Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka / All Deliberate Speed

After the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* decision, how quickly <u>should</u> schools have been desegregated? How quickly <u>were</u> schools desegregated?

Read Justice Frankfurter's notes on the language used in the *Brown II* opinion and answer the questions that follow.

DECREE # 2

- 1. The appellees in Nos. 1, 2 and 3, the respondents in No. 4, and the petitioners in No. 5 are permanently enjoined from excluding the appellants in Nos. 1, 2 and 3, the petitioners in No. 4, and the respondents in No. 5 from any public school on the ground of race.
- 2. The cases are remanded to the respective federal district and state courts for appropriate decrees to carry out the mandate of this Court in the light of the decisions in <u>Brown v. Board of</u> <u>Education</u>, 347 U.S. 483, and <u>Bolling v. Sharpe</u>, 347 U.S. 497.
- 3. The rights of the appellants in Nos. 1, 2 and 3, the petitioners in No. 4, and the respondents in No. 5 must be given effect immediately where all the relevant considerations controlling a court of equity make it feasible to do so. [Provided that steps toward full compliance with the standards enunciated in Section 4, infra, are undertaken at once by the affected school districts, the admission of a named plaintiff may be delayed for a reasonable period, not to exceed one school cycle of 12 years.]
- 4. Insofar as reorganization may be necessary in the school districts affected by our judgment and mandate and in other school districts similarly situated, so as to make effective this decree that no student shall be denied admission to any public school because of his race, the respective lower courts are to require that any new or reorganized school districts to be established by local authorities shall be geographically compact, continguous and nongerrymandered. And it shall further be made incumbent upon local authorities that within a given school district Negro students be

not refused admission to any school where they are situated similarly to white students in respect to (1) distance from school, (2) natural or manmade barriers or hazards, and (3) other relevant educational criteria. 5. On remand, the defendant school districts shall be required to submit with all appropriate speed proposals for compliance to the raspective lower courts. 5. Decrees in conformity with this decree shall be prepared and Issued forthwith by the lower courts, They may, when deemed by them desirable for the more effective enforcement of this decree, appoint masters to assist them. 7. Periodic compliance reports shall be presented by the defendant school districts to the lower courts and, in due course, transmitted by them to this Court but the primary duty to insure where deliberation of head of the person of

© 2020 Street Law, Inc.

The decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* came in two parts. First, the justices considered whether segregation was constitutional. The *Brown I* decision in 1954 determined that it was not, but there still remained the tricky question about how to end segregation. On this question, the Court heard arguments during the following term.

In 1955, the Supreme Court of the United States determined that segregation should be ended as soon as possible, but the Court also recognized that it would be difficult for communities to deal with the change and that there were many institutional, political, and social circumstances to be worked out. The Court struggled with how to phrase the order to desegregate schools and what kind of time frames should be attached to the order. The NAACP advocated for schools to be desegregated "forthwith," which implies a quick timetable. However, Justice Warren adopted the advice of Justice Frankfurter and chose other language.

Questions to Consider

1.	On page two of the typed notes, Justice Frankfurter writes his original recommendation for
	how quickly desegregation should occur. What does he say? (This is the typed version, not
	the handwritten version.)

2.	Justice Frankfurter then crosses out point 5 and changes point 6 to point 5. He also changes
	his recommendation for how quickly desegregation should occur. How does he alter his
	recommendation? (This is the handwritten note.)

3. Why do you suppose Justice Frankfurter changed his mind? Think about what actions might be involved in desegregating schools at the local level.

4. What do Justice Frankfurter's notes tell you about how Supreme Court decisions are written?

© 2020 Street Law, Inc.

5. The Court's recommendation that schools should desegregate "with all deliberate speed" had enormous consequences for the speed of desegregation. Read this excerpt of a letter from Roy Wilkins to President Kennedy regarding desegregation in Prince Edward County, Virginia.

What does the letter tell you about how quickly desegregation occurred?



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

TWENTY WEST FORTIETH STREET . NEW YORK 18, N. Y. . BRyant 9-1400

May 15, 1963

THE WHITE HOUSE

MAY 18 12 00 PM '63

Honorable John F. Kennedy President of the United States The White House Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

We are transmitting herewith petitions signed by 695 adult Negro citizens of Prince Edward County, Virginia.

As you are aware, Frince Edward County was one of the governmental units involved in the Supreme Court case of Brown v. Board of Education. Rather than accept the law of the land as enunciated by the Court in its decision in that case, county authorities closed the public schools. Since 1959 the county has provided no education for its children.

The petitions here presented request the assistance of the Federal Government in solving, so far as is possible, some of the problems created by this gross denial of human rights by local governmental action.

Since the initiation of this petition, we have noted the announcement by the Department of Justice that some remedial educational program will be sponsored by the Federal Government in Prince Edward County. We welcome this announcement and we commend the Administration for its recognition of Federal responsibility in the situation.

It is our fervent hope that any Pederally supported program will be adequate to meet the existing needs. We believe that the massive neglect and contempt for human values practiced in Prince Edward County can be met only by massive corrective action. To this end we suggest, as a minimum, that any Federal program include the steps outlined in the attached petitions.

Such a program will require the cooperation of many governmental agencies. To be fully effective, we believe direction must come from you as the Chief Executive. We respectfully urge that you supply this direction.

We are enclosing a memorandum concerning various Federal programs that we believe could be utilized in providing the required Federal assistance in Prince Edward County.

© 2020 Street Law, Inc.