A Plan to End The Monopoly Of Un-light-colored Pupils
In Many Boston Schools

(in compliance with General Laws, Chapter 71, Section 37C and
and D, and Chapter 15, Section 1 I, J, and K--as signed
into law by Governor John Volpe in August, 1965)

I

Notify at least 11,958 Chinese and Negro pupils not to come
back to Boston schools this autumn.

This figure of 11,958 is taken from the Kiernan Report,
page 63. The Kiernan Report on page 63 shows 15,482 Chinese and
Negro students in 45 Boston schools where they outnumber "whites".

The Report on the same page shows only 3,524 "white" students
in these same schools.

So, only an even 3,524 "non-white" students can be left in *Not pre-district*
these schools under the new law. Any larger number would make
these schools more than 50% "non-white".

For instance, the Lewis Annex has zero "white" pupils.
Therefore, it can only have zero "non-white" students. One single
Negro student, for example, would make it a 100% Negro school. It
can have a full staff of teachers, under the new law. But it can-
not have any students.

The Hyde School has 3 "white" students. These could only be
matched by 3 colored students to keep Negro students from out-
numbering white students, under the 50% limitation on Negro
occupancy of any school.

There could be a total of only 6 students in the school
--3 "white", 3 "non-white".

The same for the Everett School and the Boardman School.

This would mean only one child in each of the 6 grades of these schools. Actually, it would mean ½ Negro pupil and ½ of a "white" pupil in each grade--to preserve a racially mixed learning environment.

It is doubtful whether Dr. Ohrenberger and Dr. Sullivan would deem it seemly to assign a grade teacher to a grade with zero pupils or a grade with only one pupil. Therefore, a number of schools might be closed. These could well be schools where the fewness of white children, and the law's ban against Negro children in any greater number, would keep pupil numbers down to a total of less than 14 in a grade. The number of schools to be closed because of less than 14 pupils in a grade would be 23.

The section of the law forbidding the monopoly of a school by more than 50% Negroes or Chinese pupils reads (in Section 37D of Chapter 71 of the General Laws, at line 22 and 29 and 30, in the bill now being enacted):--

"The School Committee shall thereupon prepare a plan to eliminate such racial imbalance...when the percentage of non-white students is in excess of fifty percent of the total number of students in such schools."

The plan, proposed paragraph by paragraph and submitted on these pages, complies with the law.

II

Close the 23 schools, therefore, where the small number of white children, matched by an equal but no greater number of "non-white" children, leaves less than 14 pupils all together in each grade.

If these 23 schools are closed, it will add another 612 "non-white" pupils to be notified not to return to school this autumn, under the austere provisions of the law banning an excess of "non-whites."

This would bring the total number of "non-whites" to be notified not to return to their schools up to 12,570.

It may be interposed here that some "non-white" parents will object in writing to their children's being removed. But this cannot stop their removal. The law merely says, in Chapter 71, Section 37D on lines 38 to 43 of the enacted bill, that:--

"No school committee...may be required...to transport any pupil to any school outside its jurisdiction or...neighborhood, if the parents or guardian of such pupil file written objection therto with such school committee."

A school committee is not required, then, to remove a student whose parents object. It removes him only if it thinks best. The law does not insist on his removal. It leaves it to the school committee. But failure to remove "non-white" students in numbers enough to cut their excess would fail to racially "balance" a school. It would be defiance of law. A permissive exception can't stand against the law's mandate. "N on-white" children must go, parental objection or not.

III

Send the 12,570 "non-white" pupils who make the student-bodies of 45 Boston schools more than 50% "non-white" out to the suburbs.

Ok to bus to suburbs but not within Boston?

Leave in Boston Schools the 8,547 "non-white" pupils who now occupy schools less than 50% ~~whites~~ "non-white".

This will leave Boston with more than her share of "non-white" pupils.

more straightforward enmity here

The 45 cities and towns of the Metropolitan District outside Boston have 3 times Boston's population.

It will be noted that General Laws, Chapter 71, Section 37D, in line 39 and 40 of the legislative bill, entertains any school committee's "plan to transport any pupil to any school outside its jurisdiction".

The State Board of Education will provide the help needed for this distribution of pupils.

General Laws, Chapter 15, Section 1I says, "the Board of Education shall provide technical and other assistance in the...execution of plans to eliminate racial unbalance."

To picture the operation of this program, consider a day next October (1965) when the 12,570 excess "non-white" students monopolizing 45 Boston schools meet, each at his neighborhood school, to board busses bound for each of the 45 cities and towns in the Metropolitan District—the busses from one Boston school going to one town, and the busses from another Boston school going to another town— the busses from a smaller school going to a smaller town, and the busses from a larger school going to a larger town.

parody of Bible style

Approximately 240 busses will be required. They would leave at 9 A.M. after their runs with adult commuters were finished. Suburban schools would start late.

why?

At $1. per student per day for 12,000 students during 180 school days the cost would be $2,160,000.

Each suburban classroom would have to absorb 3 "non-white" Boston pupils— an addition easily accommodated.

– – – – – – – – – – – –

Nor can the suburbs refuse—not unless they defy the law and also forfeit their annual financial aid from the state as a penalty.

The law states, in Chapter 71, Section 37D:—"When the state board of education finds that racial imbalance exists in a public school it shall notify in writing the school committee...The school committee shall thereupon prepare a plan to eliminate such racial imbalance."

The suburbs in the Metropolitan District average less than 1% Negro in their schools. That's less than ¼ of a Negro pupil in each classroom. That's racial imbalance, if ever there was.

Agreed, but not by the defin'n of imbalance in this law.

Furthermore, the law in Chapter 71, Section 37D, also defines racial imbalance as "a ratio between non-white and other students in public schools which is sharply out of balance with the racial composition of the society in which non-white children study, serve and work."

The only society in which "non-white" children study is their classroom. The only society in which "non-white" children serve is their classroom. The only society in which "non-white" children work is their classroom.

The law can hardly be asking that the classroom be in balance with the classroom--like the Egyptian crocodile, which is as big as it is, "is as broad as it hath breadth", and moves by its own organs.

The law must mean that the racial composition of the "non-white" child's classroom shall not be sharply out of balance with the racial composition of the broader society in which his parents and adult neighbors study, serve, and work. _That means Boston._ [Yes] Suburban adults work in Boston. They are bedroom suburbs. [But the schools the non-white child is in are in Boston—that's where the imbalance is by definition of this law]

If the suburbs did not have to balance their classrooms with Negro pupils brought from Boston to even up their outrageous, rural, racial imbalance, they still would have to balance their classrooms with Negro pupils brought from Boston to technically comply with the law's specific mandate that the racial composition of their classrooms be not sharply out of balance with the racial composition of the society of [No—not by this law] _Greater Boston_ in which they work, revolve, subsist, and are a part.

- - - - - -

Obviously, such an even distribution of "non-white" pupils in Metropolitan society is the way the law was meant to work, and the only way it can work.

Any departure from this would run in a direction opposite to
compliance with the law.

Any alternative would compound the racial "imbalance" which
the law bids us eliminate.

Any such would trap the Boston School Committee in a denser
and denser monopoly of the schools by Negroes, and a sharper and
sharper imbalance with the composition of the Metropolitan suburbs
in which the city of Boston is geographically and socially set.

The sole, two, available alternatives (which would only worsen
the conditions which the law purports and bids to correct) are as
follows:—

Under Alternative No. 1, we could build larger schools along
the fringe of the Negro areas to receive Negro and white students in
good mixture from each side.

This would be a futile pretense. It would leave the 90% Negro
schools at the heart of the Negro community intact. They would have
the same pupils as before. Only the less heavily Negro schools near
the edge of the Negro district would be diluted with white children.

And such new school buildings along the fringe would be swallowed
up by the expanding Negro community long before they were completed.

As Alternative No. 2, we could build 23 new schools in outlying
"all-white" sections of Boston, and transport colored pupils in even
distribution to these 23 new schools and to the remaining 184 old
schools of the city—after closing down the 23 massively Negro schools
in the heart of the Negro community.

But by so doing, we would only complete the monopoly of Boston schools
by a more than 50% Negro occupancy, which the law tells us to abhor.

Already Chicago schools are more than 50% Negro. Already
Philadelphia schools. Likewise Detroit's and Cleveland's.

The Boston population was 10% Negro in 1960. The Negro population is expected to double by 1975. The school population is already 25% Negro. By 1978 Boston Schools should be more than 50% Negro.

This is indicated by City Planner Edward J. Logue in his address to the Association of Women Lawyers at the Statler Boston Hotel, April 28, on page 3 and on page 8.

It is confirmed by Thomas M. Hennessey, a member of the Kiernan Commission, writing in the April issue of the magazine "Boston", on the last page of his message.

It is further confirmed by a confidential Labor Department report, quoted in Newsweek magazine, April 9 issue, 1965.

If the Negro school population in Boston today is about 25% of the whole Boston school population, the entire Boston Negro population today is, on the other hand, only 13% of the entire Boston population. There is one Negro child for every Negro adult. There is only $\frac{1}{2}$ a white child for every one white adult. The Negro population of Boston is expanding at twice the birthrate of the whites. This is a national trend. See 1960 census quoted in World Almanac, page 286 (1-5 age-group).

1 x 1 x 1 x 1 x 1 is still 1.

2 x 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 is 32.

We can't very well keep "non-white" occupancy of every Boston school below 50% of the student body when Negro students as a whole become more than 50% of all public school students in Boston. By the time all 23 new school buildings were ready for occupancy, Boston schools would have become a Negro ghetto, choking in the white noose of suburbia--the antithesis of what the law calls for.

Only a closing now of 23 preponderantly Negro schools in Boston and a distribution of their pupils to outside cities and towns will avoid making a mockery of the new law. Anything short of that worsens the condition which the law purports to improve.

	Total Students under New Law	White now	Non-White Now	Numbers of Negroes to be moved
Lewis Annext	0	0	59	59
Lewis	6	3	563	560
Hyde	6	3	324	321
Everett	6	3	256	253
Asa Gray	8	4	285	281
W.L.P.Boardman	6	3	194	191
D. A. Ellis	20	10	631	621
P. Brooks	22	11	625	614
H.L. Higginson	12	6	314	308
I.Allen	8	4	195	191
J.W.Howe	16	8	402	394
D. A. Ellis Annex	8	4	148	144
Quincy Dickerman	24	12	474	462
Williams	8	4	138	134
Garrison	72	36	1096	1060
W. Bacon	18	9	267	258
S.J. Baker	62	31	686	655
P.T.Campbell	112	56	730	674
Quincy	24	12	148	136
Business Educ.Ann.	8	4	42	38
N. Hale	70	35	349	314
Dillaway	76	38	300	262
A.W.May	44	22	160	138
W. E. Endicott	100	50	336	286
J.P.Timilty	186	93	620	527
*C.C. Perkins	88	44	259	215
Dudley	102	51	299	248
J.J.Hurley	216	108	500	392
A.Palmer	104	52	161	109
Atherton	136	68	203	135
A.Davis	206	103	263	160
O.W.Holmes	384	192	471	279
J.Bates	102	51	121	70
Girls High	470	235	561	326
J. Winthrop	286	143	319	176
Dearborn Annex	158	79	172	93
G. Bancroft	134	67	132	65
C. Gibson	504	252	478	226
Dearborn	398	199	373	174
C.E.Mackey	562	281	448	167
A. Lincoln	324	162	250	88
Farragut	268	134	165	31
M.J.Tobin	650	325	383	58
S.Greenwood	970	485	548	63
D.L.Barrett	64	32	34	2
	7,048	3,524	15,482	11,958

To be closed or lack of numbers.