DOWNLOAD PDF THE SUPREME COURT RULING OF BROWN.

Chapter 1 : Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka :: U.S. () :: Justia US Supreme Court Center

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, U.S. (), was a landmark United States Supreme Court case in which the Court declared state laws establishing separate public schools for black and white students to be unconstitutional.

In this amendment, all citizens of the United States, either by birth or naturalization, are assured equal protection of the law. No person can hold office if they have engaged in a rebellion against the federal government. The government is not responsible for debts accrued by state governments during a rebellionâ€”this includes the costs involved in the loss of emancipated slaves. It is also clearly stated that the Congress shall have the power to enforce this amendment by appropriate legislation. We will also look into the distinctions made between the three post-Civil War Amendments. While the 13th abolished slavery and the 15th established the right to suffrage, it was the 14th which was to guarantee civil rights. The stipulations of section 1 of the 14th Amendment left much of the jurisdictional issues vague as to the limits of federal and state laws. So for example, it was not until the Civil Rights Act of that housing was brought under the jurisdiction of this amendment. This amendment consolidated the power of the radical Republicans in the South. By protecting the rights of Black Americans they hoped to keep them loyal to the Republican Party and the newly formed federal government. However, the amendment has been interpreted in contradictory waysâ€”to legislate both segregation and integration. By granting Blacks and Whites equality in the eyes of the law, the 14th Amendment undermined the Black Codes in the South passed during reconstruction and reasserted the right of the federal government to intercede if states blocked their rights. The signing of the 14th Amendment became a requirement for reentry into the Union after the Civil War. It consolidated the power of the Northern states and the Republicans. But their power was soon undermined as the southern states started passing new segregation laws and the advent of Jim Crow policies again denied Blacks equal rights and opportunities. Students will also be assigned readings in the school American History textbook for background information on this. Quiz and in-class essay Major Discussion Topics: Why were most slaves in the South? Why did the South secede? How are the powers of the state and Federal governments determined? What powers does the Supreme Court have? How can the Supreme Court enforce its decisions? What does the 14th Amendment really say? Separation need not imply inferiority of either race. Brown did not feel that social prejudice could be overcome by legislation: This group of well-to-do Blacks raised money and challenged the constitutionality of the law. The case was heard in the Supreme Court in During this period many new Jim Crow laws had been passed throughout the South. Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, and Tennessee passed laws requiring railroads to separate the races. Mississippi and South Carolina already denied the vote to Blacks and many other states were preparing to take the same steps. There were real differences of opinion within the Black community over these rulings. On one side were those Blacks who felt that they must adjust to the growing sentiment against their civil rights by developing the economic standing of Blacks before working for equal rights. Washington delivered a speech at the Atlanta Exposition in stating: The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house. On the other hand, W. DuBois argued for full, legal equality immediately. Seven Justices ruled against Plessy, but one, Justice Harlan, dissented. The destinies of the two races in this country are indissolubly linked together, and the interest of both require that the common government of all shall not permit the seeds of race hate to be planted under the sanction of law. What were the arguments against this legislation? Does separate but equal imply inferiority? How can equal facilities be determined? What is a dissent? Should the government tell people how to live or make rules that reflect how they live? Living with Jim Crow The two readings for this week are about Jim Crow legislation and how it felt to live within these restrictions. After quoting a Southern critic of the policy who pointed out the absurdity of the legislation, he reviews the major restrictions passed in this period. These laws restricted travel, housing, use of private and public facilities, amusement parks and other recreational areas, and of course schools and institutions of higher learning. He learned the same lesson when he tried to assert his rights on his jobâ€”he wanted to learn information which certain White workers felt was not his place to learn. This autobiographical sketch is an excellent introduction

to the consequences of Jim Crow legislation and attitudes. What was the purpose of the Jim Crow laws? Why were they predominantly in the South? Did these laws affect Blacks and Whites in the same ways? Why would a person write an autobiography? Why would someone want to share such pain? The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas During this week we will study the Brown decision of and the reaction of a group of dissenting Southern congressmen. Segregation is a denial of equal protection of the laws as defined in the 14th Amendment. After hearing a series of cases brought on behalf of Black students in segregated schools, the Court reviewed the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the 14th Amendment. This research proved inconclusive because it was clear that each side of the ratification debate had different goals. The proponents wanted to eliminate all legal distinctions while opponents wanted to limit the applicability of the Amendments. Education is one of the most important functions of government. Compulsory education and public expenditures for education demonstrate this importance. The right to a good, equal education was fundamental to our democratic society. This decision came at the culmination of a series of court cases challenging segregated schools. In this case, however, the plaintiffs were Black children of elementary school age residing in Topeka, Kansas. This action was brought to the United States District Court for the District of Kansas to enjoin the enforcement of a Kansas statute which permits but does not require cities of more than 15, population to maintain separate school facilities for Black and White students. Based on that authority, the Board of Education of Topeka elected to establish segregated elementary schools. Other public schools were run on a nonsegregated basis. The three judge District Court found that segregated public schools had a detrimental effect upon Black children, but denied relief because they found that the schools were essentially equal with respect to buildings, curriculum, transportation, and the educational qualifications of teachers. Other related District Court decisions were Briggs v. Elliott in South Carolina, Davis v. Elliott and the Davis v. County School Board, the Courts ordered that the schools be equalized, having established that the facilities and curriculum were unequal. In Delaware, however, after recognizing that the Black schools were inferior with respect to teacher training, pupil-teacher ratio, extra-curricular activities, physical plant, and time and distance of travel, the Court ordered immediate admission of Black plaintiffs into previously all White schools. It should be noted that although the Chancellor of the Delaware Court maintained that segregation itself resulted in an inferior education for Black children, he did not base his decision on this finding. A group of Southern politicians declared their feelings about the Brown v. Board of Education decision in the Southern Manifesto, the second reading for this week. Essentially they declared that it represents a clear abuse of judicial power. They felt that the federal judiciary was encroaching on the rights of the people. Education has not been mentioned in the Constitution nor in the 14th Amendment or any other amendment. They felt that this action would destroy the amicable relationship between the White and Black races that had been created over the last century. Forcing the races to change their relationship could only produce misunderstanding and hostility. These United States, pp. Why would segregated schools be inherently unequal? What is equality in education? Can laws create equality? Can people be forced to mix? Why would Southern Congressmen feel more hostility to the Brown decision than Northerners? Working for Desegregated Schools As stated in the introduction, the Brown decision has been seen by some as a turning point. In any case, the decision produced some earthshaking events in the United States. The struggle for desegregated schools and then general civil rights turned out to be a painful one, both physically and mentally. During this week two short excerpts about the early attempts at desegregation will be read. In this section of her book, Thee Long Shadow of Little Rock, she describes how it came to pass that one Black school child was refused entrance to the high school because of the presence of National Guardsmen. It first appeared that Little Rock would join many other moderate cities in the south and desegregate their schools with relatively little difficulty. Nine Black students were chosen to attend the formerly all White high school in September, However, Governor Faubus called out the National Guard to prevent the children from attending the school. This caused a clash between state and federal powers. B lack students attended the high school under guard for the year The following year the schools were closed. The next year, however, the schools were opened on a desegregated basis. The whole world watched these events on television.

Chapter 2 : Brown v. Plata - Wikipedia

Despite the Supreme Court's ruling in Plessy and similar cases, many people continued to press for the abolition of Jim Crow and other racially discriminatory laws. One particular organization that fought for racial equality was the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) founded in

See Article History Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, case in which on May 17, , the U. Supreme Court ruled unanimously 9â€”0 that racial segregation in public schools violated the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution , which prohibits the states from denying equal protection of the laws to any person within their jurisdictions. The decision declared that separate educational facilities for white and African American students were inherently unequal. Ferguson , according to which laws mandating separate public facilities for whites and African Americans do not violate the equal-protection clause if the facilities are approximately equal. Although the decision strictly applied only to public schools, it implied that segregation was not permissible in other public facilities. Board of Education of Topeka helped to inspire the American civil rights movement of the late s and s. Ferguson and Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka were two of the U. The case was heard as a consolidation of four class-action suits filed in four states by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People NAACP on behalf of African American elementary and high school students who had been denied admission to all-white public schools. Board of Education of Topeka , Briggs v. Elliott , and Davis v. The defendants in the district court decisions appealed directly to the Supreme Court, while those in Gebhart were granted certiorari a writ for the reexamination of an action of a lower court. Board of Education of Topeka was argued on December 9, ; the attorney who argued on behalf of the plaintiffs was Thurgood Marshall , who later served as an associate justice of the Supreme Court â€” The case was reargued on December 8, , to address the question of whether the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment would have understood it to be inconsistent with racial segregation in public education. The decision found that the historical evidence bearing on the issue was inconclusive. Hayes, Thurgood Marshall, and James M. Supreme Court, Washington, D. Board of Education of Topeka that racial segregation in public schools was unconstitutional, May 17, Painter and McLaurin v. Specifically, he agreed with a finding of the Kansas district court that the policy of forcing African American children to attend separate schools solely because of their race created in them a feeling of inferiority that undermined their motivation to learn and deprived them of educational opportunities they would enjoy in racially integrated schools. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

Chapter 3 : Brown v. Board of Education Podcast | United States Courts

At the core of the Brown case, which included lawsuits against school boards in Topeka, Kan., and several other states, was the Plessy vs. Ferguson ruling in which the Supreme Court said.

This segregation was alleged to deprive the plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment. In each of the cases other than the Delaware case, a three-judge federal district court denied relief to the plaintiffs on the so-called "separate but equal" doctrine announced by this Court in Plessy v. Under that doctrine, equality of treatment is accorded when the races are provided substantially equal facilities, even though these facilities be separate. In the Delaware case, the Supreme Court of Delaware adhered to that doctrine, but ordered that the plaintiffs be admitted to the white schools because of their superiority to the Negro schools. The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not "equal" and cannot be made "equal," and that hence they are deprived of the equal protection of the laws. Because of the obvious importance of the question presented, the Court took jurisdiction. It covered exhaustively consideration of the Amendment in Congress, ratification by the states, then-existing practices in racial segregation, and the views of proponents and opponents of the Amendment. This discussion and our own investigation convince us that, although these sources cast some light, it is not enough to resolve the problem with which we are faced. At best, they are inconclusive. The most avid proponents of the post-War Amendments undoubtedly intended them to remove all legal distinctions among "all persons born or naturalized in the United States. What others in Congress and the state legislatures had in mind cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. Education of white children was largely in the hands of private groups. Education of Negroes was almost nonexistent, and practically all of the race were illiterate. In fact, any education of Negroes was forbidden by law in some states. Today, in contrast, many Negroes have achieved outstanding success in the arts and sciences, as well as in the business and professional world. It is true that public school education at the time of the Amendment had advanced further in the North, but the effect of the Amendment on Northern States was generally ignored in the congressional debates. Even in the North, the conditions of public education did not approximate those existing today. The curriculum was usually rudimentary; ungraded schools were common in rural areas; the school term was but three months a year in many states, and compulsory school attendance was virtually unknown. As a consequence, it is not surprising that there should be so little in the history of the Fourteenth Amendment relating to its intended effect on public education. In the first cases in this Court construing the Fourteenth Amendment, decided shortly after its adoption, the Court interpreted it as proscribing all state-imposed discriminations against the Negro race. Ferguson, supra, involving not education but transportation. In this Court, there have been six cases involving the "separate but equal" doctrine in the field of public education. County Board of Education, U. Oklahoma State Regents, U. In none of these cases was it necessary to reexamine the doctrine to grant relief to the Negro plaintiff. And in Sweatt v. Painter, supra, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question whether Plessy v. Ferguson should be held inapplicable to public education. In the instant cases, that question is directly presented. Here, unlike Sweatt v. Painter, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other "tangible" factors. We must look instead to the effect of segregation itself on public education. In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to , when the Amendment was adopted, or even to , when Plessy v. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout [] the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws. Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training,

and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. We come then to the question presented: We believe that it does. Painter, supra, in finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this Court relied in large part on "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school. Oklahoma State Regents, supra, the Court, in requiring that a Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students, again resorted to intangible considerations: To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs: The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system. Ferguson, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Ferguson contrary to this finding is rejected. We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. On reargument, the consideration of appropriate relief was necessarily subordinated to the primary question -- the constitutionality of segregation in public education. We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws. In order that we may have the full assistance of the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be restored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument on Questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court for the reargument this Term. The Attorneys General of the states requiring or permitting segregation in public education will also be permitted to appear as amici curiae upon request to do so by September 15, , and submission of briefs by October 1, Board of Education, the plaintiffs are Negro children of elementary school age residing in Topeka. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas to enjoin enforcement of a Kansas statute which permits, but does not require, cities of more than 15, population to maintain separate school facilities for Negro and white students. Pursuant to that authority, the Topeka Board of Education elected to establish segregated elementary schools. Other public schools in the community, however, are operated on a nonsegregated basis. The three-judge District Court, convened under 28 U. The case is here on direct appeal under 28 U. In the South Carolina case, Briggs v. Elliott, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in Clarendon County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. The court found that the Negro schools were inferior to the white schools, and ordered the defendants to begin immediately to equalize the facilities. But the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program. On remand, the District Court found that substantial equality had been achieved except for buildings and that the defendants were proceeding to rectify this inequality as well. The case is again here on direct appeal under 28 U. In the Virginia case, Davis v. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. The court found the Negro school inferior in physical plant, curricula, and transportation, and ordered the defendants forthwith to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to "proceed with all reasonable diligence and dispatch to remove" the inequality in physical plant. But, as in the South Carolina

case, the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program. In the Delaware case, Gebhart v. Belton, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in New Castle County. They brought this action in the Delaware Court of Chancery to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. The Chancellor gave judgment for the plaintiffs and ordered their immediate admission to schools previously attended only by white children, on the ground that the Negro schools were inferior with respect to teacher training, pupil-teacher ratio, extracurricular activities, physical plant, and time and distance involved in travel. The Chancellor also found that segregation itself results in an inferior education for Negro children see note 10 infra , but did not rest his decision on that ground. The defendants, contending only that the Delaware courts had erred in ordering the immediate admission of the Negro plaintiffs to the white schools, applied to this Court for certiorari. The writ was granted, U. The plaintiffs, who were successful below, did not submit a cross-petition.

Chapter 4 : Civil Rights: Brown v. Board of Education I ()

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka was a landmark Supreme Court case in which the justices ruled unanimously that racial segregation of children in public schools was unconstitutional.

Visit Website The case went before the U. Board of Education of Topeka. Thirteen years later, President Lyndon B. Johnson would appoint Marshall as the first black Supreme Court justice. At first, the justices were divided on how to rule on school segregation, with Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson holding the opinion that the Plessy verdict should stand. But in September , before Brown v. Eisenhower replaced him with Earl Warren , then governor of California. Displaying considerable political skill and determination, the new chief justice succeeded in engineering a unanimous verdict against school segregation the following year. In May , the Court issued a second opinion in the case known as Brown v. While Kansas and some other states acted in accordance with the verdict, many school and local officials in the South defied it. In one major example, Governor Orval Faubus of Arkansas called out the state National Guard to prevent black students from attending high school in Little Rock in In , a year after the Brown v. Her arrest sparked the Montgomery bus boycott and would lead to other boycotts, sit-ins and demonstrations many of them led by Martin Luther King Jr. Passage of the Civil Rights Act of , backed by enforcement by the Justice Department, began the process of desegregation in earnest. This landmark piece of civil rights legislation was followed by the Voting Rights Act of and the Fair Housing Act of In , the Supreme Court issued another landmark decision in Runyon v. McCrary, ruling that even private, nonsectarian schools that denied admission to students on the basis of race violated federal civil rights laws. Board of Education had set the legal precedent that would be used to overturn laws enforcing segregation in other public facilities. Today, more than 60 years after Brown v. Volume I Salem Press. Board of Education, PBS. Richard Rothstein, Brown v. Board at 60, Economic Policy Institute , April 17, Citation Information Brown v. Board of Education Author.

Chapter 5 : History & Culture - Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site (U.S. National Park Serv

On May 17, , U.S. Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren delivered the unanimous ruling in the landmark civil rights case Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas. State-sanctioned segregation of public schools was a violation of the 14th amendment and was therefore unconstitutional.

They are premised on different facts and different local conditions, but a common legal question justifies their consideration together in this consolidated opinion. In each instance, [p] they had been denied admission to schools attended by white children under laws requiring or permitting segregation according to race. This segregation was alleged to deprive the plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment. In each of the cases other than the Delaware case, a three-judge federal district court denied relief to the plaintiffs on the so-called "separate but equal" doctrine announced by this Court in Plessy v. Under that doctrine, equality of treatment is accorded when the races are provided substantially equal facilities, even though these facilities be separate. In the Delaware case, the Supreme Court of Delaware adhered to that doctrine, but ordered that the plaintiffs be admitted to the white schools because of their superiority to the Negro schools. The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not "equal" and cannot be made "equal," and that hence they are deprived of the equal protection of the laws. Because of the obvious importance of the question presented, the Court took jurisdiction. It covered exhaustively consideration of the Amendment in Congress, ratification by the states, then-existing practices in racial segregation, and the views of proponents and opponents of the Amendment. This discussion and our own investigation convince us that, although these sources cast some light, it is not enough to resolve the problem with which we are faced. At best, they are inconclusive. The most avid proponents of the post-War Amendments undoubtedly intended them to remove all legal distinctions among "all persons born or naturalized in the United States. What others in Congress and the state legislatures had in mind cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. Education of white children was largely in the hands of private groups. Education of Negroes was almost nonexistent, and practically all of the race were illiterate. In fact, any education of Negroes was forbidden by law in some states. Today, in contrast, many Negroes have achieved outstanding success in the arts and sciences, as well as in the business and professional world. It is true that public school education at the time of the Amendment had advanced further in the North, but the effect of the Amendment on Northern States was generally ignored in the congressional debates. Even in the North, the conditions of public education did not approximate those existing today. The curriculum was usually rudimentary; ungraded schools were common in rural areas; the school term was but three months a year in many states, and compulsory school attendance was virtually unknown. As a consequence, it is not surprising that there should be so little in the history of the Fourteenth Amendment relating to its intended effect on public education. In the first cases in this Court construing the Fourteenth Amendment, decided shortly after its adoption, the Court interpreted it as proscribing all state-imposed discriminations against the Negro race. Ferguson, supra, involving not education but transportation. In this Court, there have been six cases involving the "separate but equal" doctrine in the field of public education. County Board of Education, U. Oklahoma State Regents, U. In none of these cases was it necessary to reexamine the doctrine to grant relief to the Negro plaintiff. And in Sweatt v. Painter, supra, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question whether Plessy v. Ferguson should be held inapplicable to public education. In the instant cases, that question is directly presented. Here, unlike Sweatt v. Painter, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other "tangible" factors. We must look instead to the effect of segregation itself on public education. In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to , when the Amendment was adopted, or even to , when Plessy v. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout [p] the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws. Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school

attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does. Painter, supra, in finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this Court relied in large part on "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school. Oklahoma State Regents, supra, the Court, in requiring that a Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students, again resorted to intangible considerations: To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs: Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system. Ferguson, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Ferguson contrary to this finding is rejected. We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. On reargument, the consideration of appropriate relief was necessarily subordinated to the primary question -- the constitutionality of segregation in public education. We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws. In order that we may have the full assistance of the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be restored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument on Questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court for the reargument this Term [n13] The Attorney General [p] of the United States is again invited to participate. The Attorneys General of the states requiring or permitting segregation in public education will also be permitted to appear as amici curiae upon request to do so by September 15, , and submission of briefs by October 1, In the Kansas case, Brown v. Board of Education, the plaintiffs are Negro children of elementary school age residing in Topeka. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas to enjoin enforcement of a Kansas statute which permits, but does not require, cities of more than 15, population to maintain separate school facilities for Negro and white students. Pursuant to that authority, the Topeka Board of Education elected to establish segregated elementary schools. Other public schools in the community, however, are operated on a nonsegregated basis. The three-judge District Court, convened under 28 U. The case is here on direct appeal under 28 U. In the South Carolina case, Briggs v. Elliott, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in Clarendon County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. The court found that the Negro schools were inferior to the white schools, and ordered the defendants to begin immediately to equalize the facilities. But the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and

denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program. On remand, the District Court found that substantial equality had been achieved except for buildings and that the defendants were proceeding to rectify this inequality as well. The case is again here on direct appeal under 28 U. In the Virginia case, Davis v. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. The court found the Negro school inferior in physical plant, curricula, and transportation, and ordered the defendants forthwith to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to "proceed with all reasonable diligence and dispatch to remove" the inequality in physical plant. But, as in the South Carolina case, the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program. In the Delaware case, Gebhart v. Belton, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in New Castle County. They brought this action in the Delaware Court of Chancery to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the state constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. The Chancellor gave judgment for the plaintiffs and ordered their immediate admission to schools previously attended only by white children, on the ground that the Negro schools were inferior with respect to teacher training, pupil-teacher ratio, extracurricular activities, physical plant, and time and distance involved in travel. The Chancellor also found that segregation itself results in an inferior education for Negro children see note 10, infra , but did not rest his decision on that ground. The defendants, contending only that the Delaware courts had erred in ordering the immediate admission of the Negro plaintiffs to the white schools, applied to this Court for certiorari. The writ was granted, U. The plaintiffs, who were successful below, did not submit a cross-petition. School practices current at the time of the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment are described in Butts and Cremin, supra, at ; Cubberley, supra, at , ; Knight, Public Education in the South , cc. Although the demand for free public schools followed substantially the same pattern in both the North and the South, the development in the South did not begin to gain momentum until about , some twenty years after that in the North. The reasons for the somewhat slower development in the South e. In the country as a whole, but particularly in the South, the War virtually stopped all progress in public education. The low status of Negro education in all sections of the country, both before and immediately after the War, is described in Beale, A History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools , , Compulsory school attendance laws were not generally adopted until after the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, and it was not until that such laws were in force in all the states. Cubberley, supra, at Slaughter-House Cases, 16 Wall.

Chapter 6 : Brown v. Board of Education - HISTORY

On May 17, , U.S. Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren delivered the unanimous ruling in the landmark civil rights case Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas. State-sanctioned segregation of public schools was a violation of the 14th Amendment and was therefore unconstitutional.

They are premised on different facts and different local conditions, but a common legal question justifies their consideration together in this consolidated opinion. In each of the cases, minors of the Negro race, through their legal representatives, seek the aid of the courts in obtaining admission to the public schools of their community on a nonsegregated basis. In each instance, they had been denied admission to schools attended by white children under laws requiring or permitting segregation according to race. This segregation was alleged to deprive the plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws under the Fourteenth Amendment. In each of the cases other than the Delaware case, a three-judge federal district court denied relief to the plaintiffs on the so-called "separate but equal" doctrine announced by this Court in Plessy v. Under that doctrine, equality of treatment is accorded when the races are provided substantially equal facilities, even though these facilities be separate. In the Delaware case, the Supreme Court of Delaware adhered to that doctrine, but ordered that the plaintiffs be admitted to the white schools because of their superiority to the Negro schools. The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not "equal" and cannot be made "equal," and that hence they are deprived of the equal protection of the laws. Because of the obvious importance of the question presented, the Court took jurisdiction. Argument was heard in the Term, and reargument was heard this Term on certain questions propounded by the Court. Reargument was largely devoted to the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in It covered exhaustively consideration of the Amendment in Congress, ratification by the states, then-existing practices in racial segregation, and the views of proponents and opponents of the Amendment. This discussion and our own investigation convince us that, although these sources cast some light, it is not enough to resolve the problem with which we are faced. At best, they are inconclusive. The most avid proponents of the post-War Amendments undoubtedly intended them to remove all legal distinctions among "all persons born or naturalized in the United States. What others in Congress and the state legislatures had in mind cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. In the South, the movement toward free common schools, supported by general taxation, had not yet taken hold. Education of white children was largely in the hands of private groups. Education of Negroes was almost nonexistent, and practically all of the race were illiterate. In fact, any education of Negroes was forbidden by law in some states. Today, in contrast, many Negroes have achieved outstanding success in the arts and sciences, as well as in the business and professional world. It is true that public school education at the time of the Amendment had advanced further in the North, but the effect of the Amendment on Northern States was generally ignored in the congressional debates. Even in the North, the conditions of public education did not approximate those existing today. The curriculum was usually rudimentary; ungraded schools were common in rural areas; the school term was but three months a year in many states, and compulsory school attendance was virtually unknown. As a consequence, it is not surprising that there should be so little in the history of the Fourteenth Amendment relating to its intended effect on public education. In the first cases in this Court construing the Fourteenth Amendment, decided shortly after its adoption, the Court interpreted it as proscribing all state-imposed discriminations against the Negro race. The doctrine of "separate but equal" did not make its appearance in this Court until in the case of Plessy v. Ferguson, supra, involving not education but transportation. American courts have since labored with the doctrine for over half a century. In this Court, there have been six cases involving the "separate but equal" doctrine in the field of public education. County Board of Education, U. In more recent cases, all on the graduate school level, inequality was found in that specific benefits enjoyed by white students were denied to Negro students of the same educational qualifications. Oklahoma State Regents, U. In none of these cases was it necessary to reexamine the doctrine to grant relief to the Negro plaintiff. And in Sweatt v. Painter, supra, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question whether Plessy v. Ferguson should be held inapplicable to public education. In the instant cases,

that question is directly presented. Here, unlike Sweatt v. Painter, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other "tangible" factors. Our decision, therefore, cannot turn on merely a comparison of these tangible factors in the Negro and white schools involved in each of the cases. We must look instead to the effect of segregation itself on public education. In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to , when the Amendment was adopted, or even to , when Plessy v. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws. Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does. Painter, supra, in finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this Court relied in large part on "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school. Oklahoma State Regents, supra, the Court, in requiring that a Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students, again resorted to intangible considerations: To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs: Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system. Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of Plessy v. Ferguson, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in Plessy v. Ferguson contrary to this finding is rejected. We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Because these are class actions, because of the wide applicability of this decision, and because of the great variety of local conditions, the formulation of decrees in these cases presents problems of considerable complexity. On reargument, the consideration of appropriate relief was necessarily subordinated to the primary question -- the constitutionality of segregation in public education. We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws. In order that we may have the full assistance of the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be restored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument on Questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court for the reargument this Term The Attorney General of the United States is again invited to participate. The Attorneys General of the states requiring or permitting segregation in public education will also be permitted to appear as amici curiae upon request to do so by September 15, , and

submission of briefs by October 1, It is so ordered.

Chapter 7 : Brown v. Board of Ed is decided - HISTORY

County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et al., on appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, argued December 10, , reargued December , , and No. 10, Gebhart et al. v. Belton et al., on certiorari to the Supreme Court of Delaware, argued December 11, , reargued December 9,

The plaintiffs were thirteen Topeka parents on behalf of their 20 children. The Topeka Board of Education operated separate elementary schools under an Kansas law, which permitted but did not require districts to maintain separate elementary school facilities for black and white students in 12 communities with populations over 15, The named plaintiff, Oliver L. Brown , was a parent, a welder in the shops of the Santa Fe Railroad , an assistant pastor at his local church, and an African American. They were each refused enrollment and directed to the segregated schools. The case "Oliver Brown et al. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas" was named after Oliver Brown as a legal strategy to have a man at the head of the roster. Brown at the head of the roster would be better received by the U. The 13 plaintiffs were: Supreme Court precedent set in Plessy v. Ferguson , U. Board of Education as heard before the Supreme Court combined five cases: Brown itself, Briggs v. Elliott filed in South Carolina , Davis v. Belton filed in Delaware , and Bolling v. Sharpe filed in Washington, D. The Davis case, the only case of the five originating from a student protest, began when year-old Barbara Rose Johns organized and led a student walkout of Moton High School. The district court found substantial equality as to all such factors. The lower court, in its opinion, noted that, in Topeka, "the physical facilities, the curricula, courses of study, qualification and quality of teachers, as well as other educational facilities in the two sets of schools [were] comparable. Supreme Court in â€”argued the case before the Supreme Court for the plaintiffs. In December , the Justice Department filed a friend of the court brief in the case. The brief was unusual in its heavy emphasis on foreign-policy considerations of the Truman administration in a case ostensibly about domestic issues. Of the seven pages covering "the interest of the United States," five focused on the way school segregation hurt the United States in the Cold War competition for the friendship and allegiance of non-white peoples in countries then gaining independence from colonial rule. Attorney General James P. McGranery noted that The existence of discrimination against minority groups in the United States has an adverse effect upon our relations with other countries. Racial discrimination furnishes grist for the Communist propaganda mills. Supreme Court that on May 17, , ruled unanimously that racial segregation in public schools is unconstitutional. The justices in support of desegregation spent much effort convincing those who initially intended to dissent to join a unanimous opinion. Although the legal effect would be same for a majority rather than unanimous decision, it was felt that dissent could be used by segregation supporters as a legitimizing counter-argument. Conference notes and draft decisions illustrate the division of opinions before the decision was issued. Vinson noted that Congress had not issued desegregation legislation; Stanley F. Clark wrote that "we had led the states on to think segregation is OK and we should let them work it out. Eisenhower appointed Earl Warren as Chief Justice. All they are concerned about is to see that their sweet little girls are not required to sit in school alongside some big overgrown Negroes. According to Susan Firestone , the study itself is dubious in conclusion and unreliable in reproduction. The activist faction believed the Fourteenth Amendment did give the necessary authority and were pushing to go ahead. Warren, who held only a recess appointment , held his tongue until the Senate confirmed his appointment. Warren convened a meeting of the justices, and presented to them the simple argument that the only reason to sustain segregation was an honest belief in the inferiority of Negroes. Warren further submitted that the Court must overrule Plessy to maintain its legitimacy as an institution of liberty, and it must do so unanimously to avoid massive Southern resistance. He began to build a unanimous opinion. Although most justices were immediately convinced, Warren spent some time after this famous speech convincing everyone to sign onto the opinion. Justices Jackson and Reed finally decided to drop their dissent. The final decision was unanimous. Warren drafted the basic opinion and kept circulating and revising it until he had an opinion endorsed by all the members of the Court. First, the court made a unanimous decision. Prior to the ruling, there were reports that the court members were sharply divided and might not be able to agree. Second, the

attendance of Justice Robert H. Jackson who had suffered a mild heart attack and was not expected to return to the bench until early June They found that a significant psychological and social disadvantage was given to black children from the nature of segregation itself, drawing on research conducted by Kenneth Clark assisted by June Shagaloff. This aspect was vital because the question was not whether the schools were "equal", which under Plessy they nominally should have been, but whether the doctrine of separate was constitutional. The justices answered with a strong "no": We believe that it does. The effect is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system. We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. Local outcomes Judgment and order of the Supreme Court for the case. The Topeka junior high schools had been integrated since Topeka High School was integrated from its inception in and its sports teams from on. The Board of Education of Topeka began to end segregation in the Topeka elementary schools in August , integrating two attendance districts. All the Topeka elementary schools were changed to neighborhood attendance centers in January , although existing students were allowed to continue attending their prior assigned schools at their option. Social implications Not everyone accepted the Brown v. Board of Education decision. In Virginia, Senator Harry F. For more implications of the Brown decision, see School integration in the United States. Deep South Texas Attorney General John Ben Shepperd organized a campaign to generate legal obstacles to implementation of desegregation. Its legislature passed an Interposition Resolution denouncing the decision and declaring it null and void. But Florida Governor LeRoy Collins , though joining in the protest against the court decision, refused to sign it, arguing that the attempt to overturn the ruling must be done by legal methods. In Mississippi fear of violence prevented any plaintiff from bringing a school desegregation suit for the next nine years. Beckwith was not convicted of the murder until George Wallace personally blocked the door to Foster Auditorium at the University of Alabama to prevent the enrollment of two black students. This became the infamous Stand in the Schoolhouse Door [49] where Wallace personally backed his "segregation now, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever" policy that he had stated in his inaugural address. Upland South In North Carolina, there was often a strategy of nominally accepting Brown, but tacitly resisting it. On May 18, the Greensboro, North Carolina school board declared that it would abide by the Brown ruling. This was the result of the initiative of D. This made Greensboro the first, and for years the only, city in the South, to announce its intent to comply. However, others in the city resisted integration, putting up legal obstacles[how? Transition to a fully integrated school system did not begin until , after numerous local lawsuits and both nonviolent and violent demonstrations. Historians have noted the irony that Greensboro, which had heralded itself as such a progressive city, was one of the last holdouts for school desegregation. However, after , the African-American teachers from the local "negro school" were not retained; this was ascribed to poor performance. They appealed their dismissal in Naomi Brooks et al. In Harlem , New York, for example, not a single new school had been built since the turn of the century, nor did a single nursery school exist, even as the Second Great Migration caused overcrowding of existing schools. Existing schools tended to be dilapidated and staffed with inexperienced teachers. Mallory and thousands of other parents bolstered the pressure of the lawsuit with a school boycott in During the boycott, some of the first freedom schools of the period were established. The city responded to the campaign by permitting more open transfers to high-quality, historically-white schools. Ferguson , the landmark United States Supreme Court decision upholding the constitutionality of racial segregation in under the doctrine of " separate but equal " were, in part, tied to the scientific racism of the era. Board of Education, the Supreme Court rejected the ideas of scientific racists about the need for segregation, especially in schools. The Court buttressed its holding by citing in footnote 11 social science research about the harms to black children caused by segregated schools.

Both scholarly and popular ideas of hereditarianism played an important role in the attack and backlash that followed the Brown decision. Katzmann , Damon J. Jackson in , during early deliberations that led to the Brown v. In his memo, Rehnquist argued: Ferguson was right and should be reaffirmed. Jenkins that at the very least, Brown I has been misunderstood by the courts. Brown I did not say that "racially isolated" schools were inherently inferior; the harm that it identified was tied purely to de jure segregation, not de facto segregation. Indeed, Brown I itself did not need to rely upon any psychological or social-science research in order to announce the simple, yet fundamental truth that the Government cannot discriminate among its citizens on the basis of race.

Chapter 8 : Brown v. Board of Education - Wikipedia

United States Supreme Court BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION, () No. 10 Argued: December 9, Decided: May 17, Segregation of white and Negro children in the public schools of a State solely on the basis of race, pursuant to state laws permitting or requiring such segregation, denies to Negro children the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment - even though.

History[edit] Coleman v. Brown[edit] Coleman v. Brown [2] [3] Previously Coleman v. The case was filed on April 23, and tried before a United States magistrate judge. The special master submitted 16 interim reports, with later reports "reflect[ing] a troubling reversal in the progress of the remedial efforts of the preceding decade". Brown[edit] Plata v. The case was filed on April 5, , and re-filed with an amended complaint on August 20, Brown three-judge court[edit] In , the plaintiffs in the Coleman and Plata cases filed motions to convene a three-judge court to limit the prison population. On October 4, , Governor Schwarzenegger issued Proclamation , declaring a state of emergency with regard to the prisons. In an order described by The New York Times as "scathing", the panel indicated that the state had failed to follow through on previous orders to improve conditions and that the cuts were needed to deal with overcrowding and poor health care that was causing an unnecessary death each week on average. The panel recommended achieving the cuts by reducing imprisonment of nonviolent offenders and technical parole violators. A three-judge court can only be convened after less intrusive orders have failed and the State has been given a reasonable time to comply with prior orders. Additionally, Kennedy writes that the prisoner release order is not overbroad because the State will be allowed to ask the three-judge court to modify the order, someday. While the two-year deadline may not be feasible, Kennedy notes that California has already made progress in reducing overcrowding and that it asked the court to reverse, not extend, the order. Since the classes certified here are improper, it follows the remedy decreed is also illegal. But it would achieve that at the expense of intellectual bankruptcy". Alito believes the prison capacity ratio imposed by the three-judge court will order "the premature release of approximately 46, criminals-the equivalent of three Army divisions. It "exemplifies what went wrong in this case", for Alito, that the judge rejecting this solution responded he would not "say yes, and the hell with everybody else. Plata[edit] Public Safety Realignment Initiative AB [edit] Instead of releasing state prison inmates, California simply moved them to county jails. After the case was argued but before Court issued its opinion the California legislature passed the Public Safety Realignment initiative , or AB The Supreme Court denied the stay without comment. He derides that, "The bluff has been called, and the Court has nary a pair to lay on the table. As of the last update on May 9, , the prison population was at Governor Brown framed efforts to implement Brown v. Plata as a way to decrease costs. The Program Guide, which is the remedial implementation plan for Coleman v. Brown, mandated the following: Plata has faced some negative and some positive treatment in the courts. Cal further discussed whether Brown v. Plata created a substantive right. Plata to make a prison overcrowding claim. The court stated that Brown v. Plata "by itself does not provide any substantive right on which plaintiff can rely, and his claim of general prison overcrowding based on Plata fails. Plata because it showed the following: Below is a list of selected scholarship. Improving Conditions and Shining a Light, 95 Denv. Margo Schlanger, Plata v. Jails, Prisons, Courts and Politics, 48 Harv. Calambokidis, From Hospitals to Prisons: A New Explanation, Cornell L.

Chapter 9 : Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka | Definition, Facts, & Significance | calendrierdelascien

After the decision in Brown v. Board of Education declared state-mandated segregation in public schools unconstitutional, the case was re-argued to determine how to correct the violations. In a directive known as Brown II, the Supreme Court ordered District Courts to determine whether local governments were pursuing integration "with.

History - Brown v. Board of Education Re-enactment The Plessy Decision Although the Declaration of Independence stated that "All men are created equal," due to the institution of slavery, this statement was not to be grounded in law in the United States until after the Civil War and, arguably, not completely fulfilled for many years thereafter. In , the Thirteenth Amendment was ratified and finally put an end to slavery. Moreover, the Fourteenth Amendment strengthened the legal rights of newly freed slaves by stating, among other things, that no state shall deprive anyone of either "due process of law" or of the "equal protection of the law. Despite these Amendments, African Americans were often treated differently than whites in many parts of the country, especially in the South. In fact, many state legislatures enacted laws that led to the legally mandated segregation of the races. In other words, the laws of many states decreed that blacks and whites could not use the same public facilities, ride the same buses, attend the same schools, etc. These laws came to be known as Jim Crow laws. In , an African-American man named Homer Plessy refused to give up his seat to a white man on a train in New Orleans, as he was required to do by Louisiana state law. For this action he was arrested. Plessy, contending that the Louisiana law separating blacks from whites on trains violated the "equal protection clause" of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U. Constitution, decided to fight his arrest in court. By , his case had made it all the way to the United States Supreme Court. By a vote of , the Supreme Court ruled against Plessy. In the case of Plessy v. Ferguson, Justice Henry Billings Brown, writing the majority opinion, stated that: If one race be inferior to the other socially, the Constitution of the United States cannot put them upon the same plane. Sadly, as a result of the Plessy decision, in the early twentieth century the Supreme Court continued to uphold the legality of Jim Crow laws and other forms of racial discrimination. In the case of Cumming v. County Board of Education , for instance, the Court refused to issue an injunction preventing a school board from spending tax money on a white high school when the same school board voted to close down a black high school for financial reasons. Moreover, in Gong Lum v. The Road to Brown Note: Some of the case information is from Patterson, James T. Oxford University Press; New York, For about the first 20 years of its existence, it tried to persuade Congress and other legislative bodies to enact laws that would protect African Americans from lynchings and other racist actions. Houston, together with Thurgood Marshall, devised a strategy to attack Jim Crow laws by striking at them where they were perhaps weakestâ€”in the field of education. Maryland and Missouri ex rel Gaines v. After Houston returned to private practice in , Marshall became head of the Fund and used it to argue the cases of Sweat v. Painter and McLaurin v. Oklahoma Board of Regents of Higher Education. Maryland Disappointed that the University of Maryland School of Law was rejecting black applicants solely because of their race, beginning in Thurgood Marshall who was himself rejected from this law school because of its racial acceptance policies decided to challenge this practice in the Maryland court system. In , the Court of Appeals also ruled in favor of Murray and ordered the law school to admit him. Two years later, Murray graduated. Missouri ex rel Gaines v. The State of Missouri gave Gaines the option of either attending an all-black law school that it would build Missouri did not have any all-black law schools at this time or having Missouri help to pay for him to attend a law school in a neighboring state. By , his case reached the U. Supreme Court, and, in December of that year, the Court sided with him. The six-member majority stated that since a "black" law school did not currently exist in the State of Missouri, the "equal protection clause" required the state to provide, within its boundaries, a legal education for Gaines. In other words, since the state provided legal education for white students, it could not send black students, like Gaines, to school in another state. He argued that the education that he was receiving in the "black" law school was not of the same academic caliber as the education that he would be receiving if he attended the "white" law school. When the case reached the U. In other words, the "black" law school was "separate," but not "equal. However, it required him to sit apart from the rest of his class, eat at a

separate time and table from white students, etc. McLaurin, stating that these actions were both unusual and resulting in adverse effects on his academic pursuits, sued to put an end to these practices. Board of Education , The case that came to be known as Brown v. Board of Education was actually the name given to five separate cases that were heard by the U. Supreme Court concerning the issue of segregation in public schools. These cases were Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Briggs v. Sharpe, and Gebhart v. While the facts of each case are different, the main issue in each was the constitutionality of state-sponsored segregation in public schools. District Court that heard the cases ruled in favor of the school boards. The plaintiffs then appealed to the U. When the cases came before the Supreme Court in , the Court consolidated all five cases under the name of Brown v. Marshall personally argued the case before the Court. Although he raised a variety of legal issues on appeal, the most common one was that separate school systems for blacks and whites were inherently unequal, and thus violate the "equal protection clause" of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U. Furthermore, relying on sociological tests, such as the one performed by social scientist Kenneth Clark, and other data, he also argued that segregated school systems had a tendency to make black children feel inferior to white children, and thus such a system should not be legally permissible. Meeting to decide the case, the Justices of the Supreme Court realized that they were deeply divided over the issues raised. While most wanted to reverse Plessy and declare segregation in public schools to be unconstitutional, they had various reasons for doing so. Earl Warren of California. After the case was reheard in , Chief Justice Warren was able to do something that his predecessor had notâ€”i. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Rather, it asked the attorney generals of all states with laws permitting segregation in their public schools to submit plans for how to proceed with desegregation. After still more hearings before the Court concerning the matter of desegregation, on May 31, , the Justices handed down a plan for how it was to proceed; desegregation was to proceed with "all deliberate speed.