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Willie deals with the role of the university in educating students to be citizens and leaders in our urbanized society. He sees urbanization as being different from, though related to, industrialization, and he sees distinct differences in the social and educational responses needed to deal with them. While industrialization, the main focus of our social and educational institutions, requires technological skills for work, urbanization requires the development of a sense of community. Willie believes that the university must seek to educate leaders from and for all levels of community—partly because all levels of community need leaders and partly because truth comes only from the fusion of a number of viewpoints—and that university education must become involved with current controversial community issues. The university must "teach activists the benefits of reasoned thought and thinkers the methods and techniques of effective action."

Charles V. Willie, Associate Professor of Sociology at Syracuse University, is presently a visiting lecturer at the Harvard University Medical School. He is also Senior Research Associate at Syracuse's Youth Development Center and Director of the Community Seminar. Dr. Willie has served on the New York State Mental Health Commission and the State Committee for the 1961 White House Conference on Aging. He is consultant to the National Urban Program of the Episcopal Church and is active in numerous human rights and urban affairs groups.
EDUCATING THE URBAN STUDENT FOR THE URBAN WAY OF LIFE

In the United States, urbanization, higher education, and continuing education are coming of age together. A little more than ten years ago, 2.7 million people were enrolled in institutions of higher education. Today this number has doubled. By 1975 it is estimated that a majority of the adults over twenty-five will have been graduated from high school. Many of them will attend our colleges and universities as part-time as well as full-time students. A survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago in 1961-62 discovered that nearly 29 million people were engaged in some kind of adult education course. This figure was about 16 per cent of the estimated 1961 national population and represented no small achievement since the main growth in adult education, as pointed out by Jerome Ziegler, is a twentieth-century development.

The urbanization statistics for this century, during which the United States shifted from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban population, are no less astounding. The 1920 Census was the first that recorded the majority of the residents of this nation as living in urban areas. Today more than 70 per cent of the people live in urban and suburban communities.

The increasing urbanization of the United States along with the expanding numbers involved in continuing education means that a major concern of the present and future must be one of equipping our students to deal with the urban community. Dealing with the urban community is different from dealing with the urban industrial world of work. In her book on The City, Rose Hum Lee states, "The most pronounced change in urban living and environment followed the Industrial Revolution." She points out that "in Western societies, urbanization and industrialization are generally associated with each other." Because of this association, we have focused many of our studies of contemporary problems upon the division of labor and specialization so characteristic of the urbanized industrial
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society; and many of our educational and training programs have been designed to teach people the occupational skills necessary to find work in the urbanized industrial society.

But in addition to the changes in work preparation brought about by industrialization, there are also the changes in relationships among people and between people and their social environment brought about by urbanization. Three decades ago, sociologist Louis Wirth of the University of Chicago wrote a famous essay entitled, "Urbanism as a Way of Life." He recognized that the major problems of survival in the urban society are not limited to circumstances of work. He pointed out this simple but profound fact: "Increasing the number of inhabitants in a settlement beyond a certain limit will affect the relationships between them and the character of the city." Wirth indicated the dimension of the urbanized industrial society to which our attention must be turned today; and that dimension is the nature of the interaction between large heterogeneous masses of people who occupy a limited geographic area. In the United States, for example, Charles Abrams informs us that "about 70 per cent of the population is now concentrated in communities occupying only a little more than one per cent of the nation's land area." The population of our cities is, of course, pluralistic. This means that in urban areas there is intense interaction among people of diversified interests and backgrounds who are uncontrolled by the "bonds of kinship, of neighborliness, and the sentiments arising out of living together for generations under a common folk tradition." 

If our continuing education is to be in line with the needs of the contemporary situation—that is, if we are to help our students fulfill themselves in the urbanized industrial society—we must educate each student for life in a pluralistic community. We must teach our students how to develop a sense of community among heterogeneous and diversified people. At the World Conference on Church and Society in Switzerland held during the summer of 1966, economist Barbara Ward said we must de-


velop some kind of community if we are to get out of the present world situation alive. The same statement may be made of the local urban setting. The rioting, ransacking, and rebelling that occurred in city after city during the summer of 1966 were preventable, just as preventable as the explosions and eruptions that characterized labor-management relations twenty-five to fifty years ago. The work in industrialization by units of our major universities like Harvard Business School contributed in no small way to the peaceful evolution of a sense of community between labor and management, particularly with reference to production. In a like manner, it is appropriate that the society turn to the university and its various programs like continuing education for assistance in dealing with the disruptions of these days.

Thus far, our universities and particularly their continuing education programs have been slow to respond to the pressing need to develop a sense of community in the urbanized industrial society. In spite of the human relations crisis that has been rampaging throughout our cities since the 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing officially sanctioned racial segregation in public education, the 1961-62 National Opinion Research Center Survey revealed that nearly 40 per cent of the subject matter offered by universities and colleges to enrollees in continuing education may be classified as vocational; approximately another 40 per cent is in the area of general education; and only 4 per cent is concerned with public affairs. This means that our continuing education programs are still concerned with urban man as worker. We are continuing to understand urbanization as if it were synonymous with industrialization and are not offering courses related to the larger responsibilities required of our students who live in cities.

The fact that so little of the subject matter of continuing education deals with public affairs and contemporary social problems has prompted some authorities in higher education to conclude that “adults avoid the study of critical issues.” It should remain an open question, how-
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ever, whether this low proportion of courses represents avoidance on the part of our students to become involved in the critical and controversial affairs of our time or avoidance on the part of educational institutions. It is always easier to attribute these deficiencies to individuals rather than to institutions. It is like calling those students with special needs whom our high schools are unwilling to accommodate "dropouts" rather than "pushouts," or like labeling those troublesome clients whom social service agencies cannot tolerate as "uncooperative." 

In the past, we concentrated our efforts on changing the student in his relationship with himself. We provided information and taught the student certain skills which were designed to contribute to self-improvement. Now we must do more! We must provide our students with the information and teach them the kinds of skills which may contribute to societal improvement. After two world wars and several other lesser wars, we now know that good individuals do not automatically give rise to good societies. There were many good individuals in Nazi Germany during the period when millions of Jews were murdered by the state. There were many good individuals in the United States during the time when loyal Japanese-Americans were uprooted from their West Coast homes in the early 1940's and detained in relocation camps, like prisoners, by the state. We cannot develop a sense of community by limiting our concern to self-improvement. The vocational and general educational emphases of the past are too narrow. These approaches may have been sufficient for the beginning centuries of this land, but they are inadequate as we move toward the year 2000.

Now can we develop a sense of community by limiting our concern to developing only the elite. Our students, especially those who participate in continuing education, are urban and diversified. Consider, both from the point of view of educational content and from that of the composition of the student body, the purpose of Harvard as stated in the 1650 Charter: "The advancement of all good literature, arts and science." These were the skills considered to be necessary for learned leaders, clergymen, and statesmen. Unlike those in the past, however, today's


learned leaders are not limited to clergymen and statesmen, and neither are they all from the upper social class. Our colleges and universities are still places for training and educating leaders. But the demand today placed upon institutions of higher learning for the public good is to seek out and educate all sorts of leaders—those in the upper, middle, and lower classes—and to teach them to become ceaselessly involved in public affairs.

This, of course, is not easy for educators. You may recall the little volume by W. Lloyd Warner and his colleagues entitled, Who Shall Be Educated? The authors of that book point out that becoming a teacher is one way of becoming upwardly mobile in the stratification hierarchy of the community. They further indicate that because teachers have in effect used education as a vehicle of upward mobility, they almost insist that their students do likewise.

If the university is an institution which is searching for truth, it is a distinct advantage to have a diversified student body in all programs; for truth emerges out of the clashing of ideas. Plato believed that philosophers should rule the state because of the union of qualities they possessed, the most important of which was their love for truth. But Plato erred in thinking that truth is an inherent quality of the philosopher. It may be that the pursuit of truth is a fundamental and inherent quality of the philosopher, but the possession of truth is not. The pursuit of truth may be a fundamental quality of any learned leader—be he rich or poor; but the possession of truth is not.

In Book VI of the Republic, Plato said, "[Philosophers] will never intentionally receive into their mind falsehood." But Rashomon, the Japanese film, provides another perspective on this business of truth. It is not that one intentionally caters to falsehood, but rather that each person's version of truth is conditioned by his own station in life, his image of himself, his experiences in the past, and his aspirations for the future. This means that no one, whether saint or sinner, philosopher or fool, can fully know the truth because the knowledge which anyone possesses is always conditioned by the uniqueness of the being who possesses it and limited by his perspective. A university which is actively searching for

truth should be actively attracting all kinds of persons into its various programs.

If the university is in the business of educating leaders, it must deliberately include among its students leaders from the slums and leaders from the suburbs. It is necessary to recruit a diversified student body because we know that students learn from each other as well as from their teachers and that the truth which they learn will emerge out of the competition of the ideas, images, and aspirations of the multitude. Each leader partially defines truth in terms of his present and past experiences. We who have specialized in teaching the white and middle class only or the nonwhite and working class only have specialized in imparting half-truths to our students and have persisted in defending the circumstance in which we teach—circumstances of homogeneous people—which do not help our students to know how little they know.

Parenthetically let me acquaint you with a real community issue which demonstrates beautifully how one's assessment of success or failure is associated with one's station in life and the perspective with which he evaluates life's circumstances. In Syracuse, New York, in 1964, the Board of Education transferred fifty to sixty Negro children from an inner-city elementary school with a predominantly nonwhite population to a predominantly white elementary school in a middle-class neighborhood. The president of the school board, who is white, Protestant, and a captain of industry, said in testimony at a hearing of the United States Civil Rights Commission that he was in favor of the bussing program because he now is convinced that programs of compensatory education are not very effective in schools in ghetto areas. In effect, he considered the bussing plan to be a success. Obviously, the president of the school board values high achievement and believes that white children who experience education in privileged settings have a responsibility to share these experiences with persons who have experienced more disadvantaged circumstances. His expression fundamentally was the ethic of the dominant majority.

Because of this ethic, the president of the Syracuse Board of Education opposed the bussing of white children into predominantly Negro inner-city schools that had overall lower achievement ratings. When in 1966 sufficient pressure was brought upon the school board to equalize the burden of bussing by proposing an integration plan for an inner-city school
with a predominantly Negro student body, the school board agreed to sponsor a plan to bus white children into one inner-city school and to increase the extra services in that school only if enough white children volunteered so that they in fact would be a majority. The plan was approached without enthusiasm and the public campaign to recruit white students to transfer to the inner-city school was delayed until only three weeks before the opening of school. The Board of Education authorized the staff of the public school system to recruit at least seven hundred white students. Because of the circumstances under which the project was launched, only sixty-eight white children signed up. This means they would have been a minority in the inner-city school for the 1966-67 school year. However, the president of the school board stated that the program was a failure and the plan to bus white children into the inner-city school was canceled.

My assessment of the program was quite different. My own background has been that of a minority person who was educated in ghetto public schools that were inadequately equipped and staffed. While the circumstances of life for members of a minority population may be disadvantaged from one perspective, they are advantaged from another perspective. To persevere in the face of great adversity, the members of a "disadvantaged" minority must develop courage. To share limited resources with others and with the community-at-large, the members of a "disadvantaged" minority must learn generosity. But most of all, the members of a "disadvantaged" minority must learn humility of receiving. The development of courage, humility, and generosity are but a few advantages that flow from being a member of the "disadvantaged" minority. These characteristics might well benefit members of the advantaged majority. Courage, humility, and generosity are good lessons to learn. My entire life has been devoted to trying to master these lessons, though not very well. Sixty-eight white children who volunteered to become members of a minority in a disadvantaged inner-city school could have begun these lessons in the fall of 1966. But the Board of Education canceled the opportunity.

When fifty to sixty Negro children volunteered to attend a predominantly white school, the president of the school board considered that program to be a success. But when sixty to seventy white children volunteered to attend a predominantly Negro school, the president of the
school board considered that program to be a failure. The numbers involved in the two programs were about the same, but the perspective of the board president varied according to the situation and his values and position in life. In the 1964 integration experience, white students continued as a majority, but in the 1966 integration experience white students would have become a minority.

In terms of the station in life which I have occupied and the perspective that I bring, there are advantages in living the life of a minority. I considered the 1966 program to be a success which would have exposed sixty-eight white children to these "advantages." I am not suggesting, however, that my assessment of the situation is right and that the assessment of the president of the school board is wrong. Each of us possesses partial truths based upon our limited view of reality from the perspective of our particular station in life. The truth will emerge only when our differing assessments have an opportunity to encounter each other in open competition.

Our colleges and universities have accepted the fact that their students come from all walks of life. Clark Kerr attributes the tremendous increases in our enrollment to the demise of two long-held notions: "that higher education ought to be restricted to a small elite . . . , and that only a small percentage of a country's population is capable of benefiting from some kind of higher education." You may recall the famous statement by President Charles Van Hise of the University of Wisconsin in 1906 when he said that he was organizing the General Extension Division so that "the boundaries of the university campus [would become] coterminous with the boundaries of the state." Ziegler's review of the development of adult education in the United States identifies this as a significant policy statement because it meant that the university had committed itself to serve all people with university-level courses and not just those persons who were able to enroll on the main campus because of financial resources or geographic proximity. It should go without saying that continuing education has sort of reneged on this starry-eyed beginning.

versities far and wide, it has tended to educate people to fulfill the needs of the Establishment.

Since urban students come from varied circumstances and stations in life, it is incumbent upon colleges and universities; and especially upon their continuing education programs, to equip these students to become leaders in whatever situations they find themselves. We must teach the urban student how to lead his friends into the mainstream of community life, contributing whatever is uniquely their own—be they upper, middle, or lower class.

That the development of leadership is still an unmet need in our society is revealed by a statement by the Reverend Arthur L. Whitaker, Negro Baptist clergyman in Rochester, New York. He was shaken by the rioting in that city July 24, 25, and 26 in 1964, and said that the potential for violent outbreak will remain as long as there is a tendency of both Negroes and whites to look for a black messiah as leader and spokesman for all Negroes. "In a complex society such as ours," the Reverend Mr. Whitaker continued, "there can be no single leader for any group. There are various levels of leadership in all groups." It would seem to me that colleges and universities ought to be training leaders for all levels. This means that colleges and universities may continue a practice which they are very capable of performing. What is new is that they should train leaders of all levels and not just leaders for the Establishment.

We have strongly asserted that the education of leaders of all socio-economic status levels is a major responsibility of our colleges and universities because truth and justice, which are essential in a community, tend to emerge from the adversary system in which all categories of people can effectively confront each other. We cannot expect one sector of society to be continuously concerned about the interests of other sectors. Even the most understanding and compassionate view the needs of others from their own vantage point. It is a limitation of our finite humanity that we cannot put ourselves in another person's position.

The specialization and division of labor which characterize the urban setting literally mean that one person or category of persons must do for another what the other cannot do for himself or itself. People of the urban community are truly interdependent. In the past, the poor and some occupational, racial, sex, and age categories have been cut off
from the mainstream of community life. This has limited their opportunity for personal fulfillment and has eliminated from the social life of the total community the enriching contribution of their full participation. Colleges and universities must deliberately develop programs in leadership training for all categories of people, including those who are "in" and those who are "out." No longer can efforts be limited to training leaders for the Establishment only. The health of the community depends upon the full and effective participation of all of its sectors.

This means that continuing education must become involved with current controversial community issues, not so much to share particular truths as to ensure that adversaries are adequately equipped with the skills necessary for honest deliberation. It is out of such deliberations that the truth may emerge. The alternative to becoming involved in current community controversy is to withdraw.

Peterson's study, *A Hundred Years of Education*, indicates what happens when colleges and universities withdraw. They tend to decline in stature. Peterson determined that during the eighteenth century university life reached its lowest point of decline in Germany, France, and England. The chief complaint was that "the University had preserved a 'medieval' form which was completely out of touch with the needs of [a] new [century]."15

In a 1964 Commencement Address, Julius A. Stratton, who was at that time president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, made his peace with the need to become involved. He said, "I do not believe that we can escape the responsibility of taking part in the solution of problems which touch most deeply upon the total welfare of the society."16 On October 7, 1966, a new president of M.I.T., Howard W. Johnson, was installed. This is what he said in his Installation Address: "The historic roles of the university—to educate youth, to preserve knowledge, and to create new knowledge—remain the same; but the emphasis on them becomes greater in a more demanding society, and the greatest emphasis will be on developing leadership." He spoke of leaders who will be concerned with service to society, service in the cause of society, and the

well-being of their fellow man. He said further that students would come closer to understanding man's purpose on this earth by seeking to serve their fellows. The new president of this school has stated his belief that "the general range of problems attacked by M. I. T. in the future will shift more and more to those that understandably affect the ways in which our society lives." He said that while science would remain a central concern, "it would be inadequate for the basic education of the M. I. T. man to stop at science and engineering." Johnson went on to say that the institute "will increasingly exert its power towards problems of human significance."17 I have deliberately quoted two presidents of Massachusetts Institute of Technology because this is an educational center that has become famous around the world for teaching students how to deal with people as well as things.

There are few teachers and administrators of colleges and universities who would disagree with these statements made by the M. I. T. presidents. Thus the basic question is not, "Should institutions of higher learning become involved in current controversial community affairs?" It is rather, "How should such institutions become involved in current controversial community affairs?"

The kind of reaction that may be anticipated as colleges and universities move in earnest into the business of educating all levels of community leaders is shown by the experience of University College, the adult education division of Syracuse University. Of the several programs pertaining to community leadership development, two are especially pertinent: (1) the Thursday Breakfast Roundtable and (2) the Community Action Training Center. These two programs were initiated during the 1964-65 school year. The first program has continued to operate; the second has been dropped.

The Thursday Breakfast Roundtable is limited to men and has included businessmen, prominent lawyers, high governmental officers, executives of major community associations such as the Community Chest and the Chamber of Commerce, a few professors with demonstrated interest in public affairs, and some outstanding clergymen. The roundtable is a public service provided by University College as a continuing channel of communication for civic leaders in the Syracuse metropolitan area. The

weekly informal meetings represent an opportunity for men sharing special responsibilities for the progressive development of the community to exchange ideas and opinions on important public issues and problems. The program begins at 8:30 A.M. and ends promptly at 9:30 A.M. The support which the Thursday Breakfast Roundtable has received in the community is indicated by the kinds of people who have consented to address the group. At one session, the mayor of Syracuse discussed "Our Major Strengths and Weaknesses, as Seen from City Hall." At another, the county executive of Onondaga County, which surrounds and includes the city of Syracuse, spoke on public health. Distinguished lawyers—heads of voluntary and public bodies—foundation executives, and other top community leaders participate in these weekly sessions.

In effect, the Thursday Breakfast Roundtable brings together the local Establishment for the purpose of sharing and exchanging views, hopefully for the benefit of the total community. At the end of the 1964-65 school year, one local daily newspaper published an editorial declaring that the enterprise was a success and expressing the hope that it would continue. And so the roundtable has continued, reaching out to top community leaders and involving them in a public affairs educational venture.

The other program, the Community Action Training Center, began at University College in the same year. A publication describing the program states the following:

We are seeking candidates who, on the basis of existing knowledge, are likely to enter long careers of organization of low income populations. They should be young, responsible, committed to hard work for seven days a week, including evenings, in the field. They should, if possible, be from low income areas themselves and able to identify with and be accepted by most people in neighborhoods of poverty, and not be perceived as deviant by the general population. Applicants should have a controlled, but intense anger about continued injustice and should be committed to hard work for people who are grappling with apparently overwhelming problems. They should be able to plan and act over a long period of time in the development of democratic organizations with enough power to alter the corrosive condition of living in poverty.

They will need to put neighborhood issues ahead of personal concerns and to be enablers to the development of organizations, instead of themselves assuming leadership roles in the organization which is created.

In practice, trainees will have varying levels of education ranging from those with relatively few years of school to students in the Graduate School of Social Work.
There will be no academic prerequisites. A certificate will be issued to each graduate by University College, the adult education division of Syracuse University.

From the descriptive material presented above, it is clear that University College was serious in its attempt to develop leadership programs for those who are "in" and those who are "out," and for people at all levels of the socio-economic status hierarchy, including both the poor and the affluent. While a local newspaper praised the Thursday Breakfast Roundtable, the morning daily paper damned the Community Action Training Center. It called the federal grant which financed the center "a strange misuse of public funds." The project was strange to the editorial writers for the local newspaper (1) because the field work unit of the Community Action Training Center was organizing "beneficiaries of public housing to protest because they are not getting more assistance"; and (2) because of the kinds of students recruited and their "lack of academic prerequisites."¹⁸

The Community Action Training Center upset the local Establishment. The mayor didn't like it, and made the existence of the center one of his campaign issues. The Syracuse Housing Authority didn't like it, and one of its members wrote a letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson signifying his alarm over the involvement of the federal government in a program designed to train "agitators" for the poor. Some businessmen didn't like it and canceled their pledges to the university's fund drive. Several local citizens, including the mayor, waited upon the chancellor of Syracuse University and made known their complaints. Finally, the federal grant supporting the Community Action Training Center terminated and was not renewed.

This first major effort by a major university of leadership development among the poor should not be viewed as a failure. There were some errors in the way the over-all program, especially its field work unit, was structured into the total university. Also, there were some errors in the style of operating. These errors probably were due to the absence of past experience on which to base this new program. As colleges and universities become more committed to educating leaders for all levels of society, they will build upon the Syracuse experience and eventually

become more successful. So the demise of the Community Action Training Center at University College could be classified as a failure; more appropriately, I think, the demise should be classified as an early event in a series which will evolve eventually into an enlarged conception of leadership training among our colleges and universities. The brief existence of the Community Action Training Center, within a university setting, confronted institutions of higher learning with the fact that they have a responsibility for training leaders of the poor as well as of the affluent, of those in the slums as well as of those in the suburbs. In due time, I predict, they will find ways of fulfilling this responsibility on a continuing basis as a new educational service for a pluralistic and urban society.

The general lines of a reconciliation between the old education and the new became clearer to me during a sentimental journey I recently took. On February 18, 1966, I returned to my alma mater to deliver the ninety-ninth-year Founders' Day Banquet Address. My wife and children accompanied me to Morehouse College, a school with a relatively small student body of men, predominantly Negro, from which I graduated in 1948. Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president of the college more than twenty years ago when I first enrolled, was present, as well as many of the old faculty members.

It was a joy to return to Morehouse College to experience the old setting, but more importantly, to sense its new spirit. I tried to capture some of that new spirit in the Founders' Day Address because I believe it is the spirit which all universities and colleges must have if they are effectively to educate the urban student for the urban way of life.

I spoke of college-community relations as "an increasingly difficult problem" for administrators during this age of demonstrations. I called the deep involvement of some colleges and universities in the onrushing affairs of the community "a challenge to their former status as places set aside for contemplation." I saw my alma mater going into its second century with the conflict in goals—whether college should be a place for creative thinking or social action—unresolved. And because of this unresolved problem, I felt that the school would endure. It has exalted students who protested and acclaimed the scholarly and contemplative.

Morehouse College has nurtured Julian Bond, who was denied a seat, to which he was elected, in the Georgia legislature because of his views
opposing United States involvement in the war in Vietnam; it has also nurtured Dr. James Nabrit of the American delegation to the United Nations, who shares the responsibility of defending the administration and its policy of war in Vietnam. Among other outstanding graduates are the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who daringly demonstrates in the city streets, and Judge Robert Franklin, who soberly presides over the Toledo city courts. It seemed to me that my alma mater was involved with mankind. To borrow a phrase from Langston Hughes, I saw Morehouse College all caught up in "the sweet flypaper of life."19

I predicted that with this breadth of involvement in the community, Morehouse College would move into the second century of its existence continuing to support all of its sons, including those who debate and those who demonstrate. But more than this, I felt that my alma mater would "strive to impart to the activists the benefits of reasoned thought, and to the thinkers the methods and techniques of effective action."20

That prediction is a call to all colleges and universities that dare to read aright the signs of the time. If they are to prepare their students for life and leadership in an urbanized, industrialized, pluralistic society, they must teach activists the benefits of reasoned thought and thinkers the methods and techniques of effective action. Only then will students become ceaselessly involved in public affairs and caught up in "the sweet flypaper of life" which, to say the least, is a bit sticky and, some might even say, rather messy.