

POWER AS A DIMENSION OF EDUCATION

--Dan W. Dodson

BIBLIOTECA
EL COLEGIO DE MEXICO

I: BACKGROUND

One of education's greatest weaknesses is its inability to close the gap between the newcomers who are naive, uneducated, and socially disorganized, and the remainder of the populace of our cities.

The significance of this problem becomes more apparent when we consider that there are today one million more people living in the slums of the cities of America than there are on our farms. It becomes doubly significant when one considers the need for bringing the underdeveloped sections of the world into participation in a space age. I am sure those who are working at this problem at home and abroad would agree with me that our progress toward this goal of "closing the gap" is torturously slow.

Neither would it be fair to say we have not demonstrated some capacity to deal with the issue. In the twenty-five years I have been at New York University, we have witnessed the ingestion of the Negro population, and now the Puerto Rican, and have seen the completion of the transmutation of the Jewish, Irish, Italian and Polish populations into respectable middle-class people ensconced in suburban residences. The situation is different today in that we do not have the time we had in pasteras to do this job.

III: THE ROLE OF POWER

It is in this context that I would like to examine the role of power in education. You will have to be patient with me if the use of the term is in contexts which seem fuzzy at times, for, like love, it is an all-pervasive term. Fundamentally, we say a person has power when he has ability to apply sanctions--either negative or positive. I think in education we would refer to these as rewards and punishments. A group has power when it has the capacity to make its interests felt as an impact in communal decision-making processes.

Most Americans think of power as a dirty word. We immediately recall Lord Acton's famous statement that "Power tends to corrupt. Absolute power corrupts absolutely." We have developed an aversion to the concept. However, power is neither moral nor immoral. It depends on how it is used. It is a necessary ingredient in social life--indeed in

life itself.

You ask what this has to do with education. I would submit the hypothesis that it would be impossible for a youth who is a member of a group which is powerless in the community to grow to maturity without some trauma to his perception of himself because of the compromised position of his group in communal life. If such a hypothesis is tenable, it has profound implications for education in our cities.

Our urban slum youth are characterized by mass apathy with its attendant low aspiration levels, and sense of individual alienation and lack of worth. It would be untrue to say that we have not served them, and served them well--so far as present or previous standards are concerned. New York City has built public housing until at present we have or soon shall have provided a public residence for over 600,000 people. Every thirteenth residence will shortly be city-owned. We have built a new seat in the schools for every third child since the war. We have expanded services galore. Not only have we supplied recreation services, we have provided youth workers to roam the streets, make contacts with these potentially delinquent youth, and try to steer them over the tempestuous years without criminal records. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not decrying what we have done. Maybe some of it has not been wise, but at least it indicates that by what lights we had, we tried. Undoubtedly what we have done is better than if we had done nothing. The point is, however, that I for one see no significant progress in what we are doing. I believe the reason lies in the issue of power.

While we have been willing to serve people, it has been at a price. Service has meant we have done things for people. We have not been willing to do things with people for this would have meant we would have to share power with them. This we were unwilling to do. If a youth wanted to come into the power relations of the community the rules were well-prescribed. First, some agency, the school, the settlement house, or the agency worker got him involved. They inspired him to take some stock in the so-called "American Way," i.e., to believe that if he worked hard, behaved right, and studied hard enough he would be recognized. This led to alienation from the subculture of which he was a part. He became ashamed of his background--every minority group in America has had to contend with the problem of its youth depreciating its own background and idealizing the culture of the dominant group. (Kurt Lewin, you will recall, advised the Jewish group to resort to education in Jewish culture to provide such youths with a "ground on which to stand" in order to make creative outreach to other groups.) These bright youths who were so involved were eventually transmuted into so-called "Ideal American"--which is to say they lost their identity with the groups of their heritage, and moved both psychologically and physically as far from it as possible. The settlement house walls are lined

in my community with the pictures of the greats they have served. They, and their constituents measured success by the number they have helped produce. By and large, those "Greats," however, no longer are identified with the groups or the neighborhoods out of which they come. What our programs have done is to siphon off the bright ones and help them individually, but leave the group itself as a residue to stew in its own problems. Hence we have never solved the problems of the slums. They stand as an institutionalized part of every American city, and the erosion of human resources of youths upon whom our programs did not "take" has been staggering.

If the hypothesis which I presented has validity, maybe the missing ingredient in our programs is that we have failed to help these groups to find leverages to power. Might it not be possible that if the group had some sense of power, some of this apathy, this resignation--this lowered-aspiration level would take care of itself? Maybe, instead of sharing so much wealth in the form of services, we should find ways of sharing power. Could it be possible that an alternative to all the use of psychiatric and psychological services by professionals the kinds call "head doctors" might be an identification with power which would help them overcome their sense of impotence?

I have been impressed that the Black Muslim movement makes its greatest appeal to the so-called "beat" segment of the Negro community. Here are youths who are alienated, apathetic, and withdrawn--victims of self-destructive behavior such as drug addiction, alcoholism, and sex perversion. Along comes this ideological movement, and these selfsame youths by some method "take power." No longer are they ashamed they are Negroes. No longer are they "beats." Granted their goals are anti-social as measured by our standards, what is demonstrated is that their problems are not those of ability, nor those of opportunity, but rather those of power.

In a like measure, consider this non-violence program in the South which has used the sit-in, kneel-in, squat-in, and wade-in techniques together with the Freedom Rides. A Spellman College student writes her parents of what I am talking about. Here is a middle-class Negro girl--caught up in the rounds of parties, and other trivia which Frazier described so well in Black Bourgeoisie. Perception of herself limited first because she is a youth, and they are themselves in all groups in a compromised relation to power; perception limited second because she is Negro. Then comes the sit-in. Her roommate is in jail. She has been to the jail to sing and pray to keep up the courage of those incarcerated. She writes her parents:

I can't explain the change this movement has brought upon me and the rest of the students. It's almost a physical

- 4 -

change. Everyone is so much closer to one another and everyone is so serious and determined to do this thing right. I myself have matured a great deal, for now I realize that I am getting older and there are decisions I must make for myself. I realize I can't run to Mama and Daddy every time I have a problem, or a decision to make. Life is not only fun and frolic any more. I don't value the frivolous things so much. There's more to life than parties, dances, clothes, boys and just fun. I am dead serious about this cause, and I am going to do everything I can to help out. We are not a bunch of hot-headed students on a new fad, but we are young adults, who are fighting something that should have been conquered long ago.

In a like measure one of the white students who got involved through the Christian Student Movement stated that heretofore they had been, as an organization on his campus, an esoteric little group, meeting in piety, and contemplating the navel. They were referred to as the "God Squad." Then comes the involvement in the sit-in and they begin to challenge the power patterns of the community. As they took power and experienced the sobering influence of using it, their concern changed from "Is there a God?" to "God help us!"

So far I have talked about the minority, the child from the slums of the cities. May not the same pattern of power cut across all the other sections of the community? Children in a family know which among them have power and which do not. Children in school know who has power and who doesn't. Some study has shown that the teachers who have discipline problems tend to be the ones the kids know are not in solid with the principal.

III: SOME EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

These illustrations were recited in some detail to indicate the role which power plays in personality development. There are many educational issues which I believe are implicit in this position.

There is a need to re-examine many dominating concepts in present educational practice. I will mention just a few of them.

Social class, as it relates to education and educative processes. In recent years, we have almost substituted social determinism for I.Q. determinism in education. We characterize the lower social class child

among other things as having low aspirations, as being apathetic, and as being overt in his aggressions. We characterize the minority group child as having a "chip on the shoulder" and usually identify him with the lower classes. The question I would raise is whether these behavior patterns stem from social class or from the feeling of the person because of his conception of his relation to power. Low aspiration is not the unique province of lower social class people. A recent study of Scarsdale, N. Y., one of our highest socio-economic suburbs, indicated that the youths of the community were very high in I.Q. In fact, the upper fifty per cent of the children rank as high on I.Q. performance as the upper ten per cent of the remainder of the nation. The entire student body ranks higher than the upper fifty per cent of the remainder of the nation. Yet these children make C in college with the average of the nation's youth. I believe the reason for this is to be found in the perception such children develop of themselves in such a milieu. Power in the school is measured in terms of making grades. In such competitive situations, many with high levels of ability become traumatized because of their impotence in such a rarified academic atmosphere. As a consequence they resign in apathy. This self-perception is not helped by the fact that they are children of parents who have power, i.e., they have succeeded and are alters against which the children must measure their own egos. Hence the children see themselves in relation to their parents as **impotent** people.

It seems to me a case could be made that people tend to react to their powerlessness in two ways. The first is to overcompensate. Adler based his whole psychology on this concept. He said the child sees himself as impotent, because of his physical and mental immaturity. Hence the dynamisms of personality stem from the attempt to overcome this limitation. We recognize this drive in many, many people--both youths and adults. On the other hand, what Adler did not make provision for was apathy on the part of those who despair that the effort is worthwhile. I believe a case could be made that instead of class being the determinant of which road a person shall take, it is more related to where he finds himself in the power-relations of those about him. In normal relationships, a youth fights back and overcompensates and makes his insecurity with regard to power the stepping stone to his development. In an increasing number of others, not restricted to social class or race, there is a growing tendency to resign in apathy.

Group self-hate. One of the phenomena we have been dealing with during the past several years is that of group self-hate. A youth becomes alienated from his group and aspires toward the values of the dominant group. Every minority group has been baffled with this problem as it has come into the main stream of American life. The explanation for it

has been related to factors intrinsic to the group. One sees many ramifications of it in everyday life. However much one may agree with the Supreme Court ruling on desegregated education, as I most certainly do, it is difficult not to feel sometimes that the compulsiveness of minority leadership to banish de facto segregation in the North stems from a feeling that anything that is all-Negro is ipso facto inferior. I might add that such is frequently and most often the case, but need not always be so. Could not a case be made that group self-hate stems more from the unequal positions of the groups with regard to power, than from the fact that one is majority and the other minority. In fact, as minority groups acquire power, there seems to be a tendency toward self-segregation. Lenski's current study of Detroit indicates that in all but two of the twelve areas of the city, one or another of the four (i.e., white Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Negro Protestant) socio-religious groups constituted a majority of the residential population. Negro Protestants in both halves of the inner city, Catholics in the outer East Side and the Southern suburbs, the Jewish highly concentrated in the Central section of the city west of Woodward Avenue, and the white Protestants constituting a majority in the remainder of the outer sections. The Jewish group which was highest in socio-economic status of all groups in the city, and who presumably could have moved to any section they chose, with the possible exception of Grosse Pointe, were more concentrated than were the Negroes who were the most restricted of any group as to where they could move. I believe this suggests that there is a direct correlation between where the group finds itself in the power-ordering of the community, and the desire for non-segregative associations.

This phenomenon cuts across many kinds of groups. The same tendency to depreciate one's own group and aspire toward identity with the dominant group is seen in youth in relation to their attitudes toward adults, women in their attitudes toward men, Jewish in their attitudes toward Gentiles, and practically every minority group of nationality background toward the dominant culture.

Educational Policy. Another impact of power on education is that of educational policy. It has long been said that the school system is the handmaiden of the power group of the community. Sociological analysis in recent years has shown how the so-called "power structure" of the community operates. Floyd Hunter's study of Atlanta, Georgia, indicated that there were about thirty men at the top of the pinnacle of power in the community. The school superintendent was not one of them. He called the tune to which the community danced. To succeed in almost any type of community leadership, one had to have his radar tuned into what they wanted and not challenge the power structure.

This type of community status-ordering is well known and can be described by almost any successful school superintendent. What is

still not clear is the difference this pattern of operation makes on the educational process. Studies of pressure groups such as the American Legion have documented one type of problem in textbook selection. Another has been documented by Neal Gross and others as they have compared the concept of the role of the superintendency as viewed by the superintendent of schools and the school boards.

A dimension which has not been explored, however, is that of method of procedure. A dominant power group in the community moves through integrative procedures. Since they set the rules, they would like to have those who would partake of power move through their orderly procedures to make themselves worthy of recognition. The groups with compromised power positions tend to move through conflict. Hence, people in power can't understand when their youths, their minority groups, or the labor groups resort to such "terrible" tactics to change the patterns of relationships.

That the school is geared to this dominant power pattern no one can seriously doubt. From teacher-training institutions to the lowliest classrooms we are experimenting with group dynamics, group process, and other such "gimmicks" to achieve integrative behaviors. Most of us carry around in our heads the great vision of Micah of the day when "The swords would be beat into plowshares and the spears into pruning hooks and men will lay down their arms and study war no more." While we had better find a substitute for war as a means of settling disputes, you and I know that if there is freedom in a society, there is going to be some conflict. You cannot have freedom and not have differences. You cannot have differences and not have groups form around them and some conflict ensue. In fact, a case could be made that some conflict is the hallmark of a free society.

When I go into a school and the principal tells me "We have no problems," I know one of three things is wrong. First, he is lying-- which is often the case. Second, he is not perceptive enough to know a problem when he sees it. This is sometimes the case. Or third, he is so authoritarian that he does not allow freedom enough for problems to come to the surface. Our problem is to deal with conflict in such manner that it does not become stultifying and destructive. A case could be made that these points of tension and conflict are the cutting edges in a free society. That we emphasize the integrative behavior and scorn the conflict pattern is indicative of the extent we as educators identify with the power structure of the community. That we do not get the children who are outside the pale of power to play at our game is indicated by the small amount of mileage we get out of them in the classrooms. We expect the children of the powerless to compete on rules laid out by the powerful. This they cannot or will not do. A labor union could never be organized by Roberts' Rules of Order. Neither can the powerless compete in integrative behavior where the rules are laid down by the powerful.

IV: METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF POWER

I would like to conclude this brief and inadequate **statement** by discussing some of the implications of power for educational method.

Identification with power. The first is the tendency to identify with power. I was impressed by a statement prepared by Mark Shadron, who works in one of the custodial homes for problem boys. Says he:

They see themselves as worthless people with little power, therefore they have little value.

Salvation means to be in control, to have ultimate power. The perfect situation, heaven, is to tell others what to do and to make them hurt.

In almost any correctional institution there will be a group of inmates who want to become clergymen. The motivation of this group . . . presents a fascinating image of what they consider a clergyman to be. One lad wanted to be a clergyman because a clergyman had no temptations and, therefore, did not get into trouble. To be a clergyman would be insurance against being arrested. Another individual wanted to be a clergyman in one of the larger communities because a clergyman always owned a new Buick, had a beautiful wife, a home and two children.

In general, clergymen have status with powerful people. They can talk with the warden on even terms and they are supposed to have influence with parole boards. They have a soft job and a pipeline straight to God. In the idiom of the institution, the clergyman is a con man with built-in protection, a person to be admired.

I believe the entire study of the Authoritarian personality should be reinterpreted in the context of power. The rigidity of personality in relation to change, seems to me to be more of a fear of losing a security with relation to a power structure than it is a mere resistance to change. It is interesting in this regard, to examine the anxiety we have about becoming the second most powerful nation. Far and beyond the danger we have of being attacked seems to be fear of loss of prestige, and that our allies might turn out to be "rice Christians" and desert us should another, more powerful nation come along.

What about our classrooms? Have you ever watched as teachers have changed the decisions of children by letting them know where they,

the authority figures, stood? Have you ever watched children wait to express an opinion until they found out how the teacher stood, and then went the way she did? Is it possible that our classrooms are really training places for "other-directedness" where children's training is how to keep their radar of life tuned in on the power so they can go the way it does?

In community affairs a comparable thing happens. In the integration of minority persons in employment the greatest single predictor of success is "How does the boss stand?" If the boss takes a firm, positive stand, there is likely to be little trouble. If he vacillates, there is almost sure to be trouble. At the political level it is interesting to note that in desegregation of public education three states had curiously different experiences. The three states were Arkansas, Tennessee and Kentucky. They are very similar. All are relatively small. All have mountainous areas with few Negroes. All have large cities with larger Negro populations. Two desegregated almost without incident. The other produced the fiasco of Little Rock. What was the difference? I believe the difference was in the political aspirations of the three governors, who tipped the scales with their power. In Tennessee and Kentucky when the desegregation issue arose the governors were both aspirants for either the presidential or vice-presidential nominations of their parties. In the other there was no such possibility of recognition. Hence two went one way and the other went the opposite. Perhaps the easiest way to desegregate education in the South would be to make all the governors of the states involved presidential candidates. It does indicate the role of power, and the problem educationally of training a generation of youth who possess sufficient autonomy that they do not sell their birthright of freedom by identifying irrationally with power for power's sake.

How train to take power. One of the most baffling problems is how to get people to take power. William H. Whyte has written tellingly of the generation which wants to work in jobs where they do not have to assume power. To the present we have no formula in community relations for getting people to take power save that of the old Union organizer who went into the plant and capitalized on the frustrations and discontent until people got so mad they took power. Usually this organization of the plant was the prelude to a long destructive conflict between labor and management. Sometimes the organizer had to be outlived and a new specialist represent the union before the stultification of the conflict could be overcome.

One thing is clear. Power cannot be bestowed on a person or a group. It must be taken. The chairman of the housing committee of a community organization which I studied in Chelsea on Manhattan's West Side said it best. He noted that the Puerto Ricans were much more

numerous than were the old-timers whom they were replacing. He said he knew that ultimately they would have to take over. He gave them every chance, he said. But, "In the last analysis, they had to take the power. I couldn't give it to them."

Too often when power is taken, those in ascendancy feel they have to remove those who dominated them previously in order to prove their own security in the new role. This is Africa today in many respects.

What are we doing in our classrooms to teach children to take power? Do we concentrate on the withdrawn, the apathetic ones, and encourage them to challenge the informal power structure which is the group, or do we "kow tow" to the power structure of the group and reinforce what is? Professor Rath's studies seem to indicate that we do the latter. Do we see the conflict which emerges from the interactive processes of the student body as "goodness" potentially, or do we see it as something disruptive of our attempts to strengthen synaptic connections? Do we see the first fumbling steps of those who have been powerless as they strike out as goodness? Or are we annoyed by it? I had a woman who teaches in Richmond say, "I tell my children never to go to the back of the bus to sit. After all we have sacrificed to make it possible for them to sit front they should take advantage of it." To that woman, where she sits on a bus will never be an unemotional matter. Most of us do not see the drama of this as she reaffirms the faith we are supposed to have. "That all people chafe under oppression," and that all people value freedom. We only see it as pushiness. Are we any different in our perceptions of what is happening in classrooms? Too many of us have not the capacity to stand in the middle of such drama and see the goodness of it..

I have talked mostly about minority groups and the problems related to their education. That is because this is my field. I suspect we could equally illustrate the things we are talking about from many other aspects of society. A parent who holds a tremendously important position in industry called me regarding his son. The youth had been advised to stay out of college for a year at the end of his sophomore year because of his grades. He has all the potentialities which the I.Q. prognoses, Science Talent search, and the others predict. However, as compared to his father who is so important, he sees himself as impotent. His father can stack advantages around him until they "run out of his ears," but he can't give him power. He has to take it. Which one of us is there who hasn't stood in the presence of countless numbers of such youths, and felt so humble that we could not somehow get them to take power? Isn't this the real education frontier?

The ethics of power. The next issue of educational methodology will relate to values. Power to what end, I would ask. Too many want power so they can manipulate others. Some chafe under the yoke of imposed

power and try to extricate themselves only so they can dominate others. Unless power is sought and used to moral ends, there can be little rational ground for its support. For instance, if a minority group seeks power merely to suppress others, then members of all other groups had best beware lest they themselves become the victims. If, on the other hand, power is sought and used to uphold moral principles, then there is no such thing as minority-majority group, the power striving is moved from private privilege to principle, and all can support it.

Another dimension of the ethics of power relates to the mechanisms through which it is regulated. The history of democracies is the continuous process of socialization of power which was abused and used to arbitrary and capricious ends. When corporations abused their power we regulated their behavior by a Sherman Anti-Trust Act. When Interstate Commerce abused its power we developed the Interstate Commerce Commission. When employers abused their powers by denying all groups access to employment we developed the Fair Employment Practice Laws, which now covers almost two-thirds of the people of the United States. When labor abused its powers we developed the Taft-Hartley Act.

The issue for education in this regard is "How do we help youths learn how to curb power abuses?" Are classrooms laboratories for training in this dimension of citizenship? How do we train youths to take and use power to moral or social ends rather than to personal and arbitrary ends. I was impressed that these sit-in kids, who had either not read Floyd Hunter's book, or else did not believe him, went into the very town he studied--Atlanta, Georgia--and restructured time-honored relations between races through non-violent techniques. They demonstrated that all power is not in a socially-ordered elite. There is power in moral position. There is power in the fact that one is a human being. If one only knows how to use it.

Community and power. The last issue relates to school and community. It is painfully obvious that youths learn more from what the pitch of power is in the community, than they do from schools, when it comes to citizenship. Most of the studies will show, I believe, that the further youths go in school the less they subscribe to what are usually considered basic human rights statements. Remmers polls show that there is a drop with each succeeding year of high school in their acceptance of such statements. Practically all the studies show that the school life itself is strongly partial to those who are in the power groups. The climate of the community out-educates the educators. Yet, the teaching profession, which has the responsibility for the growth and development of the nation's youths use school buildings by and large as sanctuaries in which to hide from community rather than using them as "gateways" to community life. Once we get inside these buildings we "play dolls" and mistake the doll-playing for reality.

As I look at the school in this era when the big issues of education are being determined, issues such as who shall go to school with whom (de facto segregation, etc.); what shall be the relation between the church and the state especially as it relates to how Christmas shall be observed or whether there shall be prayers opening the school day; issues like whether we shall mold this generation of youth to what is the current conception of what is national purpose rather than the traditional pattern of helping each achieve that which is unique to himself in the belief that national purpose is best served when this is done well; pressures on youths to make grades, not because of academic curiosity, but rather to make the parents look good in the eyes of the middle-class neighbors and other such materialistic patterns of a conforming culture; I ask myself where are the educators? What is the social role of the man of knowledge? Does his responsibility not also include taking power? Does his responsibility not include using these power-problems of community and school life as raw meat of the educative process? Are educators, who presumably are public servants and accountable to all the people, simply the handmaidens of the dominant group, and consequently mortgaged to an educative process which is integrative and alienating to all who come from the power-compromised groups who wish to partake of education? (In fact, could not a good case be made that all education in our Western culture is alienating?) As I was writing this statement, an article by Edward R. Murrow released by the Associated Press indicated that we should bring fewer foreign students here, and try to do a different job with them, for by the time they had studied here, they did not want to go home. Is this not our predicament in the world today? By the time those we have educated, whether they are ours or those from abroad, are through, they are alienated in their sentiments and sympathies from the main stream of humanity. They are unable to relate to peoples abroad when they go as our emissaries, hence in an era when we have demonstrated that we could literally abolish poverty from the globe by our technology, we have lost the allegiances of over half the peoples of the world to our way of life. Are not the seeds of the difficulty in almost every classroom of America? Is it not to be found in the value-premium we set on identification with power? Are not the educators the outstanding surrogates of this type of values?

In the era into which we are emerging, I would submit to you that raw force as a means of control is rapidly on the wane. Britain could maintain peace in the world because of her force in an empire on which the sun never set. We eclipsed Britain with the explosion of the Bomb of Hiroshima. Soon, however, Russia had the bomb. Ere long, Britain, and now France, have it. Soon the smallest nation among us will have enough force to blow the rest of us off the map. Hence the great urgency is two-fold; first, to learn to operate through shared power. Our pluralistic society should give us a lot of experience in this regard,

but we have a long way to go. Second, we must learn to substitute moral position for force as a dimension of power. Surely our classrooms should be training grounds in both dimensions of citizenship.

I would like to say in conclusion that I well understand that there is no single gimmick which is the answer to all problems. I would not like to leave the impression that power is everything. I would urge that, while we are so preoccupied with the vast plethora of educational gimmicks ranging from teaching machines to "psyche tinkering," we not use these as escapes from coming to grips with the basic issues which are main-stream. Gadgets and special services may be necessary for a few, and may lighten the learning process for the many, but fundamentally there is no royal road to learning. The basic issue is motivation. It is not that of more or better gadgets, or greater potentials in the materials with which we work, as important as these may be. It cannot be divorced from the perception the person has of himself. It is doubtful if perception of self can be divorced from the perception one has of himself with relation to power. May this not become a fruitful area for educational research and experimentation?

ARTICLE II
PURPOSE & SCOPE

SECTION 1. The purposes of the Corporation are set forth in the articles of Incorporation, and among these is, "to put into action the good will of those who live and work in the Neighborhood; the Corporation is founded on a confidence in the ability of the Neighborhood's residents and workers to act effectively in promoting their own welfare and happiness; and it expects to be the effective servant of, by, and for all the citizens of the Neighborhood.

ARTICLE III

Dan W. Dodson is Director of the Center for Human Relations and Community Studies at New York University. He is also Editor-in-Chief of The Journal of Educational Sociology.

SECTION 1. MEMBERSHIP. The following are eligible to membership in the Corporation, according to the Articles of Incorporation: all residents of the Neighborhood above ten years of age or over; all who have regular employment in the Neighborhood; all who are employed by the Corporation; all who support or participate in the activities of the Corporation; all who are duly elected by the Neighborhood Assembly; and all charter members.

A "resident" is hereby defined as one whose regular residence is unoccupied when the absence of the individual is heretofore described.

"All those who have regular employment" applies to employees, workers and others who make their occupation within the Neighborhood, and who spend at least half their working hours therein.