

difficulty with this solution is that the board of education won't adopt it—and, at this point, no one is in a position to compel them to adopt it.

Between those two answers lie others. There is, for example, the 4-4-4 plan. This plan I rejected as an answer for our community on the grounds that while it effected a kind of solution for the middle school and the high school, it gave up on the solution for the first 4 elementary years and allowed a permanent segregated pattern during these 4 years of education.

Yet another answer is the educational park. In terms of its impact as a desegregation device, I have no argument against this answer, other than the fact that it is years and years of bond issues and construction away.

But there is a second basis for criticism of the educational park. This is the fact that the plan contains within itself no ingredient for educational reform or improvement. If you rebundle on one site thousands of children from a larger geographic area but do not envisage a reform and reorganization of the structure of education, once they are on that site, you may have the answer to the question of desegregation; but your answer has nothing to do with the reform of education as such.

This criticism is not antagonistic to the desegregation intent of the plan. All I am saying is that the educational heart of the program has yet to be evolved. I think I have a partial answer in the academy concept [see exhibit C] and I would marry both, one to the other.

The plan we in Mount Vernon came up with, in the idea of the academy as an interim measure, was based on the recognition of the importance of time in terms of months, not years. The establishment and operation of the academy would call for the purchase of a sizable piece of property and the utilization of buildings already there. On this site would be evolved and conducted a program for the academic review, the supervision, and the tutorial instruction of children from every elementary school in the city. These children would come to the academy every day for 2 hours of intensive remedial, advance, corrective, clinical work on an individual basis which had been diagnostically established.

That is the academic center of the plan. It would mean that within a period of 10 or 12 months initial steps could be taken with the first several hundred children. The operation could be programmatically increased in 30-day cycles, and we should expect that in about 18 months we would be in full swing, with 2,000

of the 6,000 children in the K to 5 program at the academy for each working day they were in school.

But there is a growing hostility within the community to the accomplishment of this plan. The board voted it. The commissioner of the State of New York approved it. Civil rights groups opposed it. At one time we had the distinction of having just about as remarkable a consensus as President Johnson might have dreamed of, all opposed to the plan.

To me, the plan appears to offer a functional structural reform in the nature of elementary education, a byproduct of which would be high-speed integration of the elementary schools.

Title III would provide the planning and operational funds. Title I would provide the transportation funds. We have such money set aside for the beginning operation this coming year.

John H. Fischer, president, Teachers College, Columbia University

It seems to me that if we are to have the kind of comprehensive approach to the problem we are talking about here this afternoon, it is important to prepare first what the strategist calls an estimate of the situation. As we look at the situation we have to deal with, it would be well to take into account the facts that can't be talked away. One way or another, we will have to deal with them.

First, we have to face the fact that we are dealing here with a form of social inertia which is particularly baffling. This is not to say it cannot be changed. But to act as though we were not confronting this social analogue of Newton's first law of motion seems to me unrealistic to the point of irresponsibility.

Second, we need to face the fact that we are dealing, in this inertial condition, with apprehension, unfamiliarity, and insecurity—if you will, with fear. We lump these together and call them prejudice. But it isn't as simple or as easy as that. We have to face the components of this prejudice if we are to deal with it. If we don't deal with it, I am afraid whatever plans we lay are likely to come to grief.

In the third place, we are dealing with the hard fact of the ghetto. None of us here like ghettos. But we have them and we won't wish them away overnight. We will have to lay plans to deal with them. Unless they are taken into account in our planning, our planning again is not likely to be very effective.

In the fourth place, we are dealing with shifting residential patterns. We have not only the problem