

**EXPLORING CONNECTIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL, CIVIC, AND EDUCATION  
ORGANIZATION: AN HISTORICAL CASE STUDY OF THREE KEY FIGURES IN  
THE NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY CONTROL MOVEMENT, 1966-1968**

by

**Keith Wayne Trahan**

BA, Government, McNeese State University, 1995

BA, Sociology, McNeese State University, 1995

MAT, Charleston Southern University, 2002

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
the School of Education in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2011

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Keith Wayne Trahan

It was defended on

December 7, 2011

and approved by

Don T. Martin, Associate Professor, Administration and Policy Studies

Cynthia A. Tananis, Associate Professor, Administration and Policy Studies

Van Beck Hall, Associate Professor, Department of History

Dissertation Advisor: W. James Jacob, Associate Professor, Administration and Policy  
Studies

Copyright © by Keith W. Trahan

2011

**EXPLORING CONNECTIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL, CIVIC, AND EDUCATION  
ORGANIZATION: AN HISTORICAL CASE STUDY OF THREE KEY FIGURES IN  
THE NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY CONTROL MOVEMENT, 1966-1968**

Keith W. Trahan, PhD

University of Pittsburgh, 2011

Schools serve both to connect and separate people within society. Therefore, the landscape of school reform presents an opportunity to explicate the opposing forces of connectedness and competition that are entrenched in twenty-first century society. It can serve as a laboratory in which to study foundational social issues. This study is an historical analysis of school reform conflict through a lens of social theory. The theoretical framework of this study explicates the connectedness of social, civic, and educational organization; aspects of social organization transfer into the civic sphere through politics of recognition, leading to competing ideas about social responsibility and liberalism. This dynamic forms a foundation for school reform conflict, particularly in an education paradigm steeped in competition and advantage.

The New York City community control conflict of the late 1960s is an example of deeply rooted contestation between social groups and its impact on school reform. The conflict was a complicated conflict among parents, teachers, community members, policy makers, and academics that approached the issues from different social perspectives. This study places the community control conflict within broader social context, explicating foundational differences in social perspective that inhibit school reform. The study focuses on the works of three major figures involved in the conflict: Albert Shanker, teachers' union leader; Preston Wilcox, academic theorist, community organizer, and adviser to the community control group; and John

Lindsay, New York City Mayor from 1966-1973. This study explores the key figures' social perspectives in relation to the socio-political goals of the community control movement, the teachers' union, and policy makers.

This study illustrates how people engaged in reform efforts often contend with a complex matrix of social group connections, yielding dilemmas and contradictions between beliefs and actions. Historical research can provide insight into complex social struggles at the heart of school reform conflict. When that which is deemed best for oneself and those closest to them often conflicts with what is best for social groups with which they identify and support. Such studies can shed light on underlying and recurring social problems that continuously thwart school reform.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 BACKGROUND OF STUDY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 THE PROBLEM.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.4 THEORETICAL DESIGN .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.5 LIMITATIONS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.6 DELIMITATIONS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.7 OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>1.8 CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.2 PROCESSES OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2.3 PROCESSES OF CIVIC ORGANIZATION AND POLITICS OF         RECOGNITION.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>2.3.1 Dignity versus difference.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>2.3.2 Politics of equal dignity in Western Civilization.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>2.3.3 Republican Liberalism verses Rights Liberalism.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>2.4 PROCESSES OF EDUCATION ORGANIZATION: A DOMINANT         EDUCATION PARADIGM.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>2.4.1 Philosophical foundations of the DEP .....</b>	<b>28</b>

2.4.2	Socio-Cultural Development Theories of the DEP .....	30
2.4.3	Characteristics of the DEP.....	34
2.5	COMMUNITY CONTROL IN NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS, 1966-1968 .....	38
2.5.1	Underlying theories of the community control conflict .....	40
2.5.2	Local context of the NYC school system in the 1960s .....	43
2.5.3	A press for community control begins in IS 201.....	45
2.5.4	Conflict escalates in Ocean Hill-Brownsville .....	49
2.5.5	Repercussions of the community control conflict.....	52
2.6	CONCLUSION .....	54
3.0	METHODS.....	56
3.1	INTRODUCTION.....	56
3.2	HISTORY AND SOCIAL THEORY.....	56
3.3	DATA COLLECTION .....	59
3.4	DATA ANALYSIS.....	60
3.5	CONCLUSION .....	60
4.0	JOHN V. LINDSEY.....	62
4.1	INTRODUCTION.....	62
4.2	INFLUENCES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE AND COMMITMENT TO THE CITY .....	62
4.3	MIDDLE GROUND – U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.....	64
4.4	PLIGHT OF THE URBAN POOR .....	66
4.5	THE CITY AS MAJOR SOCIAL GROUP .....	68
4.6	CIVIL RIGHTS, PROCEDURAL LIBERALISM, AND RULE OF LAW.....	71

4.7	THE CHANGING REPUBLICAN PARTY .....	73
4.8	STATUS QUO VERSUS REFORM .....	78
4.9	EDUCATION, COMMUNITY CONTROL, AND DECENTRALIZATION .....	82
4.10	FROM COMMUNITY CONTROL TO DECENTRALIZATION .....	85
4.11	CONCLUSION .....	87
5.0	ALBERT SHANKER .....	88
5.1	INTRODUCTION.....	88
5.2	FAILURE OF GHETTO SCHOOLS .....	89
5.3	INTEGRITY OF THE SYSTEM.....	91
5.4	REFORM AND THE RIGHTS OF TEACHERS .....	96
5.5	ADDRESSING THE FAILURE OF URBAN SCHOOLS: DECENTRALIZATION AND COMMUNITY CONTROL.....	99
5.6	COMMUNITY [LOST] CONTROL .....	103
5.7	TEACHER SOLIDARITY .....	106
5.8	THE STRIKES.....	108
5.9	CONCLUSION .....	109
6.0	PRESTON WILCOX.....	111
6.1	INTRODUCTION.....	111
6.2	FAILURE OF GHETTO SCHOOLS .....	111
6.3	INTEGRATION.....	115
6.4	CRITIQUE OF PROFESSIONAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS.....	118
6.5	CHALLENGING THE STATUS QUO.....	121

6.6	PARTICIPATION .....	123
6.7	EDUCATION AND HUMANISM .....	126
6.8	COMMUNITY CONTROL: THEORY AND PERSPECTIVE.....	128
6.9	COMMUNITY CONTROL: RESTRUCTURING THE COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP.....	130
6.10	RELATIONSHIPS, PRACTICES, AND STRUCTURES OF COMMUNITY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS .....	133
6.11	CONCLUSION.....	136
7.0	SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE AND COMMUNITY CONTROL.....	137
7.1	INTRODUCTION.....	137
7.2	DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES THAT FORMED A FOUNDATION FOR THE COMMUNITY CONTROL CONFLICT .....	138
7.3	LINDSEY, SHANKER, AND WILCOX’S PERSPECTIVES ON SOCIAL, CIVIC, AND EDUCATION ORGANIZATION .....	140
7.4	DIFFERING PERSPECTIVES ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION AND LIBERALISM.....	141
7.5	LINDSEY, SHANKER, AND WILCOX’S SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES AND COMMUNITY CONTROL: SUPPORTED AND CONTESTED POLICIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMPROMISE .....	146
7.6	MANAGING MULTIPLE AND OFTEN CONFLICTING RESPONSIBILITY TO AND MEMBERSHIP IN VARIOUS SOCIAL GROUPS .....	151
7.7	CONCLUSION .....	154

<b>8.0 CONCLUSION: SOCIAL THEORY AND THE CONTEXT OF SCHOOL REFORM.....</b>	<b>156</b>
<b>8.1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>156</b>
<b>8.2 THREE PUBLIC SERVANTS WHO VIEWED COMMUNITY CONTROL FROM DIFFERENT SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES.....</b>	<b>156</b>
<b>8.3 SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES AS A DRIVING FORCE OF SCHOOL REFORM..</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>8.4 IN COMPETITION THERE IS USUALLY A WINNER.....</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>8.5 BE CAREFUL WHAT YOU WISH FOR.....</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>8.6 USEFULLNESS OF FRAMEWORKS FOR EXPLORING SOCIAL THEORY WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF SCHOOL REFORM .....</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>8.7 FINAL THOUGHTS ON COMMUNITY CONTROL.....</b>	<b>167</b>
<b>APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>169</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>172</b>

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 BACKGROUND OF STUDY**

Schools serve both to connect and separate people within society. American schools were founded to provide necessary socialization to balance contestation embedded in the economic, political, and cultural pillars of the republic (Kaestle, 1983; Reese, 2005; Spring, 2004).

Alternatively, theorists have positioned social groups as boundaries within competitive pluralist societies (Taylor, 1994). Thus, societies have competing dynamics for groups to come together and stay apart. Such dynamics are closely tied to three great descriptors of American society: liberalism, capitalism, and democracy.

Thus, people often wrestle with an individual-social dialectic. This dialectic is at the heart of many educational issues; where conflicting ideals in American society illustrate competing perspectives that give primacy to either individual or social considerations. Both hardy individualists of manifest destiny and social activists of the civil rights era are idealized icons of American history. Their competing attributes of self-reliance and social responsibility, respectively, are major components of both socialization and social problems, leaving people to wrestle with decisions of what is best for them personally and what is best for society more generally. This individual-social dialectic leads many people to oscillate between competing drives to acquire and participate (Sfard, 1998). Such struggles are very visible in education, where goals of socialization into a collective and discrimination into human capital form a foundational tension. Often, people do not consider these dynamics when trying to solve

educational problems; to do so requires explicating ties that bind people and actions that nurture groups within a competitive matrix of social organization (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004; Benhabib, 2002).

Within American schooling, broad-based social connectedness is rare. This is partly due to a fierce commitment to neighborhood schools and local control, leaving education policy mired in pluralistic competition (Spring, 2005, Hawkins, 2007). While academics wrestle with the idea of social groups and their impact on the purpose and process of education (Benhabib, 2002; Apple, 2006; Friere, 2001), policy-makers often dismiss culture and social interaction as exogenous excuses (Hiebert, 1996; Putnam & Borko, 2000). Increasingly, administrative progressives pine to wield shears as they see fit to trim the instructional deadwood inhibiting reform (Ripley, 2008; Cruz, 2009). Then, with a mix of technical skill, high-stakes accountability, and market competition schools would fertilize the barren ground of urban blight (Osbourne & Gaebler, 1992; Ravitch, 2000). Such perspectives prescribe schooling as a panacea for social ills, an idea that has been critiqued extensively as idealistic and ineffective (Spring, 2004; Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Apple, 2006; Ravitch, 2010). However, as one of few social institutions with which most individuals have significant engagement, the landscape of school reform presents an opportunity to explicate the opposing forces of connectedness and competition that are entrenched in twenty-first century society. It can serve as a laboratory in which to study the pathology of social problems.

Educators and policy-makers often invoke an image of social connectedness when discussing schools. Groups and institutions involved in education are often described as common, neighborhood, or community, with the latter serving as a current buzzword to describe educators' collaborative efforts toward common goals (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Dufour, Dufour,

& Eaker, 2008). The term community describes both the group and its relationship to broader society, internal connectedness of members and external separateness from non-members. What draws people together, what keeps them apart, and what is education's role in these processes? These are major questions for educators and policy makers that, unfortunately, are rarely directly addressed in the discourse of school reform.

From the inception of the common school, educators viewed schooling as a mechanism for social connectedness. However, the question of to whom or to what children and youth were to be connected remained nebulous (Spring, 2004; Reese, 2005; Urban & Waggoner, 2004). In this regard, the residue of the federalist and anti-federalist debate remained. At its core the issue is one of connectedness or conflicting connectedness to the nation or the state, to the secular jurisdiction or the religious congregation, to blood relatives or ideological lineage. Educators hold prime positions for developing and disseminating ideas about social connectedness. This has substantial ramifications for social and civic organization.

As social groups engage in the school policy process, they move more formally into the civic sphere. Groups increasingly engage in politics of recognition, vying for recognition, status, and ultimately, advantage (Taylor, 1994). Often, groups promote educational policies that not only improve their social position, but also use schools to push cultural and normative agendas (Apple, 2006). As a result, schools become levers of ideological management (Spring, 2004, 2005). Society's largest ideological divisions manifest in the contested landscape of educational policy, and particularly issues of school reform.

Dynamics of social stratification often play out in politics of education. Groups with political efficacy influence educational policy largely to their own benefit. The result is often the following scenario. Group A acts on the policy process and gains benefit. Collaterally, if Group

B is positively impacted, then they have little cause for action. However, if Group B incurs negative impact and has political efficacy, then it likely mounts an oppositional or coalescent counter-initiative to reclaim lost benefits. Multiply this dynamic by the ever-increasing number of social groups and a picture of education's contested landscape develops. Thus, socio-political processes yield stratified access to and achievement in education (Bourdieu, 1999; Coleman & Hoffer, 1999). Social groups use politics of education as a means of challenging or maintaining social status, both practically to improve socio-economic status and ideologically to promote particular social perspectives (Brantlinger, 2003; Apple, 2006). As age-old issues of equity and purpose plague school systems, some groups fight for policies that push particular curricula, while others struggle for policies that provide adequate schools.

Thus, the politics of education is a complex web of competing interests. Increasingly, proponents of efficiency and mass production drive both the practice and public perception of education. For example, educators' efforts to "re-brand" Pittsburgh Public Schools into City Schools are a prime example of marketing image over substance (Smydo, 2007). Over time, not only the diploma becomes a credential to acquire (Arum & Beattie, 1999), but also schools become service providers to position on the market (Osbourne & Gaebler, 1992). Schools become less the space of social and individual development envisioned by the likes of Rousseau (1762/1979), Dewey (1997), and Freire (2001) and more a mechanism for sorting cogs in the wheel (Spencer, 1891; Schultz, 1971; Turner, 2000). The result is a shift in public perception away from schooling as a paramount developmental experience and toward schooling as an avenue of acquisition (i.e., test scores, diplomas, extra-curricular achievements, etc.) (Sfard, 1998). As such, people increasingly treat acquisitions from schooling as yet another marker in the great American competition for capital.

Policy-makers use education to change broad patterns of social interaction and culture. However, motivation for and direction of change is a matter of perspective. Education has become a preferred weapon for competing social groups to proselytize social perspectives (Hawkins, 2007). In particular, schools are used to combat patterns of social interaction. Residential housing patterns have long segregated and stratified society (Cullingworth, 1997; Johnson, 1997). In response, policy-makers throughout the twentieth century used school reforms to create social interaction among children and youth in broader hopes of reconstituting the social groups of their parents and the public (Orfield, 1978). Alternatively, policy-makers have used school choice policies to increase parental efficacy over their children's social grouping. As is often the case, policies designed to move society in one direction are countered by policies designed to do the opposite. Nevertheless, a foundational issue arises regarding the government's role in the development of social groups. While specific social policies for which governments use education are contested, most groups concur that education serves such purposes (Hawkins, 2007).

People's dogmatic devotion to different social perspectives forms a foundation for contestation over social policy. Too often educators and policy-makers adhere to either-or perspectives (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004). As a result, schools' capacity to foster social connectedness and responsibility is considerably limited. Instead of engaging different perspectives in a deliberative manner, educational discourse focuses on difference and control, a competition between various social groups over the reigns of public education (Saltman & Gabbard, 2003; Feinberg & Soltis, 2004). Dogmatists on the political left and right make few strides toward conciliation. Their focus is on promoting ideologies deemed superior. The result is a stalemate between camps focused more on proselytizing their perspective than deliberating. An

alternative is found in conciliatory perspectives that acknowledge more equitable roles of institutions and individuals in today's social problems (Apple, 2006). Educators and policy-makers with a nuanced understanding of the complexity of today's educational and social issues can help people see schools less as institutions steeped in difference and control, and more as space of social connectedness and responsibility.

Such socio-political contestation often plays out in educational practice. Educators often refer to a need for theory to inform practice. Yet, perhaps a three-part dynamic is more apt. Tying broader social perspectives to education theory and practice acknowledges education's connection to social issues. Practitioners often cite a "disconnect" between theory and practice (Tananis, Trahan, & Ciminillo, 2008). While scholars wrestle with the social foundations of education, practitioners rarely have a venue or institutional reason to discuss, let alone apply broader ideas from social theory. Practitioners rarely address the major issue of policy-makers using schooling as a lever to move society in particular ideological directions. Too often, educators are left to argue over the means and processes of schooling instead of the direction in which society is being pushed. As such, Freire's (2001) point that teaching is a political act is of great importance in understanding education as a social catalyst. When teachers relegate this position they become pawns in a game directed by far off policy-makers, in spite of the fact that proximity to students and their immediate contexts gives them an invaluable standpoint from which to analyze educative and social processes. Too often, teachers are silenced through bureaucratic minutiae and institutional requirements; thus, their unique insight is rarely realized. However, there are examples of teachers engaging in political action. As such, a scene is set for the politics of teachers to conflict with those of policy makers and the community. Often school reforms are built upon or undertaken from particular social perspectives. What can develop is a

battle over the purpose and practice of schools. Battles fought by people with very different social perspective.

## **1.2 THE PROBLEM**

The New York City community control conflict of the late 1960s is a prime example of deeply rooted contestation between social groups and its impact on school reform. After years of struggle for agency, community members turned their focus toward efficacy. What developed was a complicated conflict among parents, teachers, community members, policy makers, and academics that approached the issues not only from different points of view but also from different standpoints in relation to the problem. Therefore, much of the literature about NYC community control was written to promote and critique particular perspectives and standpoints, rather than find common ground (Berube, 1994; Podair, 2002, 2009; Body-Gendrot & Gittell, 2003; Ravitch, 1974, 1983; Wilcox, 1966a; Kahlenberg, 2007). My focus in this work is the common ground through which I hope concilience between varied social perspectives can be fostered.

In much of the research on the New York City community control movement, authors did not articulate that people engaged in reform efforts often contend with a complex matrix of social group connections, which yield dilemmas and contradictions between people's beliefs and actions. Historical case studies can provide insight into complex social struggles at the heart of school reform conflict. Where what is deemed best for oneself and those closest to them often conflicts with what is best for social groups with which they identify and support (Brantlinger, 2003). Such studies can shed light on underlying and recurring social problems that continuously

thwart school reform yet are seldom the focus of dialogue (Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Fullan, 2006; Rothstein, 2010).

In this historical case study, I place the community control conflict within broader social context. By doing so, I explicate some recurring foundational social issues inhibiting school reform. In this study, I focus on three major figures involved in the conflict: Albert Shanker, Teachers' Union leader; Preston Wilcox, academic theorist, community organizer, and adviser to the community control parents' group; and John Lindsay, New York City Mayor from 1966-1973. Through analysis of each person's written work, archival documents, biographical works, and histories of the event, I explore dilemmas faced by key figures, regarding their social perspectives and socio-political goals of the community control movement, the teachers' union, and policy makers.

### **1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

As I began to study the community control conflict, my immediate question was why did people involved act in the manner and take the positions that they did? As I researched further, my answer was that they seemed to have very different social perspectives and were averse to compromise. I then drew from my background in sociology, political science, and social theory to develop a theoretical framework to study the conflict. When I put these two tracks of research together, I began to think that several aspects of social, civic, and education organization formed a foundation for the community control conflict and school reform conflict more broadly. Many people involved in the New York City (NYC) community control conflict of the late 1960s

seemed to approach the conflict, and schooling more generally, from fundamentally different perspectives on social and civic organization. Thus, the following questions guided this study.

- Did differences in social perspectives form a foundation for the New York City community control conflict?
  - What were Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox’s perspectives on social, civic, and education organization?
  - More specifically, did their perspectives on social organization and liberalism differ?
- Did the key figures’ social perspectives transfer to their support for and opposition to community control?
  - Which specific community control policies did Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox support and which did they contest?
  - What policy aspects were opportunities for compromise and what were insurmountable differences?
- How did the three key figures manage multiple and often conflicting responsibility to and membership in various social groups?

The goal of this study was to explore the impact of individuals’ social perspectives on their support and opposition to school reform. If so, then frameworks that help to unpack social perspectives and their relationship to school reform can be of use to educators and policy makers.

## 1.4 THEORETICAL DESIGN

This study surfaces and critiques some underlying perspectives on social and civic organization, which effect educational policy. Highly contested policy issues often reflect deeply rooted social issues that have been repeatedly swept under the proverbial rug. In the context of this study, school reform is similar to recent efforts in healthcare policy; underlying each are “some long-standing ideological divisions in our Congress and, frankly, in our society” (President Obama as quoted in Tumulty, 2009, p. 27). Better understanding of differences in social perspectives can help educators and policy-makers clear the pluralist logjam inhibiting social policy. Such knowledge is invaluable in school reform efforts that are often mired in an increasingly complex, yet inadequately understood social milieu.

Research focused on individual and social contexts of educational issues can uncover underlying foundational social contestation. Much of my research, such as the use of busing in equity-based reform and standards-based and accountability reform in Post-World War II American education, focuses on educators’, stake-holders’, and policy-makers’ conflicting responsibilities to various social groups. I think that beneath most educational problems lies broader social and political contestation that restrict the success of pedagogical and curricular remedies, leading to years of reform models that yield only marginal student benefit (Fullan, 2006; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). For example, AERA’s 2010 conference theme, “Understanding Complex Ecologies in a Changing World”, provides an impetus to focus research on individual and social contexts that add difficulty to the educational task (Cooley, 1993); dynamics that are too often ignored in school reform. While adaptations of Bruner’s (1960) ideal yields pithy mantras, such as success for all and all students can learn, forgetting his qualification to give

enough time and resources relative to the individual has stark consequences for educators and schools.

Simply put, society asks and expects too much from schools. For example, how can “common” schools exist for a public with divergent purported purposes of education: social functionalism (Mann, 1957; Parsons, 1959), economic functionalism (Schultz, 1971; Lessenger, 1970), cultural recognition (Asante, 1988; Taylor, 1994), and critical thought (Freire, 2001), to name a few. Pressing education practitioners and policy makers to acknowledge, deliberate, and address long-standing differences in social perspectives can shed light on the need for and lack of success in school reform.

## **1.5 LIMITATIONS**

History and social theory, the two academic domains in which this work is positioned, are largely a matter of perspective. Thus, this research was not undertaken to find truth. Much of the works on the New York City community control conflict promote the plight of one side of the conflict or the other (i.e., teachers or parents, educators or the community, etc.). Thus, as often is the case, dogmatists on either side of the conflict might take issue with this study’s focus on individual dilemmas and ideological compromise. A reason for undertaking this research is to contribute to the literature in school reform that conflicts over school reform are often founded on broader issues of social perspective and to the literature in NYC community control that neither side of the conflict was entirely right or wrong.

The choice of case to study is another limitation. Case study designs have little external validity. They are primarily exploratory studies to inform future research in the problem space.

Most school reform conflicts provide evidence of the type of social contestation that I discuss in this work; thus, other cases could have served in the same capacity. I chose this case for three major reasons. First, it is a case that has been described as important in the history of American education (Berube, 1994; Ravitch, 1974; Spring, 2004). Second, it is a case that educators, communities, and policy makers were engaged in significantly and publicly; thus, much primary documentation exists. Lastly, after researching busing and post-World War II presidential education policy, I wanted a more geographically and temporally bounded school reform conflict to examine through the lens of social theory.

Another limitation of this study is that even with extreme effort, archival research holds the possibility of missing relevant documents and evidence. The nature of archival research is investigative and thus, at some point I must end the investigation and move to analysis and discussion of findings. I acknowledge the possibility that evidence exists to refute my claims. This work is not designed to make definitive claims but to push the related discourse toward deliberation on the impact of social perspectives on school reform.

## **1.6 DELIMITATIONS**

This study has three major delimitations. First, in this study I am not attempting to cover all the aspects of social theory or social perspectives that relate to conflicts over school reform. Over the course of my graduate studies, I developed a theoretical framework to serve as a lens through which to explore school reform conflict. My intended audience is practitioners and teacher educators; therefore the framework is not an exhaustive exploration of theoretical concepts. My aim with this study is to create an accessible work that explores and clarifies aspects of social

theory that form foundations for conflict over school reform. Thus, the theoretical framework discussed extensively in chapter two marks the delimitations of my exploration of social theory.

Second, my focus in this study is not the racial aspects of the NYC community control conflict. The racial context of the community control conflict is the focus of existing literature (Gordon, 2001; Byndloss, 2001). However, in my theoretical framework for this work, race is one of many aspects of social organization and politics of recognition that have an impact on school reform conflict.

Third, I delimit my research for this study by focusing on the perspectives on and perceptions of the three key figures that I have chosen. Originally, I wanted to use a community member as one of the key figures under study but it was not feasible. The major problem was a lack of primary documents and written work by community members; particularly, work that is broad enough to give insight into an individual's social perspective. For this reason I chose Shanker, Wilcox, and Lindsey. As a public intellectual, a scholar, and a politician, respectively, each wrote and spoke enough publicly to warrant substantive content analysis and comparison of both their specific views on the conflict and broader social perspectives.

## **1.7 OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS**

Chapter one is an introduction to this study. It provides the background to the study, an explanation of the problem being study, a more specific statement of the problem, a description of the theoretical design, and a list of the study's limitations and delimitations. In this chapter, I explain the focus of and reasons for the study and provide insight into my influences and perspective in selecting and creating this study.

Chapter two is a review of literature relating to this study. This study is an analysis of school reform conflict through a lens of social theory; thus, the literature review is sub-divided into two broad sections, theoretical framework and brief history of New York City's community control conflict. In the theoretical framework, I explicate the connectedness of social, civic, and educational organization. Aspects of social organization transfer into the civic sphere through politics of recognition, leading to competing ideas about social responsibility and liberalism. These competing ideas often form the foundation of school reform conflict, particularly in an education paradigm steeped in competition and advantage. In the brief history section, I summarize New York City's community control conflict starting with some underlying theories and ending with some long-term repercussions of the conflict. In between, I provide a brief history of the two major stages of the conflict, Harlem IS 201 and Ocean Hill-Brownsville. In this chapter, I show that at the foundation of the community control conflict laid differing social perspectives, which will be analyzed through the lens of my theoretical framework in the completed study.

Chapter three explains the methodology and methods of this study. In this chapter, I explain the speculative philosophy of history that positions this study as both research in history and social theory. Drawing from national, political, and micro-history, my methods aim to research the impact that public policies and actions had on social unity by studying a historic event through the works of three key figures involved. Furthermore, I provide some specific data collection points and analysis process.

Chapters four through six focus on John V. Lindsey, Albert Shanker, and Preston Wilcox, respectively. Each of these chapters is an analysis of each key figure's writing using the theoretical framework described in chapter two. Chapter seven is a comparative analysis of

Lindsey, Wilcox, and Shanker's social perspectives as constructed in the previous chapters, highlighting major disagreements and opportunities for consilience. Chapter eight provides a conclusion to the study, exploring repercussions of the conflict and current school reform conflicts for which this studies theoretical framework could be of use.

## **1.8 CONCLUSION**

Conflict over school reform is an opportunity to explicate the oppositional forces of connectedness and competition within society. As one of the few social institutions that most individuals experience, schools serve as laboratories in which to study social issues. The community control conflict in late 1960s New York City is a prime example of the impact that different social perspectives have on school reform. People approach social issues not only from different points of view but also from different standpoints (Berube, 1994; Podair, 2002, 2009; Body-Gendrot & Gittell, 2003; Ravitch, 1974, 1983; Wilcox, 1966; Kahlenberg, 2007). Those engaged in reform efforts deal with a matrix of social group connections that lead to dilemmas and contradictions. In this study, I offer insight into the actions and ideas of three key figures engaged in the community control conflict; when what they deemed best for themselves and those closest to them conflicted with what was in the best interest of other groups.

The goal of this study is to provide educators and policy-makers with insight into the underlying and recurring social issues that hinder school reform. Stakeholders and policy makers have conflicting responsibilities to various social groups. I think that beneath most school reform conflict lies broader social and political contestation restricting the success of pedagogical and curricular remedies. The result has been continuous reforms with little broad impact on student success (Fullan, 2006; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Historic case studies provide opportunities for

better understanding of individual and social contexts that impact education. Such studies push educators and policy makers to acknowledge, deliberate, and address long-standing differences in social perspectives.

## **2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

In the theoretical framework for this study, I connect ideas from sociology, political philosophy, and educational theory to frame differing perspectives and dilemmas faced by people engaged in conflict over school reform. Specifically, I developed the theoretical framework for this study from Eitzen and Baca-Zinn's (2004) processes of social organization, Taylor's (1994) politics of recognition, and Hawkins' (2007) dominant education paradigm. The focus of this chapter is to explain the theoretical framework for this study and to provide a brief history of the NYC community control conflict.

Broadly my theoretical framework explicates the interconnectedness of social, political, and education organization. As people come together into groups, seeds of competition are planted. Informal competition between social groups transfers into the formal civic sphere and is greatly amplified in large pluralist societies like the United States. As a result, education becomes both a means of gaining advantage and a space of contestation for ideological differences. Thus, peoples' views on the purpose and process of schooling are very much related to their broader social perspectives, particularly in the areas of social and civic organization.

## 2.2 PROCESSES OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

Processes of social organization begin with two broad assumptions. First, “individuals are, by their nature, social beings.... immersed in social groups from birth” (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004, p.5). Thus, the importance of understanding the impact of social groups on society and means thereof cannot be over stated. Not only, is competition between groups a major social force that is magnified in pluralist society, but also multiple group membership leads to “conflicting expectations – and unpredictability of action” (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004, p. 32-33).

Second, “individuals are products of their social environments... [That] create, sustain, and change the social forms within which they conduct their lives” (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004, p. 5-6). In other words, individuals and societies have reciprocal relationships and this individual-social dialectic is a major social force.

Freedom consists in knowing what these [social] forces are and how they work so that we have the option of saying no to the impact of their operation.... A major function of sociology is that it permits us to recognize the forces operative on us and to untie the puppet strings which bind us, thereby giving us the option to be free. (McGee, 1975, p. 3)

As people come together, they create patterns of behavior based on the social contexts in which they live (Blau & Scott, 1962). This social organization, particularly as societies grow in complexity, occurs simultaneously at macro- (society) and micro- (social group) levels, and people develop variable ties at both levels. Societies are “social system[s], composed of interdependent parts that are linked together into a boundary maintaining whole” and social

groups are their building blocks, “collection[s] of people who, because of sustained interaction, have evolved a common structure and culture” (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004, p. 43). Thus, there are patterns of behavior specific to social groups and those more broadly shared throughout society.

Some people identify primarily with one social group, while others identify equally with many. Simultaneously, people are connected to societies (e.g., nations and religions) and might even espouse membership in even broader social organizations, such as cosmopolitanism and global citizenship (Anderson, 2004). However, “Although groups may differ in size or purpose, they are similar in structure and in the processes that create the structure” (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004, p. 30). Peoples’ simultaneous membership in and varied levels of connectedness to multiple social organizations results in a complex mix of social structure, culture, values, status, and stratification that form the foundation of social problems. It is in this mix that people often get mired when faced with social issues, of which school reform is an example.

First, people’s actions and experience in the world are shaped by social structure, “linkages and networks among the members of a social organization” (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004, p. 81), which can circumscribe their possibilities for action and experience as outlined in theories of social capital (Bourdieu, 1999; Coleman & Hoffer, 1999). In relation to human connectedness, the important dynamic of social structure is the development of social relationships through enduring interaction, where members become “united at least in some minimal way with the other members.... [And] behave quite differently than they would as participants in a fleeting interaction” (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004, p. 28). Relationships are likely to provide people with cultural and social capital from which much benefit can be gained. Thus, social structure has substantial relevance in school reform.

Second, people's actions and experience in the world are framed by culture. In the broadest sense, culture is "social heredity" (Williams, 1970) as enacted and subsequently adapted by people; thus, it is both content and process. It is transferred through socialization and can be internalized by people; thus, providing a superstructure (Marx & Engels, 1978) or horizon (Benhabib, 2002) for both social organization and individual behavior. Culture emerges through social interaction. As such, Benhabib (2002) provides the auditory metaphor, complex cultural dialogue, to describe culture's fluidity "as constant creations, re-creations, and negotiations of imaginary boundaries between 'we' and the 'others'" (p. 8). Also, culture exists at both micro- and macro-levels causing a layering effect. An historical dichotomous view held that culture was "a soul's immersion and shaping through education in the values of the collective" in contrast to civilization, which was the "material values and practices that are shared with other peoples and that do not reflect individuality" (Benhabib, p. 2). The gist is that culture is both internal and external, individually embedded and socially shared, with aspects that range in importance to and impact on people.

Social structure and culture unite some people and differentiates others. So much so that people tend to disapprove of the "ways" of other social organizations (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004; William, 1970); thus, sowing the seeds of competition among groups and societies. This informal group competition moves into the civic sphere and plays out through politics of recognition.

### **2.3 PROCESSES OF CIVIC ORGANIZATION AND POLITICS OF RECOGNITION**

Taylor's (1994) politics of recognition provides a succinct theory of how processes of social organization play out in civic organization. Much of the theory rests on Berger and Luckman's (1967) social construction of identity, which holds that various processes of social and civic organization significantly impact individuals and groups. As discussed above, an individual-social dialectic is a major social force, and it impacts the form of civic organization. For Taylor, a major theme is that the civic organization of a society needs to match its vision of social organization. Just as sociologists posit inevitable competition between social groups informally through aspects of social organization, Taylor describes competitive dynamics between social groups and societies more formally in the civic sphere.

The background to the discourse on politics of recognition relates to two historic shifts in the relationship between individuals and societies. First, the decline of feudal society led to historic shifts in the processes of social organization, particularly status and stratification (Stavrianos, 1998). This change ushered in a collapse of social hierarchies based on honor as preference and distinction (Montesque, 1752/2001; Rousseau, 1762/1993). What arose were societies that focused more on a "modern notion of dignity... used in a Universalist and egalitarian sense" (Taylor, 1994, p. 27). While the underlying premise of honor was that not everyone had it, the underlying premise of dignity was that everyone had it. Thus, dignity became a measure of equality that transcended a person's position in society. Changes in social organization occurred, particularly in values, status, and stratification. As civic organization moved from feudal to republican to democratic forms, what was "ushered in [was] a politics of

equal recognition, which has taken various forms over the years” (Taylor, 1994, p. 27). The shift from honor to dignity started a snowball down a hill.

Second, human identity was increasingly understood as individualized and influenced by an individual-social dialectic. By the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, identity was increasingly viewed as individualized,

[As] being true to myself and my own particular way of being. Develops out of a displacement of the moral accent in the [notion that human beings are endowed with... an intuitive feeling for what is right and wrong]. It comes to be something we have to attain if we are to be true and full human beings. (Taylor, 1994, p. 28)

This idea stemmed from a shift from earlier moral views based on a revealed or transcendent (external) source to a deep inner source described in the works of Rousseau, Saint Augustine, and Hegel. Soon thereafter, the works of Mead and Bakhtin, in particular, theorized that a “crucial feature of human life is its fundamentally dialogical character” (Taylor, 1994, p. 32). Thus relationships with and recognition from other people became viewed as vital to the development of individual identity. Finally, the work of Herder (1969) expanded the idea of individualized identity to group culture, which over time became more and more differentiated. The combined result was that through internalization, negative projections at a group level could do harm at an individual level.

### **2.3.1 Dignity versus difference**

The combination of individualized identity and an individual-social dialectic formed a basis for Berger and Luckman’s (1967) social construction of identity. As this theory gained prevalence,

so did the idea that recognition was a human need. The result was that individuals and groups began to pursue “due recognition” within society. With the move from honor to dignity to equal dignity for all people, individuals and groups began to push to be recognized as unique or distinct. On the one hand, politics of universal dignity developed out of the “move from honor to dignity,” emphasized “equal dignity of all citizens,” and promoted “equalization of rights and entitlements” (Taylor, 1994, p. 34). Broadly, the focus was on eliminating the social gap expanding differences in esteem, benefit, and access in cultural, economic, and political spheres. On the other hand, politics of difference relates to recognition of unique individual identity and group culture, particularly “their distinctness from everyone else” (Taylor, 1994, p. 38). While the politics of universal dignity requires that we acknowledge certain universal rights, the politics of difference requires that we acknowledge distinct individual identity and group culture. Though they grew out of one another, they were also contradictory.

### **2.3.2 Politics of equal dignity in Western Civilization**

In Western Civilization, politics of equal dignity emerged largely from the theories of Rousseau and Kant. Rousseau provides a basis for an alternative to the dominant form of civic organization. He writes of two types of relationships between individuals and society. Bad other-dependence connects to hierarchy and relates to “the need for others’ good opinion, which in turn is understood in the framework of the traditional conception of honor and as intrinsically bound up with ‘préférences’” (Taylor, 1994, p. 45). Alternatively, Rousseau described good other-dependence in his “accounts of a potentially good society” where “esteem does still play a role in... that people live very much in the public gaze. In a functioning republic, the citizens do care

very much what others think” (Taylor, 1994, p. 46). In good other-dependence there is reciprocity, equality, and common goals. It also seems that there would need to be less stratification or status differentiation, which often inhibits social connectedness. Similar social relationships have been described in Andean culture (Apfel-Marglin, 1998), in Sfard’s (1998) participatory metaphor of education, and Greene’s (1988) socialized idea of freedom.

### **2.3.3 Republican Liberalism versus Rights Liberalism**

What develops is contestation regarding foundational perspective on civic organization: differences between Anglo-American (procedural) Liberalism and Collective or Communitarian (non-procedural) Liberalism. Anglo-American (procedural) Liberalism “takes the view that individual rights must always come first, and, along with nondiscrimination provisions, must take precedence over collective goals” (Taylor, 1994, p. 56). Drawing first from Kant and continuing through Mill’s traditional liberalism (1778/1859) there is a primacy of autonomy.

Human dignity consists largely in autonomy, that is, in the ability of each person to determine for himself or herself a view of the good life. Dignity is associated less with any particular understanding of the good life... than with the power to consider and espouse for oneself some view or other. (Taylor, 1994, p. 57)

The conflation of dignity and autonomy is prevalent in current globalized societies. A result is that

Liberal society... adopts no particular substantive view about the ends of life. The society is, rather, united around a strong procedural commitment to treat people with equal respect. The reason that the polity as such can espouse no substantial

view... is that this would involve a violation of its procedural norm. For, given the diversity of modern societies, it would unfailingly be the case that some people and not others would be committed to the favored conception of virtue.

(Taylor, 1994, p. 57)

In other words, absent universal values there can be no universal substantive commitments.

Thus, civic organization is based on means, rather than ends.

Communitarian (non-procedural) liberalism draws from the philosophy of Rousseau and focuses on collective goals. From this view,

A society can be organized around a definition of the good life, without this being seen as a depreciation of those who do not personally share this definition. Where the nature of the good requires that it be sought in common, this is the reason for its being a matter of public policy.... One has to distinguish the fundamental liberties, those that should never be infringed and therefore ought to be unassailably entrenched, on one hand, from privileges and immunities that are important, but that can be revoked or restricted for reasons of public policy – although one would need a strong reason to do this – on the other. (Taylor, 1994, p. 59)

While, Anglo-American (procedural) liberalism is very much about means, communitarian (non-procedural) liberalism is focused much on ends. An example of non-procedural liberalism is Green's (1988) idea of freedom as a social dynamic, what she calls positive freedom. An example of procedural liberalism is Mill's (1978/1859) and what I would call traditional liberalism's idea of freedom as an absence of restriction on individual actions, up to the point where those actions inhibit the rights of other people. In an education context, Sfard (1998)

offers two metaphors for education, a participatory metaphor that focuses on experience and the collective and an acquisition metaphor that focuses on competition and the individual. These examples illustrate very different social perspectives, which can result in very different ideas about the purpose and organization of education.

What develops are competing social dynamics. Taylor (1994) describes multiculturalism as “the imposition of some cultures on others, and with the assumed superiority that powers this imposition” (Taylor, 1994, p. 63) in the face of social groups’ demand or pursuit of recognition of equal value. While, an initial argument for recognition is often well received, contestation develops as the argument shifts to questioning the canon or ethnocentrism. Arguments for multiculturalism are often based on an underlying “premise that we owe equal respect to all cultures” (Taylor, 1994, p. 66); yet, they often take two forms. First, students miss something of importance through the systematic exclusion of works by members of particular groups or societies, with a focus on lost contributions to individuals and societies. Second, the systematic exclusion of works by members of particular groups negatively effects the development of members and particularly students of that group. Such demand stems from the idea that misrecognition is harmful to individuals and groups (Fanon, 2004; Harding, 2006; Asante, 1988) via aspects of social construction of reality discussed above (Berger & Luckman, 1966). Opposing arguments for multiculturalism often stem from opposing social perspectives; a Neo-Nietzschean paradigm of power (Neitzsche, 2006; Foucault, 1995) verses a cultural synthesis paradigm of dignity (Benhabib, 2002; Gadamer, 1975). The result is that groups with very different social perspectives vie for influence over or control of schools. Schools and school reform policy become a space of contestation over social perspectives.

## 2.4 PROCESSES OF EDUCATION ORGANIZATION: A DOMINANT EDUCATION PARADIGM

People's conflicting perspectives on social and civic organization form the foundation of school reform conflict. As discussed above, relationships among individuals and groups often deteriorate into conflicts that spill into school policy issues, shifting the focus of reform onto particular groups gaining or maintaining competitive advantage and control of education. Thus, groups often use education as a lever of ideological management (Spring, 2004, 2005). Many, if not most groups have used or attempted to use schooling for such purposes, with varying degrees of success. Hawkins's (2007) describes this dynamic as the Dominant Education Paradigm.

Similar to the above discussion of social and civic organization, Hawkins' (2007) Dominant Education Paradigm (DEP) is "a way of structuring educational relationships" (p. 138). Hawkins' unpacks the current focus on educational excellence and the failure of school reforms that ignore broader social issues. In particular, he points out that subscribers of varied socio-cultural development theories use or attempt to use schooling as a social lever: even marginal theories in search of popular exposure, such as peace education or critical race theory, position schooling as a primary means of ideological promotion. Such has been a primary purpose of schooling for quite some time.

The structure of Hawkins' (2007) DEP is threefold. The philosophical foundations of Hawkins DEP are evolution and capitalism, which were broad philosophical shifts in how social relationships and institutions were understood. They provide the bedrock on which more specific and often opposing theoretical perspectives on socio-cultural development are built. These theories drive the creation of a curriculum-based, development enabling, selection and

certification system. The result is an educational organization rooted in conflicting social perspectives: the kind of conflict that engulfed the NYC community control efforts.

#### **2.4.1 Philosophical foundations of the DEP**

In many ways Charles Darwin's *Origin of the Species* (1859) frames human existence as competitive, visceral, and self-centered. "Although it was not among Darwin's explicit intentions.... [His] conceptual emphasis on the importance of environmental factors, adaptation, and niche dominance... contributed substantially to social scientists' notions of linear development and underscored the fusion of learning and competition" (Hawkins, 2007, p. 140). Evolutionary biology further articulates a competitive and adaptive view of humanity. Niche dominance as a biological method of selective regeneration adds an air of neutral scientific legitimacy to competitive and selective social institutions. This work contributes significantly to linear theories of development and a "fusion of learning and competition" (Hawkins, 2007, p. 140).

Raising the theory of niche dominance from individual to state levels, results in quests for competitive advantage in economic, political, and cultural spheres. Though Darwin's work was not designed as a framework for social analysis, it was pushed forward by theoretical works on population (Thomas Malthus), social institutions (Herbert Spencer) and epistemology (Auguste Comte) that promote rather definitive understanding of social phenomena; transferring biological certainty into social realms. Darwin's survival of the fittest meshes well with this competition over resources and wealth; although portrayals of development theory through meta-narratives of progress have been tempered by works in post-colonial (Harding, 2006) and post-development

(Peet, 1999) theory. Schooling continues to provide a primary means of selection and certification, a primary means of attaining advantage. “If we want to understand a certain social practice or institution, we must consider the way in which it serves to further the survival of the social system as a whole” (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004, p. 15).

Similarly, Smith’s premise is that above all humans pursue self-interest and the best means of maintaining social order is found in the laws of the marketplace. Capitalism is based on ideal rational actors driven by utility and individual concern, who in a state of *laissez faire*, will efficiently and effectively distribute scarce resources. Smith’s idealized theory of capitalism has two requirements for a regulated economy: freedom and competition. However, in practice capitalism is not that simple; human rationality, freedom, and competition are often limited by extenuating social circumstance (Carbaugh, 2001). Perhaps in response, Smith argues for publicly sponsored schooling and positions it as a mechanism to promote an ethical, stable society that would sustain accumulation of wealth (Hawkins, 2007).

Although capitalist theory and *laissez faire* in particular are significant shifts in state level economic theory in comparison to the prior command systems of mercantilism and feudalism, connections between education and economics were long standing. For example, the Chinese civil service system had long been a means of social mobility (Stavrianos, 1999). The linkage of state economic development to formal, state-sponsored schooling is a significant development. A reciprocal relationship between individual pursuit of profit and national wealth is created, with the citizenry as the economic engine and the state as the chassis. Smith even acknowledges that the state bears responsibility to intervene into economic activity when doing so in the interest of downtrodden (Apple, 2006); thereby, protecting the system by assisting individuals to attain functional positions within society.

Capitalism and evolution ushered in broad shifts in broad philosophical approaches to social relationships. They legitimize the development of institutions that bind and direct human relationships toward competition. Capitalism, in both individual and state contexts, emphasizes a desire for competitive advantage, which becomes an intractable social aspect supported by evolutionary theory. Unless tempered by social responsibility, capitalist and evolutionary theory can promote a highly self-centered or group centered society.

#### **2.4.2 Socio-Cultural Development Theories of the DEP**

Hawkins' thesis is that several socio-cultural development theories view schooling as a primary social lever. This sets up a competitive landscape of perspectives on the role of schooling in societies that is fodder for scholarly inquiry (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004; Apple, 2006). Hawkins' use of theories that lie more at the root than the branches of social theory is an interesting and seldom used strategy in current education literature with its penchant for post-theories focusing on social uniqueness, relativism, and complexity and disavowing most macro-level statements aimed at civilization and humanity. Foundational philosophies of human relationships influence socio-cultural development theories that influence the DEP. Education is then used to influence social movements that can lead to social change (Hawkins, 2007; Morrow & Torres, 1999). This cycle is similar to the reciprocal relationship that society has with schools, one that often denigrates into causal chicken or egg debates. Individuals and groups with different perspectives on social development often have very different perspectives on the theory and practice of education.

Equilibrium theory promotes homeostasis, which is “the maintenance of optimal or near-optimal functioning through regulative variations” (Hawkins, 2007, p. 142). At a broad level this concept falls within the bounds of sociology’s order theory, which holds that societies have a natural order and are drawn to a state of balance. Therefore, social problems are largely a result of individual actions, and thus answers are more likely to be found at individual levels. While a simplistic critique of order theory is that it blames the victims, there is a larger debate over the role of individual responsibility in solving social problems (Eitzen & Baca Zinn, 1992, 2004). Equilibrium theory is not revolutionary; it is incremental, encompassing theories of social change that avow “internal adjustment rather than systemic innovation” (Hawkins, 2007, p. 142). Thus, a major critique of equilibrium theory is its function in perpetuating oppressive social structures.

Structural functionalism stems from equilibrium theory and encompasses many linear theories of development and modernization. “Functionalism is a general theoretical orientation about how social events and institutions are to be viewed” (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004, p. 15). As societies transition from traditional to industrial to technological, changes in organization and relationships occur, centering on a need for technical skill. As skills necessary to be passed from one generation to the next exceed the capacity of traditional, primary modes of transfer (e.g., families and communities), societies need other institutions to assist. Also, societies reconsider policies of cultural and ethnic exclusion due to increased requirements in the size and skill-level of a labor force.

As a theoretical perspective, functionalism can be divided into social (Parsons, 1959) and economic components (Schultz, 1971). For functionalists, “role differentiation and social solidarity are the two primary requirements of social life” (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004, p. 16). These

become goals of the state pursued through schools. “Once it is recognized that modern schooling is required to meet the needs of contemporary society, then it is quite a natural step to try to identify the precise nature of those needs and to mold educational policy to try to meet them more effectively” (p. 22). Functionalist perspectives view schooling to have three roles in society, as a mechanism of cultural assimilation, political socialization, and modernization. The first two processes, assimilation and political socialization, are closely aligned to the functionalists’ views on social integration and solidarity (Parsons, 1959), the third process of modernization is aligned to views on role differentiation and development theory (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004). Parsons (1959) writes of a need for social functionalism, where institutions and structures are in place for socialization. It seems unlikely, and overly idealist that without such social mechanisms large populations of people would unify. The school class serves as “an agency through which individual personalities are trained to be motivationally and technically adequate to the performance of adult roles” (p. 297) but it is just one of many institutions of socialization. Schools supplement not replace “the family, informed peer groups, churches, and sundry voluntary organizations” (p. 298). Achievement in school is characterized as both cognitive and moral; however, questions arise regarding whose knowledge and whose morality, setting a stage for conflict over control of schooling.

Although Hawkins (2007) separates development and modernization, there is overlap and connection with functionalist theory (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004). As with general functionalist theory, development and modernization encompass both social and economic components. Much of the history of development and modernization theory relies on a meta-narrative of progress toward an ideal economically and politically powerful state. Though progressive stage theories are increasingly critiqued, development continues to theorize increasingly thick relationships

within and between societies mediated through industrial and technological infrastructure. Such theories relate to a functionalist perspective of teleological transition from traditional to more complex social relationships, requiring societies to change certain components, such as institutions, values, and behaviors. Doing so moves societies down the path of modernization and development (Hawkins, 2007; Peet, 1999). States create structures necessary to support modernization and development. These social structures have both social and economic functions. “Modernization theorists believe that economic growth... depends upon the development of a market economy with a certain degree of centralized planning, the introduction of a meritocratic reward structure, and the development of a national bureaucracy” (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004, p. 27); here we see social structures that can be traced back to the broad philosophical foundations of capitalism, social evolution, and liberal democracy, respectively. While teleological theories of development and modernization are increasingly under fire, globalization continues to transfer very similar versions of social and economic institutions and structures (Anderson, 2004).

Conflict theory centers on a perception of an unjust and inequitable society. Adherents oppose the functionalist disposition toward blaming the individual for what it views as problems created and perpetuated by unjust power dynamics embedded in social institutions and structures that deteriorate into mechanisms of oppression (Eitzen & Baca Zinn, 1992, 2004). Conflict theory stems from Marxist theory, which is highly critical of capitalism’s separation of labor and capital, which positions the working class as cogs in an economic wheel. Capitalism shifts the existence of human labor from its original creative context, to a context of productivity where labor mostly serves external means. “When we consider productive labor and living labor in relation to the subjective power of labor, we should be aware that living labor is an ontological

category and productive labor pertains to the discourse of political economy” (Watson, 2002, p. 37). Capitalist societies move away from creative work as a “way of being” (Paulston, 1999; Apfel-Marglin, 1998) toward productive labor as economic contribution to the state. Structurally, society is thus imbued with an antagonistic dynamic over the production, control, and benefits of capital; most labor controls only the physical act of production and the managerial class takes over from there.

Over time many conflict theorist have shifted focus from class-based to identity-based dynamics of power. As theories and individual perceptions of identity become more nuanced (Benhabib, 2002; Mason, 2007), necessary solidarity that drives social change becomes more difficult to achieve. Old social typologies of proletariat, bourgeoisie, and elite have been substantially disaggregated, leading to a more factionalized society enmeshed in competition for control (Benhabib, 2002). Thus, the current socio-political landscape is greatly affected by increases in competition and decreases in stability. Particularly disconcerting is the increase in number and range of vested interests operating within social institutions, particularly schools, that seek to exert control over others (Apple, 2006; Hawkins, 2007).

### **2.4.3 Characteristics of the DEP**

The characteristics of the DEP are prevalent in the education and development literature and describe a curriculum-based, development enabling, selection and certification system. Curriculum, serves as boundary and schema for schooling. “As the basic skeleton or infrastructure of the dominant paradigm, curriculum articulates in advance quite specific ranges of motion beyond which the system simply breaks down” (Hawkins, 2007, p. 146). While

substantial attempts to shift school curriculum toward more critical aims have been made, minimal progress has been achieved (Apple, 2006). What does seem consistent is the prevalence of an embedded socioeconomic curricula aimed at the economic, political, and cultural socialization of students. What is variously called “hidden curriculum”, “the grammar of schooling”, (Tyack and Cuban, 1995), and the “ways things are taught” (Dreeben, 1968) provides insight to current purposes of schools.

Education is development enabling in a human, social, and economic sense. Throughout the twentieth century, states become increasingly heterogeneous due to migration and aware of socio-cultural fissures as independence is won. A development meta-narrative is established: socio-cultural development as a linear, and once initiated, inevitable process (Hawkins, 2007). This characteristic ends up perpetuating a vision of Western techno-industrial society as the exemplar to which all other societies aspire. Development can also marginalize societies that do not pursue improvements in measures that traditionally define Western society or pursue cultural components that question hegemony. In effect development enabling often becomes synonymous with neoliberalism. An economic, cultural, and political philosophy that has progressed into a popular ideology, neoliberalism is a driving economic, cultural, and political force in the current world. It is significantly influenced by a combination of functionalism, capitalism, and liberal democracy and is an agent for the spread of these social structures (Anderson, 2004; Apple, 2006). Neoliberalism has championed mass education as a primary means of economic and social development needed to close the global wealth gap.

Development and modernization require substantial investment in bureaucratic, corporate, and educational structure. As those employed in these sectors increase their power and wealth, they increasingly developed a vested interest in the perpetuation and expansion of the

sector. Particularly in education, edocrats become increasingly active in policy arenas that perpetuate dependence on and deference to education as a primary means of economic development and educational certification as a necessity, even though substantial evidence shows that job growth is in areas where high levels of schooling are not essential (Apple, 2006; Hawkins, 2007). Emphasis on an educational panacea continues in the face of substantial research emphasizing the importance of cultural and familial context in educational achievement (Eitzin & Baca Zinn, 2004). This type of development education seems more to promote social impotence rather than agency and minimizes the role of education and formal schooling on social movements (Morrow and Torres, 1999).

Lastly, formal schooling is a mechanism for social selection and certification. A causal relationship is promoted between years of schooling, learning, and income (Hawkins, 2007); therefore, education becomes a mechanism of social and economic certification (Turner, 2000). Formal schooling also allows the education sector to more quickly respond to the economic and social concerns of states and corporate interests, which is of functional importance in a hyper-capitalist global economy. As the necessity of increasing educational attainment becomes ingrained into the social fabric, educational inflation can lead to an overqualified labor force. Again, this relates to the vested interests that promote formal education as a panacea and increased educational attainment as an economic necessity.

Such perspectives of formal schooling have substantial classroom impacts. Schools become imbued with authoritarian relationships between teachers and students, teacher insecurity due to a lack of training and low pay, and didactic pedagogy that does not reflect current research in learning theory and child development (Hawkins, 2007.). Structurally, schooling increasingly focuses on standardized testing, which is necessary given its position as

society's competitive certification and selection system (Turner, 2000; Martin, Urban, & Overholt, 1973).

Hawkins explains that proponents of each social development theory view schooling as a mechanism for social change. It is this idea that leads to education being viewed as a social and economic panacea (Hawkins, 2007; Spring, 2005), and likely asked to bear too much of the burden for social change. Individuals with different social development perspectives will likely disagree on issues of school theory and practice. Just as theoretical perspectives greatly influence individual action, so too have socio-cultural development theories formed the foundations of schooling. These theories view "education as a central force for socio-cultural development and saw formal schooling as one of the agents, if not the principal agent, of desirable social change" (Hawkins, 2007, p. 141). Even theories developed in direct opposition to linear visions of socio-cultural development, such as post-colonialism, peace education, and critical race theory, also exhibits similar agendas to influence education and schooling (Omolewa, 2007; Brock-Utne, 2007). Over time schools became a more central means of social development in comparison to traditional means, such as family, church, and tribe, whose effects seemed to dampen as proximity and diversity became issues. Schools, at least in the public sector, are positioned as a legitimate means of social development aimed at necessary or desired expansion of societies. However, institutions and the people operating them are greatly influenced, if not driven by theoretical perspectives with great reach through mechanisms of public policy. School policy, particularly reform policy, provides a space where foundational differences in social perspective emerge.

## 2.5 COMMUNITY CONTROL IN NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS, 1966-1968

As I began to study the community control conflict, my immediate question was why did people involved act in the manner and take the positions that they did? My answer was that they seemed to have very different social perspectives. As I developed a theoretical framework to study school reform conflict, I began to think that several aspects of social, civic, and education organization formed a foundation for the community control issue. Many people involved seemed to approach the conflict, and schooling more generally, from fundamentally different social perspectives.

Several scholars have written detailed histories of the community control conflict. They range from Podair's (2002) rather neutral work focusing on the complexity and sheer number of events and actors to Ravitch's (1974) less neutral work placing the issue at the center of NYC's fourth school war focused on civil rights. Berube and Gittell (1969) also provide a substantial collection of primary documents, displaying a range of perspectives and commentators on the issue. Other authors include short histories within what I would call position pieces that defend and promote a particular group involved in the issue (Gordon, 2001; Byndloss, 2001; Hatton, 1977). The issue is also thoroughly discussed in historical works on NYC schools (Ravitch, 1983) and teachers' unions (Kahlenberg, 2007). However, with the exception of Podair (2002) I think that each work focused on answering the question, who was right? Such a focus minimizes an important point and a major idea of this study: who was right, is highly dependent on a person's perspective. Thus, for my purpose, I create this brief history to outline major events, participants, and ideologies to find fertile ground in which I will dig deeper to underlying social perspectives of three key figures engaged in the conflict.

Over time, the community control conflict escalated and played out simultaneously on multiple levels in society. At a grass roots level, teachers, administrators, and policy-makers on both sides of the issue engaged in political action, including strikes, reports, arbitration, and accusations. In the schools, teachers were transferred/fired/relieved of their duties, replacement teachers/scabs were hired, community activists and teachers held strikes and rallies, and competing groups had countless confrontations. At a legal level, lawsuits were filed against the local board for bypassing established civil service processes for hiring administrators. The administrators union filed a lawsuit that wound its way through numerous courts. On the political front, Mayor John Lindsey, Superintendent of Schools Bernard Donovan, State Commissioner of Education James Allen, Jr., and the state legislature crafted and initiated various versions of decentralization and community control legislation, yet failed to craft a compromise that pleased all sides. At a broader cultural level, people directly involved in the conflict, along with ideological brethren on both sides of the issue spoke out publically, not only to promote their positions but also to persuade the general public. In the media, countless people provided competing commentary focused on propaganda and persuasion (Ferretti, 1968). Needless to say, deliberation and dialogue were not the order of the day. Ultimately, the community control conflict had repercussions on people's perspectives about schooling and society.

In this section, I draw from four thorough historical works (Berube, 1969, 1994; Ravitch, 1974; Podair, 2002) to construct a brief history, focusing on major events and three key figures in the IS 201 and Ocean Hill-Brownsville conflicts over community control. Reflecting on the community control conflict, Berube (1994) organizes the issues into three broad themes of due process, anti-Semitism and racism, and decentralization and community control, discussing the biggest repercussion of the community control conflict as the conservative backlash that sends

U.S. public education drifting toward privatization. Berube (1969) framed the prelude to Ocean Hill-Brownsville conflict within the context of a shifting civil rights climate, leading up to the establishment of three experimental community controlled districts in NYC. Arguably, the origins of confrontation were the central boards rather vague policy allowing the experimental local boards' to bypass established civil service procedures for hiring administrators. The result was a very public struggle between the teachers union, the local board, the NYC Board of Education, Superintendent Donovan, Commissioner Allen, Mayor Lindsey, and a host of advocates and critics on both sides of the issue.

### **2.5.1 Underlying theories of the community control conflict**

In the late 1960s there were shifts in the purpose and practice of groups engaged in the civil rights struggle. First, some civil rights activists moved away from non-violent civil disobedience and toward a more radical idea of “Black Power” (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1992/1967; Asante, 1970). In education, this led to a “shift from an emphasis on school integration to Afrocentrism (Black Power), African-American educational activists sought a measure of control over the operation of schools” (Berube, 1994, p. 71). Second, other civil rights activists moved toward a philosophically different and fundamentally broader focus on civil rights writ large; focusing at various times on the poor, women, and other traditionally marginalized groups, expanding the benefactors of the movement, and increasing levels of political agency. Thus, the movements' push for increased civic participation combined with the shift in focus for many in the movement from integration to Afrocentrism (Black Power) to inspire the community control movement (Berube, 1994).

Sociologists Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) work in the area of civic participation and the poor suggested, "when presented with opportunities for meaningful participation, the poor were no longer alienated" (Berube, p. 72). Berube (1994) further posits, "The Civil Rights movement was a clear example of this thesis.... [And] clearly influenced the popularity of that idea in the liberal community" (p. 72), specifically the Students for a Democratic Society's (SDS) push for participatory democracy and Great Society policies of maximum feasible participation. Activists Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton's (1992/1967) *Black Power* tightened the focus of a participatory thesis, urging "black people to consolidate beyond their own so that they can bargain from a position of strength.... [It] is full participation in the decision-making processes affecting the lives of black people" (p. 47). Preston Wilcox, "'the African American theorist of the community control movement'" (Berube, 1994, p. 72) used similar language from the beginning of the community control conflict. In "The Controversy Over I.S. 201," Wilcox (1966a) wrote that urban public schools needed a "community presence [so that] an instrumentality be developed which assures minority group parents of direct access to the channels of informed opinion and power.... The communities of the poor must be prepared to act for themselves" (p.13). The idea of institutional control was a theme of both Carmichael and Hamilton's *Black Power* and the subsequent Afrocentric theories of Assante (1988) and Shockley and Frederick (2008).

Afrocentrism was also an underlying issue of community control. While some in the civil rights movement moved to broaden the focus to include gender, class, and minority issues, others increased the specificity of the movement. In fact, "The experiments in community control first raised the issue of an Afrocentric curriculum in the public schools. From the first demonstration for community control in 1966, parents carried placards proclaiming that 'Black Children Need

Black Culture’” (Berube, 1994, p. 74). Such sentiment questions the public school’s role as agent of socialization.

Socially, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville [community control] issue questioned the very substance of American life. Can the United States avoid bifurcation into a black society and a white society? In this instance, the school controversy may well be a paradigm of America’s racial problem. What is most distressing is the failure of many American liberals to perceive the nature of the struggle. Instead of recognizing the community control movement as part of the same fight for respect, dignity, and democratic rights as the civil rights struggle in the South was in the early 1960s, many northern liberals condemn school activists as extremists. (Berube, 1969, p. 8)

Thus, the issue of community control ran deeper than school policy. It spoke to the issue of rights in relation to social and civic organization.

What developed was a battle over the structure of school systems. In particular, the question became who or what group or groups controlled schools. As Berube (1994) writes, “Black activists concluded that the educational system did not work for their children.... [And] argued that they could do no worse by running the schools themselves” (p. 73). The focus of community control advocates was on both the school board and educator levels. At the board level, suburban districts’ elected boards implied inequality in civic organization in urban areas (Spring, 2005). Suburban boards were representative and urban boards were not. Administrative progressives had wrestled control of education from a spoils system of urban ward bosses and ethnic rivalries that were prevalent in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. With authority hard won, educators were unlikely to yield control of schools to the public. For educators, participation was a more

palatable and supported option. For the community, participation was a disingenuous concession that would neither lead to increased equality nor address underlying issues in urban education.

### **2.5.2 Local context of the NYC school system in the 1960s**

In *The Great School Wars* (1974), Diane Ravitch positions the community control conflict as the major component of NYC's fourth school war focusing on "racism and reaction." The origins lie in the New York Legislature promoting a reorganization of the NYC school system as a means of addressing the failure of desegregation policy. The Parents' Workshop for Equality boycott of 1964 led the NYC Board of Education to request a review of its desegregation efforts by the State Department of Education (Ravitch, 1974). In May, 1964, State Commissioner of Education Allen's Advisory Commission on Human Relations and Community Tension released a report condemning New York City's "Board of Education for its ineffectual attempts at integrating the schools and held that desegregation could be advanced by reorganizing the school system" (p. 280).

The failure of desegregation combined with Great Society programs' push for participation set the stage for a battle over community control. Ten years after the U.S. Supreme Court's *Brown v. Board* decision segregated schools were still the norm, particularly in urban areas (Orfield, 1978). Although most de jure segregation had been eliminated, a more fundamental problem became apparent. De facto segregation, due particularly to residential patterns and private schools in urban areas made integration an infeasible goal. In a sense community control was next best alternative, shifting the focus to integrating schools and school systems at an institutional level: policy-makers, administrators, and lastly teachers. As Orfield

(1978) surmised, Brown and the idea of school integration was in essence an attempt to integrate broader society. The idea was that bringing children was a starting point. Eventually parents through their children would come together, form relationships, and a kind of organic integration would occur; one that would transfer throughout communities.

While the success of school desegregation was debatable, other policies were actively bringing African American adults into the civic sphere. Arguably, the push for community control grew out of Great Society programs' push maximum feasible participation, which provided traditionally disenfranchised people with an entry point into the civic sphere. Community organizing cleared a path to community activism.

For the ambitious young person, [the local poverty program] was the locus of power in the community, a path to leadership not strewn with civil service rules and regulations. And at the same time, it had a vast potential for good works where the need was great. (Ravitch, 1974, p. 288)

When combined with NYC schools "ineffectual attempts" to integrate schools, a stage was set for the community to assert its newfound agency and pursue a different vision of social and civic organization. Community organizing and political agency, coupled with a recommendation for reorganizing the school system sowed the seeds of the community control movement. John Lindsey waded into this morass as Mayor in 1966, even though as a candidate, he "carefully avoided controversy, endorsing educational parks... and opposing 'the bussing of young children out of their neighborhoods in order to achieve a better ethnic balance'" (Lindsey, 1965, as cited in Ravitch, 1974, p. 289).

### 2.5.3 A press for community control begins in IS 201

According to Ravitch (1974), "What happened at IS 201 in the summer and early fall of 1966 could not be understood without some account of the ideas and career of Preston Wilcox" (p. 292). Wilcox ran a Harlem community organization where he "worked to involve the poor in community action and to transmit organizational skills" (Ravitch, 1974, p. 292-293). In a report on the bussing of minority students to nearby white suburban schools, Wilcox (1961) wrote,

The schools in East Harlem wear a stigma of being inferior to schools in all-white or mixed neighborhoods.... If one can believe that a predominantly '*de facto* segregated' white school can be a 'good school', then, one must believe that a '*de facto* segregated' and predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican school can also be a 'good school.' If one can believe that one's potential has no ethnic dimensions - then one must behave in this manner. (As cited in Ravitch, 1974, p. 294)

In 1963 Wilcox became faculty at Columbia University, in the School of Social Work and stayed active in Harlem community organizations.

In March, 1966, Wilcox wrote the paper "To Be Black and To Be Successful," proposing that "the responsibility for educational and administrative policy [be put] in the hands of the local community." It is through his involvement with the creation of IS 201 that Wilcox develops the tenets of community control that were further pushed in the OHB issue. Soon thereafter, Wilcox wrote about his perspective on the connections of schools, values, and culture.

One can expect the school in the ghetto to become what schools in more privileged areas already are, a reflection of local interests and resources, instead of a subtle rejection of them. For the operating philosophy of the existing system

is too often manifested in a conscious or unconscious belittling of the values and life styles of much of its clientele. (Wilcox, 1966a)

In the spring of 1966, Wilcox found a place to put both his education and community organizing theories into practice. Wilcox led Harlem activists in proposing a School-Community Committee to run the new IS 201 in Harlem. The committee would be “selected by parents of children in the school” and comprised of “parents, local leaders and professionals in education, or outside if necessary” (Wilcox, 1966c, p. 13 as cited in Berube, 1994, p. 75). This proposal garnered support of national civil rights leaders Stokely Carmichael and Floyd McKissick, leaders of SNCC and CORE, respectively.

A major issue became the group’s desire for a minority principal, which was unlikely within the structure of NYC schools. Principal positions fell under the jurisdiction of a civil service system from which few black candidates emerged. While hiring a black principal was an original focus, there were deeper imbalances in the demographics of students and staff. Although, a majority of students were minorities, the schools employed only eight percent black teachers (Berube, 1994). The IS 201 issue starts as a demand for integration, then adds Wilcox's outline for a School-Community Committee with substantial authority to "hire the principal and the top administrative staff.... review reports from the school staff to the board of Education; administer afterschool and weekend programs; hold open meetings for parents and teachers; and work to bring the community into the school" (Ravitch, 1974, p. 296). Next, the ad hoc committee added the demand that IS 201's principal be black or Puerto Rican.

With their demand unmet, the community group took direct action. Belief in the probability of integration was waning and a focus on agency and power espoused in the work of Carmichael and Hamilton (1992/1967) and later Asante (1988) was on the rise. As such, "The

strategy of the parent and community activists was to keep IS 201 closed until their demands had been won" (Ravitch, 1974, p. 298). Once the Board of Education and Superintendent Donovan informed the ad hoc committee that it could not legally delegate its authority, the ad hoc committee began to lobby local, state, and federal policy makers to intervene, namely Mayor Lindsay, Commissioner Allen, and U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe. It also began to engage the press and television. At this point, the idea of teacher hiring practices slowly became a component of community control. As explained by ad hoc board leader Helen Testamark, "Either they bring white children in to integrate 201 or they let the community run the school - let us pick the principal and the teachers, let us set the educational standards and make sure they are met" (Ravitch, 1974, p. 299). Although, Donovan and Board of Education President, Lloyd Garrison, met with members of the ad hoc committee to work out a compromise, the Board's position was made clear in a statement at a subsequent board meeting. "The Board cannot lawfully [delegate its authority] and it cannot do by indirection what it cannot do directly" (Ravitch, 1974, p. 300).

Negotiations went on for weeks and IS 201 remained closed. Wilcox was an official advisor to the IS 201 Negotiating Committee that met with Donovan and the Board of Education at the beginning of the school year. At this point, picketers' comments gave signs of deeper Jewish-Black tensions. "We got too many teachers and principals named Ginzberg and Rosenberg in Harlem. This is a black community. We want black men in our schools" (Ravitch, 1974, p. 301). This type of comment appeared on television and in the press. A battle over authority in the school system was framed as battle between ethnic groups. Subsequently, public perception began to shift. The New York Times called for compromise, even though the ad hoc board said that compromise was not enough. Thus, the issue was a dilemma, or perhaps evidence

that the issues ran much deeper than control of a particular school. It became apparent that the ad hoc board had a different perspective on policy change than did Donovan and Garrison, fundamental verses incremental change, respectively. Basically, the ad hoc board drew a line in the sand at authority, not advisory capacity, and a black or Puerto Rican principal.

At this point, Albert Shanker became a key figure in the community control conflict. IS 201 teachers met to decide whether they would support the plan for IS 201 students and staff to start the school year at the nearby and empty PS 103 building. Ravitch described Shanker's position succinctly.

The UFT leadership made no effort to influence the IS 201 staff on whether or not to teach in PS 103. The union's president, Albert Shanker, stated that the union did not want to become involved in the negotiations: 'We feel that the involvement of parents in a community, their greater involvement in the educational process, if done in a constructive way, could result in great educational improvement.' He had no objection to the controversial screening process, so long as it did not apply to teachers already assigned to 201: 'We assume a sound reason would not mean color of a person's skin or somebody just not liking a person.' (Ravitch, 1974, p. 302)

Shanker and the UFT, a union and its leader, focused on the plight of their members, teachers. The ad hoc board's demands were largely outside the purview of a teachers' union. Shanker and the UFT's position on community control shifted with the gradual inclusion of authority over teachers.

The teachers decided against the move to PS 103 and for reporting to IS 201. In support of the decision, the Board of Education announced that 201 would open. A meeting between

Donovan and the ad hoc board led to a transfer request from the principal of IS 201, which was perceived as a coerced act. In response the teachers chose to strike. However, the strike lasted only a short time and soon IS 201 was open and picketing ceased. Soon after, another community control plan was proposed and this time the union publically opposed it “as an attempt to remove those schools and their faculties from the body of law and contractual agreements under which they presently operated.... Shanker saw it as a precedent which could ultimately lead to an abrogation of the teachers’ rights and their protection against punitive transfers” (Ravitch, 1974, p. 306). Ultimately, the State Board of Education ruled that delegation of authority over the school system was illegal. Most importantly a seed was sown for community control advocates to focus their efforts on authority over teachers.

#### **2.5.4 Conflict escalates in Ocean Hill-Brownsville**

Soon after the IS 201 conflict subsided, community control advocates engaged the establishment on another front. “In early 1967, exasperated Ocean Hill-Brownsville parents and activists began a boycott of the local board and formed their own ‘Independent School Board No. 17,’ a localized model of the ‘People Board of Education’... [With] some of the same personnel” (Podair, 2002, p. 73). The UFT originally worked with and supported the parent group in promoting reform. However, the UFT’s focus was on increased services for the district, in particular inclusion of as many OHB schools as possible in the More Effective Schools (MES) program. Schools in the MES program “received an infusion of labor-intensive educational services that required more hiring – two and sometimes three teachers per class, remedial reading and mathematics specialists, guidance counselors, and program coordinators” (Podair, 2002, p.

73). As Podair explains, the alliance between the UFT and the community group was an uneasy alliance at best. The union's focus was on a strategy of getting more for district school, meaning more money and jobs for union members, and not necessarily on effective reform that significantly benefited students or empowered community members. Thus, union and community perspectives on school reform steadily diverged. "Even as they marched with the UFT at PS 144, Ocean Hill-Brownsville parents were showing signs that their understanding of 'school reform' was very different from that of the union" (Podair, 2002, p. 74). The collaboration between the UFT and the Independent Board lasted throughout winter and spring of 1967.

A shift in reform focus from community participation to control reached a critical mass in the late '60s. For example, Elaine Rooke, the PTA president of a nearby school wrote the following in a June, 1966, school magazine: "The teachers of the school have certainly shown [students] how much they feel they are special.... We have worked closely and harmoniously toward keeping [the school] among the top schools that New York City has ever had" (Podair, 2002, p. 75). The following year, the former PTA president joined "a different community group with a much more socially transformative agenda.... [It] sought to use community action as a means of resource redistribution in the neighborhood.... [And] viewed white educators as part of the problem, not the solution" (Podair, 2002, p. 75). In regards to the districts white teachers, the former PTA president said they had "bad attitudes... don't live in the neighborhood... and they rush out of the school and the neighborhood before three o'clock" (Podair, 2002, p. 75).

Shanker and the UFT explained Rooke's and similar community members' change in perspective as stemming from the addition of radical community leaders into the groups pursuing community control. Although the addition of transplant leaders to the community control group had an impact on the perspectives of members, particularly in emphasizing aspects of

institutional inequality that contributed to failing urban schools, Rooke's change of heart was more complex.

Rooke, and many Ocean Hill-Brownsville parents like her, saw their children caught up in a cycle of failure in the neighborhood schools.... Exaggerated as these sentiments [you ruined my life – you're not going to ruin my children's too] may have been, they spoke volumes as to the perceptual chasm separating white teachers and black parents in neighborhoods like Ocean Hill-Brownsville by 1967. White teachers viewed the educational system as one that, while flawed, had helped them, and would help anyone wishing to work hard. Black parents saw the system as a failure. Each generalized from their own experiences and projected them onto the other. (Podair, 2002, p. 76-77)

In spring, 1967, as the "perceptual chasm" between the community and educators widened, Mayor Lindsey pushed for a politically pragmatic increase in school funding. In efforts to gain more funding for NYC schools from a legislature dominated by members from up-state, Lindsey asked for each of the five boroughs to be consider a "separate entity for funding purposes, an accounting maneuver that would significantly increase the total allocated to the city as a whole" (Podair, 2002, p. 79). In response, the legislature asked for actual decentralization of the school system to the borough level. Lindsey answered that he would "go the State Legislature one better: he would decentralize the schools... all the way down to the community level" (Podair, 2002, p. 79). In pursuit of increased state funding and in response to the conflict with IS 201, Lindsey appointed a panel to study the decentralization-community control issue and make recommendations. However, before the Bundy Panel's report was submitted, Lindsey worked with Commissioner Allen, and established three experimental school districts with community

controlled school boards authorized to bypass the civil service system for hiring principals.

These included I.S. 201 and Ocean Hill-Brownsville, which was recommended by the (Berube, 1994, p. 76).

As in the IS 201 conflict, the experimental districts' dispensation from civil service procedures was met with opposition from both the UFT and the principals' association. While the latter opted to file suit, the UFT engaged in direct action. The major issue was the transfer or termination, depending on one's perspective, of nineteen district teachers and administrators. This board action set into motion a lengthy cycle of protests/strikes and arbitration between the community control group and the UFT. Lines were drawn and many outside groups and public figures chose sides, including the NY Civil Liberties Union and "most black leadership in the city" supporting the local board and the AFL-CIO and future president Richard Nixon supporting the UFT (Berube, 1994, p. 78). Ultimately, the state legislature, after heavy lobbying from the teachers' union, passed a decentralization bill that entailed very little community control. "Most of the educational policymaking power remained with the central board. All citizens could vote in school elections. Most important, a complicated system of proportional representation was installed that favored slate voting and organized groups" (Berube, 1994, p. 81).

### **2.5.5 Repercussions of the community control conflict**

For a variety of reasons, many people could support community control. Yet, community control activists did not gain their desired reforms.

Ghetto schools were unquestionably failing to bring their pupils up to a par with nonghetto student.... Integration, which many people had relied on to equalize

education, was no longer numerically or politically possible.... Thus, with the problem of ghetto education admittedly acute, and with no prospect of a solution from the Board of Education, the idea of community control had undeniable appeal.... Some public officials were glad to deal with a ghetto group that, for once, was not demanding integration. Community control appeared to be a way out of the schools dilemma. If the parents assumed control, they would have only themselves and their appointees to blame for failure. (Ravitch, 1974, p. 304-305)

On one hand, the local community came together to gain authority in local school policy. On the other hand, local educators banded together to oppose the results of the community's authority directly affecting them. The teachers and administrator organized as their own communities, through unions, and exerted their own political agency, which was comparably crafty and connected. These two opposing groups, which were directly involved in the conflict, engaged in a battle over school policy. This scene has played out time and time again throughout the history of American Education.

The community groups also pushed for a more locally responsive education experience. Not in these terms and not in a global multi-cultural sense but in the sense that the community wanted their schools to reflect, celebrate, and educate from a particular cultural perspective. Along the same lines, community groups promoted the idea that educators should be from the community in which the school is situated. Thus opposing sides in the conflict exhibited different perspectives on aspects of social organization: status, values, and culture.

Berube (1969) gave an account of the issue as of late 1969 and alluded to the impact that the conflict would have in the future. He addressed the long-term impact of OHB substantially in his work *Reform Movements* (1994). The drift toward privatization can be viewed as a response

to fundamental disagreement over control of schooling. Community control at district levels shifts to community control at the school level through charter legislation. Even more direct control at the parental level is established and promoted through home schooling legislation. Such policies can be viewed as results of fundamental differences in perspective and without dialogue or compromise led to the creation of separate systems.

## 2.6 CONCLUSION

At the heart of the community control conflict were groups with vastly different social perspectives. In both the IS 201 and Ocean Hill-Brownsville conflicts, community control advocates did not gain the desired school reform. Perhaps most alarming was the escalation of visceral rhetoric by individuals and groups on both sides of the conflict. This was not an example of political participation in a traditional democratic sense. It is an example of media use, fear, and misrepresentation becoming a dominant form for communicating fundamentally different approaches to schooling. What was lost was a focus on effective educational practice and structure. In its place, a battle over institutional control and political influence ensued, a battle over aspects of civic organization.

As evidenced by the community control conflict, major differences in social perspective lie at the heart of conflict over school reform. Given the failures of urban public schools “community control appeared to be a way out of the schools dilemma” (Ravitch, 1974, p. 304-305). Often school reforms aimed to assist one group, negatively impact another group; thus, a dilemma is created and often conflict ensues. Such conflicts, for a number of reasons, present a

needed space to promote dialogue around fundamental issues of social and civic organization that lie at the heart of social issues.

## **3.0 METHODS**

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this study, I will use a social theory framework to explore an historic case of school reform conflict. New York City's community control conflict should provide ample evidence of underlying social perspectives. The case was steeped in 1960s social context, including a changing civil rights agenda, urban poverty, changing political landscape, and acknowledged school failure. Three of the key figures involved with the conflict, Mayor John V. Lindsey, Albert Shanker, and Preston Wilcox, each wrote extensively regarding social issues, school reform, and community control. Their works hold promise to build understanding in the history and social theory of the community control conflict.

### **3.2 HISTORY AND SOCIAL THEORY**

Methodologically, I draw from several forms of historical research. Drawing from aspects of national history, I aim to assist and understand the unification of diverse populations (Burke, 2005). Understanding how unity breaks down in a particular case can give insight into the process of its rebuilding. In the case of the New York City community control conflict, several scholars have written of a collapse of the liberal coalition that was a foundation for the success of

Great Society Liberalism, at least in terms of policy passage, if not long-term outcomes (Berube & Gittell, 1969; Ravitch, 1974, 1983; Berube, 1994; Gordon, 2001; Podair, 2002).

Drawing from political history, I focus on “the narrative of the actions and policies of rulers” (p. 15). Conceptualizing rulers in a broad sense, I focus on two leaders of opposing groups engaged in a social conflict, Wilcox of the community and Shanker of the teachers union. As Mayor of New York, Lindsey was in theory a leader of all the people involved in the conflict. Thus, the choice of key figures sets up a continuum of leadership, from formal to informal, engaged in conflict. This continuum provides an avenue for comparison.

Drawing from micro-history, I will analyze the social, civic, and education perspectives of three key figures in the community control conflict. Micro-history may focus “on an individual, an incident or a small community as a privileged place from which to observe the incoherences of large social and cultural systems” (Levi 1985/1988 as cited in Burke, p. 42). In this case study incoherence in social perspectives manifests in conflict over school reform. To focus on the influence of social perspectives on school reform conflict, I will study three key figures for whom there is enough historical record to analyze social perspectives.

My bricolage of historical methodology is built upon a philosophy of history that is more speculative than analytic (Stanford, 1994). As such, I provide a brief history-as-event for the New York community control conflict to set the context for a more theoretical exploration of primary sources from the three key figures under study. This is in contrast to other works on this topic written from perspectives associated mostly with the community (Berube & Gittell, 1969; Byndloss, 2001) or the system (Kahlenberg, 2007; Ravitch, 1974). While these supply substantial histories-as-accounts, they offer little room for synthesis of opposing social perspectives, which continue to surface in current school reform conflicts.

As previously discussed my research is based on a hypothesis that educational problems and social problems more generally are often based on broader differences in perspectives on social and civic organization. The community control movement was generally about the issue of education organization. Who should control schools and districts? Who is best positioned to make education decisions for children? And, who is most qualified to teach children?

If the study of history has anything of value to teach, it is the importance of seeing all sides of a question in order to understand it.... understanding is reached by a careful and unprejudiced scrutiny of the evidence and by the formation of balanced judgments in the light of that evidence. (Stanford, 1994, p. 4)

Ultimately, I want to apply the theoretical framework used in this study to contemporary school reform issues. Such searches for patterns in history that might help in current social problems falls within the confines of a speculative philosophy of history: “To make sense of our common experience of the past, and to learn something useful from it” (Stanford, 1994, p. 230).

My research continues a rich scholarly tradition of merging history and social theory. Both view the “human experience as a whole” (Burke, 2005, p. 15) and I suggest that this is vital to understanding the complex context of educating young people. Particularly, a convergence of history and social theory is important

In a period of rapid social change, [when] many people find it increasingly necessary to find their roots and to renew their links with the past, particularly the past of their own community – their family, their town or village, their occupation, their ethnic or religious group.... The ‘theoretical turn’ on the part of some social historians and the ‘historical turn’ of some theorists are very much to

be welcomed.... Without the combination of history and theory we are unlikely to understand either the past or the present. (Burke, 2005, p. 17-18)

As such, I consider myself an educator bringing aspects of social theory and history to bear in long running foundational issues in education. Hopefully, by exploring and describing deep-rooted contestation in social perspectives, my research can offer insight into aspects of synthesis and compromise that might prove helpful in matters of school reform.

### **3.3 DATA COLLECTION**

In regard to method, I am engaging in a “rational winnowing” (Stanford, 1994, p. 229) of artifacts left by and related to the three key figures being researched. Drawing from qualitative research methods, I approach research as

A process of trying to gain a better understanding of the complexities of human experience and, in some genres of research, to take action based on that understanding. Through systematic and sometimes collaborative strategies, the researcher gathers information about actions and interactions, reflects on their meaning, arrives at and evaluates conclusions, and eventually puts forward an interpretation, most frequently in written form. (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 23)

Thus, the focus of my data collection is to gather evidence of the four individuals’ perspectives on social, civic, and education organization. As such, I will conduct archival research first for works written by them and second for meeting minutes, interviews, speeches, etc., that relate to

my theoretical framework. Much of my data collection will be conducted at New York University, which houses the Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor archives, and the New York Public Library's Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture. Finally, research on Mayor Lindsey will be conducted at New York City's Municipal Archive, focusing in the Mayors' Collection.

### **3.4 DATA ANALYSIS**

Data analysis will be conducted using deductive methods based on the framework developed in chapter two. I plan to create a visual model that compares the key figures on aspects of this study's theoretical framework. Microsoft Excel will be used for data organization, analysis, and portrayal of the three key figures' perspectives on social, civic, and education organization. Lastly, comparative analysis will be conducted across the four individuals. In particular, this analysis will aim to explore avenues for synthesis of perspectives and compromise in policy, regarding school reform conflict.

### **3.5 CONCLUSION**

In this study, I use history and social theory to explore school reform conflict. Often reform initiatives are fraught with contestation revolving around issues stemming from the social context of education (Cooley, 1993). Often, school reform is entangled in broader social issues that are rarely at the forefront of public discourse. Through this analysis, I will explicate some connections between social theory and school reform conflict. My goal is to add to the literature

explaining the plethora of reform initiatives, the dearth of broad successes, and the lack of substantial links between social interventions and student success (Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Fullan, 2006). Often school reform is less about education and more about underlying social issues.

## **4.0 JOHN V. LINDSEY**

### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

As mayor of New York City, John V. Lindsey espoused a unique political ideology that became increasingly absent in American government during the latter half of the twentieth century. Lindsey's progressive liberalism and his quest for common ground often put him at odds with his own political party and other interest groups. He seemed to have a romantic – he might have called it idealistic - vision of the New York City's diverse population. He was committed to a cosmopolitan society and bringing groups together as citizens of the City. Thus, much of Lindsey's political and administrative focus was founded on an underlying social responsibility, which he developed early on in life. These underlying social perspectives transferred to his education policy, particularly with regard to community control and decentralization.

### **4.2 INFLUENCES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE AND COMMITMENT TO THE CITY**

In *Journey into Politics* (1967), Lindsey wrote of the influences that pushed him into public service and commitment to New York City. Lindsey attended St. Paul's School in Concord, New Hampshire, a boarding school with a tradition of inspiring public service. Notable alumni included many politicians and philanthropists, such as Archibald Cox, J.P. Morgan, Jr., and John Kerry. Lindsey reflected on his time at St. Paul's when deciding on his initial run for Congress.

“I was fortunate to receive an excellent education and the purpose of this training came into our conversation more than once while my wife and I were debating whether I should run in 1958. Had I received the benefit of an excellent education only to pursue a private course? Or was there not some wider, more selfless objective, in the tradition of the English public schools? To a degree, this was the tradition of my preparatory school work at St. Paul’s” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 3-4).

Once settled into a successful law career in New York City, Lindsey’s family and colleagues questioned his decision to pursue public service. His colleagues considered politics an “accumulation of petty headaches” and thought that one could have a greater impact on the community through the legal profession. Lindsey’s father, who himself had been successful in business, thought that politics would make life “unnecessarily complicated,” for Lindsey, his family, and his law firm (Lindsey, 1967, p. 9). Although Lindsey withstood such critiques and entered politics, his life and the life of his family were greatly complicated by his choice.

New York City’s diverse population also had an impact on Lindsey. Perhaps even more so since Lindsey represented the 17<sup>th</sup> Congressional District of New York, which “contain[ed] one of the greatest varieties of nationality groups of any Congressional district in the country” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 8). Respect and admiration for the many nationality and ethnic groups in the city was a mainstay in Lindsey’s writing about the City. In particular, Lindsey noted that during campaigns he and his staff had positive experiences and fond memories of journeys into various neighborhoods of the city.

Most New Yorkers make the pleasant discovery, sooner or later, that New York is a montage of small towns, embodying the rural virtues of neighborliness – providing reasonable effort is made – with the urban respect for independence and

privacy. Our volunteers learned that the majority of their neighbors were unexpectedly courteous and interesting. It was novel to visit their homes; it was absorbing to explore the neighborhood – often for the first time. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 17)

Lindsey not only identified with the City, but also viewed the diverse population as an important and valuable characteristic. Throughout his political career, Lindsey tried to bring groups together as citizens of the City.

These aspects of Lindsey’s life prior to his mayoralty reflected his loyalty and commitment to New York City, interest in the cities’ diverse groups, and commitment to public service. Combined, these aspects helped to explain Lindsey promotion of the City as a primary social group. By the time of his mayoralty, Lindsey and members of his campaign felt that they had “moved people from apathy to interest” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 17) regarding the many social issues facing the City. Throughout his political career Lindsey focused on bringing people together as New Yorkers to help improve the City, particularly the lives of groups that had been traditionally disenfranchised.

### **4.3 MIDDLE GROUND – U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

As a member of Congress, Lindsey was a stalwart of the middle ground in American politics. Lindsey discussed the middle ground as connecting social responsibility, compromise, and bi-partisanship. Absent compromise, organizations and systems, in this case municipal government and education, deteriorate into competitive stalemates between groups with differing perspectives. Lindsey cited that “Congress often [was] a prism reflecting the innumerable

expectations, hostilities, and prejudices of the viewer” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 20). Lindsey attempted to stave off the stultifying contestation among groups by seeking middle ground. He viewed this as the duty of the House of Representatives. As he explained:

The constant problem of representative government is to find the middle ground between chaos at one extreme and tyranny at the other. To the free man, extremes offer little choice. The paralysis of uncontrollable factionalism is no more palatable than the conformity imposed by an unrestrained majority. The role of the House has been that of holding the middle ground. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 21)

During his mayoralty, Lindsey’s search for common ground was a critical aspect of the City’s political and educational landscapes. Unfortunately, Lindsey often dealt with groups that rarely shared such a conciliatory perspective. In both the City and Congress, people had to decide to which group they were most responsible.

Lindsey explained the importance of relationships among members of the house, which helped establish relationships that lent themselves compromise and middle ground. “The substructure of the House of Representatives is a subtle arrangement of clusters and ‘clubs.’ Its means of communication are informal, unwritten, and more sensitive than most people realize” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 25). Lindsey described the House as an egalitarian group, where communication was an essential element of a functioning representative body. Relationships between house members grew from a sense of solidarity among elected officials; sharing and understanding the difficult path to elected office. “With rather few exceptions, Congressmen have a respect for each other... each knows, regardless of district, what one must go through to get elected.... between them [is] an understanding and a respect, even when they have little else in common” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 27). However, member solidarity had its limits.

Lindsey found that House members ultimately had to choose between connections to colleagues or commitment to constituencies.

Stripped of all the explanations, all the maneuvering, and all the posturing, in the showdown members follow what they believe to be the general wish of their constituents. Most members acknowledge their essential provincialism; that is why they normally get along with each other; why the system works as well as it does. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 27)

Ultimately, members over-riding responsibility was to those who elected them, the members of their district. At the end of the day, members of congress most often acted in line with their representative responsibility to their districts and they had a mutual understanding of this primary responsibility. Yet, they continued to work together toward middle ground. Lindsey found the duty and focus of Congress to be its efforts toward balancing common ground and responsibility to constituencies.

#### **4.4 PLIGHT OF THE URBAN POOR**

From the beginning of his political career, Lindsey was committed to improving the plight of the urban poor. In *The City* (1969), Lindsey implored people to come together to end urban poverty: “All of us must recognize the existence of a separate nation of the poor in the hearts of our cities. All of us must determine to end that poverty with rational, effective, just, and humane policies” (Lindsey, 1969, p. 149). Specifically, Lindsey offered a distinction among welfare recipients and the subsequent differences in public perception. He explained that welfare in most cities was “a collection of programs offering public assistance to those who cannot support themselves....

[And] some of the programs do not normally cause contention: aid to the aged, the blind, and the disabled; veterans' assistance; and general assistance for the destitute" (Lindsey, 1969, p. 151). These relatively publicly accepted programs accounted for approximately half of the City's welfare budget during Lindsey's mayoralty. The other half of the welfare/public assistance budget was taken up by Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the program "through which the government assists needy families where the father is missing, or has deserted, and where the children require full-time care, preventing the mother from finding work" (Lindsey, 1969, p. 151). Lindsey argued that AFDC was the component of public assistance that elicited major contention and opposition. He was a critic of AFDC, particularly how it did next to nothing to get recipients off of public assistance.

Thus, the accusation of welfare as a component of an American cycle of poverty intensified in urban areas, like New York City, where population density exacerbated entrenchment and expansion of the cycle. Lindsey was particularly concerned with the AFDC's counterproductive policies relating to employment. First, welfare recipients historically received little to no job training or education that could assist them in gaining employment and thus get off of welfare. Second, Lindsey cited that

Until [1969] AFDC directly discouraged employment by providing that a dollar of welfare benefits would be lost for every additional dollar earned from a job.

That amounted to a 100 per cent [sic] tax on earnings; no matter how hard a welfare recipient with a large family worked on a job, his total disposable family income would not increase. (Lindsey, 1969, p. 154)

However, Lindsey's argument was prone to opposition. Another perspective derived from the liberal capitalist status quo was that every dollar earned by a welfare recipient made that

person more self-sufficient and less a ward of the state. This was and continued to be a central disagreement, balancing social and individual responsibility or simply picking one side or the other. Those who picked a side tended to be either vehement proponents or outspoken opposition to public assistance programs. These positions trickled down or transferred into the realm of education, yet to a slightly less caustic degree. Generally, the public agrees that society bears responsibility for the education of children. It is too what degree and to what ends where contention sparks.

Lindsey also addressed the issue of families with male heads of households, working for wages that were insufficient to provide for a family. In such situations, families could be financially better off if the male head of household left, which qualified the mother for AFDC. Instead of a public assistance system that encouraged such actions, Lindsey supported the income supplementation programs offered in some states; however, funding was an issue. Citing New York's Home Relief Program as an example, Lindsey made the point that "the federal government does not reimburse those states with a program for the working poor; New York City and New York State must bear the full financial burden of their Home Relief Program" (Lindsey, 1969, p. 155). As with most social issues, including education Lindsey felt that the federal government needed to contribute funding to a much greater degree in order to make headway against inequality and poverty.

#### **4.5 THE CITY AS MAJOR SOCIAL GROUP**

Much of Lindsey's perspective was steeped in contradictory notions, or possibly unrealistic expectations of social responsibility. On the one hand, Lindsey promoted an idea of the City as a

primary social group to which all residents were responsible. On the other hand, much of the funding for seemingly necessary public programs to promote and maintain the City as a viable group came from state and federal government.

“A city is more than just the people who live in it; it is an interrelated, organic center of life. For too long we have thought of the city as simply a place where a lot of people live. But you cannot help a city with that kind of thinking.... And you cannot help a city only by spending to treat effects and consequences; you must be willing to treat causes and conditions before they become crises”

(Lindsey, 1969, p. 221).

Lindsey was particularly vocal in his opposition to what he saw as the City's support of other municipalities throughout the state with its high level of state taxes paid. Lindsey thought that much more of the City's state taxes paid should be returned in the form of state funding and services. Thus, Lindsey's social responsibility, at least financially in the area of taxes and funding, was focused on the City. Thus, it devolved into an issue of which groups were owed primary responsibility. Lindsey chose the City over the State.

Throughout his writing, Lindsey promoted the City as a social group to which residents were bound. Given New York City's history of ethnic tensions, its position as city on the hill was highly idealistic (Ravitch, 1974). Lindsey's view was classic American idealism. The idea that immigrants in a collection of colonies transforms into a confederacy of sovereign and highly diverse states and ultimately becomes a unified nation-state seemed an equally valiant tilting at windmills. Yet, there was honor and cohesion through the attempt, sustaining the great experiment for over two centuries. Even in their most virulent critiques of the school system or Lindsey's reform plans, neither the teacher's union, nor community control advocates wanted the

dissolution of the social contract underpinning the city or nation. Quality schools were a public responsibility. People just could not agree on effective means for attaining quality schools in the ghetto. Ultimately, there seemed to be agreement that social groups in a nation, state, and city were connected.

The biggest question became to what degree and in what order groups and the people in them were connected? Wilcox and community control advocates wanted redistribution and restructuring. Shanker and the teacher's union wanted either to maintain the status quo or to redistribute and reconsider in a different manner or direction that did not negatively impact teachers. Similar to Congressmen and their constituencies, the direction or absence of change was designed to be most beneficial to the group that was owed primary responsibility. Lindsey's primary group was the City and it included both Shanker's teachers and Wilcox's community, neither of which were very permeable. As such, Wilcox and Shanker's writing promoted a more "you're either with us or against us" position. Lindsey promoted a fusion and collaborative position that was mostly absent from Shanker and Wilcox's rhetoric, relating to community control and perhaps more fundamentally to their social perspectives.

Ultimately, Lindsey promoted the City as a primary social group and consistently implored the citizens of New York to come together. On the one hand he asserted the need for local control (e.g., municipal government) and on the other, the importance of state and federal funding. Lindsey seemed to support a rather isolationist approach to taxation. He continually called for New York to get back more and more of its taxes paid. Lindsey based his position on the states power over municipal financial structure and the federal governments golden goose, the IRS.

Our country has been undergoing a most complicated urban revolution, comparable in scope to the industrial revolution of the last century.... Whether we can survive these explosive pressures, whether we can guide them into productive channels leading to a happier and more humane environment in the cities, is one of the most severe tests of our civilization.... The nation must make an extraordinary new investment in its sagging, often debilitated cities. This will require Federal talent as well as Federal billions. But no army of technicians, no amount of Federal billions, can fill the void left by an absence of a soundly structured city government. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 135)

#### **4.6 CIVIL RIGHTS, PROCEDURAL LIBERALISM, AND RULE OF LAW**

In his writing about civil rights, Lindsey reflected both a procedural and non-procedural perspective on liberalism. His approach was not surprising giving the middle ground political perspective that he supported. During that time, Lindsey was a part of some of the most significant civil rights legislation in American history. Although he was elected to Congress in 1957, he soon held a position on the Judiciary committee.

At the turn of the decade, world-wide attention was rather suddenly focused on the swellings of the civil rights movement in the United States. The movement was to cause division and strife, but it was happening, whether it was liked or not. To avoid it was asking for eventual chaos. Both its merit and its excesses had to be faced. This may be true for some time to come. Part of the merit was the need of a comprehensive framework of laws within which Americans, regardless of

race, can enjoy their enfranchised share of the nation's promise of equal treatment. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 33)

Lindsey referred to "merit and excesses," which was representative of his perspective and his efforts at compromise between rule of law and a common good. At times, government actions for the common good might have gone too far and in the name of rule of law not far enough. Lindsey dealt with this issue not only in the community control conflict, but also in conflicts between communities and the police and in the anti-war movement, of which Lindsey was a vocal supporter.

Local police powers to protect the public against violence or the possibility of violence must be weighed against First Amendment rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The rights of peaceable assembly must be respected, no matter how controversial or unpopular the cause; at the same time, the public safety must be respected and protected. The rule of law must be adequate to do both. Arriving at a balance demands delicacy and precision, and both are elusive to the most conscientious practitioners of government. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 35)

During his mayoralty, Lindsey dealt with other dilemmas between public servants and the community conflict besides community control advocates and the teachers union. Lindsey constantly struggled to balance the common good and rule of law. His perspective required sophisticated understanding of both the issues and the different perspectives involved, and a willingness to compromise and convince other groups to compromise as well.

Although a staunch supporter of community control, Lindsey's support had limits based on his broader social perspective. His decentralization plan gave the Central Board authority "to ensure that State standards are maintained throughout the City" (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 5). This

policy supported Lindsey's perspective that education needed to have an outward focus and connect students to the broader society and economy. Lindsey's decentralization plan specifically upheld aspects of his perspective. He was concerned with issues of due process, rule of law, and merit, each of which related to procedural liberalism. For example, Lindsey granted the Central Board authority:

To intervene in instances where any action of a community board seriously threatens the educational welfare of the district, or is illegal, fraudulent or in bad faith, or constitutes a gross abuse of the powers.... Include[ing] situations where a community board practiced discrimination or violated academic freedom or other fundamental principles which must be upheld in all parts of the City. (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 5)

During the community control conflict, Lindsey continually defended due process and the rule of law for teachers and administrators, requiring that all appointments be "made according to merit, and by competitive examination where this is required by the State Constitution" (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 7). The community would be in control within ground rules set by the government; community control within governmental structure.

#### **4.7 THE CHANGING REPUBLICAN PARTY**

Lindsey wrote at length about the history of the Republican Party and that during the 1960s it began to deviate from its foundational ideals. Beginning as the party of Lincoln, the Republican Party focused on a balance between traditional liberalism's focus on the individual and a commitment to broader society. Lindsey thought that the Party needed to "Spell out in

understandable terms that the real danger of modern central government is the pervasive threat to individual liberties that stems from any undue concentration of power” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 115). Thus, Lindsey focused much on expanded accountability and the policy making process through initiatives such as the reviews boards and decentralizations. Each was an effort to expand people’s access and involvement in the public sector. In a sense, government’s role was to provide the structure within which individuals could engage in civic life and “free, nongovernment economic, social, and cultural institutions may flourish” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 116). Many of Lindsey’ policies and initiatives attempted to expand engagement and did so in the civic sphere; however, problems arose when people identified strongly with groups and were unwilling to compromise on their social perspectives (Roberts, 2010).

Lindsey also argued that within its stance for procedural liberal, the Republican Party needed to set up social safety nets for those who could not help themselves. To do so, Lindsey called for government focus to be more on individuals than groups. “We have done a great deal in this country for organizations and power groups; it is time we thought more about individuals who increasingly have become subordinate to organizations or helpless among power groups” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 116) A similar perspective seemed to drive the Johnson administrations call for maximum feasible participation and Great Society programs. Lindsey’s expansion of access to the civic sphere more often than not resulted in individuals from traditionally disfavored and disenfranchised groups coming together in opposition and support of programs that almost immediately drew a counter response from others groups. The Republican perspective of the primacy of the individual did not transfer and what developed was primarily conflict between groups. Thus, Lindsey’s social perspective and the Republican philosophy he described and their focus on balancing individual liberty and social responsibility seemed very difficult in practice.

In particular, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was a lightning rod for the Republican Party, as it was for most of the country. Lindsey describes his experience as a delegate to the 1964 Republican Convention and the process of drafting the party platform. In a speech to the platform committee Lindsey presented planks from the 1872, 1876, and 1908 party platforms to illustrate Republican commitment to the civil rights. Each proclaimed that the purpose of the federal government was to defend individual liberty to all men and extolled party support for the civil rights legislation of the time. The plank from 1876 offered a compelling summary of GOP civil rights support.

The power to provide for the enforcement of the principles embodied in the recent Constitutional amendments is vested by those amendments in the Congress of the United States; and we declare it to be the solemn obligation of the legislative and executive departments of the government to put into immediate and vigorous exercise all their Constitutional powers for removing any just causes of discontent on the part of any class, and securing to every American citizen complete liberty and exact equality in the exercise of all civil, political, and public rights. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 39)

The 1908 platform specifically declared that African Americans were due all civil liberties directed by the constitution and that any restrictions based on race were “un-American.” Needless to say Lindsey was disheartened by the events of the 1964 Republican Convention.

Lindsey lamented that his lesson on the history of the Republican Party fell on the deaf ears of the New Right. The New Right had a social perspective far removed from Lindsey’s. “The [1964] campaign and election proved that the strange brand of ‘conservatism’ which

manifested itself was a total negativism that offered little toward the solution of the complex problems of the last third of the twentieth century” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 126). Lindsey explained the 1964 presidential election between Senator Goldwater and President Johnson as the birth of the right wing conservatism. The events at the Republican convention led Lindsey to run as an independent. In his public statement declaring his political independence, Lindsey wrote:

The convention refused to reassert traditional Republican beliefs in such matters as civilian control over the military in the use of nuclear weapons; in the rule of law over rule by whatever extremist group might prevail; and in our commitment to the rightness of and necessity for a body of national law under which each man may enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness according to his merits rather than according to his race, his religion, or his national origin.... Republicans across the country who believe in the party of Lincoln should join hands and work together for the rededication of the Republican Party to those principles which have made the party in the past the center core of America. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 129)

Lindsey makes the point that too often pigeonhole categorizations were used for much deeper, fundamental differences in social perspective. In fact, the often liberal-conservative dichotomy was more like a continuum. Rarely do simple terms adequately describe people’s social perspectives. According to Lindsey, Republicans and Democrats were “often demonstrated to be a collection of factions and warring groups, a strange coalition of opposites” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 116). Even within political parties steeped in common beliefs, dilemmas over social perspective developed and drove wedges between groups.

Lindsey used Henry Stimson's term "progressive conservative" to describe his perspective. He pointed to many previous New York politicians who fit the category; including historic figures such as Stimson, Theodore Roosevelt, Charles Evans Hughes, Thomas Dewey, Nelson Rockefeller, and Jacob Javits. Lindsey described the focus of progressive conservatism as twofold:

First, that the primary and overriding requirement of all government is that it should not infringe upon the essential liberties of the individual, and, second, that within this limitation government could and must be made a powerful instrument for the enhancement of individual citizens by group action. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 121)

Lindsey gave equal credence to individual liberty and a common good. Often in politics these ideals are positioned against one another. After the 1960s, progressive conservatism became an increasingly contradiction in terms. Yet, Lindsey made a compelling argument that both ideas are needed to address large social issues.

In their hundred-year history Republicans in power have been best at finding that balance between public and private uses that guards against mediocrity (always the danger of a too greatly planned society), that reaches for excellence by respecting individual responsibility, that resists blind conformity, but which at the same time understands the use of government – namely, to create a social order in which every human being can live in dignity, respect law, and receive justice, and exploit endlessly the best in himself. (Lindsey, 1967, p. 130 - 131)

Lindsey's perspective on liberalism bridged the dichotomy of procedural and non-procedural liberalism. He attempted to ameliorate the competitive, adversarial dynamics between groups

that increasingly dominated politics (Taylor, 1994; Hawkins, 2007). As such, Lindsey's political efforts were aimed toward conciliation between groups with different perspectives.

Unfortunately, his efforts were largely futile. In the end, Lindsey left the Republican Party, joined the Democratic Party, and ran for the 1972 democratic presidential nomination. He became a politician without a party in which his social perspective fit.

#### **4.8 STATUS QUO VERSUS REFORM**

Lindsey was a critic of the political and bureaucratic status quo. Going back to his entry into politics, Lindsey sought a novel course within an increasingly changing Republican Party.

Lindsey explained himself as a "party rebel" who:

"Found that the grip of the organization was not readily broken, except by a few close friends who had been with me some years ago in the New York Young Republican Club. Patronage, it has been said, is the adhesive that holds a party organization together. The adage is pertinent even if patronage is nonexistent, for there always is the hope of it. Even apart from this, the concept of political regularity becomes a way of life for those who have long labored in a party's local vineyards. 'I'm regular' or 'I'm organization' are the terms an insurgent is most likely to hear." (Lindsey, 1967, p. 13)

Lindsey was particularly critical of patronage, citing that it was "perpetuation of a status quo – most often patronage – which has been the motivational force" (Lindsey, 1967, p. 116) behind party members' actions. Throughout his political career, Lindsey worked to expand civic engagement. He continued fighting against the status quo as mayor, facing an uphill battle

against the entrenched interests that maintained the archaic structure of municipal services, including but not limited to education.

The closed shop of unions, with which Lindsey had little patience, could be viewed as a kind of patronage. Although not entirely restrictive, unions could serve as a barrier to innovation and the injection of new blood into the system. Thus, unions are often supporters of the status quo, unless of course the status quo was detrimental to their interests. Thus, Shanker's work and the work of many professional education organizations could be viewed as maintaining the status quo; their influence, if not control over the entrance into the teaching and administrator work force or civil service. Lindsey's perspective and policies were at odds with not only Shanker and the UFT, but also many other unions and entrenched civil service groups throughout his mayoralty (Roberts, 2010). However, Lindsey was committed to challenging the status quo of municipal government.

“It became clear to me as a candidate that a primary source of New York's troubles was the structure of city government itself. It had grown, like the urban sprawl around it, into an unplanned hodgepodge of fragmented agencies, departments and bureaus, too inflexible or undirected to deal with the city's problems effectively. I believed as a candidate, and believe now, that New York City can be governed economically and efficiently. I base that belief upon the enactment of a sensible realignment of the city's administrative machinery – a project I began to carry out soon after taking office.” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 140)

Lindsey worked to consolidate and centralize some fifty municipal departments and agencies. Needless to say, Lindsey was at odds with a number of unions and civil service organizations throughout his mayoralty.

Lindsey pursued reforms within the broader education organization of the City. He proposed taking control of educating and training nurses out of the hands of teachers of nursing - though they might have been nurses themselves - and moving toward a form of apprenticeship or on the job training. Lindsey's idea was to "train registered nurses by starting women without skills at the nurse's-aide level and providing training as they work on their jobs" (Lindsey, 1969, p. 160). In a way, this system cut out the middlemen, which to a certain degree teachers and formal schooling represented. This was similar to taking control of educating children of a community out of the hands of educators and placing it in the hands of the community. In both cases, education becomes more insulated: nurses train new nurses and the community educates its children.

Lindsey highlighted programs from his first term as Mayor that reflected his perspective. In particular, the Training Incentive Payments Program (TIPP) was a municipal program that provided funding for employers providing on-the-job training to low-income, low skill employees. The method was left up to the employer and training was for whatever job he needed filled. Thus, if training was successful, the employers could "promise them wage advancements without risk; those assurances should induce unskilled workers previously without hope of improvement to stay on the job" (Lindsey, 1969, p. 220)

Lindsey also identified federally funded programs or aspects of federal funding that reflected his critique of the status quo. Lindsey was particularly fond of the Model Cities Program, which "Recognized the critical need for local initiative and responsibility.... Most of the key decisions - in terms of development, recreation, sanitation, housing, and jobs - are made not by federal officials but by the neighborhood itself through an elected council" (Lindsey,

1969, p. 225). Lindsey saw this as evidence that at least some people in Washington realized that the best assistance it could give cities was funding locally developed and led initiatives.

“It is simply not true that participation and effectiveness are divorced from each other. In fact, it is entirely possible that the correlation is the reverse – that to the extent that power is removed from the people affected efficiency and effectiveness are thereby reduced.... It is entirely appropriate to call both for an increased effort from the federal government to provide resources and a decreased level of federal structural controls. (Lindsey, 1969, p. 225).

Again, Lindsey recited the mantra of more funding and less involvement from federal government. In fact, the Nixon administration moved in this direction with its use of categorical grants instead of block grants (Berube, 1994). In effect, Model Cities was a local control initiative similar to community control that depending on the site did not have a built-in opposition group, like the teachers union and professional educators. However, Lindsey acknowledged that while funding was important it needed to be focused on underlying causes of social ills.

“Our cities need help. They need money, desperately – money to pay schoolteachers, policemen, nurses, doctors, and the men who keep the streets and parks clean and the museums and libraries open. And they need far more than money. They need essential, root changes in their method of government to bring them in line with the twentieth century. They need government that is willing to risk political capital to give citizens a chance to control their own lives. They need the courage to say that basic methods of operation have not been working and must be scrapped.” (Lindsey, 1967, p. 231)

Lindsey wrote that the two main things that cities needed from federal and state government were money and changes in both politics and administration of government; changes that allowed and compelled more people to participate in the civic sphere.

#### **4.9 EDUCATION, COMMUNITY CONTROL, AND DECENTRALIZATION**

In a letter to governor Rockefeller, Lindsey (1968a) explained his support for local control through decentralization. Lindsey's view on education reflected functionalist and human capital perspectives. He wrote specifically of the detriment that provincial perspectives had on the labor market, and repeatedly promoted a more cosmopolitan perspective.

There is a great need today for secondary education to provide a perspective far beyond the City's boundaries: The labor market is at least metropolitan-wide, if not nation-wide in many occupations, and modern communications have lured many young people into colleges and careers in all parts of the country and abroad. Americans cannot afford to be as provincial in the future as we have been in the past. The local district perspective is not a sufficiently broad outlook for secondary education in the last third of the twentieth century. (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 4)

Thus, Lindsey's decentralization plan gave the community a higher level of control over elementary schools than high schools. High schools were initially to remain under the control of the Board of Education and gradually be taken over by local community boards.

Lindsey wrote often of the community's responsibility for education; however, he held a broad concept of community. He included many groups in the mix, seemingly in efforts to invoke a broader sense of citywide collaboration and cohesion, or at least Manhattan-wide. When Lindsey wrote of the City, it was debatable whether he referred to the five boroughs or just Manhattan. Ultimately, this was one of the greatest critiques of Lindsey's mayoralty; that his focus was largely Manhattan's poor minorities, at the expense of working and middle class groups in the outer borough. Lindsey's specific decentralization recommendations were broadly citywide. He recommended "a nine-member unpaid lay board" that he thought would "serve best to generate a City-wide sense of community and provide the educational leadership needed to maintain a City-wide perspective for the entire educational program" (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 5). He also called for "City-wide evaluation and reporting," declaring that "the entire City should be kept informed about both the successes and the failures of the local programs, since education in any part of the City continues to remain the concern and responsibility of the entire City" (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 5). Lindsey's recommendations were an attempt to bring together all citizens of the City to address the issues of education and schools.

In his decentralization plan, Lindsey also tried to build a bridge between the two most outspoken opponents in the community school conflict, teachers and local community members. Lindsey's plan would allow teachers to serve on the community boards. He thought this would encourage teachers "to win the confidence of the non-professional and collaborate with citizens in the formation of school policy" (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 9). Thus, teachers were acknowledged as part of the school, and while the community was granted considerable control over its schools, structures would be put in place to promote collaboration and a broader sense of community.

In his decentralization plan, Lindsey called for considerable increases in state and federal funding for New York City schools. In particular, Lindsey requested funding for training programs and support for community members and educators involved with community controlled schools. He called on unions, community organizations, higher education, and the public and private sector to assist in these efforts. Lindsey thought that training and support could provide those involved with the needed understanding and skills to help the transition to community control succeed. He thought that training could address both education and broader social issues, such as:

- 1) Increased sophistication about the nature of the role of each in a community school system, and enhanced ability to perform effectively that role;
- 2) a more profound understanding of the needs and the roles of others in the system, and with this a greater respect for their particular skills and abilities;
- 3) deeper knowledge about the strengths, and weaknesses, of the local community and their relevance to the local educational process; [and]
- 4) greater perspective on the larger world and the community's involvement in it. (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 13)

Thus, Lindsey thought that training for people involved with community controlled schools could assist in cooperation and understanding needed in other areas of public service. He not only envisioned cooperation between groups throughout the city, but also between public service agencies and organizations. In this way community control could serve as a catalyst for addressing the City's social issues.

#### 4.10 FROM COMMUNITY CONTROL TO DECENTRALIZATION

Lindsey's perspective on school decentralization merged branches of the American Progressivism of the first half of the twentieth century. Lindsey's perspective called for professional educators to share control of education with the community. Lindsey thought that improving ghetto schools required a diverse set of abilities and skills; including teachers, administrators, parent, community professionals and lay members. All groups needed to come together to provide a quality education for students from the ghetto. In many ways Lindsey bridged administrative progressives' acknowledgement of the importance of professional expertise with democratic, Deweyan progressives call for increased civic participation (Berube, 1994).

Lindsey did not, however, concede free reign over schools to the community. He continued to support due process and procedural liberalism and was committed to have local districts fit within the broader school system. Lindsey argued that the Board of Education should have the power to make certain "State standards are maintained throughout the City, and to intervene in instances where any action of a community board seriously threatens the educational welfare of the district, or is illegal, fraudulent or in bad faith (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 5). Lindsey's plan also gave the Board of Education specific authority over issues of discrimination and academic freedom. Thus, he supported the Bundy Panel's position that all hiring should be based on "merit and fitness, and wherever practicable, on a competitive basis" (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 7). In addition, Lindsey called for a qualifying examination and, due to a shortage of licensed teachers in NYC, stronger recruiting efforts for teachers.

Lindsey's harshest critique was for the system, which had become unresponsive and unapproachable to too many people, in particular the urban poor.

The energies of the many extremely talented and dedicated individuals staffing the schools and living in our communities are frustrated and turned away by the present system. The goal of decentralization is the improvement of the quality of education in the New York City public school system, to be achieved by liberating the system from the constraints that have smothered it and by reconnecting the parties concerned with public education in a constructive, creative effort. (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 2)

Although he did not view decentralization by itself as the solution to the failure of ghetto schools, Lindsey found it to be a necessary starting point. Decentralization would not cure the social ills caused by urban poverty. Public schools have always been a major part of a city increasing community involvement was a means of increasing civic participation and strengthening schools.

Lindsey's perspective on education was influenced by functionalist and human capital theory. Lindsey wrote that a major focus of secondary schools was to fit students into an adult world and national economy. Because of this, secondary schools could no longer be provincial in focus. They needed to create "realistic links with the worlds of employment, the unions, and higher education" (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 4), which would lead more students to become productive citizens and parts of the economy.

In the end, decentralization began to look less and less like the original plan for community control. Lindsey thought that community control and decentralization were intertwined and ultimately should ensure greater local participation in schools and school policy.

Lindsey acknowledged the volatile group conflict over community control and the chance that it would escalate to substantial violence. Lindsey thought that the possibility for violence soured middle class support of community control. For Lindsey, community control of ghetto schools was an effort to emulate local control of schools in middle class neighborhoods. Yet, Lindsey thought the middle class did not see the similarities. Instead, he thought that for much of the middle class “decentralization meant black power, black control. And then somehow some kind of iron-fisted violence on top of it all” (Lindsey, 1968b, p. 6). It was a lack of support, from teachers, from the middle class, simply from enough people, that led community control activists to be viewed largely as or at least potentially as a violent faction.

#### **4.11 CONCLUSION**

Lindsey was essentially a reformer. He focused largely on administrative reform in the sense of structure and political reform in terms of participation. These were major aspects of Lindsey’s municipal policy. Lindsey’s opposition to the status quo put him in direct opposition to Shanker and the UFT, which had spent years solidifying its position within the school system and city administration. However, Lindsey’s opposition to the status quo and the UFT’s entrenched position did not go as far as community control advocates would have liked. Lindsey was equally committed to traditional notions of procedural liberalism and the common good of quality education and civic participation. His reforms aimed to alter the status quo within the structure of procedural liberalism to increase the common good.

## **5.0 ALBERT SHANKER**

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

Shanker's response to the demands of community control advocates was most often to acknowledge and address the failure of ghetto, while maintaining the integrity of the school system. Shanker promoted teacher and union solidarity, and solidarity with teachers even more broadly by reaching out to parents for support in ending the conflict. Shanker discussed aspects of parent, community, and teacher relationships and described relationships that would support successful schools and classrooms. For Shanker, the biggest tragedy was that even though parents and teachers wanted the same thing, a high quality education for students, their energies were spent working against each other in the community control conflict instead of together to improve education.

Shanker's writings regarding community control and his related social perspective were mostly in response to the policies and initiatives of Lindsey and community control advocates. He critiqued community control advocates, those working on the ground in protests and on local boards and those behind the scenes working with the Bundy Panel and Mayor Lindsey's office. At a basic level, Shanker felt that the community control demands focused on political restructuring and not educational improvement. Shanker's first and foremost concern was defending the rights and position of teachers within the school system.

## 5.2 FAILURE OF GHETTO SCHOOLS

Shanker viewed the major reason for the community control conflict to be the failure of ghetto schools. Although he acknowledged that broader “symbolic issues” were involved, Shanker thought that years of failed reforms and inadequate funding had reaped parent opposition. Parents were enamored with the idea of community control because of years of failed school reforms.

Ghetto schools... continue to turn out huge numbers of children who cannot read, cannot write, and cannot get jobs, and it is because of years of frustration on the part of parents waiting for reports to come out and attending hearings and trying to place schools in certain places, and after years and years of effort to try to get improvement without a great deal of success we now have this particular battle which I think is mainly a symptom of the tremendous bitterness and frustration. The problem is with us. It may blow up again at 201 or in any other disadvantaged school. (Shanker, 1966b)

Shanker acknowledged that educators bore most of the responsibility for educating students and that most of a school’s impact on student learning/academic achievement came from the classroom. Therefore, he thought that the focus of reform needed to be on teachers and in classrooms. Shanker’s supported reform within the existing school system, as opposed to community control advocates who had little concern with maintaining the system or the status quo.

Shanker had another recurring point; the UFT, teachers, and the community ultimately wanted the same thing, a better education for students. Shanker cited that the history of failure in

ghetto schools led parents and the community to misplace blame solely on teachers. Instead, Shanker argued that responsibility for “massive educational failure” was bore by a “rotten system,” calling the conflict:

Tragic because the parents do not see that massive educational failure cannot be explained by a simple good-teacher bad-teacher theory... [And] because that system can be changed only if parents and teachers enter into a partnership for educational revolution – a partnership which is made impossible if parents blame educational disaster on bad teachers and teachers blame it on bad parents.

(Shanker, 1966c, p.9)

Shanker used the term educational revolution, which was an obvious misnomer because throughout the community control conflict he consistently defended the status quo. More often, Shanker asked parents to join the UFT in school reform efforts, particularly funding disparities and the non-responsive and distant Board of Education.

Shanker (1966c) offered a number of aspects involved in urban school failure and some possible solutions. Shanker thought that what went on in classrooms was most important to student success. After-school, summer, remedial, and other supplemental programs could not "undo the damage caused by failure in the classroom." He cited two main ways to improve what went on in classrooms, both of which required increased funding. Shanker argued that increasing teacher pay would recruit and help keep quality teachers. He also thought that decreased class sizes would allow more individual attention for every student. Shanker cited several other specific problems within education:

- Teacher education programs did not prepare teachers to be successful in classrooms.

Internship and mentoring programs were critical for beginning teachers.

- Principals were more attentive to administrative duties and the central office than classrooms. An elected, principal teacher model would place focus on classrooms.
- Classrooms and learning were greatly damaged by disruptive students. Their removal was critical to improving the success of the remaining students.
- Para-professionals drawn from a school's parent population could foster community connections. It would also better inform them of the school's struggles.
- Integration efforts needed to continue and where not possible, smaller programs must be provided. Also, programs providing interaction between ghetto students and middle class communities could improve school success.

Shanker's most drastic solution to ghetto school failure was the change to an elected principal teacher and this change actually increased the authority of teachers. His suggestions were mostly reforms and not radical changes to the existing system. Shanker was rarely, if ever critical of teachers, focusing instead on changing the structure within which they worked.

### **5.3 INTEGRITY OF THE SYSTEM**

Shanker expressed that the union had to prevail in the community control conflict in order to maintain the integrity of the school system. In a letter to chapter chairmen, Shanker explained the importance of the UFT prevailing in the I.S. 201 conflict. "The importance of this victory cannot be overestimated, for, as we told Dr. Donovan, the basic issue at stake was the very integrity of the school system" (Shanker, 1966a). Shanker framed the conflict as a battle not simply for control but for the very existence of the school system as it was known. Shanker presented the prospect of community control as envisioned by its advocates to be a radical deviation from

existing schools. Thus, Shanker's integrity of the system was maintenance of the status quo in schools and education.

Shanker distinguished between community involvement and community intervention. The former was primarily participation of parents and community members within the school system, which Shanker cited as crucial to successful schools and very much supported by himself and the UFT. On the other hand, community intervention challenged the structure of the school system and was resisted. In particular, Shanker warned against community actions deemed detrimental to students or teachers.

Throughout the struggle, UFT and the staff of 201 emphasized the fact that this was not an effort on the part of teachers to reduce or prevent parental and community involvement in the school. On the contrary, we have always complained of apathy on the part of the community. We have always believed that increased interest and involvement on the part of the public are essential if there is to be powerful public support for school improvements. Furthermore, we have always believed that parental interests and involvement are an important factor in the success of children in school.... We should continue to support a greater voice for the community in school affairs just as we continue to fight for a greater voice for teachers and if on occasion, as in the present case, the community uses that voice to pursue ends which we consider undesirable and destructive, or to abridge the legal or contractual rights of teachers, we must be prepared to again defend the teachers and the principles we believe in. (Shanker, 1966a)

Shanker repeatedly cited the need for parental participation during community control conflict. However, he referred to working within the system as opposed to working against the system.

Shanker and the UFT promoted incremental change, a staple of the American bureaucratic status quo. Supporters of community control called for radical or at least significant and noticeable change.

Shanker also supported community involvement within the school system through the use of teaching assistants and “sub-professionals” in schools. Shanker and Mayor Lindsey both wrote letters of support in 1967 for the WTC program for training teacher assistants (Shanker, 1967c; Lindsey 1967b). Both cited the Board of Education as the reason that this program was not implemented in schools. Shanker cited that the teachers and the community were in agreement and it was the greater power, the Board of Education that was hindering school improvement. Shanker often found the Board of Education at fault for school failings.

Community control advocates, however, pressed for influence if not authority over personnel decisions. They argued that the mere presence of community members in subordinate positions was insufficient. Shanker found community control advocates’ demand for involvement, if not control of personnel decisions to be particularly problematic. Shanker supported “the right of the parents to raise objections to the appointment of teachers and supervisors.... [And] that if charges of incompetence or moral turpitude were substantiated, a teacher or supervisor would not be appointed” (Shanker, 1966a). However, Shanker argued that in the case of I.S. 201, the principal was pushed out not for just cause, but “because the Board of Education believed that the existence of hostile feelings within the community would hamper the principal’s functioning seriously and that mere prevalence of such feelings, therefore, constituted a ‘sound and serious’ objection to his appointment” (Shanker, 1966a). The Board of Education and the local board reached an agreement that if the local board had “sound and serious objections” to prospective teachers and administrators, then the person would not be hired.

Shanker dismissed the community's "sound and serious" objections as not "based on evidence," "of substance," or "proven," and eluded that charges were "made on the basis of race, color, sex, creed, national origin or mere unpopularity" (Shanker, 1966a). Shanker defended the ideals of rule of law/due process/procedural liberalism within the school system, a recurring focus of his and the UFT's statements and actions.

Personal characteristics, however, can be sound and serious issues to a group whose perspective and experience are highly connected to characteristics common to the group. Common experience of race, gender, and social class can be sound and serious issues. The community and the union disagreed on the characteristics or dispositions necessary for teacher effectiveness in ghetto schools and how these related to grounds for transfer or dismissal. Although, a large part of the early civil rights movement was the demand for rule of law and due process (e.g., procedural liberalism) within public services and school systems, by the 1960s, some people in the civil rights movement became disillusioned with this approach and sought a more separatist or independent agenda (Berube, 1994).

For Shanker, community control, at least as it played out in I.S. 201 and OHB, flew in the face of the integration efforts that he and the UFT had consistently supported: "For those committed to the fight for equality and integration in our society, as teacher unionists are, the demands themselves are totally unpalatable" (Shanker, 1968g, p. 40). Specifically, Shanker found the demand for a Black principal was unacceptable to not only the union, but also the general public: "It was criticized by the newspapers and by all civic organizations and by practically everyone, with the exception of a few extremists, both on the right and on the left" (Shanker, 1968g, p. 40). Shanker acknowledged the failure of integration in all but a few schools

in New York, yet declared his commit to continued attempts. Increasingly, integration versus community control became an issue.

Shanker made the point that the community's reasons for wanting a review board were unrelated to teachers carrying out their teaching responsibilities. Instead, Shanker argued that community complaints were "Basically... unpleasant encounters between citizens and public employees. Citizens might well experience similar difficulties with police, welfare workers, housing administrators, etc." (Shanker, 1966c). Shanker argued that demands were made for a review board, without clearly defined duties and authority. At the same time, Mayor Lindsey promoted the idea of a civilian review board for police and had an equally, if not more difficult time gaining support from professionals and the public not directly involved with a need to review police actions; people who were or more likely to have been subject to police action. In both instances, the communities that thought they were being unfairly or poorly treated were much more likely to demand change. Communities that were less involved chose to remain less involved.

Community review boards could have provided the community most directly affected by a public service oversight and possibly impact on that public service. It could serve as a kind of community control light. However, such control could be viewed as disproportionate compared to other communities within the broader City. Ultimately, Shanker disputed the term review board and called the idea "educationally unsound." As he explained:

What is usually meant is a procedure whereby parents and community groups may hire and fire members of the professional school staff and judge their competence, performance, and qualifications. This demand must be viewed as symptomatic of the bitterness and frustration which is increasing in the ghetto, for

the parents who make such demands do not really want to hire, fire or supervise teachers. They want their children to learn. They want a school system which will educate. They want the next generation to be able to take advantage of new opportunities. (Shanker, 1966c)

Again, Shanker found the great tragedy to be that parents and teachers ultimately wanted the same thing, the end of urban school failure. Shanker positioned the review board and most community control demands as counterproductive to improving education; fostering an adversarial relationship between parents and teachers who were really on the same side.

#### **5.4 REFORM AND THE RIGHTS OF TEACHERS**

By fall 1967, Shanker's focus turned from possible reform in school structure to the rights of teachers. In a November 1967, letter to OHB teachers, Shanker expressed his support for teacher transfers out of the district. Superintendent Donovan notified the union that teachers requesting transfers would receive approval; however, given the large numbers of requests, approvals could not be granted simultaneously. Shanker found this unacceptable and asked for an immediate meeting "to develop a definitive transfer plan which will protect the rights of all teachers" (Shanker, 1967b).

Later, Shanker changed his view on teacher transfers out of the district, citing that such an exodus would hurt UFT efforts in the community control conflict (Shanker, 1968j). The large number of requests for transfer early in community controlled districts' existence was evidence that teachers in the least experienced difficulties, if not outright opposed the experiment. Thus, in

the early stages, Shanker acted more as a representative, challenging the district policies and practices. As teachers and the UFT's positions within the school system were challenged by community control advocates, Shanker acted more as a delegate, rallying the troops to focus on the big picture. Shanker was largely a pragmatist concerned primarily with the plight of teachers and strength of the union within the school system.

Early on, Shanker and the UFT publically supported the experimental community controlled districts and asked teachers within those districts to do so as well. That support waned over time and turned to outright opposition. In a December 6, 1967, letter written to *The United Teacher*, letters to the editor, and titled "The Forgotten Ones," Robert Wagner, an OHB teacher at J.H.S. 271K, called Shanker and the UFT on not following through with support for the community control experiment. Wagner cited that in a September 1966 meeting at the Americana Hotel, Shanker gave OHB teachers an assurance of all necessary support. Wagner criticized Shanker and the UFT for reneging and simply paying "lip service" to community demands and meaningful reform.

Mr. Shanker, you advised us to stay with this experiment. We have been loyal to the union's recommendations, but you seem to be turning your back on us. Why are you not with us to show that you are interested in progress, not lip service. [sic] The U.F.T. has always indicated a desire for better standards in education, as indicated by MES. Let the union come forth with a sincere show of support for the teachers and the community and proves that we seek to give the youngsters of the ghetto what they need and deserve - the finest quality of professional education. (Wagner, 1967)

In response, Shanker wrote Wagner a three-page letter, outlining his and the UFT's position on the OHB experimental district. Shanker explained, "The UFT *is* about the battle for quality education and professionalism.... But one of the most important things the UFT is about... is the solidarity and participation of large members of teachers in a democratic organization" (Shanker, undated). In response to criticism for his lack of presence at the school, Shanker highlighted the presence of the combination of him and other UFT leaders. Furthermore, Shanker suggested to Wagner "that a good deal of the alienation you apparently feel would probably disappear if you joined the majority of your colleagues in the efforts they are continuing to make on behalf of those very goals you eloquently outlines [sic]" (Shanker, undated). Shanker's response to a union member critical of the UFT's position and actions in the community control conflict was to suggest joining the majority and increasing union activity.

Shanker and the UFT repeatedly warned against setting a precedent for similar actions in other communities. Shanker elevated the community control issues beyond the scope of the experimental districts, into the realm of the entire school system. He warned that a community control precedent would usher in "an era where only a Jewish principal could be appointed in schools located in a predominantly Jewish neighborhood, Italians in Italian neighborhoods, Irish in Irish" (Shanker, 1966a). Later, Shanker warned that community control demands were likely to transfer to other major cities throughout the country (Shanker, 1968g). Thus, the issue went from being about a community attempting to have more influence on the education of its children, to being about the impact that one community's actions could have on the entire school system. These goals were very different and would have required vastly different levels of support to enact.

Furthermore, Shanker dismissed the community's claim for a Black principal as rectifying a grudge from ghetto school failure. Instead, Shanker argued that the community really desired was for its school to provide quality education and the best way to achieve that is to increase parent and teacher collaboration. He accused radical community control advocates of doing just the opposite.

We must not permit extremism on the part of some parents to create a teacher backlash aimed at erecting a wall between the public and the schools. We must welcome and encourage increased parent interest in school conditions at the same time that we continue to fight against the menace of racism and attempts to substitute power plays for professional control of the schools. (Shanker, 1966a)

Shanker supported parent and community participation but within a professionally control of school system. This perspective was fundamentally at odds with community control advocates in I.S. 201 and OHB.

## **5.5 ADDRESSING THE FAILURE OF URBAN SCHOOLS: DECENTRALIZATION AND COMMUNITY CONTROL**

In a letter to the New York Amsterdam News, regarding their Nov. 11, 1967, editorial, Shanker wrote that the editorial did not accurately reflect the UFT position on decentralization. He confirmed the UFT's position in support of decentralization, particularly delegation of powers by the Board of Education to local districts. Shanker cited that the key disagreement with the Bundy report was over the determination "that the basic problems facing the New York City schools require only political and structural solutions and not educational ones as well" (Shanker,

1967d). In his response, Shanker stated that most educational solutions required increased funding.

While recognizing the value of political and structural changes, we know that these proposed changes will be utterly meaningless unless they are accompanied by a massive increase in school expenditures, to, at the very least, the per pupil expenditures of top suburban communities. The failure of the Bundy report to specifically recommend a financial rejuvenation of the school system means that for the child in the classroom there may be little constructive change. (Shanker, 1967d)

Shanker's viewed instruction and learning as the root of quality education. Thus, programs and reforms needed to focus on teachers and students in the classroom. Shanker's critique of the Bundy plan was that it focused on school and district structures, which were far removed from classrooms.

In response to the Bundy Plan, Shanker and the UFT offered an alternative decentralization plan. While maintaining the integrity of the system (e.g., the education status quo), the UFT's suggested reforms were equally as significant. The UFT's plan focused on increased funding, class time, and educational opportunities, without much change to the structure of the school system. Shanker had focused on the same reforms in a 1966 critique of ghetto schools: a hundred percent increase in per pupil funding to attract and keep quality teachers and reduce class size; universal pre-school starting at age three; and teacher internship programs. The one clear difference from 1966 to 1968 was the change from requesting removal of disruptive student to "funds for special facilities for children with special problems, emotional, mental, or physical" (Shanker, 1967b). Again, Shanker and the UFT's recurring

explanation for the problems in New York City Schools was primarily a lack of necessary funding. Each of the proposed reform would require significance increases in funding and was aimed at improving education in classrooms instead of altering school systems. As Shanker wrote:

The basic shortcomings of our school system are not due to the fact that there are three districts or thirty, but to decades of financial starvation. Insofar as the Bundy report has stressed mere changes in formal structure, it obscures the real problems. What happens to a child in the classroom is what counts. Quality depends upon whether that child gets help when he needs it - not on whether we have one school system or many. To turn over a starved school system to local control is merely a political tactic to shift blame for inevitable failure on a powerless local leadership from responsible city and state officials. (Shanker, 1967a)

However, Shanker acknowledged that the Bundy Panel also cited a need for increased funding and recognized the impact of poverty on children. It was just a lesser focus of the report compared to issues of school structure.

By late 1968, Shanker conceded that decentralization was greatly supported by policy makers and the public. The focus was now on the likelihood of recommended reforms improving education, the structure of a decentralized school system, and the impact on teachers and communities.

The question of whether our school system should be decentralized no longer seems to be an open question. The legislature, the Mayor, the Board of Education, parent and civi[c] [sic] groups have all spoken out in favor of school

decentralization. Obviously, in a system as large as ours, many decisions cannot and should not be made at central headquarters. The needs of local communities and of the central system itself are best served when real decision-making power is properly distributed. However, having said this much, many basic questions still remain. How many sub-units should there be? Which powers shall be delegated? How shall educational standards be improved? How can academic freedom and professional integrity be preserved while allowing for increased community participation? (Shanker, 1968i)

These basic questions were the basis for Shanker and the UFT's critique of Bundy.

In so doing, Shanker and the UFT referred to a wide range of educational issues, including teacher licensing, teacher placement, promotion, tenure, collective bargaining, school finance, community responsibility, integration, administrative costs, curriculum and textbooks, and local boards. In particular, the section about curriculum and textbooks gives some insight into Shanker and the UFT executive board's educational perspective. Although Shanker acknowledged that communities had a right to influence school subject matter, he warned that teachers needed to bear responsibility for choosing texts, developing curriculum, and determining instructional methods. Shanker cited this as "the very meaning of professionalism... the professional has the power to make decisions in those fields in which he is an expert" (Shanker, 1968i).

In an interview for Newsmakers on December 3, 1967, Shanker outlined several key aspects of his perspective on the community control conflict and decentralization. He was suspect of the representativeness of the community most actively advocating for control of the schools. Shanker wrote, "I think it's very difficult at this particular period of time to figure out whether any organization or any group of organizations represents any community within the

city of New York.” The Bundy Plan and community control advocates were focused more on the structure of the school system than on the quality education. Furthermore, Shanker continuously declared his support for integration and therefore was “against setting up permanent districts on a permanent racially segregated basis,” regardless of their location. On the other hand, Shanker thought “The overwhelming majority of parents, whether white or black, whether in Harlem or in Forrest Hills.... want something very simple; they want their children to graduate from our schools learning how to read and learning how to write” and being able to get jobs. Consistent with Shanker’s support of administrative progressivism, he stated, “Decisions such as the structure of a large school system of this size are not generally best made by referendum.” More districts and smaller districts require more operating costs and thus are a more inefficient model for a school system.

## **5.6 COMMUNITY [LOST] CONTROL**

By 1968, Shanker claimed that extremists had overrun the community, promoting an agenda that was not supported by most people in the community. In an interview just after the transfer/dismissal of nineteen OHB educators, Shanker stated, “the community has lost control” to a group of outsiders involved in similar protest throughout the city (Shanker, 1968k). He thought that the community was focused on getting its children back in school, while the extremists focused on disruption. Shanker criticized Mayor Lindsey’s handling of the situation, saying that the mayor used/leveraged the extremist protests outside the school to get his decentralization legislation passed.

Shanker cited evidence that the local board and its supporters did not represent all OHB parents. In writing about “working with the community,” Shanker cited an opposition rally of more than a thousand local parents as evidence that support for the local board and its efforts were not universally supported. He thought local parents would ultimately end the community control conflict.

[Parents] want their teachers back, and they have supported our demand for fair trials. They are sick of having their children lose valuable school time because of the failure of the governing board to grant just procedures. In the long run this action by parents will decide whether we have a school system or not. (Shanker, 1968b)

Again, Shanker made the point that many parents were not in support of or engaged in community control activities. He stated that it was largely outsiders coming in and leading the actions. Shanker also cited school attendance rates as evidence; substantial numbers of parents were keeping their kids home. He also cited a rally at one of the district’s schools that had an attendance of seventy-five people. This was a local rally that required little travel for parents and the local community. On the other hand, 75,000 people attended a demonstration at City Hall “to protest against the Mayor’s policies” (Shanker, 1968g, p. 51).

With evidence that many people did not support the community control advocates, or at least the repercussions of their activities, and that outsiders were in control, Shanker reached out directly to parents and community leaders. In a letter written to OHB parents and community leaders, Shanker again acknowledged the failures of ghetto schools and implored parents to come together with teachers to end the conflict and work toward improving the school.

"Terrible harm is being done to children. The teachers have been meeting with and talking to many parents who are angry and upset about what is happening in their schools. Many of them are afraid. Some of them have received threats. The teachers and their union want education to go on. We all want good education, and we are willing to fight for it. Our union has a long history of fighting for better schools and for justice and equality, especially for minority groups. We believe parents must have a voice in school policy. We believe that if parents had a real voice in Ocean Hill they would not want this governing board. They want justice for teachers, as for everyone else. If a teacher isn't doing a good job, charges should be brought and he should have a fair trial. No qualified teacher will come to teach in a place where teachers are just pushed out the way the Ocean Hill governing board is doing it. Nobody will work for schools where they can be fired after 9 or 10 years' of service [sic] without any reason. Such schools will get only the worst teachers in the future -- unless we stop this now. (Shanker, 1968a)

Given the evidence of a rift between parents and community control advocates and the local board, Shanker reached out to parents and community members. He blamed community control advocates for causing the teachers strikes and restricting their students' education. Shanker also used the possibility of educational harm to students and alienation of prospective teachers as reasons to side with teachers and end the conflict.

## 5.7 TEACHER SOLIDARITY

Shanker focused on maintaining teacher solidarity throughout the community control conflict. Earlier in the conflict, Shanker supported and work toward an agreeable transfer process for I.S. 201 teachers who wanted to leave experimental community control districts (Shanker, 1967b). His position changed as the focus of conflict shifted to OHB. In a letter to OHB teaches, Shanker asked them not to transfer out of the district (Shanker, 1968j). Shanker cited that large numbers of transfers would weaken the UFT's leverage to obtain a settlement and leave parents who supported the teachers feeling like they fought for nothing. Furthermore, he warned that newly hired teachers would be ill equipped to carry on the fight against the objectionable community control policies. Shanker's primary point in calling for teacher solidarity was to stop the spread of community control policies, or at least their detrimental impact on teachers.

The meaning is clear. The Superintendent and the Board of Education have failed to uphold the contract and their own by-laws under pressure from the Mayor and the Ford Foundation. Only these teachers stand in the way of a rapid spread of similar vigilante activities throughout the city. We will never be able to repay their heroic self-sacrifice. All of them were offered transfers to "more favored" schools. But they remained to fight because they knew that a victory here by a handful of extremists would merely postpone the battle to another day at another school. Whatever action is required of us, they cannot be made to suffer for their willingness to carry on the fight for all of us. (Shanker, 1968b)

Throughout the conflict, Shanker focused the union on solidarity and strength in numbers. Shanker called on current members to recruit new members into the union. He

acknowledged that union teacher might have to win over new teachers because of the negative press the UFT had received during the community control conflict. Shanker also offered talking points on which to focus: "Tell non-members what it was like before we had strength. Tell them what we face without strength in the future. Tell them what we can gain for ourselves and our children through a united profession." (Shanker, 1968i)

However, teachers also did not have universal solidarity. At least two teacher groups professed a different perspective on community control, the Teachers Action Caucus and Teacher for Community Control, and the African American Teacher Association. Each was a staunch supporter of community control and the experimental districts.

By 1968, with the community control conflict still underway, Shanker and the UFT had another major battle on the horizon, contract negotiations. Shanker focused on three major areas of negotiation: increasing teacher pay, maintaining due process after decentralization of the school system, and improving schools. Shanker argued that inflation negated much of the salary gains that the union had won for teachers and that the gains had come after year of "educational neglect." Also, teachers needed the new contract to uphold due process protection into newly decentralized local districts and protect them from becoming "victims of power struggles" in schools and districts. Shanker's final focus was the familiar call for more funding in order to improve ghetto schools.

We know that whether the schools are under local boards or a central board, unless tremendous sums are made available for improvements in the classroom and on the school level, there will be no breakthrough in the battle against academic retardation. Conflict born of despair and justified discontent will increase. (Shanker, 1968b)

## 5.8 THE STRIKES

Shanker reiterated the point that the UFT was not and would not strike in opposition to a decentralization plan. Strikes were warranted in response to “Extreme provocation in order to protect the integrity of our union and to prevent a serious step backwards in terms of hard-fought benefits and gains we have won for schools and for children, as well as for teachers” (Shanker, 1968c). Shanker repeatedly wrote of how solidarity among teachers took precedence over solidarity with the community seeking control over schools. The union needed to ensure not only the reinstatement of OHB’s transferred/dismissed teachers, who were cleared of all charges and ordered to be returned without sanction, but also certain protections prior to decentralization, including “protection against discrimination, maintenance of our collective bargaining agreement, impartial binding arbitration, and [requiring that] every class must have a licensed teacher” (Shanker, 1968c). Shanker had mentioned these protections in prior critiques of the Bundy report. However, overtime he became particularly concerned with the many “unwritten understandings arrived at during negotiations as well as a whole back ground of established policies and practices which are outlined in circulars, third step and arbitration decisions, the by-laws, etc. and which are grievable” (Shanker, 1968c). Shanker warned that decentralization would be detrimental to contracts and agreements that had been hard-won by the UFT over the years and related to established interactions with the Board of Education. If decentralization meant the need to re-negotiate with local boards, then it was detrimental to teachers and the union.

In his September 8, 1968, Newsmakers interview, Shanker described that the reasons for the strike went beyond re-instatement of the dismissed teachers to “question[s] of the security of

our contract, of the security of the union and of the maintenance of our working conditions... there is no compromise possible on these basic issues." Over time, Shanker presented issues that related to the basic solvency of the union, particularly the legitimacy of contracts and protection of members. While the degree to which these issues were violated was disputed, any violation would have been cause for union action, not just a teachers union but any union.

After arbitration and prior to the final strike of the community control conflict, Shanker wrote similar letters to UFT members, chapter chairmen and delegates, and parents. The arbitration committee ruled in favor of the union and the dismissed/transferred teachers. Soon after, the UFT and Board of Education reached an agreement for teachers to be "returned to their regular teaching assignments in their schools free from harassment, violence, and threats of violence" and "the OHB governing board and administrators were directed to facilitate this return" (Shanker, 1968f). However, conflict between teachers and community control advocates continued after the agreement and official reinstatement. In a December 1, 1968, Newsmakers interview, Shanker described the continuation of problems even after the Board of Education had taken over the local district and a trustee was appointed. Problems finally subsided after the implementation of the full decentralization plan for New York City schools.

## **5.9 CONCLUSION**

As Shanker declared, ghetto schools were in crisis and the reasons were many. The claims and actions of community control advocates and the responses from union teachers were counter-productive to school improvement, at least in the short term. Issues surfaced during the conflict that if addressed could help improve the quality of education. In particular, the conflict illustrated

that it would be very difficult to enact school reform without the support of teachers and parents, and of those reforms required increased funding. Shanker summed this up succinctly.

We want basically the same thing: better education. There is no simple solution for the ills of our school system. Decentralization by itself will not change the schools. No matter what the structure of the local district, it will take a lot of money and a lot of hard work to make the schools better. Teachers want nothing more than to teach children. They stand ready to work with parents and the community. (Shanker, 1968d)

Basically, Shanker and the Union wanted parent and community participation with the system and in support of the status quo, or at least not in outright opposition to either. Community control advocates seemed to want exactly the opposite.

## **6.0 PRESTON WILCOX**

### **6.1 INTRODUCTION**

Preston Wilcox had a number of themes in his works regarding community control. Wilcox's perspectives on the failure of education, integration, professional control of education and social services, the American status quo, participation, and humanism informed his call for a change in the relationship between the community and its school. Wilcox's educational perspective drew both the school into the community and the community into the school. As Wilcox wrote, "The school must become a part of the local community before it can be influenced/shaped/modified. The local community must develop a sense of community before it can influence a school" (Wilcox, 1972c). The goal was to weave the school and community into a fabric that covered broad social issues, including but not limited to education (Wilcox, 1966a).

### **6.2 FAILURE OF GHETTO SCHOOLS**

Preston Wilcox was driven to advocate for community control largely because of the failure of urban schools. "The ghetto school, controlled by the same educational leadership, have failed to transmit to the intergenerationally stable lower class youth of the ghetto the requisite skills to become effective citizens" (Wilcox, 1966b, p. 5). Ghetto schools failed while on the watch of teachers, administrators, and the Boards of Education. Because of this abject failure, Wilcox

began to rethink control of schools and relationships between schools, the communities in which they resided, and the communities to which students belonged. Wilcox thought that ghetto schools should not be compared to non-ghetto schools because of the vastly different contexts of the schools and their students.

Minority group youth and communities must become their own yardsticks. They are usually compared in invidious ways with others without taking into account the limitations placed upon them in terms of access to opportunities and responsibility. If it is true that the public school system can do no more than it is already doing, then the communities of the poor must be prepared to act for themselves. Residents of the ghetto must have a chance to do what all others have effectively failed to do – assume a leadership role in the education of their children. (Wilcox, 1966b, p. 6)

In his effort to remedy the problems in urban schools, Wilcox created an alternative model that combined his educational and social perspectives. His educational perspective focused more on relationships and processes, rather than traditional notions of content and pedagogy. Wilcox viewed the school as embedded in the community and vice versa. His social perspective was in line with his experience in social work and community organizing. Wilcox promoted participation and opposed the status quo.

Wilcox identified “resistive forces” that inhibited improvement in urban schools. These forces were generally most people directly involved with ghetto schools, except students. Wilcox’s critique was that people involved with schools were largely sheepish and selfish. Wilcox espoused that education and educators’ focus needed to be on students, participation, and citizenship instead of paperwork and administrative accountability. The schools primary

accountability was to students, parents, and the community and not bureaucratic requirements of the school system (Wilcox, 1968a).

*Brown v. Board* (1954) and the Civil Rights Act (1964) made strides to eliminate de jure segregation. However, prospects for integration in schooling and society were dim, particularly in the large urban centers. By the mid-1960s, some people called integration a fallacy. As Wilcox wrote,

The 'integration-segregation' issue has turned out to be a series of 'games white people play' to keep Black people in their place.... There are two ways to mute this growing power [gained from concentration of Blacks in the inner city]: to scatter Black people geographically and to metropolitanize the urban complexes so that the suburban and urban white coalitions can be gerry-mandered into a partisan (anti-Black) political force. The current white integrationist movement, then, is a move to retain white control over Black education. It is not a move to educate Blacks, effectively. (Wilcox, 1970a, p.3)

Wilcox wrote that the failure of ghetto schools and integration required changing not only who controlled schools, but also “changes in philosophy, attitudes, behavior and perspective,” regarding education and society (Wilcox, 1970a, p.4). Wilcox determined that the school system, like most systems of bureaucratic capitalism, was oppressive to Blacks and the Poor; working within them was counterproductive to improving their plight. Thus, Wilcox called for disengagement from integrated racism and creation of community controlled institutions.

For Wilcox, part of the problem was that urban schools were largely charged to educate poor minorities students, a group whose social context was long steeped in oppression. Thus, the education for poor minorities needed to consider the setting and social context of the school and

its students. According to Wilcox “The nature of that education must be defined by” the oppressed people (Wilcox, 1970b). Conversely, education generally reflected the dominant population. The dominant population historically set the policy for the common, public school system, which did not adequately take into account the context, history, or needs of the minority poor. In Wilcox’s more forceful terms, traditional schooling was schooling for “white nationalism.” Oppressed people educated within that system often became advocates of the status quo and the system that oppressed them in the first place (Wilcox, undated).

Thus, Wilcox spent much of his career promoting and working for alternatives to an oppressive urban school system. Wilcox’s educational alternatives were a combination of community controlled and managed schools, and limitation, if not elimination of centralized school systems. He also situated schools within the broader social context of the ghetto and called for social reforms that would help students more fully attend to their education.

As long as compulsory education laws exist, it should be compulsory that all school children be guaranteed the economic, health, social and physical resources to make school attendance a viable reality. Community health, mental health, housing should be controlled by the host communities. Collective uses of medicare and medicaid [sic] are suggested along with a guaranteed opportunity income. (Wilcox, 1970b)

Wilcox acknowledged that a switch from a traditional school model to a community school model would “be wrought with controversy and conflict” (Wilcox, 1966a, p. 5). Within the school system, conflict came as the community took control from or exerted control over educators. From broader society, conflict stemmed from the educational and structural changes

promoted by community control. Wilcox's community control was a drastic change from the norm of public schools.

### 6.3 INTEGRATION

Wilcox was critical of integration efforts. If integration was an ideal supported by the masses, then it should not have required such high degrees of political and legislative enforcement. Often, Whites supported integration as long as Blacks supported the status quo. As Wilcox wrote,

It is ironic that our democracy... should, on the one hand, require special legislation... in order to admit blacks to a presumed 'inclusive' society, and on the other hand, lose its composure when these same blacks readily accredit the existence of creative differences in experiences and competitive advantages stemming from reactions to the color of their skin. (Wilcox, 1966c, p. 3)

Wilcox accused the UFT and the Council of Supervisory Associations (CSA) of being "engaged in a political coalition that made school integration and effective achievement by the large majority of black and Puerto Rican children a planned impossibility" (Wilcox, 1969a, p. 18). In fact, Wilcox viewed the integration movement in education as a way for Whites to keep control over Black schools (Wilcox, 1970a). Thus, Wilcox did not view integration as a necessary or even desired reform model in ghetto schools. Instead, he argued that Blacks in the ghettos needed to control their own local schools.

Wilcox also viewed integration, as attempted and practiced, to be process of assimilating Blacks into an educational and social status quo dominated by middle-class perspectives.

Integration as attempted and practiced led some Blacks to assimilate into the status quo. Wilcox used the term “Black Bourgeoisie” for those who “chose social integration and entrepreneurship, with a small ‘e,’ as a price for social integration,” comparing them to “Authentic Black people” who chose “to control, define and manage their own socio-economic development” (Wilcox, 1969b, p. 13-14). Similarly, Wilcox viewed “Authentic Black students” those who “accept themselves; view their skin colors as being permanent conditions linked to a rich cultural heritage, and perceive white defined integration as” assimilation (Wilcox, 1969b, p. 14). Thus, students in failing urban schools, schools of the status quo, were miss-educated or victims of educational genocide, a term used by more militant community control advocates.

Historically, Wilcox viewed integration as changing, not solving the plight of Blacks. In “Is Integration Relevant,” Wilcox (1966) offered a number of before and after examples of the failure of integration.

From the underground railroad to the “A” train to Harlem; from sharecropping to absentee landlords; from southern intimidation to northern slum attrition; from southern non-education to northern min-education; from the legitimization of police brutality against blacks in order to assure white supremacy to the legitimization of police brutality against ghetto residents in order to protect outsiders; from political disenfranchisement to political manipulations; from physical integration and economic decapitation in the South to physical separation and economic dependence in the South to physical separation and economic dependence in the North.

Wilcox viewed the newer plight of Blacks as “integrated racism” where society continued to be organized for the protection of White interests. Instead, Wilcox called for Blacks to demand and

utilize their constitutional rights, which were endowed regardless of social status. Thus, groups that increasingly advocated Black separatism, such as the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), had “come to recognize that the interests of blacks in this democracy are not always consistent with those of whites” (Wilcox, 1966c, p. 4). Thus, advocates of Afrocentrism or in a broader sense ethnocentrism acted in the best interest of their groups. Blacks in the ghetto were at least partially led to Afrocentrism by the failure of integration or at the least the realization of its limitations as a solution to social problems.

Wilcox’s critique of integration did not mean he opposed people coming together within society. Instead of integration as assimilation, Wilcox offered “authentic integration” as an alternative means of coming together in a society. Wilcox described authentic integration in the context of schools:

The sharing of mutually self-reaffirming education experiences by students from a variety of ethnic, religious, social and economic backgrounds. It embodies curriculum modifications, changes in school organization, a redistribution of decision making roles and a confrontation of the track system. Designed to enable students to learn to establish co-equal relationships and to understand the true nature of the society, it focuses its attention on helping students to acquire the skills, insights and knowledge to participate in solving their own problems and those of the society of which they are a part. (Wilcox, 1972a)

In essence, Wilcox viewed multi-cultural schools as the culmination of the ideal authentically integrated school. He argued that support for authentic integration would lead people to understand the necessity of community control of urban schools by the Black majority. Since

that was unfeasible in most urban environments, Wilcox thought supporters of multi-cultural control would transfer that support to community control.

#### **6.4 CRITIQUE OF PROFESSIONAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS**

Wilcox was a critic of professional control of schools, education, and public services. Wilcox cited Christopher Jencks, who concurred of the need for “off-setting the power of the professions” and argued that the only way to do so was to “establish a freer market and thus give more direct power to parents and students” (Jencks 1966 as cited in Wilcox, 1966b). Wilcox wrote that professional control inhibited ghetto citizens from learning the requisite skills to adequately engage the system on their own behalf. Professionals became barriers between residents and public services, stunting development of individual agency.

The professional caste system in the ghettos has so effectively intervened that the key decisions are often made by professional rather than the families they come to serve. The art of decision-making cannot be learned if the opportunity to learn how to do so is not afforded. (Wilcox, 1967, p. 139)

Wilcox’s critique of teachers primarily centered on their involvement in failing ghetto schools. Traditionally, teachers educated into the status quo. Wilcox’s vision for a new structure and purpose for a school was education for the development of community. Wilcox not only opposed professional control of schools, but also the professionalization of teaching. Credentials were a significant aspect of the educational status quo. He thought that credentials were not a requirement for being a good teacher (Wilcox, 1969b).

Wilcox also saw a tendency for “unsuccessful do-gooders” to become ghetto fascists. I.S. 201’s prison look and feel was a particular example of unexpected receptions for seemingly good ideas. Although architecturally Mayor Lindsey and urbanists heralded I.S. 201 as a jewel of urban design (Roberts, 2010), ghetto residents found it to greatly resemble a prison. By 1972 after four strikes, the prison became Wilcox’s metaphor for New York City’s ghetto schools and warden Shanker an “unsuccessful do-gooder” playing out his “Hitlerian inner tendencies” (Wilcox, 1972b). In preparation for a strike that year, the UFT passed a resolution that “‘Non-Teaching’ teachers would be free not to teach but to ‘maintain surveillance over the students’ (note the Attica language) if the ‘intruders’ (the parents) refuse to leave” (Wilcox, 1972b). In response, Wilcox pointed out that almost all teachers were white, nearly none lived in the local communities of the schools, and few if any were parents of students at the school. Teachers were much more like intruders into the community.

Teachers are ultimately accountable to the parents of the children they teach.

Parents as the cultural transmitters [sic] and propagators of the breed, have a non-negotiable, natural right to be involved in shaping the destinies of their children – and all children. This right precedes ‘legal/legislative’ rights. Imagine me as a Black parent sitting back and deliberately permitting a teacher who is afraid of my community and my child to have unlimited rights to miseducate my child.

Unthinkable! (Wilcox, 1972b)

Wilcox viewed parents and communities as having a much more direct responsibility and commitment to their students than did teachers.

Wilcox described the “professional backlash” of administrators and teachers in I.S. 201 as evidence that “professionals are people too – with selfish and personal interests” (Wilcox,

1966b). Personal interests led many teachers to strike out of fear minority teachers would do a better job of educating ghetto students. More broadly, Wilcox argued that this selfish motivation transferred to unions in general, citing that members primarily looked out for themselves, their families, and the union.

[Unions] have in fact become the bastions of white racism. Actually, these unions don't mind minority youth being educated – so long as they don't acquire saleable skills. The discriminatory practices of white-controlled unions are designed to ensure that positions will be passed on to the children of union members. (Wilcox, 1969a, p. 18)

Wilcox also thought that many teachers came from families that were connected to organized labor and for them the strike was largely blind obedience. To counteract professional control and union obedience, Wilcox supported the creation of alternative organizations for public service. For example,

One local organization in the I.S. 201 Complex is currently constructing a membership corporation that will, when operative, produce jobs, training, union-type services and shared profits for all its members, all of them local residents. It is a creative attempt to view money and employment in the context of collective human needs and not as mere individual entrepreneurial profits. (Wilcox, 1969a, p. 21)

Instead of union or non-union and professional or para-professional distinctions, Wilcox envisioned a more collective focus for schools, society, and the economy. His suggested reforms were radical deviations from the existing system and the status quo.

## 6.5 CHALLENGING THE STATUS QUO

Wilcox critiqued the competitive and individualistic basis of capitalism as detrimental to and inconsistent with Black communities. Wilcox called for Black communities to move away from capitalist “socio-economic relationships,” and educate its youth for “cooperative economic shared-decision-making” (Wilcox, 1969b, p. 13). For example, people in the community should pool savings in credit unions to collectively solve daily problems. Otherwise, ghetto residents’ adherence to the dominant liberal capitalist perspective steered them into a restrictive welfare system, “Was established to contain the have-nots who subscribe to and are the victims of capitalism” (Wilcox, 1969b, p. 14).

Wilcox critiqued aspects of government bureaucracy that were inconsistent with civil rights related legislation. Wilcox focused particular attention on the Economic Opportunity Act’s (EOA) (1964) providing the poor with access to the bureaucratic capitalist system and the possible impact this could have on the system and the status quo. In particular, Wilcox was a critic of EOA’s maximum feasible participation requirement. He thought that participation within the status quo would not reap benefits for those not served by the status quo. Thus, the need for community control arose. EOA required “maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served” (Wilcox, 1966d, pp. 1-2). Wilcox wrote that in actuality the participation was peripheral and did not amount to real participation in the development of anti-poverty program’s process and structure. For example, although their communities elected minority poor representatives to the citywide boards, in most cities Mayoral appointments filled the remaining board positions. The mandate amounted to the poor having

minority representation on boards, with actual authority and control remaining in the previous bureaucratic and social structure controlled by the majority.

Wilcox also thought EOA helped to expand a cottage industry for white and black ghetto assistants within and outside bureaucracy. As explained by Wilcox:

One sees in this white-do-gooder behavior a linking of capitalism and racism. Far too many whites – and Black-skinned people – are ‘doing well, doing good:’ exploiting by getting paid to keep Blacks in their places. Those with Black skins who start a ‘movement’ or a militant action in order to get a job are in the same bag. (Wilcox, 1969b, p. 9)

People who made money off of the poor living in the ghetto had a vested interest in maintaining the ghetto. Thus local EOA programs worked much like welfare, promoting a cycle of poverty.

The combination of white racism and bureaucratic capitalism in this country had conditioned a small number of people – in this case, members of the labor and education and business establishments – to want to make decisions about the lives of large numbers of people, whether or not their decisions corresponded to the needs and desires of the people for whom the decisions were being made.

(Wilcox, 1969a, p. 19)

Thus, education fell into this category and was an agent of “white racism and bureaucratic capitalism.” Educators act “So as not to disturb the way things are, they behave toward minority youth as though they were not human or educable or employable. Then they offer token opportunities that will not upset the status quo” (Wilcox, 1969a, p. 18). Thus, minority students continued to be directed away from college-preparatory programs and into vocational training.

Wilcox regularly called for changes to the system, the status quo, on behalf of non-Blacks as well. His call was primarily for Blacks and included non-Blacks who were not victors in the competitive status quo. The group that the system failed needed to take more control of the system, particular if those working within the system can do no more to improve the situation.

## **6.6 PARTICIPATION**

Ghetto residents needed to participate in their communities to fix failing schools, limit professional control schools and social services, and challenge the status quo. Wilcox had worked with the urban poor in community programs for years, and continued focus on increasing community participation and impact in EOA poverty programs. Wilcox viewed engagement with community programs and community life as an aspect of citizenship, which was crucial to improving the plight of Blacks in the ghetto. The ghetto school system run by middle-class professionals failed; therefore, a solution or at least a step in the right direction was community control efforts “to push democracy to its outer limits by including the lower class minority student and his parents” (Wilcox, p. 1966b, p. 6). Wilcox envisioned community control promoting and providing opportunities for civic participation, which was necessary for Blacks and the poor to change their plight. As Wilcox wrote, “The real power rests with the informed public; the public which thinks for itself, guards the right of others to do so, and acquires the skills... to hold those who govern accountable to the governed” (Wilcox, 1968b, p.2).

While director of AFRAM Associates, Inc., Wilcox initiated a program designed to increase parental participation in schools. AFRAM provided technical assistance to nine Parent Implementation Follow Through Programs around the country. These programs were funded

through the federal Follow Through program, designed as a continuation of the Head Start program into elementary and secondary schools. Wilcox stressed the program's use of "parents as paid staff, as agents of the parents" versus "traditional Parent Workers" (Wilcox, 1972c, p.4), as a means of providing both civic participation and economic assistance. Similar to the parental engagement in the Parent Implementation Follow Through Program, Wilcox envisioned the level and degree of participation by ghetto residents to transfer to other areas of social services. Wilcox called for re-structuring of the relationship between Blacks and the system, particularly through the possibilities available through EOA.

The EOA provided the poor with access to the bureaucratic capitalist system and the possibility of impacting the system and the status quo. Wilcox then laid out a vision of effective and appropriate roles for the poor within the opportunities in EOA. Wilcox thought that representation of the poor in poverty programs was of major importance. This paralleled the importance of community and parent participation in the schools of their children. Wilcox describes his work with the urban poor and the increase in participation and impact in poverty programs' structure and practices; however, the impact was cited as probable and more indirect than participation, which was more easily tracked.

Wilcox discussed the poor as an interest group operating within the structure of government and society. Wilcox's reading of the EOA found it gave the poor, really the interest group "the poor" that included the poor and their legitimate advocates, access into the system. Their position within the system was very different than their historic position as clients of the system.

The poor could become involved in program implementation. They will be on the scene to observe the behavior of the professional, to hear him talk with those in

the 'other world', [sic] to determine if his presentation is a façade or whether it is for real. As important is the contribution the poor can make in humanizing the service and 'educating' the professionals as to how to best use themselves and to further clarify and specify their separate and discrete roles. There is a danger that these will just become jobs for the poor: jobs which aid the individual in his own economic and social matriculation but do not serve to modify the stance of such agencies toward the poor. (Wilcox, 1966d, p. 5)

Since the poor have not been served or done well within the socio-economic status quo, it is understandable that as a group they might not be sheep of the status quo. This presents a huge problem for people and groups embedded in the bureaucratic systems; real participation by the poor poses a threat to the status quo and to their groups' position within it. Legislation often mandates participation without prescribing specific processes for doing so and perhaps even more importantly, without naming someone or some group as the responsible party that works toward implementing the mandate. Thus, bureaucratic systems tend to have ways around difficult choices and actions. Wilcox viewed EOA as creating public service systems aimed at improving the plight of the poor. Participation by the poor could be "a means to develop [their] social competence, social responsibility, social opportunity, and social power;" therefore, legitimate advocates support the poor's right to self-determination and tie their professional success "to the efforts to help the poor to gain greater control over their lives" (Wilcox, 1966d, p. 5).

Wilcox's social perspective was steeped in grass roots participation and development. He was not interested in helping Blacks and the poor attain low-level positions within schools (i.e., teacher assistants) or filling minority positions on governing boards. Neither gave the poor much

chance to create opportunities for themselves. They were minimum representation within the system, within the status quo.

The poor should be helped to deploy themselves in such ways as to be able to pursue their own interests and to draw upon the resources and skills of others for these same purposes. This does not mean that the location of the poor on policy-making bodies is sufficient. The poor cannot alter their plights without the aid of others. The poor must not only be involved in the selection of peers to serve on such bodies but in the selection of their own advocates: the non-poor. (Wilcox, 1966d, p. 7)

Black and poor people's mere presence in the system, a system that supports a status quo and that has not been beneficial to or constructed in their best interest, is insufficient to promote their plight. Wilcox suggested flipping of the social service system's structure, at least in relation to public services and programs of which Blacks and the poor were primary target. Having the poor take majority positions in control of programs and selecting their own non-poor advocates was a necessary step. Wilcox thought that only non-poor advocates selected by the poor were legitimate advocates of the poor. Thus, the poor should determine who spoke on their behalf.

## **6.7 EDUCATION AND HUMANISM**

Wilcox discussed that one of the great failures of American education was a lack of focus on "educat[ing] people to become Human Beings" (Wilcox, 1971, p. 2). Wilcox critiqued the education system as based on "A certain kind of competition that's vested in the failure of someone else" and filled with people who never examined if they were "capable of perceiving

kids as being people” (Wilcox, 1971, p. 3-4). Educators too often viewed students as vacuous vessels for educational experts (Freire, 2001; Sfard, 1998). Wilcox viewed humanism as an important yet devalued and often absent purpose of education, a purpose in stark contrast to the education status quo.

Wilcox suggested humanism, with significant connections to ethnicity, as an alternative to the failed American melting pot. White Anglo-Saxon protestant characteristics saturated the mix, mostly assimilating other cultural and ethnic ingredients. Thus, the melting pot didn’t work in American society (Moynihan and Glazer, 1963). Wilcox found the metaphor largely obsolete and was committed to a multicultural approach.

This observer brought several non-negotiable views with him. He calls it his baggage. The local community has a right which does not require approval outside of itself to assert its own right to reaffirm its own cultural heritage. Local residents have a right to Black, Puerto Rican and/or white. They can-not be either effectively unless their essential ethnic references and their right to be human are deeply intertwined. No one can assert his humanity as he denies his ethnic uniqueness. (Wilcox, undated)

Wilcox used the term white racist in reference to people, regardless of race/ethnicity, who did not respect ethnic and cultural differences and its effect on social organization. He held that American education focused on compulsory assimilation instead of humanist cultural pluralism.

In community control, Wilcox saw an opportunity to fulfill his vision for humanist education. Poor Blacks would be able to instill their culture and values into their children’s school. The school would not be viewed as “a potential white school... a white-controlled school coated within a community in which Blacks/Puerto

Ricans/Chicanos and other Spanish-speaking groups/Indians/Oriental are the *majority* and which values compulsory assimilation above cultural pluralism" (Wilcox, 1972c).

Wilcox was adamant that students could be black and successful; could live in the ghetto and be successful. Basically, no characteristic should restrict a person from being successful.

If one believes that a segregated white school can be a 'good' school, then one must believe that a segregated Negro and Puerto Rican school, like I.S. 201, can be a 'good' school also. We must be concerned with those who are left behind and who will be left behind even if the best conceivable school desegregation program should be implemented. And behind my concern lies the conviction that one can be black (or white or Puerto Rican), reside and attend school in an enforced ghetto, and still be successfully educated to the limits of his potentialities.

(Wilcox, 1966a, p. 1)

Many people lived in a ghetto at some point in their life. It was unfeasible to transport all children out of ghettos for the purpose of education. Therefore, ghetto schools were nearly inevitable. Educating ghetto students was a critical aspect of school systems, particularly in large cities.

## **6.8 COMMUNITY CONTROL: THEORY AND PERSPECTIVE**

Wilcox acknowledged that school systems were not entirely responsible for the failure of ghetto schools. Yet, from the perspective of ghetto "the problem is stated in terms of a fact: the present system has failed, and is failing, in its task of enabling minority group youth to seize the

opportunities America holds out for its other citizens” (Wilcox, 1966a, p. 5). Minority youth in the ghetto did not experience the same opportunities as White youth not from the ghetto. Experimental programs in community control offered an opportunity to increase the connection and responsibility between the community and educators regarding the education of ghetto youth. Wilcox explained his reasons for working within the public school system, citing: “If [the school system] belongs to the public, there should be no necessity for communities to set up parallel systems” (Wilcox, 1966a, p. 4). In calling for community control of schools, Wilcox called for two major reforms, to increase connections between communities and schools and to alter urban schools’ aversion of urban black communities.

Wilcox’s solution was to increase the connections and responsibility between the community and the school. In the experimental community control program at I.S. 201, Wilcox found an opportunity: “in at least one school in one community, the school administrators and teachers will be made accountable to the community, and the community made obligated to them, in such a way that responsibility for successes and failures is shared” (Wilcox, 1966, p. 5). For Wilcox, the need was to “alter the relationship between the administrators of the existing system and the people in such a way as to bring the services offered more clearly into line with what is desired by the clientele” (Wilcox, 1966a, p. 4). Schools should not simply be duplications of some dominant ideal. Wilcox argued for increased ownership of ghetto schools by ghetto communities and parents. Educators and politicians needed to spend less time and resources applying the dominant model of schools to communities: a model that has failed in ghetto schools. Instead, communities needed to develop schools that reflect their own contexts.

Wilcox’s second point was that ghetto schools historically have been an insidious reproach of their local communities, while schools in communities of higher socio-economic

status have unequivocally endorsed their communities. Wilcox thought that it was difficult for students to be educated in a school that belittled their communities' culture and social structure. He argued that people in the ghetto had a sense of duty to one another and their community, an underutilized and devalued ideal in ghetto schools. Thus, Wilcox's community control plan was based on an idea "that a community can organize effectively around the process of educating its children and that it has the capacity to intervene directly in that process" (Wilcox, 1966a, p. 5). He also acknowledged the possible precedent that the realization of his plan would create; not only Blacks and the Poor, but any community has the right and responsibility to guide the education of its children and youth. Ultimately, the concepts of community control were already realized in middle-class, majority schools. Schools with large marginalized populations stood to benefit most from aspect of community control.

## **6.9 COMMUNITY CONTROL: RESTRUCTURING THE COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP**

Wilcox's idea for community control of ghetto schools was a new model for community and school connections. Early on in the I.S. 201 community control experiment, before it became a conflict, Wilcox focused largely on representation and engagement of the school's parents. In his initial plan, parents were charged with serving on and selecting members of the school-community committee. The idea was to draw from within the community first and then from outside the community if necessary. The key characteristics of committee members were understanding of and connection to the community. The school-community committee would have substantial powers, including

“Responsibility for providing a continuous review of the curriculum to ensure that it remains relevant to the needs and experience of the students and that it be sufficiently demanding to bring out their best possible performance” (Wilcox, 1966a, p. 2). As the community attempted to increase its power over aspects of schools that were previously professionally controlled, educator support began to unravel.

Wilcox also viewed the school as an anchor of the community and an active space for community engagement. The school-community committee would run after-school and weekend programming for students. Student programs within school would focus on remediation and enrichment. Student programs outside of school had a much broader focus: “Systematic responsibility for engaging the children in meaningful and effective community projects such as housing surveys, block cleanups, tutorial [sic] programs for younger children, publication of block newsletters, etc.” (Wilcox, 1966, p. 3). Wilcox thought that extra-curricular programs aimed at engaging knowledge and learning outside the classroom and instilling positive perspectives of and experiences with the community were also vital to schools.

The school also served as an anchor for adult community engagement. The school-community committee should promote the use of the school as a center for programs and events. The committee also served as a place where people could engage in addressing broader social issues that impact the community. “The committee should also concern itself with those larger issues such as police brutality and public safety, and the operations of the Welfare system, which impinge so critically on the lives of school children in the ghetto” (Wilcox, 1966, p. 3).

Wilcox’s community control plan also enlisted parents and the community to participate in the evaluation of the school. Therefore, the committee also disseminated information to the community so that it could better evaluate the school’s effectiveness. This was to ensure that “the

school is an instrument of the community and not of the district school board or system" (Wilcox, 1972c). Many of these external programs were aimed at getting people involved in the civic sphere and closely resembled community development programs with which Wilcox had worked for many years.

A major point of contention in the community control conflict was the selection of school principals. From the beginning, Wilcox thought that the community needed to have control over the selection of principals to ensure a principal's first responsibility was to the parents and community of the students of the school. However, he did not demand a Black principal. He believed it was the committee's decision.

"The first task of the School-Community Committee would be to screen and interview candidates for the position of principle [sic]. This may seem an extreme proposal, but it is essential if there is to be any cooperation between the school and the community. Moreover it is based on the fact that principals in the New York public school system have far more power and independence vis-à-vis the Board than is generally realized, or than they generally take advantage of.... A principal prepared to exploit his position for the benefit of his students is an inestimable asset to the community; such a man is the sine qua non of this experimental program.... But the man best suited for the role proposed here would be one whose devotion to education did not depend on his isolation from the community.... This principal would be committed to utilizing these values as a resource for education. (Wilcox, 1966a, p. 2)

Wilcox considered the demand the justified prerogative of the community. The communities of Harlem 201 and Ocean Hill-Brownsville chose to demand a black principal and Wilcox

supported and defended that choice. However, that choice was the root of professional backlash from the UFT and the CSA. Soon after, the educator organizations withdrew their support of the community control experiment and opposition ensued.

Wilcox supported a notion that choosing school leaders should be the responsibility of the community of the school. More broadly communities have a “right to pursue [their] own interests” in doing so (Wilcox, 1966b, p. 5). It was not an exclusive prerogative of the Harlem, OHB, or ghetto communities. As Wilcox wrote, “A Lithuanian community has a right to ask for a black principal; an Irish community has a right to demand a Jewish principal, just as even the KKK has certain rights in a democracy” (Wilcox, 1966b, p. 5). Wilcox seemed comfortable with setting a precedent for a community choosing its school’s principal based on ethnic characteristics or characteristics of the community’s choosing.

## **6.10 RELATIONSHIPS, PRACTICES, AND STRUCTURES OF COMMUNITY CONTROLLED SCHOOLS**

Wilcox developed a detailed community controlled, community-school model for education. Community schools differed quite a bit from traditional schools in the areas of relationships, instructional practices, and structures. The relationships between students, parents, educators, and the community would become more equal. A community-school was “an extension of the home and community and not a substitute for it.... Parents visit the school to engage in problem solving and not just to have problems solved. They begin to behave/feel/think as though the school belongs to them” (Wilcox, 1972c, p. 4). Also, the relationship of students to the school would change. Instead of the standard individually listed student rosters, community-schools

would list students by extended families, to accentuate their membership in families and communities.

Community-Schools would also establish relationships with parents by providing education and training opportunities to them. For example, “Parents Clubs based on a grade level.... Approach the parents as adults in their own right and to afford them the opportunity to acquire the skills with which one enhances the learning and motivation of his own children” (Wilcox, 1967a, p. 139). The clubs would focus on personal, social, and recreational needs and the training would be on skill development and parenting,

A rather unique aspect of Wilcox’s community control plan was the role of foster teachers. Foster teachers would serve as “teachers outside the school, foster parents within the school.... to help individual students in their efforts to bridge the gap between school and home” (Wilcox, 1967a, p. 138). Their major focus would be on students without active, involved parents or an established teacher relationship. The goal of community-schools’ relational changes was to better connect students, families, schools and the broader community.

Community-Schools instructional practices and structures of schools were designed to increase connections between students, parents, educators, and the community. In a community-school, the school was accountable to the community and the community obligated to the school; thus, there was shared responsibility. This new structure was based on shared power.

The community-centered school differs from the traditional public school in that it deliberately shares power with the community it serves. It attempts to define and identify those powers which belong exclusively to the local community, those which belong exclusively to the professionals, and those which should be shared. (Wilcox, 1967a, p. 137)

Wilcox provided some examples: the community was in charge of hiring the principal, educators were responsible for teaching and learning, and they worked together on evaluation.

Wilcox also explained the different educational perspectives behind community-schools and traditional schools. For Wilcox, traditional schools often used more didactic methods; “require[ing] students to memorize what the teacher offers and to regurgitate it on command. The student becomes the depository for the teacher’s knowledge, not the enactor, evaluator, and thinker he desires to become” (Wilcox, 1967, p. 133). On the other hand, Wilcox envisioned community-schools “help[ed] youngsters become addicted to the ideas a) of learning for use; b) of developing a sense of functional curiosity; and c) of assuming a large part of the responsibility for developing their own intellectual resources” (Wilcox, 1967a, p.133). Wilcox focused his differentiation traditional and community schools on issues of learning, pedagogy, and educational philosophy and the structure of the school system. In many ways, the conflict related to the traditional versus holistic education debate of the same time period (Berube, 1994).

Wilcox likened community-schools to freedom schools. Wilcox viewed the school as a community center where people came together for fun and relaxation, to enjoy and engage in the arts, to develop social policies and “mutual aid programs designed to aid the less fortunate in dealing with their problems” (Wilcox, 1967a, p. 134). Community-Schools promoted and provided space for lifelong learning, formal and informal, inside and outside of formal schooling.

## 6.11 CONCLUSION

Wilcox explained the substantial difference between decentralization and community control. He viewed decentralization as the creation of “subsystems” that functioned similarly to the Board of Education. It was the process of decentralizing the school system that held promise for engaging the public, included ghetto residents in decision-making processes. As Wilcox cited, “Struggle should be built into the process to stimulate crisis learning and escalation and expansion of a sense of civic right and obligation” (Wilcox, 1968a, p.1). Thus, the process of decentralization could impact people’s perspectives in relation to other groups and to create a collaborative decision-making process to determine the structure of a decentralized school system.

Community control was a substantial change in the structures, relationships, and purpose of schools that may or may not be implemented in a decentralized system. A community-school’s most notable aspect was its “redistribution of power with a set of exclusive powers being assigned to the local community boards” (Wilcox, 1968a, p.1). A goal of community control was to reduce professional control of schools, for the failure of ghetto schools occurred on their watch. At the same, Wilcox acknowledged that teacher were crucial to schools. However, their influence could be both positive and negative, depending on teachers understanding and engagement of the students’ parents and community. Ultimately, a community-school “Function[ed] as an acculturation tool, an educational instrument, and a community center” (Wilcox, 1967a, p. 133); each looked very different when compared to the equivalent functions in a traditional school and each was designed to better serve ghetto students and their community.

## **7.0 SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE AND COMMUNITY CONTROL**

### **7.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this study, I sought insight into the social perspectives of three key figures in the community control conflict. Through my research, I found that Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox each expressed commitment to public service and improving New York City schools, particularly those in the ghetto. They differed, however, in their perspectives on the effective means of improving schools and the types of improvement that best met the needs of the students, schools, and communities. I found their commitment to be common, but the devil was in the details.

Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox wrote about many ideas – well, Lindsey and Wilcox did at least – and inter-connected issues that fed into the community control conflict and social problems more broadly. They spent much of their careers working on solutions to solve the problem of failing ghetto schools. Lindsey and Wilcox, in particular, spent even more of their careers working on the plight of Blacks and the Poor in urban ghettos. Each individual's had an array of ideas about the causes and solutions to the problems; too often these ideas and solutions were inconsistent or in opposition to one another.

## **7.2 DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES THAT FORMED A FOUNDATION FOR THE COMMUNITY CONTROL CONFLICT**

Lindsey fought for the urban poor who had not been served well by ghetto schools. The poor needed either assistance in or change to the system. Lindsey attempted both with public assistance and education reform aimed at improving outcomes for the poor and increasing their participation in the process. He pushed for reform of the status quo mainly through increased participation and access to the system, not opposition to the system. Lindsey was a critic of the bureaucratic and political status quo, issues such as patronage, entrenched professional and bureaucratic control, and unresponsiveness to the public. He proposed opening up the system to an infusion of new blood and participation (Roberts, 2010); participation generally, and definitely people from local communities. Lindsey pursued collaboration but was stymied by bureaucratic inertia.

Lindsey's educational perspective supported the status quo and its functionalist and human capital purpose for education. He was a supporter of education for functionalism and human capital, particularly in high school. He promoted an idea of citywide responsibility for schools, which counteracted the conflicting groups, teachers and the communities, that were battling for control. So, he was a critic of certain parts of the status quo and not others. So, he was a reformer to a greater degree than Shanker but not to the degree of Wilcox. Lindsey supported community control within a government structure.

Shanker, first and foremost, was a proponent of professional control of education. Shanker was committed to professional control of education. After all, the teachers' union had worked long and hard to promote teaching as a profession and their status within the education

system. The strikes were about school systems maintaining professional control, due process, and rule of law, fearing that a strong community control precedent could lead to the dismissal of each.

Shanker also promoted traditional education and schools. Thus, reforms should focus on teachers and classrooms, instruction and learning, and removing disruptive students. Like Lindsey, Shanker supported a functionalist and human capital purpose for education. He was also a proponent of the selection and certification system, supporting strict differentiation between teachers as professionals and assistants as sub-professionals.

Wilcox was a critic of the status quo and professional control of schools. His reforms opposed bureaucratic capitalism and integrated racism. Wilcox called for change in the purpose of schools, to focus on humanism, liberation, and community development. His perspective was the type of marginalized ideology that challenges the dominant functionalist, human capital purpose of education (Hawkins, 2007). Wilcox made a point to pursue reforms based on his educational perspective within the public school system. His social perspective didn't necessarily require formal schools as a conduit. Wilcox's reforms were just as much community development as they were education. Much of Wilcox's community control theory was designed to use education to promote a broader social perspective, encompassing aspects of humanism, ethnocentrism, and communitarianism. Wilcox supported a philosophy and purpose of education very different than traditional schools. He was a social critic who developed a model for education and schools, a model in stark contrast to traditional schools.

### **7.3 LINDSEY, SHANKER, AND WILCOX'S PERSPECTIVES ON SOCIAL, CIVIC, AND EDUCATION ORGANIZATION**

For Shanker, teacher solidarity and the failure of ghetto schools were key. Both were major themes in Shanker's writing and both related to issues of social, civic, and education organization. At first glance, these two themes seem to be contradictory. It was if Shanker was saying he was totally against ghetto school failure and would do whatever it took to solve the problem except if it negatively impacted teachers' collective status and position within the system. However, the possible contradiction might have been a matter of perspective. Shanker viewed most of the reasons for ghetto school failure as external (See table in appendix). Teacher solidarity was internal. If you subscribe to administrative progressivism, you believe that professional control is in the best interest of the system and the individuals served by the system. Community control was an attack on the system and professional control. Therefore community control was not in the best interest of the students. This logic reflects Shanker's perspective, which was steeped in procedural liberalism, administrative progressivism, and social and economic functionalism; attacks on any of these, and community control advocates were attacking each, were not in the best interest of students or society and therefore should be fought against.

Lindsey was focused on the social and civic organization. In a way he tried to apply his focus in those areas into the dominant system of education. He didn't really seem to want or try to change the system of education, just the interactions and relationships within that system. It seemed very much a pluralist stance, which went well with his "come together" focus for the City. Ever the idealist, Lindsey focused on positives of diversity and not competition between

groups. He sought the middle ground, even though he had seen it fail in Congress with provincial voting patterns and the New Right. Yet, he was still committed. It seemed such a simple notion, bringing people together, particularly in the context of schools. The theoretical framework discussed above illustrates that issues of education and schools are complex because they travel through and are steeped in the conflicts and contestation of social and civic organization. Then, these dynamics of social and civic organization formed a foundation for a Dominant Education Paradigm of functionalist competition (Hawkins, 2007). The dominant purpose of school is to foster competitive, procedural-liberalism, making more socially focused reforms like Lindsey's coming together and Wilcox's humanism radical by comparison.

#### **7.4    DIFFERING PERSPECTIVES ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION AND LIBERALISM**

Broadly, Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox's writing reflected varied focus on aspects of social organization and liberalism. They wrote very differently about social groups with which they identified. Shanker and Wilcox both focused most of their writing and action on improving the status of groups with which they worked and identified, teachers and the urban minority poor, respectively. Lindsey focused more on building connections between groups within the context of the City.

On the issue of liberalism, Shanker and Wilcox's perspectives were at odds and Lindsey pushed for middle ground. Shanker referred to due process and rule of law as major issues in the community control conflict. He found it unacceptable to set a precedent where due process and rule of law could be restricted in community controlled districts. A key issue is that efforts

toward non-procedural liberalism and a common good are in opposition to the status quo, setting up a competitive dynamic between subscribers to different social perspectives. This kind of foundational difference was apparent when comparing the works of Wilcox and Shanker, who focused on and promoted very different visions for society.

Wilcox critiqued the system as oppressive; perpetuating the rules of procedural liberalism was unimportant to people oppressed or opposed to oppression by the system and status quo. Wilcox was uninterested in perpetuating procedural liberalism, which was largely the structure for an oppressive social system and status quo. He found participation within the system to be somewhat pointless. Participation of oppressed people in the oppressive system led to assimilation and not liberation. Wilcox rarely wrote of due process and rule of law; largely because he was an outspoken critic of the system to which those ideas were closely tied. Institutional racism inhibited the procedures of the system.

Wilcox pushed Black's and the poor to enact their constitutionally granted rights, engage the system, and change it to reflect their interests and perspectives (e.g., changing the purpose of education and social service programs). By coming together as interest groups engaging the system on their own behalf, Blacks and the Poor participated in politics of recognition. These efforts would counteract the varied groups that traditionally spoke and acted on behalf of Blacks, the Poor, and other marginalized minorities within the status quo, bureaucrats, "educrats," and "poverticians." The oppressed needed to take control of the system and the institutions that should work for them in order to counteract and change the oppressive system. In the context of education, Wilcox found the failure of ghetto schools to warrant restructuring of the relationship between community and school. A major problem in ghetto schools was the lack of relationships between schools, parents, and the community.

Wilcox wrote primarily with regard to Blacks, and the Poor, and the dominant majority. Wilcox mentioned other ethnic groups little and when he did it read as if the mix of ethnicity, race, and social class usually led the non-Black and non-Poor to identify with the dominant majority. Given the dominant majority's marginalization of Blacks and the poor and absent humanism, it would be very difficult for a person to identify with the dominant majority and the oppressed. However, Wilcox also promoted an idea of the common good through humanism in which ethnicity was a primary or at least very important characteristic. Wilcox was largely focused on working for a common good. The system and the status quo were in opposition to the common good with a focus on assimilation.

Lindsey referred fondly to the middle ground of the House of Representatives. Members of the House were able to establish relationships when, as Lindsey says, they had little in common besides winning elected office. In particular, members' relationships grew out of the clubs and informal interactions. However, members of Congress might have found common ground in most of them were middle-aged, wealthy, white males. In his writing, Lindsey was generally critical of state and federal government, at least in relation to the City. During his time in Congress, Lindsey reached the realization that local concerns were primary for Congress members. At least in terms of federal government, the local trumped broader designations of social organization (i.e., political party, states, and the nation).

Lindsey's commitment to the City as a primary social group was evident throughout his writing. Lindsey's attempt to get others to come together as members of the City was a major aspect of his mayoralty. As such, he enacted policies designed to open access and participation in society. Lindsey embarked on a reform agenda largely based on increasing participation, particularly the participation of the previously underserved and disenfranchised. Lindsey tried to

find middle ground between competing connections to various social groups. Although knowing the difficulty in bringing people in a broadly pluralist group together, Lindsey's focus as Mayor was largely bringing people together as the City. To do so, he initiated reforms designed to increase civic participation and decrease economic disparities. However, on both fronts, Lindsey faced opposition from groups (i.e., teacher, civil servants, and suburban middle class) that perceived the reforms as detrimental to their interests and positions within society. Thus, Lindsey's efforts to bring one group into the fold of the City alienated other groups (i.e., teachers, administrators, the police, etc.).

Lindsey's progressive conservatism pointed to an effort at conciliation of procedural and non-procedural liberalism. Lindsey acknowledged that the system had failed the poor and poor Blacks in particular, thus an aspect of the common good was to do everything possible to help them attain social mobility. He mentioned specifically an historic idea in the GOP that all people needed a minimum existence, a safety net. He supported income supplementation, which really was income redistribution, policies not in line with strict procedural liberalism or the emerging New Right. His conflict with the Republican Party was largely based on his departure from traditional liberalism and move toward progressive conservatism, which resembled a middle ground between procedural and non-procedural liberalism. However, he was not an entire communitarian because he supported traditional liberalism. For Lindsey, government needed to provide the means and structure so that all people could enjoy liberty. Lindsey's decentralization plan was largely community control within governmental structures approach.

Shanker almost exclusively focused on teacher solidarity. This was to be expected given he was president of the teachers' union. Shanker also reached out more to other unions (AFL-CIO), rather than other educator organizations, like the CSA. Other than identifying with

teachers, Shanker made a point of his participation in the civil rights movement and the UFT's commitment to school integration. He continually voiced support for parent and teacher cooperation. Shanker continually sought a parent-teacher coalition, citing the importance of parental support within the school system.

He determined that the community was split, largely between parents who wanted the conflict and strikes resolved and their children back in schools and community control advocates who were largely outsiders and radicals. With respect to the community control movement, Shanker made decisions about what groups made-up of the community. The outsiders were the radicals who overran the community control movement. Parents were simply looking out for the best interest of their children, which began as agitation for school improvement and ended as seeking schools to reopen. Shanker repeatedly said parents and teachers really wanted the same thing, quality education for students. Shanker was kind of splitting the community into the radicals and mostly outsiders who came in, took over, and demanded control of the school system, and the parents, who wanted the schools open, their children in attendance, and to improve the quality of education. Shanker made determinations about the make-up of the community seeking control of schools.

Shanker was also a major proponent of procedural liberalism. He wrote as if the goal of the public sector was to set up a system to which everyone adhered, a system that was universal. Shanker viewed community control as an attack on procedural liberalism; setting such a precedent was unacceptable. First and foremost, Shanker's goal was due process and the integrity of the school system. Shanker described the strikes as necessary to ensure that procedural liberalism prevailed.

Shanker argued that the most pressing student and community right was quality schools. He acknowledged that ghetto schools lacked quality and blamed the failure on a rotten school system. Shanker argued that increased funding was the solution. He did not think changing the structure of schools would help with school quality, particularly if the change took control from professionals and gave it to people with little to no experience and expertise in education. Ghettos didn't require different schools. They needed increased funds to hire more teachers, so that classes would be smaller and students would get more attention.

## **7.5 LINDSEY, SHANKER, AND WILCOX'S SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES AND COMMUNITY CONTROL: SUPPORTED AND CONTESTED POLICIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMPROMISE**

In some ways, the culmination of the community control conflict was the passage of New York City decentralization plan. Toward the end of the community control conflict, the focus shifted to decentralization of New York City schools. As Shanker cited:

The question of whether our school system should be decentralized no longer seems to be an open question. The legislature, the Mayor, the Board of Education, parent and civi[c] [sic] groups have all spoken out in favor of school decentralization. Obviously, in a system as large as ours, many decisions cannot and should not be made at central headquarters. The needs of local communities and of the central system itself are best served when real decision-making power is properly distributed. (Shanker, 1968i).

Six decentralization plans were submitted to the Legislature for consideration with varied views on the distribution of power. Ultimately, the Legislature passed somewhat of a compromise plan, primarily drawn from the Lindsey and the New York Board of Regents plans. Of the six submitted plans, the Board of Regents, Bundy, and Lindsey plans, generally, placed more authority/responsibility at the local level than did UFT, Board of Education, and CSA plans. The latter groups proposed mostly to maintain the status quo and the former three advocated for fairly significant reforms (Buder, 1968).

The Bundy plan, which largely represented community control advocates was not nearly the kind of radical reform supported by Wilcox (Berube, 1994; Podair, 2002). Therefore, the Bundy plan is presented for comparison as the general community control demands and supplemented with aspects of Wilcox's more radical plan for community-schools. Wilcox called decentralization mostly structural reform. It was not the kind of radical change in education that he promoted. The Bundy Plan compromised some of Wilcox's call for community control and nearly all of his call for humanist education reform. The Bundy plan was more about the structure of community control than the content, whereas Wilcox focused substantially on both. Like the UFT, community control advocates were not a homogenous group; there was disagreement and dissent in their ranks as well.

In line with his focus on the City as a whole, Lindsey's plan ensured the citywide central board (e.g., Board of Education) a substantial role in schools. The Lindsey plan gave the central board oversight power to ensure local board compliance with state education standards and district norms, particularly those relating to educators and staff. The Lindsey plan also kept high schools under the jurisdiction of the central board for three years after decentralization. Lindsey had discussed this necessity specifically:

There is a great need today for secondary education to provide a perspective far beyond the City's boundaries: The labor market is at least metropolitan-wide, if not nation-wide in many occupations.... Americans cannot afford to be as provincial in the future as we have been in the past. The local district perspective is not a sufficiently broad outlook for secondary education in the last third of the twentieth century. (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 4)

Not surprisingly, the Bundy plan shifted considerable power and jurisdiction to local boards. The central agency would provide more technical support, focusing on issues such as facilities use, integration, and long-range planning. It would also operate all non-regular schools. Wilcox referred to higher educational authority as primarily to the state, regarding issues of standards and certification. His distaste for the Board of education was apparent, citing his community control theory as "part of a concerted effort to make the school a function of the community in which it exists rather than the mere tool of a distant Board of Education... [And] to mute the damage done from outsiders" (Wilcox, 1969a, p. 20). Thus, Wilcox's community control theory covered most aspect of the school and education within the jurisdiction of a school- community committee. Wilcox's primary target for reform was the school.

Surprisingly the UFT did not specify the Central Agency's powers and jurisdiction in its plan. During the conflict Shanker had placed much of the responsibility at the feet of superintendent Donovan and the Central Board. Shanker had previously stated support for transfer of power to local boards, citing "communities should have greater control of their schools... many decision many powers currently monopolized by the Board of Education should be delegated to community school boards" (Shanker, 1967d). By the end of the conflict Shanker

considered decentralization inevitable and was focused on maintaining teacher's position and rights in relation to both central and local boards.

The three plans were in consensus for a mayor appointed, nine-member board; although Bundy would provide an option for a Mayor-appointed three person paid commission. However, both the Bundy and Mayor's plans called for four members to be chosen from candidates nominated by an expanded screening panel and the remaining five to come from the local board chairmen assembly's nominations. The UFT plan sought to have all members come from a pool of candidates voted on by all local board members.

Both the Bundy and Mayor's plans agreed on an eleven member local board, with six members elected by representatives from school parent assemblies and five appointed by the mayor from community group nominations submitted to the central board. The UFT supported an eleven-member board, also, but with all members elected by parents. In fact, the UFT plan closely resembled Wilcox's call for parent control of a community-school's representative body (Wilcox, 1966a).

The three plans each called for a different number of local districts. This number agreed with the focus of their broader perspective on community control. The Bundy plan called for thirty to sixty local districts, "reflecting diversity, sense of community, [and] local involvement" (Buder, 1968); thus, pushing hardest for localized community control. However, in efforts to improve the possibility of integration and decrease administrative costs, the UFT plan called for fifteen or fewer local districts. Lindsey's plan would maintain the number of local districts prior to decentralization for three years after the passage of the plan; an incremental approach that increased participation with less impact on the structure of the system.

As to be expected, the plans differed considerable in the areas of personnel and curriculum. In fact, the only consensus in these areas was on the elimination of the Board of Examiners, the independent city agency responsible for teacher licensing (Ravitch, 1974). With regard to teachers, the differences across plans were substantial. Between Bundy and the Mayor's plan the disagreement was primarily over the central board's involvement in hiring teachers. In the Bundy plan, the local board had almost full control over hiring and assigning teachers, within the state requirements for teacher eligibility. The Mayor's plan added only that teachers needed to pass a qualifying exam administered by the central board. The UFT, however, called for the central board to control hiring and assignment, based on teacher scores on a national examination.

Administrative hiring was another area of disagreement. In both the Bundy and Mayor's plans principal and teacher hiring was handled the same. The UFT supported the idea of the elected principal-teacher model with other administrative positions also handled separately from teachers. As for tenure, both Bundy and the Mayor's plans honored tenure granted to teachers prior to decentralization; however, a new tenure system would be developed by the district. The UFT specifically called for the continuation of a citywide tenure system.

Differences relating to curriculum were similar to those relating to personnel. The Bundy plan called for local boards to have complete control of curriculum, subject only to requirements of the state. The Mayor's plan placed a level of oversight on the local board; calling for the central board to evaluate local board decisions. The UFT plan had curriculum policy determined by local boards, with educators choosing books and methods.

The Bundy and Mayor's plans mostly agreed on budget structure. Most notable, both gave local boards complete control of funds. However, Bundy called for funds to be allocated by

a central board created and Mayor approved needs-based formula and the Mayor's plan called for continued use of the "regular budgetary process of involving Mayor, Board of Estimate and City Council" (Buder, 1968). Again the Mayor's plan kept community control within the existing government structure. The UFT plan kept the central board in control of the budget relating to contracts, salaries, and pensions.

Overall, the Mayor and UFT's plans were in line with the perspectives recognized in the writing of Lindsey and Shanker. The Bundy Plan, however, was much less radical than the envisioned reform of Wilcox. For example, Wilcox focused much on a humanist, ethnically responsive education with more community and less individual focus. Much of Wilcox's critique focused on the why of education, aspects of purpose and philosophy of education, more so than the structure of the system. In terms of the system, Wilcox's theory of community control focused more at an individual school level, rather than the school system level.

## **7.6 MANAGING MULTIPLE AND OFTEN CONFLICTING RESPONSIBILITY TO AND MEMBERSHIP IN VARIOUS SOCIAL GROUPS**

As for issues of responsibility to and membership in various social groups, Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox's primary focus was on different groups. Wilcox was an advocate for Blacks and the Poor and most of his career was spent working and developing programs aimed at their plight. Shanker's focus was primarily teachers; however, he referred much to his commitment to students and parents, particularly from the ghetto. Lindsey's focus seemed to be on getting people to come together as a City and improving the plight of Blacks and the Poor, within one of world's most cosmopolitan and pluralistic cities.

Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox each worked toward bringing people together, just with different approaches. Although Lindsey's focus of coming together as the City was simpler in theory than Wilcox's humanist multiculturalism, it was just as difficult and idealistic. Shanker's focus was more traditional: education, integration, and social mobility. Although this approach was the preferred method of the status quo, growing numbers of the impatient, idealistic, and disenfranchised were increasingly cynical.

Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox were committed to social responsibility and public service. However, they seemed to have very different perspectives on what that meant. Lindsey exhibited social responsibility through public service and commitment to the City. Lindsey wrote specifically and at length about his commitment to the urban poor. His commitment probably stemmed from social responsibility and experience, since he was neither minority nor poor. Lindsey wrote of the impact that canvassing the neighborhoods had on him, as both a candidate and Mayor, allowing him to interact with people from the myriad ethnicities, cultures, and communities of the City.

Lindsey also tried to compel people to be committed to the poor. His support of policies for income supplementation, training, and community control aimed to lessen the socio-economic divide that hindered society. However, Lindsey had a somewhat contradictory position on taxation. On the one hand, he promoted solidarity as the City and called for increased funding for the City and its poor. On the other hand, he lobbied to keep the City's money from going to other parts of the State and Nation. Although Lindsey proclaimed a cosmopolitan social and cultural view, he was somewhat provincial in his view on the City's commitment to the broader state and nation.

Wilcox thought blacks, minorities, and the poor were at odds with dominant groups; groups that benefitted from the status quo. Wilcox thought most teachers and parents were not on the same side because schools were largely not working in the best interest of students. At least when compared to parents, Wilcox viewed teacher as outsiders, coming into the community for a job. Wilcox critiqued people who made a buck off the ghetto. This critique is apt to the degree that many teachers lived comfortably in the suburbs; earning salaries that got them there from working in ghetto schools. Wilcox critiqued many aspects of this structure. He did not think credentials were necessary to teach and he thought parents' earning a living from working in schools was an essential reform in both education and economics.

Comparing Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox's perspectives, blind support for the word integration seemed simplistic. Each of them thought the idea of integration through and determined it to have very different meanings. Wilcox viewed integration as a fallacy. He called integration as pursued in the civil rights era, integrated assimilation into the dominant majority (e.g., white, middle-class, capitalist). Instead, Wilcox supported humanism, which he connected to issues of ethnicity and class, and positioned against the dominant majority, white middle-class culture and bureaucratic capitalism. Humanism fostered authentic integration into a multicultural society absent the natural competitive animosity of social groups. Wilcox argued, "community control is not a racist movement" (Wilcox, 1969a, p. 19), and also that "ethnic groups should be in control of their own educational programs as a counter-racist strategy" (Wilcox, 1972a, p. 3). Wilcox critiqued integration as historically implemented, focusing instead on the best interests of the group to which he owed primary responsibility. For Wilcox, humanism was tied closely to ethnicity. Humanization should be the goal of education, promoting pluralism and

multiculturalism. If multiculturalism were not possible, supporters of multiculturalism would promote ethnocentrism and not assimilation, racist integration.

Both Shanker and Lindsey focused on the importance of integration efforts to plans for school reform in the ghetto. Shanker was a long-time supporter of the civil rights movement and school integration. He viewed community control as setting a precedent for intended segregation or at least the cessation of attempts at integration, which stood in the face of the historic focus of the civil rights movement. Shanker stated being “against setting up permanent districts on a permanent racially segregated basis” (Shanker, 1967c). Lindsey’s focus was again the City as a social group, a primary social group. Secondary education had provided some of the few bright spots in integration: “Not only racially, but the integration and cosmopolitanism that has been brought about because of the number of students from diverse backgrounds who travel all over this City to take advantage of the varied opportunities” (Lindsey, 1968a, p. 4). Lindsey objected specifically to the provincial focus for education, relating a necessarily broader focus for education to functionalist and human capital perspective, social functionalism in relation to the City as a social group and economic functionalism in the classic sense of fitting into the economy.

## 7.7 CONCLUSION

Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox acknowledged to the failure of ghetto schools and their thoughts on the matter reflected their broader perspectives. While Lindsey was focused on bring people together as the City, Wilcox and Shanker were focused on improving the social and economic status of their groups. Lindsey sought primarily increased participation and funding for NYC

schools. For Lindsey, there seemed to be two major aspects of community control, gaining increased funding from state and federal government and increasing community participation in schools. Shanker focused on increasing funding for standard education reform, which Wilcox viewed largely as a perpetuation of the problem. Thus, Shanker's focus was primarily maintaining professional control of schools and Wilcox's was on gaining community control in order to radically reform schools. Wilcox called for radical change in ghetto education, changes that would directly affect Shanker's interests.

It is doubtful that any school reform will become a formula for solution. A suggested solution from one perspective is often in opposition to an established aspect of education from another perspective. A key might be that on certain aspects of the framework and community control conflict, the three were not so much supporting opposite positions but were focusing on different aspects. In a sense they were talking past each other on issues relating to community control and improvement of education.

## **8.0 CONCLUSION: SOCIAL THEORY AND THE CONTEXT OF SCHOOL REFORM**

### **8.1 INTRODUCTION**

Much of my research has been on education's impact on human connectedness. Both my philosophy of education and more broadly my "way of being" (Paulston, 1999; Apfel-Marglin, 1998) were steeped in ideas of social connectedness and responsibility. Whereas connectedness is the acknowledgement of bonds that tie group members together, responsibility is valuing and committing actions beneficial to the group. But, the devil is in the details. It is difficult enough to explicate the ties that bind people and the actions that nurture groups, much less the myriad of groups that fuel social dynamics in pluralist democracy. It is at this intersection where I directed this study.

### **8.2 THREE PUBLIC SERVANTS WHO VIEWED COMMUNITY CONTROL FROM DIFFERENT SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES**

I found Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox to be sincerely committed to public service, yet they disagreed adamantly on the particulars of how best the public would be served. Education is perhaps the least contested public service, yet sparks vehement conflict within society. I have researched a number of broad social issues and in this study wanted to drill down into a specific

education conflict, involving school reform. Shanker made the point that community control focused on the political structure of education, redirecting reforms away from the most important aspects of education, “why students can’t read” or don’t read, or do well in math, science, physics, etc. Shanker, like many educators, believed in the power of teachers, classrooms, and schools to solve the problems of student learning and achievement. As far as school impact on larger social issues, Shanker regularly mentioned its role in integration but made little references about schools’ relationship to broader social, economic, or political reform. He was a Western Traditionalist (Berube, 1994): schools primary focus was to impart in students the necessary capacity to function socially and economically in society.

I chose this case because reading about the three figures in other works (Body-Gendrot & Gittell, 2003; Berube & Gittell, 1969; Byndloss, 2001; Gordon, 2001) provided a glimpse of three individuals whose life’s work was public service, yet they were often portrayed negatively because of their perspectives on many of the deep issues involved in the community control conflict.

### **8.3 SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES AS A DRIVING FORCE OF SCHOOL REFORM**

Both schools and socialization can have different purposes depending on one’s point of view. “We expect schools and societies to reflect each other, not just in terms of the subjects taught, but also with respect to how the school is organized and functions” (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004, pp. 5-6). Schools are agents of socialization with which most people have direct contact. Often, people’s points of view regarding the purpose of schools and social organization are very much related.

People are frequently conflicted on social and educational issues due to their varied responsibility to numerous social groups. Absent compromise, they choose to act in the interest of one or another. In such instances, people's master status, which "has exceptional significance for social identity" (Eitzen & Baca-Zinn, 2004, p. 31), is particularly important. For example, many US middle class mothers are avowed liberal Democrats and proponents of educational equity. Yet, when faced with an opportunity to support policies designed to assist traditionally disfavored social groups, they seemingly act from a master status as parent, exhibiting an overriding concern for possible impact on their children. If they think that a school policy can negatively impact their own children, then they are very likely to actively oppose it, regardless of the prospect for broader social benefit (Brantlinger, 2003). Thus, varied and often conflicting connections to social groups often play out in school reform issues.

A complex mix of social processes forms a context in which social interventions, such as education, must work. Brantlinger (2003) illustrates the importance of understanding people's connections to social groups in regards to school reform, particularly equity and excellence movements where the purported goal is expansion of education's social benefits (Berube, 1994). For example, policy-makers often focus reform on the education of sub-groups, which largely correspond to aspects of social status and stratification. Similarly, interest groups often focus on reforms that benefit their particular constituency. Add to this the fact that particular groups, namely wealthy Whites have traditionally been well served by schools and the social status quo, and school reform becomes a noticeably adversarial enterprise. Without an understanding of the matrix of social groups with which people identify, school reform aiming to assist specific groups will continue to be encumbered by other groups that incur real or perceived negative impact.

Sfard (1998) uses corresponding metaphors of education as participation and education as acquisition to illustrate differing approaches to the purpose of education. The former is focused on connection between people and the latter on competition. Examples of the latter abound in current education, from neo-liberals' control of the Dominant Education Paradigm (Hawkins, 2007) to conservative modernist's pursuit of social advantage (Apple, 2006) and in both cases policy-makers most often aim education at economic concerns. Such a focus has also been a major characteristic of the era of educational excellence (Berube, 1994), during which there has been a steady increase in income gaps both domestically and globally (Babones, 2006). Perhaps acquisition and competition are less conducive to participation and relationships. If so, policy-makers who understand and address the complexity of social organization might be more likely to promote policies that foster relationships and cooperation instead of policies steeped in competition and advantage.

Given the difference in people's social perspectives, it is important that schools foster the development of students who can both engage and critique society: culturally, economically, and politically. Without competence to do each, schools and society are stultified by social change (Fullan, 2006). Furthermore, without connectedness and responsibility, groups often battle over different visions of the world (Taylor, 1994); radicals on both the political right and left exemplify such zeal in U.S. education (Apple, 2006). Thus, education from these opposing points of view is more a difference in direction than purpose. It is schooling for "ideological management," (Spring, 2005) where the management is largely the same, yet ideology is vastly different. As ideology trends toward dogmatic adherence, the possibility of compromise decreases. Middle ground is greatly narrowed and difficult to find.

Thus, schools social power focuses less on conveying ideas and abilities that reflect cooperation and more toward promoting ideas representing competition. The move from a common school ideal toward specialized schools allows particular ideologies to gain social traction. For example, the more tied a family is to a particular ideology, the more likely they are to enroll their children in schools that are closely tied to that ideology or opt out of the system altogether and home school (Apple, 2006). Thus, social interaction and the prospect of relationships are stunted. In pluralist societies with dogmatic social perspectives, social groups increasingly compete to use schooling as a mechanism to effect social interaction and culture. Schools become levers for ideological management (Spring, 2005), not only for stability within social groups, but for prostylitizing and possibly evangelizing throughout broader society.

#### **8.4 IN COMPETITION THERE IS USUALLY A WINNER**

As seen in the comparison of Lindsey, Shanker, and Wilcox differing social perspectives resulted in very different proposed policies for school reform. Thus, it could be useful for education policy-makers to analyze the cultural, economic, and political contexts within which education exists.

Whatever the particular controversy in education may be, it is often the case that insufficient attention is paid to the social context in which the issues take on importance.... Schools are a human invention. They have a history. They change forms either in reaction to social forces or because of our conscious attempt to change them. Thus, participants in the schools and in society give schooling a

structure; but schools also structure those who work in them and pass through them. (Feinberg & Soltis, 2004, p. 10)

Through analysis of the social context of education educators might better understanding how foundational social theories influence social structures and become more likely to critique dogmatic social perspectives that compete to use schools as a lever of social manipulation.

Hawkins' (2007) Dominant Educational Paradigm (DEP) described the pervasive influence of functionalist perspectives on modern education, which both Lindsey and Shanker supported. Trends toward schooling for economic functionalism restrict the creation of social movements that oppose dominant ideologies (Morrow & Torres, 1999). Thus, Wilcox's proposal of humanist school reform was met with much resistance. In the current education landscape, neoliberalism, which draws from the theoretical foundations order theory and functionalism, drives a hegemonic vision of global civilization that while promising prosperity, often delivers disparity to far too many people. Although social perspectives stemming from conflict theory, such as critical modernism and post-development theories foster a more comparative and contextual understanding of society, they have been equally opposed and dismissed since Wilcox's attempts.

The purpose and foundation of American education has always been a contentious topic. "In the early nineteenth century, workingmen, Protestants, Catholics, reformers, urban dwellers, and others shared a belief that the school was the key to social control and social stability. This belief became a standard fixture in the rhetoric surrounding the American school" (Spring, 2004, p. 99). American schools from their inception have been hailed as a panacea for social ills. As of yet have not lived up to the expectation. Arguably, the reasons lie in the foundation, not the practice of education. If the majority of students in a country attend public schools mandated to

maintain equitable educational opportunities for all, yet educational outcomes continue to be significantly stratified, then education is most likely susceptible to larger social issues.

The foundation of public schooling was based on institutional assimilation and preservation of the status quo. No matter how much support is added, a flawed foundation will lead to collapse unless a new separate foundation is built or the original is fixed. In essence, Wilcox proposed a radical deviation from public school norms of professional control and education for social and economic functionalism. However, he didn't want to control the system, as it existed. He wanted to change the system altogether. Framing the movement as community control, positioned the community against the teachers, who had fought long and hard for professionalization of their field and improvement in their working conditions. Thus, the conflict developed over rather the community or teachers should control education, with most people rarely if ever considering the bigger issue of Wilcox's critique of the purpose of schools. It became a matter of nearly forcing the choice between community control and teacher control of schools, and given the success of administrative progressivism (Berube, 1994), the choice was easy for most people outside of the immediate school community.

Within social, civic, and education organization hangs an interconnected, complex web of competing interests. As theories and individual perceptions of identity become more nuanced (Benhabib, 2002; Mason, 2007), necessary solidarity to drive social change becomes more difficult to achieve (Morrow & Torres, 1999). Old social typologies of proletariat, bourgeoisie, and elite have been substantially disaggregated, leading to a more factionalized socio-political landscape entrenched with competition for advantage (Taylor, 1994; Benhabib, 2002). Thus, the current education landscape is greatly affected by increases in competition and decreases in stability.

## 8.5 BE CAREFUL WHAT YOU WISH FOR

Although he was concerned with generally improving ghetto schools in a broad sense, Lindsey's reform focus seemed to be less about schools, and more about broader social issues. Lindsey's major goals for school reform were to bring people together, through civic participation mainly, and to increase funding for school, through federal and state government. The former largely elicited the conflict between community groups and teachers, as calls for participation turned into demands for control and the latter foretold increased federal involvement in education. Eventually, Lindsey's call for increased federal education funding, which was echoed by urban mayors and governors, was answered with far reaching outcomes. Rarely do you get something for nothing and as federal funding for education increased so did federal control.

After World War II, school reform became increasingly politically led and driven by broader political and economic agendas (Cross, 2004). Policy-makers distanced from the day-to-day work in communities and schools could much more easily focus on broader social issues. For example, school redistricting policies stemming from the Civil Rights Act of 1964 disrupted or promoted social connectedness, depending on one's social perspective. On the one hand, such policies of dispersal were antithetical to the revered ideal of neighborhood schools; on the other, policies of inclusion promoted connectedness of a diverse many into one. Similarly, equity reforms were viewed to grant advantage to social groups that have been traditionally disfavored (Berube, 1994) or to retract advantage from social groups that were historically successful (Ravitch, 1983, 2000). From either perspective, schooling served as a lever of ideological management (Spring, 2004) for policy-makers to change the dynamics of social organization. Such policies were a practical application of Lindsey's call for people to come together.

The federal government steadily expanded its involvement in education. In 1983, The National Commission on Excellence in Education and its publication of *A Nation at Risk* solidified the idea of education as a panacea for social ills. Although most Post-World War II presidential administrations wrestled with ideological tension and inconsistency in their educational policy (Cross, 2004), a connecting thread was an increasing consensus regarding social and economic functionalism as a primary purpose of schools. Educational progressives and community control advocates made little headway in change the purpose of schools, toward humanism and participatory democracy. However, over time such ideological differences diffused into an increasingly bi-partisan education agenda promoted with only marginal differentiation across presidential administrations (Berube, 1994; Cruz, 2009).

Historically, presidential education policy represented broader social agendas that oscillated between conservatism and progressivism. President Eisenhower had to have his arm twisted to support federal funding for schools and he largely ignored the social implications of the Brown decision. He turned his attention to education policy due to concern for domestic order and international competition. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, however, promoted using education to address social issues, particularly racial and economic inequality, in aspirations of fomenting a vision of a greater society. By the late 1960s radical social movements were opposed by a rising tide of conservatism ushered in with the Nixon era (Spring, 2004). "Challenged by the conservatives on the right and romantic radicals and cultural critics on the left, Great Society liberalism withered on the vine of ethnic, racial, and gender conflict and in the poisoned soil of economic decline in the 1970s" (McGee, 1975, p. 219). This conservative reaction combined with increased cynicism toward government to usher in political agendas for smaller government and accountability that were pursued by each president from Reagan to

Clinton. For the most part, education policy reflected each president's point of view on foundational issues of U.S. society and government: federalism, accountability, and socialization.

Largely in response to the community control movement of the late 1960s, Leon Lessinger's (1970) *Every Kid a Winner: Accountability in Education* "sparked the accountability movement" (Spring, 2004, p. 451). Both Lessinger and the proponents of community control believed that schools needed to be more responsive to the public, yet they differed on the means of attainment; the former supported a public accounting of schools successes and failures and the latter democratic localism (Spring, 2004). In this case, means of accountability differed according to one's point of view on civic organization (Taylor, 1994). At this point the accountability movement was less specific to education than the public sector generally, in part due to the increased public cynicism of government and the media's increased amplification of events and actions that sparked such cynicism. When combined with Clinton's "New Government" agenda (Osbourne & Gaebler, 1992), accountability gained even more traction in the public sector.

## **8.6 USEFULLNESS OF FRAMEWORKS FOR EXPLORING SOCIAL THEORY WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF SCHOOL REFORM**

The Dominant Education Paradigm significantly impacts society (Hawkins, 2007). Perhaps more importantly the theoretical foundations of the DEP influence social structures that perpetuate particular social perspectives that may marginalize significant sections of the population. Social movements have historically been primary sources of change and innovation in society and

substantial social conflict has been in the education policy arena. Therefore, social divisions over school reform need to be “situated in the context of the contested relations between the state and social movements in the overall process of cultural reproduction and change” (Morrow & Torres, 1999, p. 93).

Morrow and Torres (1999) analyze the relationship between schooling and social movements within the context of the state. Education and cultural reproduction are functionally related; schooling is largely a mechanism for dominant groups to perpetuate their vision of society. This is played out in the context of theories of the state, which are categorized by level of social complexity and dissonance. Liberal political analysis is the most basic theory and focuses on sovereignty and citizenship. Liberal democratic theory assumes sovereignty and citizenship, and focuses on the problems of representation and accountability. Marxist social theory emphasizes the importance of unequal power distribution and its impact on social stratification and political coercion. Finally, critical theory of the state merges political sociology and neo-Marxism to focus on the intersection of institutional structure and power within society; the concept of the state becomes a heuristic for understanding social interaction and structure, and an arena of confrontation for conflicting political projects.

Morrow and Torres (1999) connect theories of the state to education: the purpose of school as dependent on theoretical perspectives. Functionalism has greatly influenced the rise of neoliberal ideology that promotes new types of state intervention and changes in the logic of public action and the nature of the democratic pact, with a vision of schooling as a mechanism for the spread of capitalism. In opposition to this view are critical perspectives that emphasize the erosion of democracy, largely at the hands of neoliberal ideology, thus arguing that there is incompatibility between democracy and neoliberal hyper-capitalism.

The contested nature of educational reform is reflective of conflict between the state and social movements over the process of cultural reproduction and change. This directly relates to the face-off between sociological conflict and order theories that plays out in economic, political, and cultural contexts. Functionalism may argue that economics and socialization are fundamental components of society, but there seems a deeper foundation based in the structure of relationships and responsibilities of the members of society. Frameworks for analyzing social issues within socio-historic context offer a means of getting at the foundational contestations within society.

Social theory frameworks can assist in placing school reform conflicts within broader socio-historic context. This can increase understanding of the interrelated nature of society and the theoretical foundations of social structures. Doing so allows light to be shed on the path from philosophy to action: philosophies inform theoretical perspectives that influence methods (Crotty, 1998). Socio-historic frameworks help track this path in social issues. In comparative education such frameworks attempt a Kandelian approach of bringing to bear philosophy, history, political science, and sociology in order to deal with the complexity of socio-educational systems (Bereday, 1967). Solutions to social problems need understand and address foundational issues. Aiming reform at schools may change the look of the primary social lever, but has little impact on the social perspectives of the people wielding the lever.

## **8.7 FINAL THOUGHTS ON COMMUNITY CONTROL**

I began this last chapter reflecting on this study of the community control conflict. In many ways the community control conflict supports the need for federal involvement in education. Given the

significant differences in social perspectives of the three key figures, and their connection and leadership within three larger groups of teachers, community advocates, and progressive conservatives. Shanker continued and became the president of the AFT and a dominant voice of union teachers for another thirty plus years. Wilcox also continued to work as a community organizer and educator in Harlem for just as long. It is most interesting that Lindsey, who ardently sought middle ground throughout the conflict, left public service altogether after completing his second term as mayor. Also, Lindsey's avowed political perspective, progressive conservatism, also largely disappeared from the current political landscape.

The goal of this study was to provide educators and policy-makers with insight into some underlying and recurring social issues that hinder school reform. Stakeholders and policy makers often have conflicting responsibilities to various social groups. As illustrated by the community control conflict, broader social and political contestation often lies beneath school reform conflict restricting the success of pedagogical and curricular remedies. The result has been continuous reforms with little broad impact on student success (Fullan, 2006; Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

## APPENDIX

**Table 1.** Themes found in research of Shanker’s writings

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION	CIVIC ORGANIZATION	DEP
<b>FAILURE OF GHETTO SCHOOLS</b>		
Funding is key Community involvement versus intervention Personnel matters not decided on characteristics Integration efforts Teachers and parents want the same thing, quality education Due process Review boards		
	<b>INTEGRITY OF THE SYSTEM</b>	
	Focus reform on teachers and classrooms Rotten system Professional control	
	<b>THE STRIKES</b>	
	Not about decentralization Due process and security of contracts Securing rights moving into decentralization Problems even after arbitration and agreement	
<b>TEACHER SOLIDARITY</b>		
Need to stop CC Strength in numbers, recruiting Not universal either Contract negotiations		
<b>COMMUNITY [LOST] CONTROL</b>	<b>REFORM AND THE RIGHTS OF TEACHERS</b>	<b>ADDRESSING THE FAILURE OF URBAN SCHOOLS: DECENTRALIZATION AND CC</b>
Outside radicals  Reaches out to parents  Teachers and parents must work together	Teacher transfers  From community control supporters to opponents  Dangers of setting a precedent	Funding and instructional reform versus political and structural changes Funding, universal PK, and internship programs  Concedes decentralization, fights for professional control in local districts

**Table 2.** Themes found in research of Lindsey’s writings

<b>SOCIAL ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>CIVIC ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>DEP</b>
MIDDLE GROUND – U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES		STATUS QUO VERSUS REFORM
Competing connections to groups  Importance of Relationships	“Between chaos and tyranny”	Critique of bureaucratic and political status quo  Expand participation and increase local control
THE CITY AS MAJOR SOCIAL GROUP		EDUCATION AND DECENTRALIZATION
Taxes, funding, and federalism  Pluralism, solidarity, and the City  PLIGHT OF THE URBAN POOR  Cycle of poverty Distinction of welfare recipients  Welfare – male HOH Income supplementation		Functionalism and human capital theories Citywide responsibility for schools and education Building bridges between the community and teachers Funding and training
		FROM COMMUNITY CONTROL TO DECENTRALIZATION
		Collaborative control Community Control was not free reign Still functionalist and Human capital focus, particularly in high school
INFLUENCES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE AND COMMITMENT TO THE CITY	CIVIL RIGHTS, PROCEDURAL LIBERALISM, AND RULE OF LAW	
St. Paul’s School  Family and colleagues  Diversity of the City	Balancing rule of law and common good Community control within governmental structure	
	THE CHANGING REPUBLICAN PARTY	
	Balancing traditional liberalism and social responsibility – civic participation Social safety nets Liberalism, conservatism, and Civil Rights Progressive conservatism	

**Table 3.** Themes found in research of Wilcox’s writings

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION	CIVIC ORGANIZATION	DEP
FAILURE OF GHETTO SCHOOLS		
Importance of context to school Professionals too often focused on paperwork Educating the oppressed Failure was on the watch of professionals Rethink control of schools		
INTEGRATION		
Integration as assimilation Integration as white/professional control Integration changes, doesn’t solve plight of Blacks Integrated racism		
EDUCATION AND HUMANISM		
Humanism tied to ethnicity Pluralism versus compulsory assimilation Education not vest in competition and failure Authentic integration and multi-culturalism		
	CHALLENGING THE STATUS QUO	
	Critic of bureaucratic capitalism, Critic of educrats and povertists Favored cooperative economics shared-decision-making	
	PARTICIPATION	
	Community control as civic participation Opportunities in EOA Real participation and not just presence	
CRITIQUE OF PROFESSIONAL CONTROL		CRITIQUE OF PROFESSIONAL CONTROL
Unsuccessful do-gooders, ghetto fascists, and intruders Professionals are people too, selfish  Teachers, organized labor, and blind obedience Membership corporation and collective focus		Professionals as barrier to public services Unsuccessful do-gooders, ghetto fascists, and intruders Professionals are people too, selfish  Teachers, organized labor, and blind obedience
		COMMUNITY CONTROL: THEORY AND PERSPECTIVE  Restructuring the community and school relationship Must embrace Black community School as a community anchor Community chooses principal Holistic/Humanist education

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, W. (2004). *All connected now: Life in the first global civilization*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Apfel-Marglin, F. (1998). *The spirit of regeneration: Andean culture confronting western notions of development*. New York: Zed Books.
- Apple, M. (2006). *Educating the right way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. New York: Routledge.
- Arum, R., & Beattie, I. (Eds.). (1999). *The structure of schooling: Reading in the sociology of education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Asante, M. (1988). *Afrocentricity*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Babones, S. (2006, January 23). Globalization of inequality. Pittsburgh, PA.
- Benhabib, S. (2002). *Claims of culture: Equity and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bereday, G. (1967). Reflection on comparative methodology in education, 1964-1966. *Comparative Education*, 3 (3), 169-187.
- Berger, B., & Luckman, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.
- Berube, M., & Gittell, M. (Eds.). (1969). *Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville; the New York school strikes of 1968*. New York: Praeger.
- Berube, M. (1994). *American school reform: Progressive, equity, and excellence movements, 1883-1993*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Blau, P., & Scott, W. (1962). *Formal organizations: A comparative approach*. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Body-Gendrot, S., & Gittell, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Social capital and social citizenship*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Arum & I. Beattie (Eds.), *The structure of schooling: Reading in the sociology of education* (pp. 56-68). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Brantlinger, E. (2003). *Dividing classes: How the middle class negotiates and rationalizes school advantage*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Brocke-Utne, B. (2007). Language of instruction and student performance: New insights from research in Tanzania and South Africa. *International Review of Education*, 53(5-6), 509-530.
- Brocke-Utne, B. (2000). *Whose education for all? The recolonization of the African mind*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Bruner, J. (1960). *The Process of education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Buder, L. (1968, March 30). Text of Regents' proposals for decentralization of City school system. *New York Times* [clipping]. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 53, Folder 5. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Burke, P. (2005). *History and social theory*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Byndloss, D. (2001). Revisiting paradigms in Black education: Community control and African-centered schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 34(1), 84-100.
- Carbaugh, R. (2001). *Contemporary economics: An applications approach*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College.
- Carmichael, S., & Hamilton, C. (1992). *Black power: The politics of liberation in America*. New York: Random House. (Originally published 1967).
- Cloward, R., & Ohlin, L. (1960). *Delinquency and opportunity*. NY: Free Press.
- Cooley, W. (1993). The difficulty of the education task. University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research and Development Center.
- Coleman, J., & Hoffer, T. (1999). Schools, families, and communities. In R. Arum & I. Beattie (Eds.), *The structure of schooling: Reading in the sociology of education* (pp. 56-68). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cross, C. (2004). *Political education: National policy comes of age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cullingworth, B. (1997). *Planning in the USA: Policies, issues, and processes*. London: Routledge.
- Crotty, M. (1998). The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process. London: Sage.
- Cruz, G. (2009, Sept. 14). Can Arne Duncan (and \$5 billion) fix America's schools? *Time*. 174.
- Darwin, C. (1961). *Origin of the species*. New York: Collier. (Originally published in 1859).

- Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and Education*. New York: Free Press. (Originally published in 1938).
- Dreeben, R. (1968). *On what is learned in school*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dufour, R., Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning communities at work: New insights for improving schools*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Eitzen, D., & Baca-Zinn, M. (1992). *Social problems*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Eitzen, D., & Baca-Zinn, M. (2004). *In conflict and order: Understanding society*. Boston: Pearson.
- Fanon, F. (2004). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Feinberg, W., & Soltis, J. (2004). *School and society* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ferretti, F. (1968, November 18). Who's to blame in the school strike? *New York Magazine*, 22-35.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Freire, P. (2001). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Fullan, M. (2006). *Turnaround leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gadamer, H. (1975). *Truth and method*. (W. Glen-Doeppel, Trans.). London: Sherd and Ward. (Originally published 1960).
- Gordon, J. (2001). *Why they couldn't wait: A critique of the Black-Jewish conflict over community control in Ocean Hill-Brownsville (1967-1971)*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Harding, S. (2006). *Science and social inequality: Feminist and postcolonial issues*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Hatton, B. (1977). Schools and Black community development: A reassessment of community control. *Education and Urban Society*, 9(2), 215-33.
- Hawkins, J. (2007). The intractable dominant educational paradigm. In P. Hershock, M. Mason, & J. Hawkins (Eds.), *Changing Education: Leadership, innovation, and development in a globalizing Asia Pacific* (pp. 137-162). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Herder, J. (1969). *J. G. Herder on social and political culture*. (F. Barnard, Trans.). London: Cambridge University Press.

- Hiebert, J., Carpenter, T., Fennema, E., Fuson, K., Human, P., Murray, H., Olivier, A., & Wearne, D. (1996). Problem solving as a basis for reform in curriculum and instruction: The case of mathematics. *Educational Researcher*, 25(4), 12-21.
- Johnson, W. (1997). *Urban planning and politics*. Chicago: Planners Press.
- Kaestle, C. F. (1983). *Pillars of the republic: Common schools and American society, 1780-1860*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Kahlenberg, R. (2007). *Tough liberal: Albert Shanker and the battles over schools, unions, race, and democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lessenger, L. (1970). *Every kid a winner: Accountability in education*. New York: Simon Schuster.
- Levi, G. (1988). *Inheriting power: The story of an exorcist*. (L. Cochrane Trans.). Chicago: Chicago University Press. (Originally published 1985).
- Lindsey, J. (1967). *Journey into politics: Some informal observations*. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company.
- Lindsey, J. (1968a, January). *Letter to Governor Rockefeller regarding decentralization plan*. Office of the Mayor (John V. Lindsey), Subject Files, 1966-1973, Box 34, Folder 595. New York City Municipal Archives, New York.
- Lindsey, J. (1967b, March 17). *Letter to the Board of Education regarding the Women's Talent Corps*. Office of the Mayor (John V. Lindsey), Subject Files, 1966-1973, Box 25, Folder 345. New York City Municipal Archives, New York.
- Lindsey, J. (1968b, June 9). *Mayor Lindsay this week* [Transcript]. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 58, Folder 11. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Lindsey, J. (1969). *The City*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Mann, H. (1957). *The republic and the school; The education of free men* (L. Cremin, Ed.). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Martin, D., Urban, W., & Overholt, G. (1973). *Accountability in American education: A critique*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Book, Co.

- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1978). *The Marx-Engels reader* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). R. Tucker (Ed.). New York: W.W. Norton.
- Mason, M. (2007). Multiculturalism, shared values, and an ethical response to globalization. In P. Herschok, M. Mason, & J. Hawkins (Eds.), *Changing education: Leadership, innovation, and development in a globalizing Asia Pacific* (pp. 93-114). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- McGee, R. (1975). *Points of departure: Basic concepts in sociology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hinsdale, IL: Dryden.
- Mill, J. (1978). *On liberty*. Indianapolis: Hackett. (Originally published in 1859).
- Montesque, C. (2001). *The spirit of the laws*. Kitchner, Ontario: Batoche.
- Morrow, R., & Torres, C. (1999). The state, social movements, and educational reform. In R. Arnove, & C. Torres (Eds.), *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local* (pp. 91-114). New York: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Nietzsche, F. (2006). Thus spoke Zarathustra: A book for all and none. A. Del Caro & R. Pippin, (Ed.). (A. Del Capo, Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Omolewa, M. (2007). Traditional African modes of education: Their relevance in the modern world. *International review of education*, 53(5-6), 593-612.
- Orfield, Gary. (1978). *Must we bus; Segregated schools and national policy*. Washington: The Brooking Institution.
- Osbourne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Reading, MA: Adisson-Wesley.
- Parsons, T. (1959). The school class as a social system: Some of its functions in American society. *Harvard Educational Review*, 29(4), 297-318.
- Paulston, R. (1999). Mapping comparative education after post modernity. *Comparative Education Review*, 43(4), 438-463.
- Peet, R. (1999). *Theories of development*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Podair, J. (2002). *The strike that changed New York: Blacks, whites, and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville crisis*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Podair, J. (2009). *Bayard Rustin: American dreamer*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Putnam, R., & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say about research on teacher learning? *Educational Researcher*, 29(1), 4-15.
- Ravitch, D. (1974). *The great school wars, New York City, 1805-1973: A history of the public schools as battlefield of social change*. New York: Basic Books.

- Ravitch, D. (1983). *The troubled crusade: American education 1945-1980*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left Back: A century of failed school reform*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Reese, W. (2005). *America's public schools: from the common school to "No Child Left Behind."* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ripley, A. (2008, Nov. 28). Rhee tackles classroom challenge. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1862444-2,00.html/>.
- Roberts, S. (2010). *America's Mayor: John V. Lindsey and the reinvention of New York*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rothstein, R. (October 18, 2010). *An overemphasis on teachers*. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from [http://www.epi.org/analysis\\_and\\_opinion/entry/an\\_overemphasis\\_on\\_teachers/](http://www.epi.org/analysis_and_opinion/entry/an_overemphasis_on_teachers/).
- Rousseau, J. (1979). *Emile: Or, on education* (A. Bloom, Trans.). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1762).
- Rousseau, J. (1993). *The social contract and the discourses*. (G. Cole, Trans.). New York: Knopf. (Originally published in 1762).
- Saltman, K., & Gabbard, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Education as enforcement: The militarization and corporatization of schools*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Schultz, T. (1971). *Investment in human capital*. New York: The Free Press.
- Shanker, A. (1966a, September 22). *An open letter on 201*. United Federation of Teachers Records WAG 022, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 54, Folders 16. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1966b, October 9). *The WINS News Conference* [Transcript]. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 87, Folder 28. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1966c, December). A Citizens' Review Board for teachers? A teacher speaks. *American Teacher*. pp. 9-10. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 53, Folder 5. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.

- Shanker, A. (1967a, November). *United Action*, [Published monthly by the United Federation of Teachers, Local 2, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO]. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996 Box 57, Folder 14. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1967b, November 6). *Letter to UFT members from Ocean Hill-Brownsville*. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 54, Folder 16. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1967b, December 3,). *Newsmakers: A live broadcast in color on WCBS-TV, Channel 2, New York/Interviewer: Ralph Penza* [Transcripts]. UFT Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 58, Folder 3. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1967c, March 8). *Letter to Audrey Cohen, Executive Director of Women's Talent Corps, Inc.* Office of the Mayor (John V. Lindsey), Subject Files, 1966-1973, Box 25, Folder 345. New York City Municipal Archives, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1967d). *Letter to the New York Amsterdam News*. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 54, Folders 16. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1968a, June 4). *Letter to the list of UFT's active parents and community leaders*. UFT Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 57, Folder 18. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1968b, August). *United Action*, [Published monthly by the United Federation of Teachers, Local 2, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO]. UFT Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 57, Folder 18. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1968c, September 5). *Letter to UFT members regarding strike vote*. Guide to the Teachers Action Caucus (United Federation of Teachers) Records, Box 1, Folder 3. Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1968d, September 6). *Letter to parents regarding possible strike*. Guide to the Teachers Action Caucus (United Federation of Teachers) Records, Box 1, Folder 3. Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1968e, September 8). *Newsmakers: A live broadcast in color on WCBS-TV, Channel 2, New York/Interviewer: Ralph Penza* [Transcripts]. UFT Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 58, Folder 3. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.

- Shanker, A. (1968f, October 3). *Letter to chapter chairmen and delegates*. Guide to the Teachers Action Caucus (United Federation of Teachers) Records, Box 1, Folder 3. Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1968g, October 20). *Speech at the Association of School Business Officials Conference, Houston, TX* [Transcript, edited]. UFT Records, WAG 022, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 57, Folder 19. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1968h, December 1). *Newsmakers: A live broadcast in color on WCBS-TV, Channel 2, New York/Interviewer: Ralph Penza* [Transcripts]. UFT Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 58, Folder 3. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (1968i). *United Federation of Teachers statement on decentralization*. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996 Box 57, Folder 15. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shanker, A. (undated). *Letter to R. Wagner regarding The Forgotten Ones*. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 54, Folder 16. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Shockley, K., & Frederick, R. (2008). Constructs and dimensions of Afrocentric education. *Journal of Black Studies, 40*(6), 1212-1233.
- Smydo, J. (2007, July 11). Pittsburgh schools drop 'public' from name to boost image. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*. Retrieved July 1, 2009.
- Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher, 27*(2), 4-13.
- Spencer, H. (1891). *Education: Intellectual, moral, and physical*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.
- Spring, J. (2004). *The American school: 1642-2004* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Spring, J. (2005). *Conflict of interests: The politics of American education* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill
- Stanford, M. (1994). *A companion to the study of history*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Stavrianos, L. (1998). *A global history: From prehistory to the 21st century* (7th Ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.

- Tananis, C., Trahan, K., & Ciminillo, C. (2008, November). *Addressing complexity: Conducting evaluation of a comprehensive math-science partnership (MSP)*. Presented at American Evaluation Association Conference, Denver, CO.
- Taylor, C. (1994). *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tumulty, K. (2009, August 10). Can Obama find a cure? *Time*, 5, 26-29.
- Turner, R. (2000). Sponsored and contest mobility and the school system. In R. Arum, & I. Beattie (Eds.), *The structure of schooling: Readings in the sociology of education* (pp. 22-34). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Urban, W., & Wagoner, J. (2004). *American education: A history* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wagner, R. (1967, December 6). *The Forgotten Ones* [Letter to the Editor of The United Teacher]. United Federation of Teachers Records, Sub-series B: UFT Presidential Files of Albert Shanker, 1935-1996, Box 54, Folder 16. Wagner Labor Archives, Tamament Library, New York University, New York.
- Watson, H. (2002). Globalization as capitalism in the age of electronics: Issues of popular power, culture, revolution, and globalization from below. *Latin American Perspectives*, 29(6), 32-43.
- Wilcox, P. (1966a). *The controversy over I.S. 201 - One view and a proposal*. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 11, Folder 22. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1966b). Issues and answers - Black male principal. *Renewal*. October-November, pp. 5-6. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 10, Folder 17. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1966c). Is integration relevant? *Renewal*. August, 1966, pp. 3-4. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 13, Folder 4. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1966d). *The poor as a special interest group: A revised edition* [Original version, "The poor as a special interest group – Food for thought," September 12, 1965]. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 14, Folder 4. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1967a). The school and the community. *The Record – Teachers College*. November, 1967, Vol. 69, No.2, pp. 133-142. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 15, Folder

3. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1968a). *A letter: General principles on decentralization* [Unpublished letter to G. Bivins]. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 12, Folder 7. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1968b). *The meaning of community control*. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 13, Folder 14. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1969a). Education for Black liberation. *New Generation*. Vol. 51, No. 1, Winter, pp. 17-21. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 12, Folder 4. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1969b). Education for Black humanism: A way of approaching it. Published in *What Black educators are saying* (Nathan Wright, ed.) published by Hawthorn Books, 1970, pp. 3-17. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 12, Folder 3. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1970a, February 20). *On the way to school-community control: Some observations*, [Revised edition of "Community control: Some observations," published in *Foresight*, March 24, 1969, Detroit, MI]. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 11, Folder 15. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1970b). *An alternative to Black educational genocide*, [Prepared by request for a meeting of the National Board of Trustees of the National Urban League held in Kansas City, Missouri, May 11-12]. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 10, Folder 4. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1971, October 20). *Community control as a social movement*, [Unedited presentation to Fordham University's Urban Institute]. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 11, Folder 14. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1972a). *Preferences in school organization patterns - White-controlled school integration vs multi-cultural control*. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 14, Folder 6. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1972b). *Warden Shanker and the correction officers - The students as inmates*. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 16, Folder 17. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.
- Wilcox, P. (1972c). *Changing conceptions of community* [Published in *Educational Leadership*]. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 11, Folder 8. Schomberg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.

Wilcox, P. (Undated). *Community education center concept - A beginning statement*. Preston Wilcox Papers, Writings A-B, Box 11, Folder 16. Schomburg Center for Research on Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.

Williams, R. (1970). *American society: A sociological interpretation*. New York: Knopf.