the student learns is never tested against the realities of life. "It is a common feeling that what is learned in school is learned only for the purposes of the school and this is the well known irrelevance of education." ⁶ John Bremer believes that the traditional school is no longer in phase with the rest of society, especially its youth segment. The world has become too complex for education to operate in only one way. There must be alternatives for students and education must find a way to reestablish connections with society.

"In a neighborhood school, even one that uses the local community resources, a student can go all the way through school without knowing the city." ⁷ Many of the
children in cities, especially the disadvantaged, remain in the same geographic area for a large part of their lives, and it has been established that the interests and attitudes of children are influenced most by the immediate environment rather than by institutions such as the school. McDonald has said that despite the great physical mobility characterizing our society, "a child growing up on the north side of Chicago may never get to the Art Institute, Shedd Aquarium, or Adler planetarium, and if financially handicapped--the chance of moving about the city to use its resources is extremely limited and the cultural environment is not likely to motivate him to avail himself of such resources." In poverty areas the residents have been characterized as "community-bound." They are knowledgeable and can function within their immediate environment, but "they can be timid about venturing unto unfamiliar areas or doing unfamiliar things--being forced to go out of their community to seek what they need causes resentment." According to John Bremer "we pretend that students learn inside school and not outside in the community." The educational institution includes teachers and
administrators, but excludes parents, businessmen, other professionals, and other people in the community with special skills. Since the institution of education is separate from the rest of life it required a specialized profession; professional educators, who quickly isolated themselves from other professions and fields. An educational establishment grew and it became dedicated to "the study, servicing, and expansion of formal schooling as a separate and discrete institution, often accumulating powerful vested interests irrelevant to the real improvement of education. . . . To the extent that schools are staffed by professional educators, learning tends to become isolated from the significant concerns of the community, and the narrower functions and tasks of the school come to dominate the broader purposes of education."\textsuperscript{11}

The narrow functions of the school have led to an educational program that can be characterized largely by uniformity. In this, the public school system has a long history. In the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth century, at a time of rapid industrialization in this country, and
also at the time when the basic organization of education was being formulated, there was a great influx of people immigrating from Europe. Diversity was the rule then, more than at any other time, and it was believed to be necessary for the educational system to serve to integrate, or to serve as the "common melting pot." This was done by "emphasizing a common heritage, common aspirations, common learnings, common dress, and a common routine within the school." According to Newman and Oliver uniformity and conformity have characterized the American educational system ever since.

Even though education in the United States is publicly sponsored and attendance compulsory, it can "conceivably encourage and reinforce cultural diversity by providing a wide range of alternative types of education." The fact remains, however, the American educational system has not done this. "Schools have attempted to file down or erase distinctive cultural traits, denying that important cultural diversity ever existed." The educational establishment has combined with other forces at work in America, such as the mass media and the publishing industry, to produce an over-all effect
of cultural uniformity. The public school system, through compulsory attendance, has gained a virtual monopoly over the lives of persons from age six to early twenties, and although it is not solely responsible, this monopoly has allowed it to "accelerate the process of cultural standardization."

Today it is not uncommon for responsible educators to assert that traditional schooling with its regimented approach to teaching, has failed to engage the minds of most children most of the time; that in placing a premium on conformity and insisting that children behave like silent mannequins for much of the day, the schools have become grim and joyless. More and more of those who run the schools are conceding that instruction from first grade through graduate school too often is pallid and unpalatable, too far removed from the juicy vitality of the world beyond the classroom. . . .

The resource system, the "means and materials for extending and enriching a person's education" is limited under the present organization first of all to what can be provided in the school context, and further to what can be distributed to the various schools or, in some cases, to what can be moved around from school to school. Generally, the kinds of programs and facilities that can be economically provided by a school district
have been limited by the size and, therefore, the number of schools in the district. The concept of the educational park is in part a response to this problem. The education park provides:

1. facilities that could be too expensive to provide in a greater number of smaller schools.

2. programs that require highly specialized teachers who could not be staffed in all schools.

3. programs that would attract too few students in smaller schools.

4. services in health, recreation, counseling, job placement, and education of the handicapped which are either not provided or only partially provided in smaller schools.  

But the education park can be as isolated or as insulated from the community as the neighborhood school. The issue here is not one of dispersal versus consolidation but rather one of isolation versus using the resources of the community.
2.3. THE COMMUNITY AS THE CLASSROOM

The task confronting education is to "create a system in which the resources of the city are intimately integrated with the educational process, so that large numbers of children can utilize all the resources of the city for their education."¹

The city is already a teacher. It teaches children many things:

. . .how to pop drugs; how to be a successful bully or extortionist; how to pick pockets and shoplift without being caught; how to break windows, bend parking meters, strew toilet paper, and paint obscenities on public buildings; how to con others into sympathy; how to hate and injure and terrorize; how to beat raps.

Cities "set and symbolize the value preference of the overwhelming majority of our people. The city manufactures the cultural wasteland that is universally disseminated on film, tape, and microwaves; the city prints the pornography and the scandal sheets; it rips the ears with rivets, pneumatic drills, horns and subways; it spews poisons into the air and pollution into our waters. Its overcrowding dehumanizes our souls, and destroys our sympathy."²

It has been the belief of educators that the school classroom should be an antidote to what the city teaches.
According to Bailey, that belief has been partly responsible for the failure of education. The point is that the city is an effective teacher, and the school not always so. The problem is to organize the positive aspects of the community as educational resources.

The city is the focal point for the creation and reproduction and display of almost everything that is beautiful and ennobling and memorable in our civilization. It is in the great cities that theaters and symphonies and museums and libraries are located. In and around cities are the centers of the vast enterprises of commerce and industry, of medicine and social service, of transportation and communication that hold such enormous promise for the future of the human race. Cities are the foci of modern guilds and labor unions whose apprenticeships are such an important part of our total educative system. In our cities, professional and aesthetic talent of exquisite talent abounds. Cities are pluralistic; cities offer options.

Bremer's premises in the Philadelphia Parkway program were that students learn in and from the community—"the complex and real city in which they live." He says that children learn what they choose to learn; that they will learn that which interests them; and they learn in cooperation, not competition, with each other. To bring these premises to a reality, the whole
system of "homogeneous grouping, testing, grading, and memorizing" must be discarded.\(^4\)

If links are established between education and other community activities then both the school and the community will have to stop operating by a different set of rules. A "student cannot go from a passive, unresponsible role in the classroom to an active, effective one in the community." Education must be put "in step with the pace of the community, so that students can operate in both...[and] work effectively toward real solutions to real problems."\(^5\)

According to Fantini and Young there is evidence that students do learn more effectively in "real, process-oriented, active, and personalized situations," and they have stated that the educational system should provide a variety of experiences in areas such as commerce, government, and community service, in which the student can be involved in "real-life learning experiences."\(^6\)

The informal classroom is one major modern educational reform. Basically, the informal classroom is child-centered rather than teacher-centered, and it gives the student responsibility for organizing his own learning
program. Discipline is seen as coming from within, through freedom, rather than being externally imposed. The student moves around the classroom and works on whatever interests him. There are things expected of him, however. In the case of an elementary student, he is expected to do a certain amount of reading, writing, and arithmetic, but he does them when he wants, and at his own pace. A high school student is expected to complete a certain project or task which he himself has chosen, with some guidance from the professional staff. The informal classroom has been gaining acceptance in the United States, especially at the elementary school level, but the problem is that it is still a reform within the instructional contexts of school. The concept is still valid, though, and it has now become necessary to expand the informal classroom concept, such as the Parkway program in Philadelphia has done, beyond the walls of the school. The city, then, becomes the informal classroom.

The resource potential of urban communities is tremendous. They offer a multitude of learning laboratories; a great number of people, activities, and
facilities that can and should be organized into the educational process. They offer problems to be solved and conflicts to be resolved, and they contain the political, governmental, and economic mechanisms for their resolution.

The educational system, with a new kind of apprenticeship, must find a way to use the talents and experience of doctors, lawyers, governmental officials, businessmen, musicians, scientific researchers, planners, builders, and many others to some educational advantage for students. Rather than compartmentalizing students into age groups, students should be exposed to a variety of kinds of people and a variety of age levels. Students learn from and with adults and from and with other students, and it works both ways. Arthur Pearl at the University of Oregon found that in cross-age tutoring, both the tutor and the student benefited.8

The family unit, just as the larger community, is an un-tapped resource. It has been found that the home is an important and effective educator, for better or worse, for any one child.9 It would be beneficial for both parents and child to participate in a "joint
venture" in education. Through this participation parents would be more aware of what the educational system was doing, and more aware of its goals. In a time when there is much talk about "community control" it would seem to give the citizen-parent a stronger case for a voice in educational decision-making, and it would give them a stronger base from which to make decisions. They would have more of a stake in the educational system; they would be both teacher and learner.

The community as a whole suffers from the failures of the educational system and it would seem reasonable that the community should assume a greater responsibility in educating its citizens. Linking education with other activities—establishing new and closer relationships between individuals and institutions—can have important and positive effects on the individual. Frustrations in dealing with large institutions are common. As closer relationships are developed and as students work in and learn about an institution, they learn how to "negotiate the system and a sense of potency and power can result from learning how these institutions operate." This could have a significant effect on student achievement,
according to the Coleman Commission which found that a sense of control over one's own destiny was an important predictor of a student's performance.

Ivan Illich has proposed four kinds of educational resources which, to a large degree already exist in cities. They are: (1) skill models; (2) peer matches; (3) professional educators; and (4) educational objects. He proposes establishing new networks, or "learning webs," to make these resources available and accessible to anyone who wanted to learn.11

The first of these networks involves skills—such as reading, typing, accounting, foreign languages, computer programming, understanding electrical circuitry, machinery manipulation, etc. A "Skill Exchange" would provide a network by which people with special skills could be made accessible to anyone in the community who wanted to learn a particular skill. Many skills are scarce in the present educational system precisely because the educational system requires that the teaching of skills be done by "certified" people.

The second network, "Peer-Matching," which is essentially a communications network, involves bringing
together persons interested in the same learning activity. Present schools, with their standardized programs emphasize the commonality of students, but the peer-matching network would simply bring together persons who, at one point in time, had a common, specific interest, even if it was all they had in common. It expands the range of peers with whom a student can interact. Instead of limiting the range of peer-matches to what the school classroom, or even the school as a whole, can provide, the network expands it to what the community as a whole can provide. This has important implications for student individuality, because it provides a means by which a person with a very special interest can find someone else to share it with.

The third network is the "Reference Services to Educators-at-Large." Illich says that three kinds of professional educators would be needed. One kind would be responsible for operating the networks, and for maintaining the facilities and their accessibility (e.g., through transportation). A second group would be responsible for guiding and counseling individual students, and for assisting students in reaching their
educational goals. A third group, called educational masters, would provide "intellectual leadership" for students.

The fourth, and last network, the "Reference Services to Educational Objects" would provide access to facilities and things that can be used for learning. It would provide "special access to ordinary things... [and] easy and dependable access to special things made for educational purposes." The former applies to things in everyday use; the resources of and in the community's businesses, institutions, factories, etc. Examples might be working with a machine in a factory, or with an airplane in an airport hangar. The "special things" are objects reserved specially for educational purposes, and would consist of the resources of and in libraries, museums, botanical gardens, zoological parks, laboratories, etc. There might also be special "rental agencies" for storing many kinds of educational materials.12

Private facilities and activities, and even public ones, the way they are presently structured, exclude children (or most people for that matter) from their "special domain." But if the artifacts of and in those
facilities are to be used for education, then those facilities will have to cease to be impenetrable. Incentives could be used to induce community establishments to expand their concerns to include education. Tax credits or outright payments could be given to those establishments which provided some kind of educational service. It will not be easy to penetrate those "special domains," but the potential gains should make it worth the trouble. The Parkway Program in Philadelphia, though, has already done it—penetrated some of the city's establishments.

The Parkway Program, a "non-school" high school, is a combination of the informal classroom and the education without walls (EWOW) concepts; the city of Philadelphia is the informal classroom. Except for a headquarters where tutorial groups meet (for counseling, program planning, evaluation), there are no fixed sites for classes. Classes are held wherever the students and staff can find resources to take advantage of, or wherever they can find space for classes.

Parkway began in 1969 with just 143 students, and has grown each year. Students have been very favorable
towards the program. In the second year alone, over
10,000 high school students applied for 500 places in
the program. Selection for the program is done com¬
pletely by lottery, with an equal number of students
coming from each of the eight school areas in Philadel¬
phia. Some students are also accepted from parochial,
private, and suburban schools. The student body is
predominantly middle-class, although in 1970, it was a
little more than 50 per cent black. As far as intelli¬
gence goes, it includes a wide range of students (I.Q.
range from 74-140) and also includes students who are
college-bound and those who are not.13

After about two years of operation, over 200 com¬
munity organizations were participating in the program,
including the Franklin Institute, General Electric Co.,
Insurance Company of North America, Drama Guild, Urban
League, police department, public library, an art museum,
a local art college, a professional jeweler, hospitals,
a city newspaper, an automotive garage, churches, an
architectural firm, a T.V. station, and the zoo. These
organizations either provide space, equipment, or instruc¬
tion, or all three. The extent of their participation in
instruction might be from a single learning unit to the planning and teaching of an entire course.

The program is organized into units of 180 students. Each unit is independent of the other units and they have their own headquarters (which contain office space for the staff, lockers for students, and space for tutorials and town meetings), staff, and their own curriculum. The program expands by adding an entire new unit, not by adding to existing ones.

The curriculum of each unit has five basic areas. They are: (1) faculty offerings; (2) institutional offerings; (3) tutorials; (4) management groups; and (5) town meetings. Faculty offerings are courses taught by the Parkway staff or interns (from local colleges). They are the more academic courses such as geometry, typing, languages, etc., but a particular course taught by a staff member would be one in which he had a special interest or special knowledge, such as a course on 17th century poets by an English teacher. Institutional offerings are the courses offered by institutions and individuals in the community (businesses, industries, hospitals, museums, etc.). The tutorial is a sub-group of
each unit and it consists of 15-16 students, selected randomly, and two faculty members. The tutorial is what really holds the program together. Its functions are to satisfy state requirements in math and English (this may be done in a number of different ways), evaluate a student's performance (students also evaluate the program and teachers), provide emotional support and counseling (on program planning) for students, and to provide for administration—keeping track of where students are. Management groups in each unit are ad hoc student groups which are formed for attacking specific problems that arise, and the town meeting is a weekly gathering of the entire unit student body and staff for discussing current community problems. 14, 15

The distribution of the Parkway unit headquarters is an uneven one, and they are not localized. They each draw their students from the school district as a whole and locations for headquarters have been determined by where available space could be found. One unit occupies one floor in an old office building and another is in a partially used elementary school.
A note here on social mix. Busing, school pairing, and school consolidation are presently the means of achieving integration in a residentially segregated society. But this is still accepting the present organization of education. Integration means confrontation and interaction, and these do not necessarily happen in an "integrated" school under the present organization. The school, with its standardized program, serves the white middle class (and even them not very well) before it serves blacks and other minority groups. It just further alienates them. But now, giving the student responsibility for his learning (the informal classroom) and using the community as the classroom offer a greater potential. Using the community as the classroom assumes there is only one school—the community itself (by community I mean the metropolitan area—see section 4). By using the voluntarism of students, which comes with the informal classroom, how much better it would be to collect persons from diverse groups around particular interests, activities, and facilities. The networks operating Illich's educational objects and peer-matches would be color-blind. Persons, regardless of race or class, with
particular interests, would be collected around activities and at facilities as a result of those interests. Different classes and races undoubtedly have different interests, but there are common interests. Mass media sees to that. I have already stated that Glazer and Moynihan found group solidarity and distinctiveness after the third generation in their study-groups, but the fact remains that the groups did change—they are Americanized. So, the task for education is to make accessible, a range of activities and experiences as diverse as possible, to permit genuine interaction of individuals from diverse groups.
3. ADVANCES IN TECHNOLOGY: IMPLICATIONS

Today the schools are criticized for their failure to provide equality of opportunity to poor black children. The charge is true, but it is by no means the whole truth, nor is it new. The public schools have always failed the lower classes—both white and black. Current educational problems stem not from the fact that the schools have changed, but from the fact that they continue to do precisely the job they have always done.¹

Thirty or forty years ago failures in the educational system were not so serious. A man, then, with little education could still get a job (unskilled) and become part of the productive system. But now, with increasing mechanization, unskilled jobs are becoming more scarce and education is becoming more essential; essential to the extent that it has been predicted that a young person of today will have to be retrained two or three times during his lifetime for completely different or new occupations.² Although their problems are especially acute, the demands on the educational system from technological advance go beyond the problems of the
poor. Silberman has said that the failure of schools to educate the poor is actually an exaggeration of the failures of the public school system as a whole. Many educators have said that education as we now know it "has failed to engage the minds of most children most of the time." The educational system, because it continues to do what it has always done is becoming less and less effective. "More and more of us, not merely the disadvantaged, are learning in spite of education, not because of it."

I see as the task of highest priority for our society the extension of education to the disadvantaged elements of our society, both rural and urban and both white and black, and the deepening of education for all groups. I see this not so much as a way to full employment as a means to achievement of even higher technologies and thus to economic progress.

Students should be educated for work that does not yet exist—not for specific vocations or occupations and not to "facilitate their adjustment to the world as it is." Silberman has said that the educational system should "educate a nation of educators," people who will have the ability to educate their families, friends, community, and themselves. The aim of education as
Alfred North Whitehead put it is "the acquisition of the art of the utilization of knowledge." Students must learn how to learn. They will have to learn how to apply accumulated knowledge to future problems.

What kind of world is it that we are educating for? Herman Kahn and Anthony J. Wiener have stated five future trends. They are:

1. Increasingly sensate, empirical humanistic, pragmatic, utilitarian culture.

2. Transitional, mass consumption society characterized by higher GNP and personal incomes, affluence (among the better educated).

3. World-wide industrialization and modernization.

4. Institutionalization of change, especially through research, development, innovation and organized diffusion.

5. Accumulation of scientific and technological knowledge.

As society advances and as change accelerates life becomes more leisurely. This century has seen a marked increase in the amount of time Americans spent in leisure activities. In 1900, 25 per cent of the total national time (inhabitants x 24 hours x 365 days) was spent in
leisure activities. By 1950 it had increased to 34 per cent and by the year 2000 it is estimated to be 38 per cent. The 4 per cent increase from 1950—2000 is roughly equivalent to one workday (8 hours) per week.

Education, in a new sense will be the main purpose of life. . . . Man in the past may have been a hunting animal, a fighting animal, or a working animal. Future man will be a learning animal, not just during what we now think of as the school years but during all of life.

The future is going to require not "millions of men ready to work in unison at endlessly repetitious jobs . . . not men who take orders in unblinking fashion." It will demand men who can cope with continual change, men who can recognize new problems, and who can apply the vast accumulated knowledge to new situations and new problems. In the future "machines will deal with the flow of physical materials and men with the flow of information and insight." Routine work will be performed by machines and men will be free to do the intellectual and creative work. "Men instead of being concentrated in gigantic factories will be scattered across the globe, linked together by amazingly sensitive,
near instantaneous communications. Human work will move out of the factory and mass office and into the community and home. "15 Education as well will move out of the confines of the school and into the community.

What do these tremendous technological advances mean for educational facilities? The distribution of educational facilities should be thought of as a problem to increase the availability of education. This would be the opposite of what the current practice is. Schools are now "dressed up to look like a medieval college with power points and are located in gentlemanly seclusion." 16 An activity that is going to occupy an increasing portion of one's life should be "in contact with areas near and far where the rest of life is to be spent." 17 For the disadvantaged, again, this is especially important. As Coleman said the effectiveness of the educational system will depend on the relative intensity of the two divergent influences--the school and the local environment. Education must become an integral part of the life of the local community or even the home and must counteract the negative effects of the local environment. It must "challenge the ability of the ghetto to destroy the
student." Tirell said the same thing when he wrote "we who find ourselves entrusted with the responsibility of dispensing HOPE in the form of information, knowledge, and skills have the obligation of the aggressive dispensing, if necessary, of these educational tonics to the angry and resisting. Nor can we begin to diagnose, treat, and cure, if we wait for the patient to come to us; we must bring our diagnosis and treatment to the people who ail, where they ail." 18

The educational system will have to respond to more people than it now does—all ages and all groups. It must be set up to respond more often, for longer times, and in more ways. In "form, location, and duration" it must be highly accessible to the whole population. If educational facilities are going to be accessible to the whole population, throughout their lifetimes, then those facilities must be, in the words of Cedric Price, as "omnipresent as the population itself." 19 There must be an "immediacy to both the location structure and interval of such servicing." 20 "Education if it is to become a continuous human-servicing service run by the community, must be provided with the same lack of peculiarity as the supply of water..." 21
4. THE METROPOLITAN AREA: A POLYCENTRIC ORGANIZATION

This study is concerned with the implications of using the "community as the classroom." But what is the community? The community, here, could be a "neighborhood," a district, a city, a metropolitan area, or a whole nation or culture. This section will focus on one of these—the metropolitan area; and on one model for its organization—a polycentric organization.

Metropolitan areas have been the primary areas of growth for the last century and a half in this country, and since there is no evidence to the contrary, they will continue to be the areas of growth in the future. As the metropolitan areas have grown, their suburban areas have mushroomed. In fact, in the last decade (1960-70), the suburban areas have grown at the expense of the central areas. From 1960-70, nineteen of the twenty-five largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas had a negative net migration in their central cities and a positive net migration outside their central cities. As of 1970, in nineteen of those twenty-five metropolitan
areas, there were more people living outside the central city than were living inside.¹

The historical trend of suburban growth is very strong. From 1870 on, the development of the streetcar and the railway facilitated a more or less linear growth, outward from the central area of cities, along their lines of transportation. From 1920 on, with the development of the automobile and bus transit systems, the areas between the streetcar and railway lines filled in with residential growth. This growth was more or less homogeneous—in density and type, and was so strong that even where there were attempts to limit the growth, they were unsuccessful.²

According to Peter Hall, after the basic decisions are made as to the predominant residential form (this is dependent on cultural attitudes—in the United States it is the single family residence at a medium or low density), what is most important in determining the form of the urban area is the distribution of employment. This determines the journey to work and work is the largest generator of traffic during the working week. Historically, work has been concentrated in the central areas
of cities (CBD). In many metropolitan areas, from one-fourth to one-third of all jobs are located within a ten square mile at the center of the city. In the past, the growth of the CBD has kept pace with the growth of the region as a whole. But the question now is will the central area continue to be the area of growth for employment?

Prior to 1850 the growth of cities was a result of concentration of "goods handling" activities in the central areas. The central areas were largely devoted to trading, storing, and transferring from one mode of transportation to another, raw materials and finished products. After 1850 the economic character of the central areas changed. New kinds of activities were added to and sometimes displaced the older activities, and these new activities were conducted in offices. This has been the trend since 1850 and according to Hall "it threatens to be a major feature of the development of the great metropolitan centers in the immediate future. . .at the very center of the structure of the central business district. . .there is found a relatively small nucleus of highly skilled professionals. All these people, in one
way and another, live by creating, processing or exchanging ideas." The kinds of people found in the CBD are stockbrokers, company lawyers, medical consultants, university lecturers, government officials, publishers, journalists, television producers, and advertising specialists.

"The central business district therefore can be seen as a highly specialized machine for producing, processing, and trading specialized intelligence." Intelligence is a commodity that has a very high cost of transportation. For this reason these activities must and are willing to locate in the CBD, the most accessible area, where they must pay the highest rents in the metropolitan area.

This process is continuing because the ideas industries are growing more rapidly than industry as a whole. In 1850, the ideas industries consisted mainly of professions such as medicine, law, and banking, but now with increasing mechanization economic activity has shifted from a concentration on physical production to activities such as research, education, and production and sales management. "The market for bread or shirts
expands less rapidly than the market for fashion magazines or television programs: an evergrowing proportion of physical production represents processed ideas."  

It has been estimated that the transmission of ideas or information has been increasing in advanced countries between 3 per cent and 6 per cent per year. In a major city such as New York or San Francisco an average person might receive "100 million bits of meaningful information per year. . . . There is clearly a real possibility that in a world increasingly concerned with the transmission and receipt of information, very few centers will be able to compete. The economic life of the world will be concentrated into a few major information centers." At the level of the metropolitan area this would suggest that these "ideas industries" would continue to locate in the central area, or CBD.  

But there have been tremendous advances in person-to-person communications, and in data storage and processing. Melvin Webber has stated that these advances in communications, along with improved urban transportation, allow the diffusion of face-to-face contacts over the wide urban area. He argues that an establishment on
Wilshire Boulevard in Los Angeles, a city which has a pattern of dispersed activities and a much less strongly developed center than other cities, has as many "linked establishments within any given time-distance as has a similar establishment in Rockefeller Center in New York." 8

Most major U. S. cities however do not follow this Los Angeles model, historically. It may be true for cities that are structured from the beginning by automobile transportation. But the other major U. S. cities are highly centralized, and structured by radial public transportation which makes the center the most accessible place in the region. These cities also have established patterns of land values and land uses. The advances in person to person communication has not had as great an effect on these cities in relation to their centralization of the ideas industries. Technology merely speeds up and increases the number and range of possible person to person contacts and does not necessarily reduce the need for establishments to locate in a highly accessible place where there is a possibility for a great number of face to face encounters. So, according to Hall, the ideas industries will continue to locate in the
metropolitan center and they will displace many of the traditional activities of the CBD such as manufacturing, wholesaling and warehousing, and the more generalized kinds of retail shopping.9

Kevin Lynch and Melvin Webber have suggested a way for organizing the metropolitan area that is somewhere between being highly centralized and completely dispersed. They suggest a poly-centric organization. The existing CBD would become one of a number of centers of high density or intensity dispersed throughout the urban area, but it would continue to be the largest. Transportation is an important factor here. To facilitate this dispersion of high intensity centers, all parts of the metropolitan area would have to be more or less equally accessible. This would be unlike the present transportation patterns which make the central areas the most accessible place in the metropolitan area. Lynch has proposed a triangulated grid of transportation to provide equal accessibility throughout the area. Use intensity would build up along the major lines of transportation, with greater intensities at intersections of transportation lines (see Fig. 4.1).
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The polycentric organization would reduce transportation costs somewhat and would also provide some external economies by clustering certain kinds of activities. A hierarchy of subcenters would evolve. According to Lynch the larger the center the more specialized would be its activities. The existing CBD, being the largest, would contain the most highly specialized activities. Zoning would not have to be used to effect this organization. Lynch says that the exact pattern of development would be determined by the social and economic forces, or according to Webber, the spatial organization would follow the social organization and the resultant pattern would be "as pluralistic as society itself."  

The community in this study, then will be the metropolitan area. With a polycentric organization, and with a certain degree of specialization of activities in those centers, no part of the metropolitan area could be thought of as self-contained as far as the educational system is concerned. The resources of the community, which the educational system is to use, will not be located in any one part of the urban area; they will be dispersed throughout the area.
5. A NEW ORGANIZATION

I have described the present organization of education--its emphasis on preparation, modeled after industrial assumptions, and its localized spatial organization--and I have discussed two major consequences of that organization--the lack of social mix and the isolation, or separation of education from the rest of life. The concept of using the community as the classroom--to organize the resources of the community to provide "real-life" experiences and alternatives for students, and to facilitate continuing education for everyone--will require a radically different organization for education. I will now present and discuss a new spatial organization for educational facilities, in the context of a polycentric organization of a metropolitan area.

First I would like to present a comparison between the present educational system and another way of looking at the problem. Let us consider, for purposes of illustration only, twenty-five of what we might call
educational programs, learning units, subject areas, educational experiences, courses, or whatever. The present organization of education distributes each of these twenty-five experiences to each of a number of localized facilities, or schools (see Fig. 5.1). The important points to remember, here, are (1) each of these localized facilities perform essentially the same functions and (2) if we consider, again for illustrative purposes, the twenty-five experiences as the full range of educational experiences, then these localized facilities have a monopoly over the educational lives of students.

"Neighborhood"
○ Educational Experiences

Fig. 5.1
There have been departures from this organization. One of these is the concept of the "magnet" school. Briefly, the magnet school is a specialized school which draws its students from the entire school district. There are a number of examples of this kind of school throughout the country—the Houston Independent School District's School for the Performing Arts, the Walt Disney Magnet School in Chicago (specializes in the communications arts), and vocational-technical schools. The Walt Disney school goes a little further than some others in that it admits a certain number of students from Chicago suburbs and also provides programs for students in the conventional schools (600 at a time for visits of one week). The addition of the magnet school concept to the present organization is shown in Fig. 5.2.
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Fig. 5.2
Another way of looking at this problem, one which relates to using the community as the classroom, is to distribute each of these twenty-five experiences according to the distribution of certain activities in the community, activities that can be considered resources for learners (see Fig. 5.3).

This, then, begins to establish the basis for organizing educational facilities in this proposal. The proposal, here, will consist of two basic parts: one of which taps the resources of the community and which can be generally thought of as having a community-wide orientation; and which relates to the distribution of activities in commerce, government, industry, etc.; and the other which is more "local" in orientation--but not necessarily localized, relates primarily to the residential distribution, and consists partly of distributing
similar functions to a number of locations throughout the community. The facilities in this proposal that relate to the first part (community-wide orientation) will be called special learning centers and those that relate to the second part (more local orientation) will be called homebases. There is no clear-cut distinction between the two kinds of facilities, and they should be thought of as part of a continuum bounded at one end by the homebases and the other end by the special learning centers (see Fig. 5.4). For instance, the homebases will also use some of the community's resources; e.g., retired persons, mothers, local commercial, services, etc. The homebases will also have some functions which are more community-wide in scope and in some cases a homebase might also be a special learning center. There is a range in the scope of the community's resources, also. A suburban city government office would not be metropolitan in scope because there are other suburban city governments with similar functions, whereas a zoological park would be metropolitan, or wider, in scope.
Before describing the two kinds of facilities, I would first like to discuss the major types of learning spaces that will be in this proposal. Primarily it will consist of four types: laboratory, seminar, individual study, and office. The laboratory is work space—for individuals or groups. Examples of this type are an informal classroom for the youngest students; labs for physics, chemistry, biology, etc.; studios for drawing, painting, sculpture, films, music, etc.; and generalized demonstration space for setting up special programs. The seminar space is for interaction of students in small groups. It would consist of lounge-type spaces which are strongly inter-related and also related to the other types of learning spaces. They should be available for both scheduled and unscheduled activities. Individual study space might be study carrels with equipment for language tapes, computer microfilm reading, typing, and
other automated individualized instruction. They would be linked to a centralized data bank. Offices are for staff members and others, and they would provide for tutor-student consultation.

The homebase should be thought of (1) as an attempt to increase the availability of educational facilities and services, and (2) as a means of providing a "constant" in an educational system in which the students are moving throughout the city and one which offers many options. All educational facilities, both the homebases and the special learning centers, should be operated on a 24-hour basis, 365 days a year, and they should be available for both formal, or scheduled, and informal, or unscheduled, education—for all ages. Since education is to be a 24 hour service, its organization and spatial distribution must relate to where people are at all times of the day. The homebases relate primarily to the residential distribution of the population. The intent is to provide educational facilities close to the home—the easiest way for children to get to school is to walk. It is also to provide more accessible facilities for mothers, families, the elderly, nighttime use, week-end use, etc. The
important distinctions between the homebase and the "neighborhood school" are that the homebase is not the sole basis for organizing educational facilities in the community, and it is not necessarily localized. An individual would not be assigned to any one homebase but could actually use any one of his choosing. It is likely, though, that an individual or a family would use the one that was easiest or quickest to reach. In addition, students from one homebase would visit other homebases for additional experiences, because some differentiation of these facilities would be encouraged. This differentiation of homebases refers to what I previously stated as some functions of the homebase which were more community-wide in scope. A homebase that was highly differentiated, because of its programs or its participants, would provide valuable experiences for individuals from other homebases, and in a sense, would become a resource itself.

Social mix within the homebases would not be essential. Some interaction would occur through the students' visiting other homebases, but full-scale social mix would be achieved at the community-wide level of the special
learning centers. This also refers to what I stated previously as the attempt to use the interests and the voluntarism of students as the vehicle for social mix. It might even be desirable that a particular homebase, located in an area of the city that had a predominant minority population, would be used primarily by that minority group. The facility could work with the local institutions and organizations as an instrument for preserving the local culture.

In an educational system which has highly individualized programs, and one which has students moving throughout the city to its various resources, one of the functions of the homebase is to hold the loosely organized system together. The homebase will provide guidance and emotional support for individuals, giving him a place from which to begin his educational travels, a place which he can always call "home," and to which he can always return.

The homebase should have some internal organization. The organization of the Parkway Program could be used as a model. Parkway is organized into units of 180 students, each of which operates independently of the others. The
units are further broken down into sub-groups, called tutorials, which consist of 15-16 students and two faculty members. The tutorials provide emotional support, counseling, program planning, evaluation, and administration—keeping track of where the students are. If an internal organization on this order can be provided, then maximum and uniform sizes of homebases are not required. Larger facilities, consisting of a number of somewhat independent units, are possible if the internal organization can break the scale down and provide the emotional support for individuals.

The homebase will provide all four types of learning spaces previously mentioned: laboratory, seminar, individual study, and office. Generally, the homebase will be used more by the younger students. Older students will spend more time outside the homebase. Theoretical laboratory experiences, for instance, will be sought at the special learning centers or "on-the-job" at some community resource. Each student will have an assigned individual study space, and additional ones will be left unassigned for informal, spontaneous use. Older students will relinquish their individual study space and use one
in a special learning center from which he might be operating for a period of time. Older students might return to the homebase perhaps once weekly for meetings with his tutor-advisor. Tutor-advisors are staff members whose role is to assist the students in developing their educational programs. Their role will be a questioning, non-directive one. Students will be encouraged to schedule their own programs. The goal will be for complete self-scheduling by age 16, partial self-scheduling by age 13, and assisted self-scheduling by age 10.² The contact of a tutor-advisor with an individual student will be a long-term one--through age 18. The homebase could be thought of partly as an information-advisory center. In terms of Ivan Illich's educational networks, a student planning his program, with his tutor advisor at his homebase, and through the centralized data bank in which is catalogued all of the available resources and educational experiences available to students, will gain access to (1) peers from the community-at-large with similar interests, (2) educational objects (facilities, tools, materials), (3) persons with special skills, and (4) professional educators who can provide intellectual stimulation in a particular area.
As an example, a student who is scheduling his own activities, selects a project to work on. His first stop is at his homebase to consult with his tutor-adviser. Together, they would discuss the student's plans and search out peers, skill models, other professional educators, resources, etc. The student would then go to a special learning center or directly to a community resource; e.g., some government office, industrial concern, business, service organization, etc. His work could be done in the homebase, at a special learning center, in some community establishment, or at home. The student would make a contract with his tutor-advisor regarding what he wished to accomplish, and by when he would have it completed. Older students would make weekly, monthly, or even longer contracts, whereas younger students would begin by making 1/2 hour contracts.

The facilities and staff of the homebase would also be available to any resident on an informal basis. Anyone in the community with a particular problem or question could use the facility for assistance in finding where to go for help.
Some of the information-advisory function could eventually be assumed by electronic data processing equipment linked to the central data bank. There will always be a need for some staff to perform this role, however, because adult models will be helpful for the young and some personal interaction is desirable.⁴

The homebases will provide services on an informal basis for all ages. On a more formal basis it will provide programs for individuals from early childhood through age 17 or 18. For children under age 4, child care will be provided, both on a regular basis and on a short-term, irregular basis; e.g., "child-parking" for busy mothers. A full range of clinical services would be offered, and the service would be available both day and night, with some provision for short-term boarding. Mothers would be encouraged to participate, and older children and other adults, such as retired persons, would be used as tutors and aides. For the 5-18 age group, ungraded, highly individualized programs will be offered.

The special learning centers are that part of the system that generally follows the distribution of activities in commerce, industry, government, etc. The
functions of the special learning centers are: (1) to serve as a bridge to the community's resources, to provide real-life contacts for students, or contacts in specialized areas; (2) to bring into the educational system people who have special skills or knowledge; (3) to provide continuing education for all people, because they will generally be located in centers of high intensity; and (4) to provide special educational programs.

The special learning centers could be thought of as another public utility. They provide a base from which educational activities can take place, and they are a facility from which community establishments can operate—in that they provide some specialized educational services for people who work in the related establishments, as well as using the personnel in those establishments in educational experiences for students from the community-at-large. The character of the special learning facilities are to a certain extent determined by their use of and use by the related establishments. In this sense, then, the facilities must be very flexible so that they can change as the related establishments change. Their
location can be "fixed," or permanent, but their form must be flexible. The facilities are supplementary in the sense that they provide facilities or services which the community resources cannot provide.

The development of the special learning centers is highly dependent on the organization of the metropolitan area. To the extent that sub-centers of higher intensity do not develop, and therefore, less specialization occurs, and to the extent that the community organizations do not assume responsibility in education, the educational system will have to assume a greater role. With the separation of education from these other activities, the organization of education will become more formalized. More specialized kind of schools would develop—vocational schools, performing arts schools, business schools, etc.

The special learning centers, just as the homebase, will provide all four types of educational space—laboratory, seminars, individual study, and office. The laboratory space will be what the community's resources cannot provide, and will also be for special programs; individual study spaces would be both assigned to students for varying periods of time, and unassigned for
informal, spontaneous use. The office space would be for professional educators, who provide intellectual stimulation for students on a one to one basis, and also for "skill models," or tutors, from the related establishments who might be used on a regular and extensive basis. The scheduling of time at the special learning centers would be macro-scheduling rather than micro-scheduling. Students might spend a day, a week, or weeks at one special learning center.

I have mentioned that younger children would also be moving out from their homebase, to other facilities—to special learning centers, as well as other homebases. It is easy to see the value of taking older students out into the community as the Parkway Program has done, but what is the benefit for younger children? The answer is to provide special, short-term programs that could not be provided in every homebase.

Frederick J. McDonald has presented a model for this kind of experience. He writes of an educational project developed by the Unified School District of the City of San Jose, in conjunction with the Lockheed Corporation and the RAND group. Children from low socio-economic
areas of San Jose, along with some teachers, parents, and Lockheed personnel, were taken to the Big Sur on the California coast, where they lived for a week and participated in the program. The program was based on a land game which was invented by Lockheed personnel, and it required the children to go out and survey the surrounding area. It required them to work together and fostered a genuine group feeling among them. The whole program was educationally valuable and was thoroughly enjoyed by all participants—students, teachers, and parents.

In the same way, special learning centers could provide special programs for young children as well as older students. They would be programs that could not be put into every homebase, or moved from one to another—these are both limiting factors. The programs would probably be of short-term duration, set up at some special learning center where it could take advantage of some resource. A zoological park, for instance, if that were a special learning center, could set up special programs related to wildlife. One program, which appealed to a certain group, or range, of students,
could be set up for a certain period of time, and afterwards, another program set up which attracted a different group of students with a little different interest. Students would be attracted to various special programs set up around the community as a result of their own interests.

Figs. 5.5 and 5.6 are illustrations which show the spatial organization and the relationship of the homebases and special learning centers to intensity of use. Generally, the homebases will tend to be located in areas of low to medium intensity. The homebase relates to the residential distribution, and in American cities the predominant residential form is now the single-family residence at a low to medium density. The special learning centers will tend to be located in centers of higher intensity, although there will be exceptions; e.g., a zoological park might be located on the fringe of the metropolitan area. Fig. 5.5 shows the path through the system in a hypothetical situation. An individual would begin at his homebase--he, or his parents, might choose the one closest (1), or he might choose another (2). From his homebase the student would visit other homebases
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as well as special learning centers (3). Let us construct a set of experiences in the special learning centers for a fifteen year-old boy, who we can assume, is moving around completely on his own. He visits the zoological park (4) once a week for studying animal life. The program is one set up by the educational system in conjunction with the zoological park staff, and it runs for ten weeks. Our student has become interested in animal life and he returns on some evenings for additional, informal study. His next visit is to a special learning center at a local university where he is tutored by college art majors in painting and sculpture. To satisfy state requirements in social studies, the student is working on a law project, and for this he goes to a special learning center (5) in the largest center of the area--what used to be called the CBD. There he works individually with a professional staff member, who in a traditional school system would be a social studies teacher. This individual is highly educated in his field and he now works individually with students on projects in his area, and provides "intellectual stimulation." The student is also tutored on his
project by lawyers, judges, and college law students who are close by in their own work. In the area of mathematics, our student is working on a computer problem. In one of the office parks are located a number of computer-related firms. At the special learning center at this office park (6) our student gets assistance on his project from both professional staff and tutors from the computer firms. For two hours a day, three days a week, the student goes to the special learning center at the medical center (7). A special three-week program on the environment and public health is being given for individuals at a certain level of sophistication. Once a week the student will return to his homebase for consultation with his tutor-advisor. Finally, our student has recently become interested in architecture and he wants to learn more about the field. For this he goes to a special learning center in another office park--completely on an informal basis--where there are a number of architectural firms. These firms use the related special learning center for communicating with one another--keeping abreast of current problems and developments, as well as for providing better
"working conditions" for employees (for this will be as common as coffee breaks are now)—and for communicating with the public. Through his contact with architects, our student can gain some understanding of the field and of the very real problems, related to architecture, that architects and everyone else face.

How do we implement this new organization, or how do we get from the existing isolated, localized neighborhood school system to one that uses the whole community as its classroom? Undoubtedly, it would have to begin the same way the Parkway Program in Philadelphia began—by tapping available resources and using space wherever it can be found. The Parkway Program holds classes in office conference rooms, church basements, lobbies of public buildings, vacant commercial buildings, etc. As the demands on the community establishments increased, supplementary facilities, the special learning centers, could be built by the educational system. This would probably occur fairly early because community establishments are not presently so structured to assume this new role in education. The construction of supplementary facilities would depend on the intensity of use of the
community resources. The greater the intensity at one node, the more extensive the facility would be, and the sooner it could be added.

Some resources are most certainly located in remote places of the metropolitan area, and as a result, the educational system would have to settle for a more limited use of that resource. The limiting factors would be (1) accessibility and (2) what level of service that resource was able or willing to provide. A greater use could be made of that resource if it were willing to assume a greater role and provide services and/or facilities by itself, or if the educational system were to assume the increased transportation costs, or provide some kind of facility at that location; e.g., a temporary or mobile facility. Generally speaking, though, it is likely that establishments in the higher intensity nodes will be the most ripe for tapping for educational gain. They will also justify more extensive facilities by the educational system. On the other hand, the more the community resources can provide in the way of services and facilities, the less the educational system will have to provide.
There is a substantial investment in existing educational facilities, and these will have to be used, unless they can be sold, or until they can be phased out. Some of them could be used, to begin with, as homebases. Both their location and their form will be limiting factors, however, to the extent that they are (1) located centrally in the "neighborhood," away from other activities, and (2) not flexible (e.g., rigid egg-crate design, etc.).

Transportation is very important in this proposal. It is one of the keys to equality of educational opportunity. If there is to be equality of opportunity for all, then everyone must have equal access to all facilities and all of the community's resources (people and facilities). I have mentioned in section 4 that equal access was a prerequisite for the development of a polycentric organization of the metropolitan area, but access there was with the private automobile. For persons without private automobiles (the young and the poor), public transportation will have to be provided. The feasibility of and the level of service provided by a public transportation system will be largely dependent
on the intensity of use of the various centers of activity in the metropolitan area. Higher intensity centers would provide a greater feasibility and a higher level of service. Public transportation might have to be subsidized so that it could be provided at no cost, or at least very low cost. This is necessary for every learner to have great and equal access to all resources.

Cedric Price has said that "defence, energy, and commerce have in the past been sufficient generators of cities. "This project (Potteries Thinkbelt) assumes that education and the need to exchange information may have a similar generative force: cities can be made by learning." Price's Thinkbelt proposal was for an area in northern Staffordshire which in the past was dominated by one industry—the manufacture of pottery—an industry that was now defunct. Price proposed that education become the major industry of the area, and that new industry develop in conjunction with education. The concept of using the community as the classroom, in a little different sense, will also have a generative force for cities. In the context of a polycentric organization of the metropolitan area, the concept would have the effect
of intensifying certain nodes of activity, through the desire and the need to participate in education. The only way for this concept of education—encompassing the whole community—to work is to insure that it is very easy for people (both learners and tutors) to participate. There must be an immediacy between the educational facilities and the related community establishments. If architects, lawyers, computer specialists, persons in medical care, industrial workers, etc. are to participate for certain periods of time, then they will have to be able to move quickly and easily between their places of work and the educational facilities. This might generate a tendency for activities to collect at centers of higher intensity, because that is primarily where education and the exchange of information will occur. It could also generate the clustering of certain kinds of activities at a particular center. It might increase the tendency toward specialization, because it gives another reason for people and organizations to communicate with one another; e.g., the example of architectural firms located in an office park and the need and desire for them to communicate with one another
and with the public. The trend toward specialization might defeat the purposes of education, because a narrow range of activities might not attract a wide range of persons. To avoid this, it is important that all activities attempt to open up—make their "special domains" highly visible and penetrable—and increase the scope of their concerns to attract as wide a range of persons as possible.

Finally, the educational system I have described can go a long way toward creating a sense of "community"—something that does not now exist—within the large urban agglomeration. But first of all, what is a community?

Conventional sociological definitions of community emphasize (a) a set of households concentrated within a limited geographical area; (b) substantial social interaction between residents; and (c) a sense of common membership, of belonging together, not based exclusively on kinship ties. The essential criterion seems to be a psychological one—"a sense of common bond," the sharing of an identity, holding things in common esteem.7

Communities are usually identified in terms of "legal-political boundaries, ethnic groups, occupational classifications, or simply areas of residence." But, according to Newman and Oliver, this standard definition does
not distinguish among more explicit criteria which foster human interaction and create a sense of belonging. They do not distinguish between a group and a community.

Newman and Oliver, then, defined community as a group:

(1) in which membership is valued as an end in itself, not merely as a means to other ends;

(2) that concerns itself with many and significant aspects of the lives of members;

(3) that allows competing factions;

(4) whose members share commitment to common purpose and to procedures for handling conflict within the group;

(5) whose members share responsibility for the actions of the group;

(6) whose members have enduring and extensive personal contact with each other.8

This definition excludes areas of residence, political units, and occupations as valid identifiers of communities. Each of the six criteria above should be thought of as a continuum. A greater or lesser degree of community is possible depending upon how well each of the six criteria are satisfied.
Community, in contemporary American life and as defined by Newman and Oliver, is "missing." There are a great number of human groups; e.g., professional associations, churches, corporations, labor unions, clubs, families, etc. But few of these fulfill the criteria for community—because of the very special and narrow function that they serve.

Modern life has become fragmented. The process of specialization, division of labor, and personal isolation have all been accelerated to the point where the individual finds it difficult to relate to other persons, except within a narrow social class or vocational group.

The inability to associate or communicate beyond the limits of one's special "place" is destructive to a sense of identity within community, because community demands the ability to perceive. . . .relatedness among a variety of people, institutions, events, and stages of life.9

Social change has also tended to destroy an individual's sense of relatedness.

. . .the tremendous rate of social change. . .tends to destroy the stability required to establish a sense of relatedness among people. . . .[it] aggravates the difficulties
of one generation's relating to the next; it thwarts the opportunity to observe or sense continuity within the human career; and it places considerable strains on the human personality by valuing primarily adjustment and flexibility.  

There is a trend toward depersonalization of experience. Machines are doing work that was formerly performed by humans and this

...may well erode our ability to discriminate the more subtle, less easily communicated differences among human beings—the differences that make each person unique. Not only automation, but a variety of conditions of modern and suburban living (specialization, extreme mobility, geographic isolation of production and consumption) tend to inhibit the development of meaningful interpersonal experience.

Powerlessness—the feeling that an individual has no control over his destiny is a growing problem with the existence of large, aloof bureaucracies, influential corporate structures, and extreme social mobility and change. The individual finds it hard to see how he can influence the determination of social policy or the decision-making that affect his life so profoundly.

So, community is "missing" in modern American life. This is not to say that social change, technological
advance, automation, specialization, etc. should not occur. On the contrary, individuals benefit from these phenomena, as well. Change, even rapid change, insures flexibility and as a result, guards against the stagnation of a society into fixed styles of living and thinking. Technology offers the possibility of solving many human problems. Advances in communications and transportation offer the potential for people from widely different backgrounds to share common experiences. Automation can free individuals from the demands of the environment or material needs to pursue interpersonal relationships. Specialization and the division of labor provide the individual with many more alternatives or areas of choice, which he did not have previously. A specialized and differentiated society has the potential for fulfilling specific interests, needs, and desires.

Nor is there an attempt to restore types of community that are no longer appropriate. "Community is 'missing' not in the sense that old fashioned ones no longer exist, but in the sense that we have not yet devised conceptions of community that deal with particular challenges of the modern environment."
"missing community" must be seen in terms of a presently developing institutional framework which is "inimical to the pursuit of human dignity." 

The educational system, with the community as the classroom, will be the vehicle for the search for "missing community." The existing school system, with its emphasis on preparation, by being isolated from other activities, and with its localized spatial organization, cannot facilitate this search. Even a localized organization which uses the resources of the local area is not enough. The greatest potential is provided by considering the metropolitan area as the laboratory for education.

Education is pervasive. It touches the "many and significant" aspects of our lives—especially in this proposal, because in using the community as the classroom, learning occurs where "things are happening." The activities of the urban area—those in commerce, industry, government, recreation, etc.—are organized into the educational system. Education, because of this, and more than any other thing in our lives, can help to create "community." By facilitating connections between the individual and activities, establishments, institu-
tions, and other individuals from diverse backgrounds; and by dissolving the barriers based on age, ethnicity, occupations, and the distinction between students and people in "real life," common commitments can be established and the tendency for human experiences to fragment can be reduced. Through these connections, or links, by learning about, working with, and working within the various components (people and activities) that make up the urban agglomeration, a true sense of relatedness, a sense of connection and continuity might be developed.
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