

17121

A HARD LOOK AT CITIES AND URBAN STUDIES*

(5163)

by
Dan W. Dodson, Director
Center for Human Relations and Community Studies
New York University

BIBLIOTECA
COLEGIO DE MEXICO

This learned society would be remiss in its social obligations to the day and age, were it to go from this meeting without a serious consideration of the issues in which it has an equity stemming from the riots and other serious disturbances of the past two summers in the large cities. We meet in the sequela of the Los Angeles riot in which more than thirty persons were killed, and more than \$175,000,000 worth of property has been destroyed. We cannot abdicate our responsibilities as presumed "men of knowledge" and shut our eyes to the human condition of which these conflicts are mere manifestations, without experiencing for ourselves dry rot morally and sterility both professionally and academically.

The large cities are today the places of the great encounters over those issues which are at the heart of our democratic society. They are the places where the new designs in social relationships are being forged. If the sociologist is to be relevant to the era of which he is a part, he too, must come to the encounter with the city and the issues which it poses. It will not make much difference for instance whether the city is seen as a social system in the years ahead; it will make a lot of difference whether it is seen in its shifting power relationships. It would make a lot of difference if some of the brilliant talent of this Society could be sufficiently innovative to assist in better understanding how to relate to these teeming concentrations of people to each other. It would be presumptuous to review the empirical data relating to cities. If collection and analysis of such data could have solved their problems, we would have long since "had it made." A casual examination of cities individually or collectively would suggest the deeper underlying causes of which the present tensions are but symptoms:

1) The city is rapidly becoming the locale for ghettoizing "The Other America."¹ to use Harrington's colorful phrase.

The revolution in agriculture has driven millions of marginal people from the farms to the cities. Unlike other mass migrations, these marginal people are of native stock, native language, and are American Citizens. A large segment of this new in-migration is Negro, hence, is identifiable. This means the problems relating to his assimilation cannot be hidden by his escaping identity, as happened with previous migrations.

Another aspect of this modern encounter differs from the past. In the previous in-migrations there were succeeding incoming groups which pushed the predecessors of the slums higher up the socio-economic scale.

* Paper presented at Am. Sociol. Ass. Convention on September 2, 1965, at a section meeting on cities.

¹Harrington, Michael, The Other America, N. Y., MacMillan, 1962.

301.34
C734

Sociologists referred to this as invasion and succession when it involved demographic factors. Thus the Irish profited from the in-migration of the Jewish and Polish groups, the Jews from the in-migration of the Italian, and the Italian from the arrival in the city of the Negroes. Of all the previous groups there was always a group beneath them. With the most recent arrivals, the Negroes, there are no groups below--thanks to the cessation of migration. Hence, the social status ordering threatens to become hardened and become a caste pattern.

The color is like the isotope in the blood stream. It places a tracer on the problems of the society to make sure they are not hidden. Another reason they cannot be hidden is that the city has become the locale where most of these encounters are now taking place. The hidden problems of the plantations and rural by-ways are now on Main Street, U.S.A. in full view of not only the enlightened citizenry of our own country, but of the world to see.

Hence, problems which we never solved with other groups because they escaped identity into broad streams, or else hid on the plantations, are now crying for solution. We are at the encounter with them in the most dynamic spot of America, in the core of these metropolitan concentrations.

There is another dimension to this ghettoized "other America" which is different to the other experiences of the past. We come to this encounter at the time of greatest automation and mechanization of industrial production of all time. We face the issue of not only how to desegregate and integrate minority groups into the main stream of life, but also how to integrate all youths--particularly those without specialized skills--into the labor market. On both counts the city becomes the milieu in which the problem is to be met. It becomes the central concentration of those populations for which the society has no program.

The enormity of the issue staggers the imagination. One simple figure will suffice to indicate its nature. Between 1950 and 1960 New York City lost a middle class white population almost the size of Washington, D.C. and gained in its place an ethnically identifiable, largely lower socio-economic status group of Negroes and Puerto Ricans about the size of Pittsburgh, Pa. and lost 110,000 population. It should be pointed out that this out-migration did not start in 1950 nor did it stop in 1960. The city school system still loses about 4,000 white children per year in the exchange between Negro children transferring into the city numbering about 20,000 and the transfer out of 16,000 whites.

A question might be asked concerning the concept of the core city as a ghetto. The ghettos of the city have always been with us. The Lower East Side in New York, Halsted Street in Chicago, the Chinatowns of almost all large western cities, illustrate the pattern of the past. The ghettos of the present era are different, because of their size in relation to the remainder of the core city. New, N.J., for instance, did not have a neighborhood less than 25 years old at the war's end. Hence, when the post-war out-migration started the entire city was ripe for change. Between 1950 and 1960 she lost 25 per cent of her white population and gained 107 per cent in her ethnically identifiable groups.

Cleveland, Ohio lost over 18 per cent of her white population in the core city in the same ten-year interim, and gained a quarter of a million or approximately 70 per cent in the Negro group. These data suggest that the core city is rapidly becoming a ghetto to encompass the marginal and the disadvantaged for the total of the society.

2) All large cities are faced with severe financial problems. This gain of high welfare cost populations and the loss to the suburbs of low welfare cost populations has brought such an attrition of resource what these communities are all in serious financial difficulties. All of them have by-passed their statehouses and gone to Washington for funds with which to meet their problems. The shift of population from the rural to the city has been so great that inequities caused by it have triggered the Supreme Court ruling of "One man, one vote."

To use New York and her environs again as the illustration, New York City spent the equivalent of approximately \$1,100 per child on welfare services other than education in contrast to Nassau County where the expenditure was some \$325.00. The school system of New York City deteriorated in its competitive position with the suburbs to the point that it is conservatively estimated that it would take one-fifth billion dollars per year additional to bring her back to the competitive status of 1940.

At the same time that low welfare cost populations are moving from the inner cities, there is a deliberate attempt to keep the minority group encapsulated within the core area and at the same time siphon off the industries which do not contaminate suburbs, and which add to their tax base. Mahwah, N.J. stands as a classic example. They induced the Ford Motor Company to build their new plant in that community. As soon as the contract was signed, which would add 50% to the tax base of the community, the city fathers passed a zoning ordinance to the effect that one could not build residences in the community on sites less than an acre in size. This has since been raised to two acres. Hence one cannot build there for less than \$30,000. The community, then has the increment in taxes from the plant, but has none of the responsibility for the industrial population which works there. They are encapsulated in the core cities of New York City, Newark, N.J., and Paterson, N.J. The 5000 people who work there meet the commuters who live there twice each day as they interchange on Route 17. On almost any arterial route into the city one can observe the two-way traffic as those who come into the city to man the filing cabinets interchange with the residents who are commuting in car pools to the industries in the suburbs. This financial aspect of the city, and its inability to financially provide a quality of encounter as peoples come together, is one of the greatest issues before the American people.

3) All large cities are increasingly "muscle bound in their own rituals" as bureaucratization stifles their capacity for flexibility in meeting new needs. The Policeman's Benevolent Association becomes a power bloc in New York City with sufficient leverage to prevent any review or reform within the law enforcement organization. The teachers organization becomes a vested interest in education which precludes assigning teachers to areas of need and makes impossible the orchestration of resources with-

in the personnel to serve the needs of the community. The use of the school plants to provide after school or community programs is determined more largely by whether power arrangements can be made with the custodians than whether the needs are paramount. To these could be added the bureaucracies of welfare, health and transportation as growing power interests which determine ends to be sought in program rather than instrumentalities for achieving ends.

Closely related to these factors of bureaucratization are the subterfuges which are used to by-pass such structures which are difficult to reform. Many years ago the failure of the school to provide programs for youths was apparent. It was easier in New York to establish a Youth Board than to require that the school reform its program. Now programs such as Mobilization For Youth, and HARYOU are easier to start than it is to reform the Youth Board to make it do what it was designed because the schools had faulted on their responsibility. No programs of government today are used as leverages to get existing bureaucracies to alter themselves. Hence, the pyramiding of agency upon agency creates a no-man's land jungle of social enterprises.

4) The large cities are rapidly losing whatever consensus they possessed which provided a basis of authority in policy-making. This is a hard factor to define, but exists, no less. It is implied in the frequent statement that New York City cannot be governed, it can only be administered. In part it is what perhaps Parsons^{2/} is discussing when he talks about value orientations. In part it is what Cantril^{3/} is talking about when he discusses faith in the system. Primarily, government requires a degree of consensus on basic values, on procedural matters, and basic norms. It requires more. It requires some confidence in the system itself, as to its fairness, and its ability to deliver on the hopes of the people.

The institutional structures of the society must inculcate the collective meanings into the lives of the young in such a way that they become operable for them. This major principle in our society is what might be called "the American Way." It says in effect that each will be rewarded according to his ability and his initiative. As long as there is faith in the system people subvert their own interests and frustrations in the hope that if they do not make it at least their children will. Lynd, it will be remembered, quoted the taxi driver in Middletown as stating his faith. What happens when a large segment of the society does not believe in these mythologies of the dominant society any longer? In the Negro group particularly, the behavior of the riots are not understandable outside this sense of loss of faith in the basic ideologies of the dominant group. It will undoubtedly grow in dimensions as a problem so long as the cities are the concentrations of those for whom the dream

2/ T. Parsons, Talcott, Structure and Process In Modern Societies (Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1960, p. 172

3/ Cantril, Hadley, The Politics of Despair, (N.Y. Basic Books, 1958)

is no longer vivid enough to warrant investing a life in.*

This means there is less and less of what Karl Deutsch^{4/} has called the will to pursue collective goals. Were the mass culture not so pervasive, which produces a certain amount of coercion and uniformity, this would be a more serious factor than it is at present. Except for broad basic issues, there is little consensus concerning public policy. Hence, administration of city government is determined by pressure groups, power tactics, and publicity. For example, problems of the slums cannot be corrected without riots to dramatize the issues concerning them. School desegregation cannot be achieved in this city in which we are meeting, for instance, without a "raw meat" confrontation between power interests.

5) The cities' housekeeping is an increasing problem. Air pollution, for instance, is reaching staggering proportions. One estimate suggests that the amount of noxious substance inhaled on an average day in New York City is the equivalent to smoking sixteen cigarettes. On the worst days this probably means the equivalent of smoking more than a pack of cigarettes. There seems to be no surcease on this matter. Unless atomic energy reduces the amount of gasoline used and fuel oil burned in buildings and industrial plants, the cities may succumb from their own contamination of their nests.

A comparable housekeeping factor is transit. One need only examine traffic patterns of any large community to indicate the severity of this problem. The logistics of getting millions of people to work stations in the inner city within thirty minutes of each other and transporting them back to their residence within the same span of time during a day suggests the impossibility of solution of this problem. As an ex-commuter, vividness of this problem is brought home by one's own experience. At the small station, it was not uncommon to have 25 commuters

* Here one should understand that not all Negroes are caught up in this pattern of hopelessness. Roy Wilkins, executive-secretary of the NAACP, wrote "the teenage hoodlums of New York City are undercutting and wrecking the gains made by the hundreds of Negroes and white youngsters who went to jail for human rights."

It should be clear that Wilkins and those who have worked through integration procedures, believe the system worth trying to save, and that their hope for the future involves working through the system rather than trying to destroy it. One cannot observe the psychological disengagement which has taken place within the past decade in the Negro community, and not feel the sense of rejection which has accompanied the loss of faith in what is thought to be the white man's (Mr. Whitey) mythologies on which our collective life rests.

^{4/} Deutsch, Karl, Nationalism and Social Communication, N.Y. John Wiley, 1953, p. 151

for the 7:45 train, 125 for the 8:20 which arrived at Grand Central Station at 9:00, and perhaps 4 for the 8:40 which arrived at Grand Central at 9:25. This means whether the transportation is by public conveyance or private, there is an enormous capital investment in transportation equipment which is idle except for perhaps two to three hours per day.

A closely related problem is that of sewage and waste disposal. The unwillingness to control waste treatment means that pollution has robbed communities of large segments of their recreational facilities so far as recreation on water is concerned. The Great Lakes are rapidly becoming cesspools, the rivers sewage ditches, and the beaches health hazards.

6) The associational relations in city life are increasingly segregated and rapidly losing those qualities which might be referred to as "human." The migration of white populations to suburbs leaving the minorities concentrated in the inner or core cities has led to what the mayor of Philadelphia has referred to as a "white noose around his neck." The withdrawal of the white population from the encounter with the newcomers and the sense of rejection implied, engenders senses of hostility which have to be understood if the riots of Rochester, New York City, Chicago, and more recently Los Angeles are to be comprehended.

The inability of the city to finance services plus the housing segregation and discrimination have created ghetto situations which so alarmed Conant^{5/} when he studied the disparity of educational opportunity between the slum and the suburbs that he referred to the tensions that were building up as "social dynamite." The prediction of 1961 came true two years later. How complete the middle class withdrawal from the interracial encounter has become is suggested by the statement made by a member of the Jewish Community Council of Cleveland in 1963 to the effect that so far as they could tell, not a single Jewish youngster would finish the Cleveland public high schools that year. (This is mentioned not to disparage the Jewish segment of the population, for it tends to remain in the encounter longer than most others. It is simply to provide data on a middle class segment of the community on which we have information.) These factors have to be understood as an aspect of modern urban living.

Another dimension of this associational pattern is what is happening to traditional institutional life. The family, for instance, has always tended to be disorganized, but in vast areas of urban life today, the traditional "two adult" household is atypical. Clark found in the central Harlem area an ordinarily high per cent of the households were "one adult" institutions. In this same area approximately every fourth child is born out of wedlock and every tenth child known to the courts either as delinquent or neglected. Obviously this neighborhood of the largest of the metropolitan complexes represents the most distorted aspect of urban life, but it is different only in degree, not in kind, to other ghetto areas of New York City and the other large cities.

5/ Conant, James E., Slums and Suburbs, (N.Y. McGraw Hill, 1961)

6/ Clark, Robert E. and Pava, Sylvia, Urban Society, (Fifth ed. 1966)

7/ Mumford, Lewis, The City in History, N.Y. Harcourt, Brace and World,

No one needed to come to a sociological convention to have these facts presented. They are commonplace from one source or another. The issues they present relate much more to how the city is to be placed in the scope and theory of social organization. Some have complained that the social theorists of our day are rural and small town in background and are prejudiced toward the city. This charge has led to the title of a passage in one of the more popular urban sociology texts titled "Are Cities Un-American?"^{6/}

One noted urban planner Lewis Mumford has conceived the function of cities as performing the great civilizing role in history.^{7/} They took the poor, the humble, the rejected, the uncouth, and brought them to the great encounters which in X + 1 or 2 generations usually transmuted them into urbane, sophisticated peoples. This great civilizing function, however, has tended to bog down in many of the past civilizations because the cities attracted such large numbers of marginal populations that the community froze the process and refused to integrate the newcomers purposively into its common life. Hence, to keep down tension, the previous civilizations have attempted to keep such populations amused and thereby tranquilized to the end that this "bread and circus" approach brought such an attrition of resource that the civilizations fell of their own weight.

There are conservatively estimated to be a million more people living in the slums of the large cities of America today than live on all the farms. It is also estimated that there are perhaps a million more yet to be expelled from agriculture and sent to these urban places.

The lack of integration of these populations into the common life of the community in America is today an internationally known scandal. The poverty program despite all its fine phrases and ideologies is basically an attempt to control the tension in these metropolitan communities. One of the crucial issues facing us today is whether this resource will be merely "bread and circus" designed to tranquilize marginal people sufficiently to keep them content in Egypt so they will not seek the "Promised Land" or whether the resource will be used to stimulate people to shake off their apathy and assist them in moving toward a position as peers with other power segments of the society and their ultimate integration. Such evidence as is available from the Lower East Side of New York City and Rochester, New York, suggests that no federal funds will be used which challenge the local political power arrangements, and that any initiative and autonomy of action will have to fit within the local power order. Unless this basic impasse can be resolved, there seems little hope that federal programs will do more than what traditional welfare has done throughout history--that is, play a tranquilizing role. Be this as it may, America is today in many respects at the testing point, as to whether her cities will fulfil Mumford's concept of their mission.

^{6/} Gist, Noel P. and Fava, Sylvia Fleis, Urban Society, (Fifth ed. 1964)
^{7/} Mumford, Lewis, The City In History, N.Y. Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

A second interpretation of the city is a more recent one from the theologian Harvey C. Cox.^{8/} Cox's conception is that the role of the city is to desacralize and demythologize people who come from small town, more provincial, more tribal, more dogmatic types of ideological orientations. Here he would not be talking about "secularism" as an ideology but a continuous process of secularization. The function of the city in this conception would suggest separate groups working as teams toward autonomous goals limited only at the points at which they would interfere with the rights of others, searching-not for ultimate answers-but for pragmatic programs. This process, he would contend, provides a true basis for pluralism, and is the true goal of the Technopolis.

Be these goals of cities as they may, it should be pointed out that they are not the conceptualizations of sociologists by and large they are the fruits of broader views and less academically circumscribed orientations.

The city and the sociology of knowledge. A hard look at the cities, for a sociologist, could not be finished without some look at the research about them. With great charity to ones self and his colleagues in the discipline, a case could be made that the fruits of our research could be characterized as great quantity of data production and analysis and a great limitation of conceptualization. The early studies dealt with the ecology of the city. This taxonomy allowed one to locate precisely where which phenomena could be found. It gave little direction that was fruitful in dealing with the problems. The study of the bureaucracy has been scintillating but offers little guidance on dealing with it as an urban phenomenon. The same could be said of the studies of social disorganization including crime, divorce, health, and the others. Studies of social class have contributed more to reinforcing stereotypes of groups toward each other than have they offered guidelines for dealing with status problems.

The studies of the large cities have been monumental. The Harvard study^{9/} of New York City, Gottman of the Megalopolis^{10/} and the varied others are indicative of the time and energy which have gone into examination of this social phenomena. One almost gets the impression, however, that the researchers were seduced by their researches to the point that they were more concerned with getting the sand out of the gears of the bureaucracies than with coming to grips with the basic issue of conceptualizing the city in modern life. One is reminded of Mannheim's reference to the men of scholarship when he quoted Nietzsche, "I have forgotten why I ever began."

^{8/} Cox, Harvey, The Secular City, N.Y. The Macmillan Co., 1965.

^{9/} Vernon, Raymond, et.al., Anatomy of A Metropolis, Garden City, N.Y. Doubleday, 1962 and eight other books comprise this report.

^{10/} Gottman, Jean, Megalopolis, N.Y. The Twentieth Century Fund, 1961.

^{11/} Clark, Kenneth, Dark Shatter, N.Y. Harper Bros., 1965.

Mannheim goes on to expound,

"If today one inquires concerning the ends served by analysis, the question is not to be answered with reference to either nature or the soul or society, or else we formally posit a purely technical, psychical, or social optimum condition, as, for example, the most "frictionless functioning."^{11/}

In this context one tends to agree with Kenneth Clark^{12/} in his elequent preface to Dark Ghetto that it is hard to be relevant in our research and theorization unless we are purposively involved.

This raises tremendously significant questions for the man of knowledge. I should like to discuss them in several dimensions. The first relates to the role of the scholar and his knowledge as a resource. In the vast struggle for civil rights in the past decades, the access to knowledge through the scholar has been in the hands of the status quo. A simple illustration will indicate the problem. The author was asked to do an examination of racial imbalance in a suburban community of New York City by a citizens group which was marginal economically and power-wise, but which had a just legal grievance that could not be adequately pursued without expert resource for collection and presentation of objective data. As a matter of ethics, the University felt that it should not go into communities to do studies of this nature except at the invitation of the Boards of Education or some equally responsible group. From the University's point of view, this is defensible. From the standpoint of ethics, one wonders, however, what the responsibility of the scholar is in situations of this sort, for fundamentally the resource of a university in this kind of encounter can only be on the side of the status quo. Hence, a case, which ultimately was won, had to be prosecuted with resources acquired through countless collections of nickels, dimes, and quarters from little people whilst the Board of Education had the resources of the entire tax purse of the city to defend their position and could have commanded the resources of any respectable university to gather data for its own use. Except as it happens incidentally or accidentally through the kindly interests of some committed professor, the expertise of the man of knowledge is available only on the side of those who represent the power arrangements of the average community. This will grow in proportions as a problem in the years ahead as government money reinforces the patterns which are in existence in these urban communities.

The second issue one is reluctant to raise. It is the problem of identity of scholarship with the power order. I use "power order" as contrasted with "power structure" because I refer to the power which holds the social order together through the widespread consensus about its norms and values. As one works with those who are powerless, he is impressed with the staggering proportions of this issue. For sake of illustration, let me pose a power oriented hypothesis concerning the social role of the

^{12/} Clark, Kenneth, Dark Ghetto, N.Y. Harper Bros., 1965.

man of knowledge. Could not a good case be made that the behavioral scientist's major function is to provide the rationalizations on which the contemporary order rests? Is not the role of the historian fundamentally that of providing the rationalizations as to why the power order deserves to be in the dominant position it holds? Is not the reason the historical past is constantly changing due to the fact that power arrangements are constantly changing between groups? When American was dominantly Protestant in power, was not our history dominantly Protestant? As the Catholic group came into the power order, did history not become our Christian tradition and as the Jewish group is now emerging in the power order, is not our history rapidly becoming our common Hebraic Christian tradition?

In a like manner, let us look at our own scholarship in the behavioral sciences. At the middle of the last century the theologians were called on to provide the rationalizations as to why the power order could not get creativeness from some people. Thus was born the theory of infant damnation. By the end of the century the psychologists had emerged with status, hence they provided a new and secular version of infant damnation which was the low I.Q. Very rapidly we sociologists are providing our version of infant damnation which is low social class. Thus it goes. If one reads the literature of "validated hypotheses" about those who are outside the power order, he is impressed with the endless cliches of "low I.Q.," "low social class," "weak ego strength," "lack of father image with which to relate," "inability to forego immediate pleasure for long-range goals," "matriarchal domination," "cultural deprivation," etc. Now Bloom, Deutsch and others have discovered that unless those who are marginal to power have stimulation in their pre-school years, they are fatalistically impaired in their ability to ever learn. One comes to the conclusion that if the "little man" ever succeeds in making his outreach and upreach to full selfhood, his first job will be to beat down the mythologies the behavioral scientists have created about him.

A third aspect of this relationship is perhaps most important of all. Could it be that the impact of this tremendous change in the relation of the city to the society will require recasting most of the theory we now possess. Civilizations of the past have often been referred to as city states, but may we not now be in a City Society which is different to anything on which current theory has been validated? Does not the city cut the very ground from under much of the mythology which has passed for theory in the past. For instance a modern text on the Metropolis^{13/} warmly defends the neighborhood and the neighborhood school. To quote:

"The neighborhood may be conceived of as the area that can be conveniently traversed by foot from home. It is the area of frequent face-to-face contact. It contains the unit as the critical element in city planning was

^{13/} Fiser, Webb S., Mastery of the Metropolis, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962 (Paper back) A Spectrum Book) p. 22.

introduced by Clarence A. Perry^{1/} in 1929. Perry's concept was built around an area large enough to include one elementary school. It was to be bounded by arterial streets, have its own small parks and recreational areas as well as local shops. The schools and other neighborhood institutions were to be grouped together as the focal point of the neighborhood."

1/

Clarence Arthur Perry, "The Neighborhood Unit," Regional Survey Of New York And Its Environs, Vol. VII (New York: Regional Plan Association, 1929, p. 34-35.

This statement adequately describes the optimum conditions under which defacto segregation of people now take place. Each such place becomes a turf on which they hide from encounters with each other in about the same way as gangs in the Lower East Side use the block on which they live. It is doubtful that the neighborhood as a concept ever had much validity. Most studies we have done in the inner city indicate that the block on which the person lives or the project in which he lives, becomes his local social world. It is certain that this concept of neighborhood does not fit the pattern of modern urban renewal. New York City will soon have a project in the Northwest Bronx which will shelter 65,000 people. To talk of neighborhood schools of 600 size, and other such neighborhood services on such a level is to be completely irrelevant to the issues of the times.

The city and the encounter. It is commonplace to say that the city is in crisis. It is worthwhile to do the fragmented studies of its problems. It is more difficult when submerged in the process itself to keep perspective and see the city as a whole and in time dimensions. May not the greatest problem of all scholars be the intervening variables which are built into their own cognitive apparatus that predetermines what they see? May we not also be in need of becoming demythologized; and can this happen without purposive involvement? In these great cities, the great encounters are taking place. There is much evidence that the city will deliver ultimately on its commitment to ingest these massive marginal migrations which have been produced by the great technological revolutions. I suggested to a class recently that perhaps in the next 25 years a stereotype of a Negro man would be the "city slicker" just as 25 years ago his counter part was stereotyped as "Step-N-Fetch-It." A student reminded me that it was already happening. He said, "Don't you remember what happened to the mayor of Selma, Alabama, in Washington, D.C.?" Also, "Don't you remember that they referred to his being 'taken' as his having been 'murphyed' suggestive of the transmutation of the dumb Irish peasant of Pat and Mike fame to the 'city slicker'." The city milieu makes all groups so dependent upon each other that is it impossible for any group's interests to be long neglected without their creating such dysfunction of the system that orderly processes are seriously impaired. (Consider the CORE group blocking traffic on the Triboo Bridge at the rush hour). Hence, all groups have power, i.e., they have the capacity to make their interests felt in community decision-making.

Government must proceed through shared power relationships. There is no monolithic "power structure" in this sense. In a world of cheap destructive energy where force as a dimension of power is on the wane, may not this skill of working through shared power relations be the most important for man's survival? Do we see this as goodness?

The question which is perhaps most relevant in concluding this hard look is fundamentally value oriented and for this no apology is made. In dealing with the great encounter, there is the tendency of the middle class to withdraw. Hence, suburbs become lily white, antiseptically middle class. A question keeps recurring as one examines this segregative process. As ensconced as they are in these kinds of shielded situations without windows through which they are brought to the encounters with the mainstream human life and the types of problems that have always pricked the conscience of righteous men, is it possible for middle class people to transmit through the generations the kind of values which gave our nation its unique and distinctive flavor and character? It is doubtful that they can and it is doubtful that scholars can meet their obligations as men of knowledge unless they, too, are engaged meaningfully and purposively in these great encounters.

ward--for the most part they were all the same small coterie who played musical chairs since they were the same people only serving in different capacities in each organization. If these groups made any discernible difference in the plight of the "little man" it was undetected. It did give a few individuals high visibility, and earned for them significant recognition on the part of the power structure of the wider community.

So, when the question is asked, "Does Community Organization Process Preserve the Dignity and Worth of the Individual?" one must needs ask, "Which individual?" and "What kind of process?" Let us take each of these in turn.

1) Which individual? As a general rule of thumb, most community planning is done by and under the leadership of the power order of the community. (It will be noted that the reference is to power order as against "power structure" since power is used in a broad sense. It is used in the sense that one could not have social order were there not power generated through the consensus of the majority of the community on many issues. This makes order possible.) This means the planning is devoted to furthering the collective goals of the group which has the power in the community. This group may be benevolent toward those who are marginal to the power order, but by-and-large power interests control and dominate community planning. Hence, the dignity and worth of people is either enhanced or derogated by the planning operation. By and large very little community planning is calculated to enhance the dignity and worth of those

This address was given at the Consultation on Community Organization and Community Development, Division of Home Missions, National Council of Churches, December 7-10, 1964, Philadelphia. Dr. Nelson is Director of the Center for Human Relations and Community Studies, New York University, New York, New York.