The present situation of the schools in urban poverty areas does not look good. There have been no appreciable gains in academic achievement, in spite of the infusion of many special programs targeted at the children of the poor. (There have been, on the other hand, some improvements in college entrances, especially in New York, where here the C.C.N.Y. student demonstrations of 1969 forced the Board of Higher Education to implement an open admissions plan several years ahead of schedule.

If current history is any indication of the future, we can expect to see more of the same poor performance results in schools with high black and Puerto Rican enrollments, more schools tipping to a nonwhite resegregated status as the city's white population continues to escape from the advancing minorities. By the end of the decade these minorities may be the cities' majority.

What functional role the urban schools have had as conveyor belts to semiskilled, skilled, and professional jobs seems to be disappearing with the continual relocation of industries and other businesses to the suburbs, the South, and foreign countries. Accordingly, we should expect to see increasing unemployment, more welfare, and more legalized use of drugs along with the illegal traffic. The solution James Conant suggested in *Slums and Suburbs* over 10 years ago, "to prepare a student for getting and keeping a job as soon as he leaves school and . . . to encourage those who have academic talent to aim at a profession through higher education," does not appear to be feasible at this late date. The emerging solution to the "social dynamite" Conant warned us of seems to be the use of police and pacification methods. The new money, new jobs, and new programs are concerned with security and the drug problem. While drug awareness lessons try to cope with clandestine and often open drug distribution, schools are at the same time party to the giving of amphetamines and other drugs to disruptively hyperactive children.

Despite the loss of business, certain other types of opportunities are opening up. The indications seem to be that the local political apparatus and the civil service will be inherited by the nonwhite minorities. Thus, by 1984 it would not be unrealistic to suppose that the education, police, and sanitation personnel will be predominantly black and Puerto Rican in New York, Chicago and other large cities. In New York City we might expect a civil service corps of perhaps 500,000 (it is now about 300,000) ministering to the needs of a working class and lumpen consuming-nonproducing class perhaps 5 to 10 times as large.

A racial "liberation" of the city may be definitely in the cards, by which I mean that nonwhites will have a degree of control over the welfare, policing, and other governmental services affecting their own people. Looked at in narrowly political patronage terms, this move will be seen as a victory for the nonwhite urban masses. One should expect to see not only a big increase in the size of the bourgeois civil service class but also an improvement of services. Presumably, a "native" bureaucracy should be more conscientious about the performance of its duties than a "foreign" bureaucracy which leaves the native preserves every night to return to its own compounds.

The great danger of the above sketched racial liberation movement is that it may quickly degenerate into a domestic form of neocolonialism. That is to say, if no transformation of the economic and political structures attends the racial change of the guard in cities, then the situation of the masses will remain essentially the same. For the simple reason that the new class of civil servants and politicians (no matter what its color or ethnicity) will be tempted to corruption and "cooping" (sleeping on the job) as was the previous class.
A cursory perusal of the postliberational experiences of former colonies from the Philippines to Nigeria seems to indicate the persistence of old, corrupt, colonial habits. The "new class" as Djilas and Fanon have carefully explained, moves into power and immediately takes on the manners and prejudices and life styles of those they have displaced. Fanon said the new bourgeois class "must simply be stoutly opposed because, literally, it is good for nothing. This bourgeoisie, expressing its mediocrity in its profits, its achievements, and its thoughts tries to hide the mediocrity by"... chromium plating on big American cars, by holidays on the Riviera and week-ends in neon-lit night clubs." 2 Milovan Djilas noted a similar phenomenon in the Communist countries in his book, The New Class. 3 Governing elites—no matter what their class, race or ideology—naturally govern for their own immediate interests.

Returning to the more specific question of the racial transformation of the governing classes in our cities, there is real danger of another of Fanon’s models coming to pass:

The government services swell to huge proportions, not because they are developing and specializing, but because new-found cousins and fresh militants are looking for jobs and hope to edge themselves into the government machine. And the dream of every citizen is to get up to the capital and to have his share of the cake. The local districts are deserted; the mass of the country people with no one to lead them, uneducated and unsupported, turn their backs on their poorly laboured fields and flock towards the outer rings of suburbs, thus swelling out of all proportion the ranks of the lumpen proletariat. 4

The domestic neocolonies of the cities in the U. S. are even more bound by the controls of the "mother country" than are the non-white nations of the third world. They may think they control the city, but the city is a legal, constitutional, and political creature of the state. As just one example of the power of the state over the city we need only look at Newark’s position vis-a-vis the New Jersey Legislature. It has recently passed a law exempting the Newark police from residency requirements and has refused once again, despite the pleadings of Newark’s mayor, to adopt a state income tax law, preferring to rely on property and sales taxes. The states and the Federal government have an iron grip over the financial resources and ultimate future of the cities.

The black leadership of majority black cities is learning that their power will be less than that of their white predecessors.

Nothing of any significance in terms of improving the lot of the urban masses will happen until the people who are directly affected by governmental services will have the dominant say as to how those services are performed. This would mean that whatever boards or councils are set up around schools or police or sanitation districts, etc. would be formed by the clients themselves. The bylaws of said boards would be such that their actions would mirror the will of the people.

If individual sin is pride or hubris, then sin in the social structure could be termed "elitism." Government which allows for the formation of elitist structures must sooner or later succumb to corruption. This holds true whether the elites be national or local, elected or appointed. The point is that a leadership class by definition must separate itself from its following by virtue of its position. Because leaders have greater abilities, know more and have more power by virtue of their position, they must eventually come to think that they deserve more, and ultimately, that the whole system exists for them.

To counter this tendency for power to corrupt and absolute power to corrupt absolutely, democratic mechanisms should be devised which will turn the leaders of the people into the true servants of the people. "No leader, however valuable he may be, can substitute himself for the popular will." 5 The big question, of course, is how the transformation from elitism to democracy is to happen. It seems that the odds are overwhelmingly against a democratic movement. It has already been mentioned that the real controls are in the hands of state legislaures, courts, the Federal government. A more basic reason operating against the formation of authentic democratic movements is the lack of a clear democratic ideology and the continued widespread acceptance in the ideology of making it. The making-it ideology is just as alive today as it was when the Horatio Alger stories were popular. The dream is the same in the slums or in the suburbs, although the content of the dream may be different. In the slums it has to do with hitting a number and escaping from the rats. In the suburbs it may be to circulate among the beautiful people in the world of two-acre zoning. In both cases the theme is movement, escape to something better. If you cannot escape in reality, you can do it via fantasies induced by commercials or drugs. This American dream precludes the possibility of positive, collective action in solving social problems. The American dream solution has been that you "solve" a problem (poverty, boredom, bad neighborhood) by moving away from it and leaving it for others. This means that everyone is out for himself in the quest for happiness. What group action there is is usually undertaken by parochial associations to defend or assert their power against others.

No real communities exist in the slums, which are by definition anti-communities. They are geographic areas but not neighborhoods in the sense of a network of continuing and complex associations. The modern slum is a highly mobile, unstable area of deteriorating housing, schooling, services, and everything else. It is moving towards becoming a ghost town, with abandoned and burned out buildings. A neighborhood is an urban village with established areas for social interactions between and within the generations. It has its gathering places such as the church, park, drug store, storefront clubs. In the slums most of the local stores have been boarded up; the supermarket has an armed guard and other storekeepers carry guns, so that fraternization is inhibited. Liquor stores are the only flourishing businesses.

The schools of a neighborhood may not be ideal academies for the stimulation of creative intelligence, but they do provide a better basis for social control of youth than do the schools of slums. The reason is permanency of the staff and families. In a neighborhood a teacher will have in her classroom over the years all the children and cousins of one family so that parents, teachers, and children come to know each other well.