

Brown's Lesson: To Integrate or Separate is Not the Question, But How to Achieve a Non-Racist Society

Thomas E. Kleven

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/rrgc>



Part of the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thomas E. Kleven, *Brown's Lesson: To Integrate or Separate is Not the Question, But How to Achieve a Non-Racist Society*, 5 U. Md. L.J. Race Relig. Gender & Class 43 (2005).

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/rrgc/vol5/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Maryland Law Journal of Race, Religion, Gender and Class by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. For more information, please contact smccarty@law.umaryland.edu.

BROWN'S LESSON: TO INTEGRATE OR SEPARATE IS NOT THE QUESTION, BUT HOW TO ACHIEVE A NON-RACIST SOCIETY

THOMAS E. KLEVEN*

*Brown v. Board of Education*¹ represented a great victory in the struggle for racial justice in the United States. *Brown* ended American apartheid, the explicit use of law to promote white supremacy and the perpetual subordination of African Americans in a caste-like status.² This subordination was carried out in the most undemocratic way possible, with the total exclusion of African Americans from the political process. Yet, African Americans coped with enforced segregation, maintaining strong family ties and group solidarity.³ Some thrived within the black community, and a few achieved success in the greater society,⁴ while continuing to endure the indignities of racism.⁵ But, for the most part, the black community was excluded from mainstream American life, and the quality of life and the opportunities available within the black community were far inferior to the white community.

Since *Brown*, some progress has been achieved toward greater racial equality. African Americans are present in greater numbers than before in virtually all areas of social life that represent success—business, government, academia, entertainment, and various professions, some of which African Americans were previously

* Professor of Law, Thurgood Marshall School of Law, Texas Southern University. Thanks to all those who have been kind enough to comment on and thereby help improve this article, including especially my friends and colleagues Taunya Banks, John Brittain, Marty Levy, and Ken Williams. A version of the article was presented at the Scholars of Color Conference hosted by Tulane Law School in New Orleans in May 2005.

1. 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

2. See, e.g., Martin L. Levy, *Separate But Equal Is Inherently Unequal*, 28 THUR. MARSH. L. REV. 121, 121 (2003) (“[T]he unrepentant meaning of *Brown* was the doom it spelled for American apartheid!”).

3. See, e.g., JOANNE M. MARTIN & ELMER P. MARTIN, *THE HELPING TRADITION IN THE BLACK FAMILY AND COMMUNITY* (1985) (discussing the African origin of the helping tradition, its continuance during and after slavery into the early twentieth century, and its decline as a result of the Depression and black migration to urban areas).

4. See, e.g., BART LANDRY, *THE NEW BLACK MIDDLE CLASS* 18-66 (1987); Charles J. Ogletree, Jr., *The Integration Ideal: Sobering Reflections*, in *BROWN AT 50: THE UNFINISHED LEGACY* 167, 168-69 (Deborah L. Rhode & Charles J. Ogletree, Jr., eds., 2004).

5. A phenomenon that regrettably continues to this day. See, e.g., ELLIS COSE, *THE RAGE OF A PRIVILEGED CLASS* (1993) (reporting on the anger and alienation felt by middle-class African Americans as a result of the racism they still experience in their daily lives).

excluded entirely.⁶ Yet, fifty years after *Brown*, the United States remains a highly racialized and racist society. Though present in greater numbers, African Americans are grossly under-represented in the successful aspects of American life,⁷ and are grossly over-represented in those aspects that represent its hardships. African Americans are still highly segregated educationally and residentially in schools and neighborhoods of far lower quality than those in white communities.⁸ The incomes of African Americans lag far behind those of whites;⁹ the poverty and unemployment rates are far higher;¹⁰

6. See *infra* note 7.

7. African Americans comprise about 12% of the population of the United States. U.S. Census Bureau, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000. Yet as of 1/31/00 the number of black elected officials, although at an all time high and almost seven times the number in 1970, represented less than 2% of all elected officials. David A. Bositis, *Black Elected Officials: A Statistical Summary, 2000* (Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 2002) at <http://www.jointcenter.org/whatsnew/beo-2000/index.html>. And while there has been a substantial increase in the number of African Americans in the legal profession and in business, African Americans still represent less than 5% of federal judges and less than 4% of lawyers, and own only about 4% and account for less than 1% of the profits of the nation's non-farm businesses. Federal Judicial Center at http://air.fjc.gov/history/judges_frm.html; ABA Commission on Racial and Ethnic Diversity in the Profession, *Miles to Go 2000: Progress of Minorities in the Legal Profession* 9 at <http://www.abanet.org/minorities>; U.S. Census Bureau, Black-Owned Businesses: 1997 (October 2000). And while many more African Americans attend college now than previously, due to a substantially lower graduation rate the gap in completion rates has not improved over the years; between 1978-1998 the four-or-more-years-of-college completion rate for African Americans 25 years or older increased from 7.2% to 14.7%, while the rate for whites actually increased a bit more from 16.4% to 25.0%. WILLIAM B. HARVEY, MINORITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION 2000-2001, Tables 3, 4 & 9 (2001).

8. See *infra* notes 50, 72, "Ethnic Diversity Grows, Neighborhood Integration Lags Behind" (Lewis Mumford Center, 2001) at <http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/WholePop/Wpreport/page1.html> (reporting that despite modest improvement residential segregation among African Americans and whites remains high throughout the country); "Separate and Unequal: The Neighborhood Gap for Blacks and Hispanics in Metropolitan America" (Lewis Mumford Center, 2002) at <http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/SepUneq/Sureport/SURepPage1.html> (reporting on the gap in quality of life as between white and minority neighborhoods).

9. As of 2002, the median family income for African Americans was only 62% that of white families. U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States-2003, Social and Economic Characteristics of the White and Black Populations:1990-2002 at www.census.gov/prod/www/statistical-abstract-us.html (extrapolated from gross numbers). As of 2001, the median individual income for black males was only 71% of that of white males, while the median individual income for black females was 98% that of white females. U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Historical Income Tables-People at www.census.gov/hhes/income/histinc/p02.html (extrapolated from gross numbers).

10. As of 2002, 21.5% of black families were below the poverty level, as compared with 7.8% of white families. These figures represent a substantial drop from 33.9% for African Americans in 1967 (the earliest year reported) and 15.2% for whites in 1959. However, over the years the proportion of families below the poverty level who are African American has

the average life span is significantly shorter and the infant mortality rate significantly higher;¹¹ and on average, far more African Americans are in jail.¹²

It seems fair to say that what little integration there has been of African Americans into the mainstream of American life has benefited a select few, and that a large segment of the black community remains a virtual underclass with little immediate prospect for improvement.¹³ In addition, much overt bigotry in such areas as housing and employment continues to deny opportunities to African Americans,¹⁴

always been two to two and a half times their proportion of the overall population. U.S. Census Bureau, *Historic Poverty Tables* at www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/histpov/hstpov4.html (extrapolated from gross numbers). Over the years the unemployment rate of African Americans has always been about twice as high as that of whites, the figures for 2003 being 11.6% for black men as against 5.6% for white men and 10.2% for black women as against 4.8% for white women. Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, The Ohio State University, "Social/Economic Indicators: Comparing Brown Era Racial Disparities to Today," Slides 13 & 14 at www.kirwaninstitute.org/multimedia/presentations/BrownPresDisparity/Data.ppt.

11. As of 2001, the life expectancy of African Americans was 72.2, as against an overall rate for all races of 77.2 and for whites of 77.7. National Center for Health Statistics, "Health, United States, 2003," Table 27 at www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/pubs/pubd/his/updatedtables.htm. And the infant mortality rate of African Americans was by far the highest of any ethnic group, almost double the rate for all races, and more than double the rate for whites. *Id.* at Table 19.

12. As of June 2003, the total number of males incarcerated in the United States was 1,902,300, of which 832,400, or almost 44%, were African American. Black males were incarcerated at a rate of 4,834 per 100,000, as against an overall incarceration rate of 1,331 per 100,000 and a rate for white males of 681 per 100,000. The total number of females incarcerated in the United States was 176,300, of which 66,800 or almost 40% were African American. Black females were incarcerated at a rate of 352 per 100,000, as against an overall incarceration rate of 119 per 100,000 and a rate for white females of 75 per 100,000. Paige M. Harrison & Jennifer C. Karberg, "Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear 2003," U.S. Department of Justice Statistics Bulletin at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pjimo3.pdf. Since the mid-1970s, the rate of incarceration in the United States has risen sharply, and particularly for African Americans. As of 1974, the number of people who had ever served time in federal or state prison was 1.8 million, of whom 646,000 were African American; by 2001 the respective figures were 5.6 million overall and 2.2 million for African Americans, who represented 40% of the increase. Thomas P. Bonczar, "Prevalence of Imprisonment in the U.S. Population, 1974-2001," U.S. Department of Justice Statistics Bulletin at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pdf/piusp01.pdf. It is hardly a stretch to view incarceration as this era's means of forcibly segregating African Americans, as well as other minorities and poor whites.

13. See, e.g., DOUGLAS S. MASSEY & NANCY A. DENTON, *AMERICAN APARTHEID: SEGREGATION AND THE MAKING OF THE UNDERCLASS* (1993); WILLIAM JULIUS WILSON, *THE TRULY DISADVANTAGED: THE INNER CITY, THE UNDERCLASS, AND PUBLIC POLICY* (1990).

14. Regarding housing discrimination, see Orfield, *infra* note 49. Regarding employment discrimination, see U.S. Equal Opportunity Employment Commission, *Race-Based Charges* at <http://www.eeoc.gov/stats/race.html> (reporting during fiscal years 1992-2001 an annual average of more than 29,000 complaints of race-based employment discrimination, roughly 12%-13% of which on the average and 19% in 2000/2001 received meritorious resolutions).

and the system itself, although nominally color-blind, is structured so as to impede black advancement and maintain white privilege.¹⁵

In confronting the issue of ongoing racism, those of us struggling for racial justice must decide what steps are most likely to further the goal of creating a non-racist society. We might start by asking ourselves what a non-racist society would look like. Part I addresses that question and concludes that both integrationist and separatist approaches are compatible with visions of a non-racist society. Part II traces the history of *Brown* through the mid-1970s, during which time the dominant strategy was integrationist, and evaluates the rationale for that approach. Part III traces the history of *Brown* since the mid-1970s, when as a result of society's conservative drift the integrationist approach was largely abandoned. Part III concludes that a separate and unequal system has become institutionalized in the United States and sanctioned by the Supreme Court, and that a more separatist strategy would not likely have yielded a different result. Part IV argues that *Brown* is interrelated with a broader class struggle in this generally hierarchical and inegalitarian society, and concludes that a multi-racial and multi-ethnic movement for both racial and social justice is indispensable for the achievement of a non-racist society. Part V reviews the lessons we have learned from the history of *Brown*.

I. WHAT WOULD A NON-RACIST SOCIETY LOOK LIKE?

I would like to start by offering three visions of a non-racist society: (1) a society in which the concept of race is non-existent; (2) a non-hierarchical society in which the races voluntarily separate; and (3) an egalitarian society which is partially integrated and partially separate by choice. Strains of all three can be found in the struggle for

15. See Part III below; DAVID COLE, NO EQUAL JUSTICE: RACE AND CLASS IN THE AMERICAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM (1999) (on the systemic race and class bias in the criminal justice system); JOE R. FEAGIN, RACIST AMERICA: ROOTS, CURRENT REALITIES, AND FUTURE REPARATIONS (2000) (on the systemic nature of racism in the United States); Richard Thompson Ford, *The Boundaries of Race: Political Geography in Legal Analysis*, 107 HARV. L. REV. 1841, 1852 (1994) (arguing that "even in the absence of racism, race-neutral policy could be expected to entrench segregation and socio-economic stratification in a society with a history of racism."); Cheryl I. Harris, *Whiteness as Property*, 106 HARV. L. REV. 1709, 1715-21, 1737-57 (1993) (discussing slavery, segregation, and the racialization of the law in general in the United States).

racial justice in the United States, and all might inform the choice of strategies in the ongoing struggle.

One vision is of a society in which racial differences are irrelevant in all aspects of social life, no more significant than, say, the color of one's eyes is today, or even a society in which the very concept of race is non-existent. Perhaps over time, as the world becomes increasingly globalized, there will be so much interaction among the peoples of the world that the differences we now call race will in fact disappear. Or perhaps people will come to see race not as a biological reality but as a social construct, and will decide to discard it as a way to identify and classify people and to view all humanity as one race. Since in such a society race would be a random or non-existent factor, it would be highly integrated and have a highly uniform culture, as opposed to the racial distinctions and ethnic differences that exist today.

A second vision is of a society in which racial distinctions, whether viewed as a biological fact or a social construct, would continue to exist, and the races would by choice largely separate themselves into their own spheres, but without a hierarchical or dominative relationship among the separate spheres. The style of life might differ substantially among the separate spheres, but the races would perceive the quality of life in their respective spheres as comparable to one another. To the extent that there is interaction among the various racial spheres, it would be by mutual consent and to the mutual and comparable benefit of all parties. Even the seemingly inevitable global society of the future could conceivably operate in this fashion, with separate nation-states organized largely along racial lines in an egalitarian world community that would obviously have a far different power structure than exists today.

A third vision is of a pluralistic and heterogeneous society somewhere in between the first two, partially integrated and partially separated by choice, where people are not treated adversely or disadvantaged on account of race, and where racial differences are acknowledged and respected. Such a society would be highly egalitarian. There would be equality of access, without regard to race, in those areas of social life that are related to people's opportunity to succeed in life, and racial hierarchy would not exist in terms of economic status and political power. But people's desire to separate along racial lines in certain aspects of social life would be accommodated, and cultural differences among ethnic groups would be viewed as enriching society as a whole.

To some extent these three visions of a non-racist society parallel the dialogue that has historically pervaded the struggle for racial justice in the United States. The integrationist vision of a society where race is irrelevant is akin to Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech, where he spoke of people being judged not "by the color of their skin but by the content of their character" and of blacks and whites "sit(ing) down together at the table of brotherhood" and "join(ing) hands as sisters and brothers."¹⁶ Visions of the separation of the races on equal terms can be found in Marcus Garvey's so-called Back to Africa movement,¹⁷ the Republic of New Africa's demand for a separate nation comprised of states of the Deep South,¹⁸ and Elijah Muhammad's call for "a home we can call our own, support for ourselves until we are able to become self-sufficient."¹⁹ The pluralistic vision comports most, perhaps, with the "equal opportunity" society the United States purports to be today, where people are free to pursue their individual destinies and to associate freely with like-minded people under conditions of "liberty and justice for all."

None of these three visions of a non-racist society is, in my opinion, the "correct" view in any moral or ethical sense. Rather, it is more a question of people's preferences and of what is feasible at particular historical junctures. Given the value that many people of all ethnicities place on their ethnic identity in the United States, the vision of a society in which race is irrelevant is not in the cards today. If such a society is ever to come about, those who favor it will have to advocate for it and try to convince others of its desirability over an extended period of time. Nor is a society in which the races separate into largely separate spheres—as has occurred to some extent among ethnic groups in other societies, though often through violent means and rarely, if ever, on equal terms²⁰—an option in the United States.

16. "I Have a Dream," AFRO-American Almanac at www.toptags.com/aama/voices/speeches/speech1.htm.

17. See W.E.B. DuBois, *Back to Africa*, in MARCUS GARVEY AND THE VISION OF AFRICA 105-19 (John Henrik Clarke, ed. 1974); Marcus Garvey, *Redeeming the African Motherland*, in MARCUS GARVEY 47-56 (E. David Cronon, ed. 1973).

18. See WILLIAM L. VAN DEBURG, *NEW DAY IN BABYLON* 144-49 (1992).

19. Muhammad Speaks Website, "Integrating with evil," at www.muhammadspeaks.com/integratingwithevil.htm. See also C. ERIC LINCOLN, *THE BLACK MUSLIMS IN AMERICA* 83-93 (1994) (on the Black Muslim's goal of the separation of the races by stages - first personal, then economic, and finally political).

20. As with, for example, the partition of colonial India into largely Hindu India and largely Muslim Pakistan, or the break-up of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia into more

African Americans are not likely to move to Africa in great numbers, nor is it likely that the United States will cede territory for a black republic. Ethnic separation in enclaves largely isolated from mainstream American society, in the fashion of the Amish and other communal groups, is conceivable, but likely, if it occurs, to be small in scope. Even the Nation of Islam, which probably has the most separatist philosophy among African Americans today, is fairly small in number and has remained largely within mainstream society.²²

Currently in the United States, the pluralistic vision of an egalitarian and non-hierarchical society seems most compatible with people's views and most capable of being achieved. Contemporary views in the United States cover a rather wide spectrum. Many identify strongly with their ethnicity, while others do not; many prefer a degree of separateness, while others favor full integration. Most seem to believe in or at least to accept the United States as a diverse society where people should be free to pursue their chosen destinies under conditions of equal opportunity.²³ There also seems to be substantial consensus about what constitutes the "good life" in terms of material well-being. On the other hand, the United States is highly segregated, hierarchical, and inequalitarian along ethnic and class lines; in particular, as the next two sections will show, with regard to

ethnically homogeneous states. See, e.g., SUZANNE MICHELE BIRGERSON, *AFTER THE BREAKUP OF A MULTI-ETHNIC EMPIRE: RUSSIA, SUCCESSOR STATES, AND EURASIAN SECURITY* (2002); NOEL MALCOLM, *BOSNIA: A SHORT HISTORY* (1994); IAN TALBOT, *INDIA AND PAKISTAN* (2000); YUGOSLAVIA AND AFTER 87-115, 138-154, 196-212, 232-247 (David A. Dyker & Ivan Vejvoda, eds., 1996).

22. See LINCOLN, *supra* note 19, at 92-93 (opining in the early 1960s that "[t]here are indications that Elijah Muhammad does not really consider the physical separation of the races in this country a viable project" in light of a lack of a concrete proposal for such and the Nation's involvement economically in mainstream society); DEAN E. ROBINSON, *BLACK NATIONALISM IN AMERICAN POLITICS AND THOUGHT* 6-7, 88-90, 118-28 (2001) (describing in general, and with regard to the Nation of Islam under the leadership of Louis Farrakhan, "how and why black nationalism mostly took the form of 'ethnic pluralism'—pursuit of racially solidaristic efforts in a pluralistic political system subsumed by a capitalist economic one.").

23. See, e.g., PEW Research Center for the People & the Press, *PEW Values Update: American Social Beliefs 1997-1987* at <http://people-press.org/reports/print.php3?PageID=580> (reporting that 90% or more of respondents consistently agreed completely or mostly with the statement that "our society should do what is necessary to make sure that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed.").

education, which in turn is central to equal opportunity. Thus, if the vision of a pluralistic and non-racist society is to be realized, there will have to be a movement to establish a non-hierarchical and egalitarian society in the United States. Whether that is possible and what it would take is the focus of the final two sections.

II. *BROWN* THROUGH THE MID-1970S: PUSHING INTEGRATION

Aspects of the alternative visions of a non-racist society are also present in the history of *Brown*. Prior to *Brown* the separate-but-equal doctrine permitted the enforced separation of the races in many areas of social life so long as the separate facilities were equal.²⁴ In fact, segregated schools were never equal in terms of the resources provided them, and, in general, black children received an inferior education to that available to whites.²⁵ One approach that Thurgood Marshall and his team could have taken in *Brown* was to accept separate-but-equal and insist that states live up to it by devoting more resources to black schools. That was the tenor of some of the pre-*Brown* cases like *State of Missouri v. ex rel. Gaines v. Canada*,²⁶ where instead of providing a separate law school for African Americans, the state paid for its black residents to attend schools in other states, and the Supreme Court ordered Missouri to establish a law school for African Americans if it refused to admit them to the white law school.

But as reflected in *Sweatt v. Painter*,²⁷ decided four years before *Brown*, the ultimate strategy was to build a step-by-step case against separate-but-equal.²⁸ There, in response to *Gaines*, Texas created a law school for African Americans that the Supreme Court recognized was clearly inferior to the white law school in terms of physical facilities and resources, and that could easily have been held to violate the separate-but-equal standard on that basis alone.²⁹ In

24. *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

25. See HARRY S. ASHMORE, *THE NEGRO AND THE SCHOOLS* 109-26, 153-60 (1954) (a prominent study around the time of *Brown* detailing the inequalities in the South between black and white schools, although noting the lessening gap during the 1940s and early 1950s as the pressure to overrule *Plessy* was building).

26. 305 U.S. 337 (1938).

27. 339 U.S. 629 (1950).

28. See RICHARD KRUGER, *SIMPLE JUSTICE* 126-284 (1980); MARK V. TUSHNET, *THE NAACP'S LEGAL STRATEGY AGAINST SEGREGATED EDUCATION* (1987).

29. *Sweatt*, 339 U.S. at 633-34.

addition to such tangible factors, Marshall argued and the Supreme Court agreed that the black law school was not equal in its intangible aspects like its standing in the profession and the social advantages and professional contacts students derive from attending the white school.³⁰ Consequently, the University of Texas's law school had to open its doors to black students.³¹

Sweatt was the final nail in the coffin of separate-but-equal and was followed four years later by *Brown*, which held that with regard to education "separate is inherently unequal."³² This has come to be a controversial statement. If one reads it to mean that under no circumstances could an all black school, a school with all black students and all black teachers, provide an education comparable to a white school, then it is a clearly erroneous and racist statement that denigrates the ability of black children to learn and of black adults to teach. Such a reading seems implicit in Clarence Thomas' remark in *Missouri v. Jenkins*³³ that "it never ceases to amaze me that the courts are so willing to assume that anything that is predominantly black must be inferior."³⁴

There are, however, more benign, if still contestable, ways to read what is meant by the notion that separate is inherently unequal. One is to read it as saying that in the context of the United States' racist history, the forced separation of the races is inherently unequal because it is imposed by whites as a means of maintaining white supremacy. Under this view, separate schools would not necessarily be unequal when freely chosen in the context of an otherwise non-racist society. A society is certainly conceivable, for example, where some parents choose to place their children in one-race schools and others in integrated schools, where there are schools available to

30. *Id.* at 634.

31. *Id.* at 636.

32. 347 U.S. at 495.

33. 515 U.S. 70 (1995).

34. *Id.* at 114 (Thomas, J., concurring). In *Jenkins*, with Justice Thomas' concurrence, the Court held that it was inappropriate in a then largely black school district that had previously practiced intentional segregation to require the district to undertake efforts to attract non-minority students from other school districts so as to enhance integration of the district's schools, or to implement remedial educational measures for students performing below national norms absent a specific showing of the extent to which the underperformance is a direct result of the prior segregation rather than of other factors. While it is easy in light of Justice Thomas' remark to understand his concurrence in the first part of the Court's ruling, how he could also join in denying needed funding to underperforming black schools borders on the perverse.

satisfy everyone's preferences, and where the quality of education and life chances of all children are comparable.

The question is whether such an approach was feasible following *Brown*, and if not, whether it is today.³⁵ Following *Brown*, the Supreme Court had to deal with how to remedy enforced segregation. One approach would have been to say that the state's only obligation was to operate schools on a color-blind basis, and that so long as it did so, any incidental racial separation would be permissible. Another approach, which the plaintiffs in school desegregation cases advocated and the Supreme Court developed after a hiatus of more than a decade following its "all deliberate speed" formulation,³⁶ was to insist on integration in fact.

The Supreme Court first faced this choice of alternatives in *Green v. County School Board*.³⁷ In *Green*, the school district, a rural county with one previously white and one previously black school segregated by law, adopted a freedom-of-choice plan allowing parents to choose the school their children would attend.³⁸ All whites chose the previously white school, and most African Americans the previously black school.³⁹ Due to housing patterns in the county, the district could have integrated both schools by adopting a plan that assigned children to the schools nearest their homes.⁴⁰ Consequently,

35. There is some evidence of benefits for all students of an ethnically and economically diverse education in terms of scholastic achievement, life chances, and interethnic relations. This has led some to emphasize the importance not only of racial but also of class integration. See, e.g., Molly S. McUsic, *The Future of Brown v. Board of Education: Economic Integration of the Public Schools*, 117 HARV. L. REV. 1334 (2004) (arguing that equalizing funding of black schools is not enough to equalize educational opportunity, that evidence shows that the best way to achieve that goal is to integrate schools by economic class, and that the effort to help bring that about should include modified integration plans in state school finance cases and the promotion of residential integration); Gary Orfield and Chungmei Lee, *Brown at 50: King's Dream or Plessy's Nightmare* 21-26 (Harvard University Civil Rights Project, 2004) at www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/reseg04/resegregation04.php (noting that in 2001-02 88% of intensely segregated black schools had high concentrations of poverty). In the context of a still racist society with high concentrations of poverty in the black community, it may be that ethnic coupled with economic integration is the best approach if it is doable. Until that comes about, however, every effort must be made to assure adequate funding for predominantly black schools, which are likely to continue to exist for many black children for the foreseeable future whether by choice or otherwise. Nor is it necessarily the case that an integrated education is best for every child, nor would an integrated education necessarily be preferable in a society less racist and less divided by class.

36. *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955).

37. 391 U.S. 430 (1968).

38. *Id.* at 433-34.

39. *Id.* at 441.

40. *Id.* at 442 n.6.

despite the facial color-blindness of the freedom-of-choice plan, the Supreme Court held it inadequate and ordered the district to adopt a plan that in fact produced integration.⁴¹

The second case, *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*,⁴² arose in an urban school district previously segregated by law. The district adopted a neighborhood school plan that assigned children to the schools nearest their homes.⁴³ There was no showing that the attendance zones were drawn for the purpose of promoting segregation. Yet, because segregated housing patterns—coupled with the location of schools under enforced segregation in the heart of black and white neighborhoods—produced largely one-race schools, the Supreme Court held the plan inadequate and ordered the district to employ other measures that would in fact integrate the schools.⁴⁴ In particular, the Supreme Court sanctioned forced busing as a desegregation remedy.⁴⁵ Subsequently, many lower courts required forced busing, which became a highly controversial measure among both whites and African Americans, and at times resulted in violence from its opponents.⁴⁶

One might criticize both *Green* and *Swann* along the lines of Justice Thomas as implying that separate schools can never be equal

41. "School boards...operating state-compelled dual systems...[have] the affirmative duty to take whatever steps might be necessary to convert to a unitary system in which racial discrimination would be eliminated root and branch." 391 U.S. at 437-38. "[I]f there are reasonably available other ways, such for illustration as zoning, promising speedier and more effective conversion to a unitary, nonracial school system, 'freedom of choice' must be held unacceptable." *Id.* at 441.

42. 402 U.S. 1 (1971).

43. *Id.* at 8-9.

44. *Id.* at 25-32.

45. *Id.* at 29-31.

46. The evidence regarding support for forced busing as a means of achieving school integration is mixed. See, e.g., Gary Orfield, *Schools More Separate: Consequences of a Decade of Resegregation* 6-7 (Harvard University Civil Rights Project 2001) at www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/deseg/separate_schools01.php (reporting that Gallup polls during the 1990s showed majority and growing belief among both African Americans and whites that integration improves education for both groups, while that at the same time both groups favored neighborhood schools); HOWARD SCHUMAN, CHARLOTTE STEEH, LAWRENCE BOBO & MARIA KRYSAN, *RACIAL ATTITUDES IN AMERICA: TRENDS AND INTERPRETATION* 123-25, 240-41, 248-49 (1997) (reporting on Gallup, National Opinion Research Council, and other attitudinal polls finding that whites have generally been unsupportive of forced integration and have consistently opposed forced busing, although opposition has declined somewhat from over 80% between the mid 1970s and mid 1980s to 67% opposed in 1996; and that black support over time for the principle of integrated schools has always been nearly unanimous, that African Americans were about evenly divided between support for and opposition to forced busing when it first started in the mid to late 1970s, and that by the mid 1990s their support for forced busing rose somewhat to about 60%.

and that school integration is a prerequisite for racial equality.⁴⁷ But in context again, a more benign reading of the cases is possible. Following *Brown*, there was massive white resistance to school desegregation in the South.⁴⁸ Given that the school districts in *Green* and *Swann* chose not to adopt plans that would have produced more integration, the freedom-of-choice and neighborhood-school plans they did adopt could be seen as not color-blind at all but rather conscious efforts to maintain segregated systems. Another reading might be that, in the context of historical racism and in light of the difficulty of assessing people's motives when their actions are ostensibly color-blind, the assumption must be that desegregation plans yielding less integration than other available plans were chosen for racist reasons, at least until the vestiges of that racism became sufficiently attenuated to warrant an assumption of evenhandedness.

A related criticism of *Green* and *Swann* is that they discredit the ability of African Americans, whose views of the appropriate remedy as the victims of enforced segregation ought to receive great weight, to decide what is best for their children and the black community as a whole—as reflected in *Green* in the choice of the previously black school and in *Swann* in the choice to self-segregate residentially. Again, there is a more benign reading. Following *Brown*, enormous pressure was brought to bear on African Americans, whose livelihoods depended greatly on the white community, not to push for integration,⁴⁹ such that the choice made by most black parents in *Green* could be seen as more apparent than real. In addition, the residential segregation in *Swann* could be seen less as a result of choice and more as a by-product of housing discrimination and intimidation by whites,⁵⁰ as well as of the inability of African

47. See *supra* text accompanying note 33.

48. See, e.g., NUMAN V. BARTLEY, *THE RISE OF MASSIVE RESISTANCE: RACE AND POLITICS IN THE SOUTH DURING THE 1950'S* (1969); ROBERT L. CRAIN, *THE POLITICS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION* (1968); Michael J. Klarman, *Brown, Racial Change, and the Civil Rights Movement*, 80 VA. L. REV. 7, 97-118 (1994).

49. See BARTLEY, *supra* note 47, at 193-96.

50. Compare National Urban League, *The State of Black America-2001* at <http://www.nul.org/soba2001/sobareresults.html> (reporting that 32% of African Americans polled said they have chosen not to move somewhere because they felt unwelcome); Gary Orfield, *Housing Segregation: Causes, Effects, Possible Cures* (Harvard University Civil Rights Project 2001) at www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/metro/housing_gary.pjp (reporting on widespread private and governmental housing discrimination; "Black fears of violence and intimidation in some white communities are still serious obstacles to housing choice," text at note 25); *R.A.V. v City of St. Paul*, 505 U.S. 377 (1992) (overthrowing as

Americans, due to racial income differentials, to afford housing in the more expensive white neighborhoods.⁵¹ Thus, the Supreme Court's rulings in *Green* and *Swann* might actually reflect the real desire of black parents for an integrated education for their children,⁵² which could not be obtained due to the constraints of a still racist society.

Moreover, given the society's history of racism and the involvement of the state in promoting it, it could be that the separatist choices of both whites and African Americans were not truly free, but conditioned responses to that history.⁵³ If this were true, a period of forced integration might be thought necessary to counteract that conditioning and enable people to choose what is best for themselves and their children in a context relatively free of racist thinking. A related point, akin to *Sweatt*, is that given the society's racist heritage, whites, who dominated the avenues of opportunity in the society, would not view predominantly black schools as equal to white ones irrespective of the quality of education they actually provided, and consequently that forced integration was necessary to help counteract this white racist mentality.

III. BROWN FROM THE MID-1970S: SANCTIONING SEPARATE AND UNEQUAL

The point of the discussion so far is not to argue that the choice to pursue an integrationist strategy following *Brown* was correct, but to note that there was a plausible rationale for it. There is no way to

violation of free speech Bias-Motivated Crime Ordinance as applied to burning of cross on lawn of black family in predominantly white neighborhood).

51. Compare Orfield, *supra* note 49 (reporting on high and unchanging levels of residential segregation between 1980-2000, despite black preference for and increasingly favorable attitudes of whites toward residential integration, due in part to economic factors and in large part to massive discrimination in housing and finance markets as well as to government involvement per exclusionary zoning and the racist administration of housing subsidy programs); Daria Roithmayr, *Locked In Segregation* (October 2004), University of Illinois Legal Working Paper Series, Working Paper 18 at <http://law.bepress.com/uiuclwps/papers/art18> (arguing that white privilege is maintained, even absent intentional discrimination, through monopoly power attained through historical racist practices and perpetuated through a resultant ability to price minorities out of white areas and lock them into segregated areas whose poorer amenities impede opportunity; and advocating that anti-discrimination law focus more on the effects of monopoly power than on an individual discrimination model as a means of attacking institutionalized segregation).

52. See *supra* note 45.

53. See, e.g., Charles R. Lawrence, *The Id, the Ego, and Equal Protection: Reckoning With Unconscious Racism*, 39 STAN. L. REV. 317, 329-44 (1987) (discussing the impact of this society's culturally racist belief system in producing unconscious racist attitudes and actions).

know what would have happened, once enforced segregation was rightfully overthrown, if racially separate schools had been accepted so long as the process was facially color-blind, and if instead the effort had been to push for adequate funding for black schools—a form of separate-but-equal perhaps, but more by choice or acquiescence than by force of law.

There was a plausible rationale for such an approach as well. The first choice of African Americans might be to live in a non-racist society. But given the reality of racism, the struggle to integrate might produce undesirable consequences outweighing its benefits, such as a white backlash or a brain drain from the black community of a privileged few, while leaving the bulk of the community behind and in worse straits than before. Strengthening the black community from within, to the point that it could either thrive on its own or be sufficiently strong to demand access to the greater society on equal terms, might in the long run be a more viable path to a non-racist society or at least a more desirable outcome for the black community as a whole if full equality could not be achieved.

The evidence is conflicting and debatable. Significant advances in narrowing economic inequalities as between the white and black communities were achieved between the mid-1950s and early 1970s,⁵⁴ during which time *Brown*, *Green*, and *Swann* were decided and the integrationist push was at its height. Thereafter, beginning in the late 1960s and continuing to the present day, the country has moved in a more conservative direction, and the relative position of the black community has in many respects stagnated and, in others, deteriorated.⁵⁵

54. See *infra* note 54.

55. Median black family income was 54.3% that of whites in 1955, rose to 61.3% in 1970, dropped back to 55.1% by 1990, and by 2002 had risen to 62.1%. See *supra* note 9; U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1995-2000, Money Income of Families at www.census.gov/prod/www/statistical-abstract-us.html (extrapolated from gross numbers). The median individual income of African Americans did rise consistently from 49.8% in 1954 to 71.0% in 2001 for males and from 54.2% to 97.8% for females. U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, *supra* note 9 (extrapolated from gross numbers). However, the relative improvement these figures reflect is tempered by the fact that they represent actually employed people, that the unemployment rate of African Americans greatly exceeds that of whites, see *supra* note 10, and that the income of black males still lags far behind that of whites. Moreover, the disproportionate rates of black families living in poverty and of unemployed African Americans have not improved over the years. *Id.* And the dramatic increase since the mid 1970s in the incarceration of African Americans, *supra* note 12, is tantamount to a new form of segregation.

Undoubtedly, this conservative trend was in significant part a reaction to the Civil Rights Movement, as well as to the anti-Vietnam War movement, both of which were grassroots movements that seriously challenged white privilege and entrenched power. Would the outcome have differed if the alternative tactic of pushing for adequate funding for black institutions were taken? This seems questionable. The outlawing of legally-mandated segregation ended an official racial caste system in the United States, and the struggle for racial justice thereafter overlapped, although it did not entirely merge into, a struggle for social and economic justice and thus became more akin to a class struggle.⁵⁶ The outcome of this shift and of the conservative drift of recent years has been the judicial sanctioning of the hierarchical class structure that prevails in the United States.⁵⁷ This class structure is an inherent feature of American-style democratic capitalism and, in particular, of the institutionalization of a separate and unequal system that affects all working class people and, especially harshly, African Americans and other ethnic minorities.⁵⁸

The country's conservative drift began with the election of Richard Nixon in 1968.⁵⁹ Since then, a prominent aspect of the conservative movement has been to attack the judiciary for engaging in alleged "social engineering" and to stack the courts with judges who will "strictly construe" the Constitution.⁶⁰ These are code words with strong racist undertones.

56. See, e.g., Thomas Kleven, *The Supreme Court, Race, and the Class Struggle*, 9 HOFSTRA L. REV. 795, 797-815 (1981) (arguing that the Supreme Court became less willing to intervene in the 1970s when the issues coming before it began to shift from explicitly racist claims to issues relating to society's economic structure).

57. See *infra* note 89.

58. See *supra* notes 13, 15; MANNING MARABLE, *HOW CAPITALISM UNDERDEVELOPED BLACK AMERICA* (2000).

59. See DONALD GRIER STEPHENSON, JR., *CAMPAIGNS AND THE COURT: THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS 179-83* (1979).

60. See, e.g., STEPHENSON, *supra* note 58, at 179-82, 199-209; William H. Rehnquist, *The Notion of a Living Constitution*, 54 TEX. L. REV. 693, 696-97, 698 (1967) (an article written by Justice Rehnquist several years prior to his appointment to the bench in which he criticized a living law approach to the Constitution on the ground that "[a] mere change in public opinion since the adoption of the Constitution, unaccompanied by a constitutional amendment, should not change the meaning of the Constitution," because "[j]udges then are no longer the keepers of the covenant; instead they are a small group of fortunately situated people with a roving commission to second-guess Congress, state legislatures, and state and federal administrative officers concerning what is best for the country); *Columbus Board of Educ. v. Penick*, 443 U.S. 449, 489, 513 (Rehnquist, J., dissenting) (criticizing the majority's ruling upholding a finding of a school board's having intentionally practiced segregation as pursuing "a policy of 'integration über alles'").

Within the Supreme Court, the change began in the early 1970s. While continuing to push for integration in school districts that had been segregated by law or official practice,⁶¹ the Supreme Court began to limit the remedies for intentional segregation in ways that sanctioned segregation in fact. In *Milliken v. Bradley*,⁶² the Supreme Court held that suburban school districts that were not created for segregationist purposes and had not themselves practiced official segregation could not forcibly be included in a desegregation plan of a center city that had practiced segregation and was then virtually all black due to white flight to suburbia and private schools.⁶³ In addition, in *Pasadena City Board of Education v. Spangler*,⁶⁴ the Supreme Court held that once desegregation has been achieved, a school district does not have a continuing obligation to affirmatively integrate its schools if resegregation occurs as a result of people's private choices of where to live rather than through state action.

After *Pasadena* and *Milliken*, racial segregation in fact is not unconstitutional so long as it results from people's "choice" to separate themselves by race.⁶⁵ But is this the mutual choice of whites and African Americans not to go to school together, or is it the choice of whites imposed on African Americans through their greater affluence

61. See, e.g., *Keyes v. School District No. 1*, 413 U.S. 189 (1973) (extending *Brown* to school districts that have intentionally practiced segregation in the absence of laws mandating it); *Columbus Board of Education v. Penick*, 443 U.S. 449 (1979) (holding that school districts have a continuing obligation to dismantle dual school systems until desegregation has been achieved); *Dayton Board of Education v. Brinkman*, 443 U.S. 526 (1979) (same).

62. 418 U.S. 717 (1974).

63. In *Milliken v. Bradley*, 433 U.S. 267 (1977), the Court did uphold as part of Detroit's desegregation plan court mandated compensatory education programs designed to undo the unequal educational opportunities of intentional segregation. The Court's subsequent opinion in *Jenkins*, *supra* notes 32-33, seems now to negate the requirement of compensatory education programs, unless it can be shown that students in a previously segregated district are still suffering educationally as a direct result of that segregation and not of other socio-economic factors. That showing would seem to be very difficult to make in light of the Court's apparent view, in cases relieving school districts of their continuing duty to desegregate, that sufficient time has now passed to attenuate the effects of enforced or intentional segregation. See *infra* note 71.

64. 427 U.S. 424 (1976).

65. Compare *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1, 678 A.2d 1267 (1996) (holding that the de facto segregation in Hartford's public schools of ethnic minorities who are also highly disadvantaged economically deprives the students of "a substantially equal educational opportunity" in violation of the Connecticut Constitution); James K. Gooch, *Fenced In: Why Sheff v. O'Neill Can't Save Connecticut's Inner City Students*, 22 *Quin. L. Rev.* 395 (2004) (arguing that constitutional violation found in *Sheff* has not been rectified and cannot be without moving from a system of local to county school districts, and urging the Supreme Court to order that as a remedy in light of the unwillingness of the legislature to adopt it due to suburban political dominance).

and consequent ability to price African Americans out of the suburban housing market? One possibility after white flight to suburbia would be for African Americans who prefer integration to follow. But in *Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corporation*,⁶⁶ the Supreme Court held that it is permissible for suburban communities to use their governmental powers to push up the cost of housing to a level that effectively excludes most African Americans, unless it is shown that this was done for a racist purpose. This will likely be very hard to do, even though there is sociological evidence that much exclusionary zoning is in fact racially motivated,⁶⁷ since the governmental measures are facially color-blind. Thus, *Arlington Heights* sanctions classist state action that has the incidental effect of excluding African Americans and of fostering racial separation that is not a strictly private matter of mutual choice.⁶⁸

So now we have African Americans trapped in center cities, which due to white flight and accompanying industrial flight has left them financially less well off than the surrounding suburbs and consequently unable to raise as much money for their children's education in a society that relies heavily on local financing of schools. In *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez*,⁶⁹ the Supreme Court sanctioned this, holding that in the name of local

66. 429 U.S. 252 (1977).

67. See, e.g., Eric J. Branfman, Benjamin I. Cohen & David M. Trubek, *Measuring the Invisible Wall: Land Use Controls and the Residential Patterns of the Poor*, 82 YALE L.J. 483 (1973); Barbara Sherman Rolleston, *Determinants of Restrictive Suburban Zoning: An Empirical Analysis*, 21 J. URBAN ECON. 1 (1987).

68. A few state courts and a few state legislatures have attempted to address exclusionary zoning with at best modest success. See e.g., Jeffrey M. Lehman, *Reversing Judicial Deference Toward Exclusionary Zoning: A Suggested Approach*, 12 J. AFFORD. HSG. & COMM'Y DEV. LAW 229 (2003) (arguing that state legislatures are not likely to be willing to combat exclusionary zoning due to suburban political dominance and that the few legislative efforts to date have been largely ineffectual. Noting that most state courts have historically given extreme deference to local zoning and surveying the few that have intervened, and arguing for stricter judicial scrutiny of exclusionary zoning); Henry A. Span, *How Courts Should Fight Exclusionary Zoning*, 32 SETON HALL L. REV. 8 (2001) (arguing that the few state court and legislative efforts to date to combat exclusionary zoning have had only modest success and have resulted in little racial or socio-economic integration, and that the solution must be primarily a political one due to courts' inability to manage the issue remedially, but that courts should more aggressively force legislatures to address the issue). A few suburban communities have voluntarily adopted inclusionary ordinances requiring developers to build or contribute to lower cost housing. See, e.g., Barbara Ehrlich Kautz, *In Defense of Inclusionary Zoning: Successfully Creating Affordable Housing*, 36 U. SAN FRAN. L. REV. 971, 977-79 (2002) (surveying the history of inclusionary zoning efforts and concluding, based on evidence to date, that it has potential as an approach to opening up suburbia).

69. 411 U.S. 1 (1973).

control states may design their school financing systems in this manner even if it results in inferior educational opportunity for poorer people living in poorer, disproportionately minority,⁷⁰ school districts.⁷¹ And finally, beginning in the early 1990s, the Supreme Court began to relieve previously segregated school districts of their continuing obligation to desegregate on the ground that sufficient time had passed to attenuate the effects of imposed segregation.⁷² As a result, there has been a significant increase in segregation in public schools, and almost as many children nation-wide attend substantially segregated schools as at the time of *Brown*.⁷³

70. In *Rodriguez*, for example, the evidence showed that the state's very poorest school districts were heavily populated by minorities. 411 U.S. at 15 n.38.

71. Following *Rodriguez*, law suits based on state constitutions were initiated in state courts throughout the country in an effort to force states to reform their school financing systems and allocate more money to poorer school districts. Although the results differ from state to state, in general there has been at best some modest reform in some states to reduce but not eliminate the inequalities between richer and poorer school districts, and the political obstacles to reform from recalcitrant legislatures have been and remain substantial. See, e.g., Molly S. McUsic, *The Law's Role in the Distribution of Education: The Promises and Pitfalls of School Finance Litigation*, in LAW AND SCHOOL REFORM 88-159 (Jay P. Heubert, ed., 1999) (noting that "despite litigation in nearly every state over the past two decades, interdistrict disparities in the United States have not diminished," at 90, and advocating class integration and an adequate education standard as the most viable solutions); NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FINANCE, EQUITY AND ADEQUACY IN EDUCATION FINANCE: ISSUES AND PERSPECTIVES (Helen F. Ladd, Rosemary Chalk & Janet S. Hansen, eds., 1999) (a series of articles on various aspects of school finance litigation and reform).

72. See, e.g., *Freeman v. Pitts*, 503 U.S. 467, 495-96 (1992) ("Where resegregation is a product not of state action but of private choices, it does not have constitutional implications. As the *de jure* violation becomes more remote in time and these demographic changes intervene, it becomes less likely that a current racial imbalance in a school district is a vestige of the prior *de jure* system."); *Board of Education of Oklahoma City Public Schools v. Dowell*, 498 U.S. 237, 249-50 (1991) (standard for determining whether desegregation decree should have been terminated is whether school board "had complied in good faith with the desegregation decree since it was entered, and whether the vestiges of past discrimination had been eliminated to the extent practicable."). Justice Marshall dissented vigorously in *Dowell*, 498 U.S. at 251-52 (Marshall, J., dissenting) ("I believe a desegregation decree cannot be lifted so long as conditions likely to inflict the stigmatic injury condemned in *Brown I* persist and there remain feasible methods of eliminating such conditions.").

73. Racial segregation in schools began to diminish in the late 1960s and early 1970s when courts and the federal government began to vigorously enforce desegregation. The degree of racial separation of black children reached its lowest point in the mid to late 1980s, has been increasing since then, and has now returned to about the level of the earlier years. See, e.g., Erica Brandenburg, Chungmei Lee, and Gary Orfield, *A Multiracial Society with Segregated Schools: Are We Losing the Dream?* (Harvard University Civil Rights Research Project 2003) at www.civilrightsresearchproject.harvard.edu/research/reseg03/resegregation03.php; Erica Brandenburg & Chungmei Lee, *Race in American Public Schools: Rapidly Resegregating School Districts* (Harvard University Civil Rights Project 2002) at www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/deseg/resegschools02.php. These studies attribute the increased school segregation of the 1990s to the movement of whites to suburbia,

As a result of the cases discussed above, the Supreme Court has sanctioned a facially color-blind separate and unequal system that disadvantages all working class people, and especially severely African Americans and other ethnic minorities. This system is not simply the result of people's private choices but of official state action.⁷⁴ Would the situation be different if, instead of challenging separate-but-equal in *Brown*, the effort had been to force states to adhere to it and adequately provide for black schools?⁷⁵ Not likely. The Civil Rights Movement ended enforced segregation in the United States and, in so doing, empowered the black community politically and socially.⁷⁶ But even without the Civil Rights Movement it is inconceivable that this country would still be practicing official apartheid. Not only was the business community coming to see enforced segregation as impeding its ability to maximize profits,⁷⁷ but the United States could not be the world's leading power if it still practiced apartheid.⁷⁸ And if the power elite still prefer separation, the foregoing discussion has shown how it is possible to achieve it through facially color-blind means that maintain racial and class hierarchy.

the increased concentration of minorities in central cities, and the Supreme Court's deemphasis on desegregation.

74. Compare cites at *supra* note 15.

75. Compare DERRICK BELL, SILENT COVENANTS: BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE UNFULFILLED HOPES FOR RACIAL REFORM 20-28 (2004) (presenting a hypothetical Supreme Court opinion sustaining *Plessy* but with a requirement of equalized funding for black schools and of black participation in the decision-making process, and opining in retrospect that in light of entrenched racism a more gradualist approach would have had a better chance of "opening opportunities for effective schooling for African Americans"); Angela Onwuachi-Willig, *For Whom Does the Bell Toll: The Bell Tolls for Brown?* 103 MICH. L. REV. 1507 (2005) (arguing that, due to the same political factors that impeded the push for integration, Bell's approach "would have landed minorities in exactly the same position as they are in today").

76. As evidenced, for example, by the substantial, although still disproportionately small, increase since that time in the number of black elected officials, professionals and college graduates. See *supra* note 7. See generally JACK M. BLOOM, CLASS, RACE, & THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT 120-224 (1987); PETER B. LEVY, THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT (1998); MANNING MARABLE, BLACK AMERICAN POLITICS 79-98 (1985).

77. See, e.g., Michael J. Klarman, *supra* note 47, at 37-71 (1994); SOUTHERN BUSINESSMEN AND DESEGREGATION (Elizabeth Jacoway & David R. Colburn, eds., 1982).

78. See, e.g., DERRICK BELL, *supra* note 74, at 59-68 (on the Cold War imperatives contributing to the *Brown* decision); MARY DUDZIAC, COLD WAR CIVIL RIGHTS: RACE AND THE IMAGE OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY (2000).

IV. TOWARD A UNIFIED MOVEMENT FOR RACIAL AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Faced with the relative failure of the integrationist movement and society's continuing racism, many African Americans have begun to adopt a more separatist approach. This is reflected in diminished support for integration⁷⁹ as well as in efforts to establish Afrocentric schools within and outside the public school system,⁸⁰ the concentration in largely black suburbs of relatively affluent African Americans who could afford to live in integrated communities,⁸¹ and the refurbishing of homes in inner city neighborhoods by successful African Americans who formerly might have chosen to leave the community.⁸² Perhaps, on balance, this approach will prove more

79. See, e.g., STEVE FARKAS & JEAN JOHNSON, *TIME TO MOVE ON: AFRICAN-AMERICAN AND WHITE PARENTS SET AN AGENDA FOR PUBLIC* (1998) (reporting on a 1988 Public Agenda Foundation Survey finding that 80% of black parents, as well as 86% of whites, believe improving educational quality is more important than integration. National Urban League, *supra* note 49 (reporting on 2001 survey of black adults showing 60% believing the primary focus of black organizations should be economic opportunity, 24% political leadership, and only 7% integration). *But compare id.* (also reporting that 80% of African Americans polled prefer living in racially mixed neighborhoods); Orfield, *supra* note 45, text at note 25 (reporting on a 1997 Gallup poll showing that blacks overwhelmingly prefer integrated to all black areas).

80. See, e.g., Eleanor Brown, *Black Like Me? "Gangsta" Culture, Clarence Thomas, and Afrocentric Academies*, 75 N.Y.U. L. REV. 308 (2000) (arguing in light of growing dissatisfaction with the integrationist ideal that Afrocentric education offers a promising response to an educational crisis facing the black community in poor urban environments and advocating it on the secondary school level); Kevin D. Brown, *Reexamination of the Benefit of Publicly Funded Private Education for African-American Students in a Post-Desegregation Era*, 36 IND. L. REV. 477 (2003) (examining the possible benefits of school vouchers in light of resegregation, the declining commitment to integrated education, and the failure of public schools to respond to the needs of African-American children).

81. See, e.g., Sheryll D. Cashin, *Middle-Class Black Suburbs and the State of Integration: A Post-Integrationist Vision for Metropolitan America*, 86 CORN. L. REV. 729 (2001) (discussing the growing choice of middle-class African Americans to live in all-black suburbs, and arguing that for African Americans the suburban ideal is largely a chimera and that African Americans would fare better in integrated settings in terms of the ability to provide government services and of access to educational and economic opportunity).

82. See, e.g., Lynette Clemetsen, *A Black Enclave in Pittsburgh is Revived*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 9, 2002 at www.cmh.pitt.edu/newsenclave.htm (describing the movement of middle-class African Americans back to Pittsburgh's Hill District, once one of the nation's most prosperous black communities but now one of the city's poorest areas); Bill Johnson, *Don't use race against gentrification*, THE DETROIT NEWS, Mar. 29, 2002 at www.detroitnews.com/2002/editorial/0204/01/a11-452037.htm (discussing modest black gentrification of Detroit's older neighborhoods); MONIQUE M. TAYLOR, *HARLEM BETWEEN HEAVEN AND HELL* (2002) (examining the impact and dynamics of the recent black gentrification in Harlem); Jamal E. Watson, *Middle-class Blacks also Bring Change to the "Hood,"* AMSTERDAM NEWS, July 25/2003 at www.wilmingtonjournal.blackpressusa.com/News/article/article.asp?NewsID=2943&SID=3

beneficial for the black community than the seemingly fruitless struggle to integrate a society where many of the white majority are not so inclined and where ethnocentric thinking is still prominent among many ethnic groups. Still, it will likely leave the black community as a whole in a less-well-off status. Particularly disturbing is the current trend toward gentrification of center cities, the impact of which has been to bring whites back to the cities, to break up established black communities,⁸³ and to push African Americans to less convenient suburban areas where they may become even more isolated than before.⁸⁴ There is a resemblance here to a process that is occurring in underdeveloped countries throughout the world.⁸⁵

Race conscious efforts, such as affirmative action and the reparations movement, may help alleviate racial inequality. But affirmative action, now sanctioned in a lukewarm way by the Supreme Court,⁸⁶ is not likely to be extended beyond higher education, and is likely to benefit relatively few African Americans. And reparations, if they ever come about, are likely to be token at best.⁸⁷

(describing movement of "droves" of middle-class African Americans back to working class black neighborhoods in New York City).

83. See, e.g., John A. Powell & Marguerite L. Spencer, *Giving Them the "Old One-Two:" Gentrification and the K.O. of Impoverished Urban Dwellers of Color*, 46 How. L.J. 433 (2003) (arguing that gentrification displaces and damages the quality of life of urban dwellers of color, and recommending policies for addressing these harms). Compare J. Peter Byrne, *Two Cheers for Gentrification*, 46 How. L.J. 405 (2003) (arguing that on balance gentrification is good for both central cities and for poor and ethnic minorities, at least if accompanied by affordable housing programs for displaced residents).

84. Compare Mary Jo Wiggins, *Race, Class, and Suburbia: The Modern Black Suburb as a "Race-Making Situation"*, 35 U. MICH. J.L. REFORM 749 (2002) (discussing the phenomenon and examining the causes, racist and otherwise, of economic disinvestment in suburban black communities); "The New Enclaves in America's Suburbs" (Lewis Mumford Center 2001) at <http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/suburban/SuburbanReport/pag1.html> (reporting on the rapid increase in black and Latino suburbanization in the 1990s, with a very high degree of segregation especially for African Americans).

85. See, e.g., Mike Davis, *Planet of Slums*, 26 NEW LEFT REVIEW 5 (2004).

86. See *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 123 S.Ct. 2325 (2003) (public law school may consider race or ethnicity as a factor in admissions process for purpose of attaining diverse student body provided it does not set aside slots or establish quotas for minority applicants and employs same general standards to all applicants); *Gratz v. Bollinger*, 123 S.Ct. 2411 (2003) (public university's consideration of race in admissions process must be narrowly tailored, must entail individualized determination of merit, and bonus awarded minorities may not function as virtual set-aside); *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, 515 U.S. 200 (1995) (affirmative action in letting of government contracts must be judged under strict scrutiny standard of review).

87. See, e.g., Taunya Lovell Banks, *Exploring White Resistance to Racial Reconciliation in the United States*, 55 RUTGERS L. REV. 903, 907, 964 (2003) (arguing that "the reconciliation of all Americans estranged from one another because of the legacy of racial subordination that targets black Americans should be the ultimate goal of the black reparations movement," that due to white resistance "[m]eaningful racial reconciliation between blacks

What is needed, rather, is a movement for social and economic justice that is a multi-racial and multi-ethnic struggle of all those who suffer from the ever widening inequalities and increasingly rigid class structure that have come about over the past generation.⁸⁸ This is not to reduce racism to classism, which are distinct, though highly interrelated phenomena.⁸⁹ Bigotry and white privilege are ongoing problems that must be confronted head-on through vigorous enforcement of anti-discrimination laws and by extending affirmative action as far as is legally and politically possible. But those things alone are not enough to bring about racial justice. Many of the impediments to racial justice, such as exclusionary zoning and the financing of public education, affect working class and poor whites as well as African Americans and other ethnic minorities, and cannot be addressed in isolation from their classist aspects. It is not possible to open exclusionary communities to African Americans without also opening them to disadvantaged whites, nor to reform school financing without addressing it for all who are adversely affected by the present setup.

Moreover, one of the main causes of white resistance to racial justice has been the increasingly inegalitarian class structure that exists in the United States.⁹⁰ Put another way, a more egalitarian social

and whites in the United States, if it ever occurs, will be difficult, and probably take generations,” and that while struggling for reparations African Americans should engage in “self-healing” in part through helping other subordinate racialized groups); ROY L. BROOKS, *ATONEMENT AND FORGIVENESS: A NEW MODEL FOR BLACK REPARATIONS* 141-80 (2004) (advocating, as a prerequisite for the achievement of racial reconciliation, an “atonement model” consisting of a government apology for the injustice of slavery and enforced segregation, coupled with “rehabilitative reparations” and thereafter forgiveness by the black community, while recognizing the present lack of white support for reparations and the need for an educative political movement to bring it about); SHOULD AMERICA PAY?: *SLAVERY AND THE RAGING DEBATE ON REPARATIONS* (Raymond A. Winbush, ed., 2003) (articles pro and con reparations and analyzing the issue from historical, legal and political perspectives).

88. Compare MARABLE, *supra* note 57, at 256 (“Any authentic social revolution in the United States must be both democratic and popular in character and composition. A majority of Americans, Black, Latino and white, must endorse socialism.”); Molly Townes O’Brien, *Brown on the Ground: A Journey of Faith in Schooling*, 35 U. TOLEDO L. REV. 813 (2004) (arguing that *Brown’s* goal of promoting integration as a means of advancing equal educational opportunity and overcoming white prejudice, while noble, cannot be achieved without accompanying societal reform and the creation of a more egalitarian society).

89. See MARABLE, *supra* note 57, at 256, 260 (noting “the convergence of racism, sexism and economic exploitation which comprises the material terrain of this nation,” and opining that “separate and even autonomous apparatuses must be created after the revolution to effectively uproot racism and patriarchy.”); LYNN WEBER, *UNDERSTANDING RACE, CLASS, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK* (2001) (on the intersection of race, class, gender and sexuality).

90. As of 1995 the wealthiest 1% of U.S. households owned 39% of the nation’s wealth, and the top 20% owned 84% of the wealth. Wealth and income disparities have steadily

structure is, in my view, a necessary though not sufficient condition for the achievement of racial justice. In an egalitarian class structure, where the hardships of falling to the bottom are high, it is in the interest of the majority to identify a minority that through various discriminatory practices can be made to suffer disproportionately the hazards of social life. This division within the working class, in turn, serves the interests of society's elite by impeding a more unified movement of society's disadvantaged against elite privilege and domination.

The achievement of a more egalitarian society in the United States—a society, for example, where all are entitled to a quality education through college, to a decent job at a livable wage, to adequate health care and retirement benefits—will only come about through a unified struggle. And through the process of unified struggle, as has happened at times, for example, in the union movement, people of diverse ethnicities may have the opportunity to gain the mutual understanding and respect that is a prerequisite for racial as well as social justice.⁹¹

increased over the past generation. Wealth and income in the United States are more concentrated at the top now than at any time since the Great Depression. See Bureau of the Census, *Income Inequality (1947-98)* at www.census.gov/hhes/www/p60204.html; Bureau of the Census, *Income Inequality Tables*, at www.census.gov/hhes/income/histinc/ie4.html; *BACK TO SHARED PROSPERITY: THE GROWING INEQUALITY OF WEALTH AND INCOME IN AMERICA* (Ray Marshall ed., 2000); Isaac Shapiro & Robert Greenstein, *The Widening Income Gulf* (1999) (publication of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities) at www.cbpp.org/9-4-99tax-rep.htm. Moreover, there is evidence that mobility, i.e., the ability to improve one's relative socioeconomic status, is diminishing in the United States, although there is disagreement among analysts over the extent to which this is occurring. Compare, e.g., *LOW-WAGE AMERICA: HOW EMPLOYERS ARE RESHAPING OPPORTUNITY IN THE WORKPLACE* (Eileen Applebaum, Annette Bernhardt & Richard J. Murnane, eds., 2003) (a series of studies detailing increasing inequality and decreasing mobility in the United States due to globalization, technology, deregulation, changes in financial markets, and the decline in labor unions), with Isabell V. Sawhill, *Opportunity in the United States: Myth or Reality?* in *NEW MARKETS, NEW OPPORTUNITIES?: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL MOBILITY IN A CHANGING WORLD* 22-35 (Nancy Birdsall & Carol Graham, eds., 1999) at <http://brookings.nap.edu/books/081570917X/html> (concluding that intergenerational mobility has increased since 1960, that there is considerable upward and downward income mobility over one's lifetime although many get stuck at the bottom for a long time, but that economic mobility has declined over the past few decades due to slower economic growth).

91. The union movement has, of course, had its own sorry history of racism. Recently, however, scholars have begun to examine the contribution that inter-racial solidarity among workers has made to successful struggles against their bosses. This solidarity was often subsequently undermined to the detriment of workers in later struggles. See, e.g., RICK HALPERN, *DOWN ON THE KILLING FLOOR: BLACK AND WHITE WORKERS IN CHICAGO'S PACKINGHOUSES, 1904-54* (1997); MICHAEL S. HONEY, *SOUTHERN LABOR AND BLACK CIVIL RIGHTS: ORGANIZING MEMPHIS WORKERS* (1993); DANIEL ROSENBERG, *NEW ORLEANS DOCKWORKERS: RACE, LABOR, AND UNIONISM, 1892-1923* (1988).

What it will take to bring people together in this way is hard to say: Another great depression? A gradual economic decline as the United States faces increasing economic competition in the global economy? A recognition that the so-called American dream is a myth as economic inequalities continue to increase and the opportunities to advance in life decline? A recognition that the suffering faced by hundreds of millions of people in the world is directly related to how the United States conducts itself and to the quality of life in this country?

The history of the Civil Rights and anti-Vietnam War movements, as well as of earlier struggles for workers' rights to unionize and for women's right to vote, illustrates that grassroots mobilization is indispensable in any struggle for racial and social justice. The history of *Brown*, and of state court exclusionary zoning and school finance cases,⁹² shows that legal battles can contribute to struggles for racial and social justice, but that without ongoing grassroots mobilization, legal victories are likely to be thwarted.⁹³ Also, the incipient fascism of the so-called war on terror, and the public's passive response to date to the threat it represents to people's rights, shows that a reactionary turn in the United States is not out of the question. Fascism is invariably racist, as evidenced by the scapegoating of Arabs and Muslims in the so-called war on terror.⁹⁴ A renewed virulent racism against African Americans may currently seem unlikely, but it is not out of the question if the country's rightward drift continues.⁹⁵

92. See *supra* notes 67, 70. See also *supra* note 64, re the difficulty in remedying the de facto segregation found in *Sheff v. O'Neill*.

93. Compare Thomas Kleven, *The Relative Autonomy of the United States Supreme Court*, 1 YALE J. LAW & LIB. 43 (1989) (arguing that the role of the Supreme Court is to help legitimize and stabilize an inegalitarian system by mediating disputes threatening the dominance of the power elite so as to avoid more serious challenges to the system); GERALD ROSENBERG, *THE HOLLOW HOPE: CAN COURTS BRING ABOUT SOCIAL CHANGE?* (1991) (arguing that courts are highly limited in their ability to bring about meaningful social change due to a lack of sufficient independence from other branches of government on whose support they depend to implement their rulings, that reliance on courts often diverts resources from needed political struggle and pacifies reformers through symbolic victories that stop short of real reform and mobilize opposition, and that courts are most effective when they follow rather than lead political reform).

94. See William B. Rubenstein, *The Real Story of U.S. Hate Crimes Statistics: An Empirical Analysis*, 78 TULANE L. REV. 1213 (2004) (reporting that African Americans, Jews and gays report the most hate crimes, and that following 9/11 there was a staggering growth of hate crimes against Muslims and Arabs and which are still at very high rates).

95. Compare DERRICK BELL, *FACES AT THE BOTTOM OF THE WELL: THE PERMANENCE OF RACISM* 158-94 (1992) (an allegory of space traders who offer to bail out the United States

What I mean, therefore, by the title of this essay is not that the question of integration or separation is unimportant in the struggle for racial justice, but that both approaches are likely to leave the black community as a whole in a disadvantaged state unless accompanied by a broader struggle for social justice. This struggle must recognize that racism is but one manifestation of the injustices associated with an inegalitarian society and world order. Moreover, even if it were possible to overcome racism in an inegalitarian society, some other form of discrimination would arise to replace it as a means of maintaining hierarchy, much as religion or social status has been used in racially homogeneous societies.⁹⁶

V. CONCLUSION

It is speculative whether the quality of life for individual African Americans, or within the black community as a whole, would be better today if, instead of the post-*Brown* integrationist approach, the focus had been on equalizing the quality of black schools. The questions are always: (1) where do we go from here, and (2) what have we learned from the past that will help us to decide?

The history of *Brown* shows that, in the school context, there are obstacles to either an integrationist or separatist approach to racial justice. School integration requires either cross-district remedies or residential integration,⁹⁷ whereas quality education in black schools

from its economic crisis in exchange for all the country's African Americans, who at the end are herded in chains onto the spaceships).

96. See, e.g., *supra* note 20; ROBERT DELIEGE, *THE UNTOUCHABLES OF INDIA* (Nora Scott, trans., 1999) (on the systemic exploitation and discriminatory treatment in India of the Untouchables, although they "cannot be distinguished by any particular physical trait," at 2); YAAKOV KOP & ROBERT E. LITAN, *STICKING TOGETHER: THE ISRAELI EXPERIMENT IN PLURALISM* (2002) (on the second class status of Arab Israelis and characterizing the situation as "separate but not equal"); BRENDAN MURTAGH, *THE POLITICS OF TERRITORY: POLICY AND SEGREGATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND* (2002) (on the segregation in Northern Ireland of Protestants and Catholics); GÉRARD PRUNIER, *THE RWANDA CRISIS: HISTORY OF A GENOCIDE* (1998) (on the historical hierarchical status of Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda, and how the self-interested use of that division by colonial powers fomented the ultimate genocide); KAMAL SALIBI, *A HOUSE OF MANY MANSIONS: THE HISTORY OF LEBANON RECONSIDERED* (1988) (on the division in Lebanon between Christians and Muslims).

97. Some have suggested the use of school vouchers as a possible means of achieving integration, while recognizing the political power of suburbanites interested in preserving their advantages as an obstacle. Compare James A. Ryan, *Schools, Race, and Money*, 109 *YALE L.J.* 249 (1999) (discussing evidence that racial and socio-economic integration improves educational opportunities for poor and minority students, and suggesting vouchers and other school choice options as possible means of promoting integration if properly structured), and

requires reforming school finance. The Supreme Court has backed away from both those issues, and the few state courts that have tried to address them have had difficulty producing remedies. This is because remedies demand political action and the judiciary will ultimately succumb to the political process when, as now, political forces are arrayed against reform.

Secondly, the *Brown* experience teaches us that in the United States the struggle for racial justice and social justice are intertwined. Full social justice demands and includes racial justice, and full racial justice cannot be achieved without social justice. Thus, both struggles must be pursued simultaneously in all aspects of social life.

In that regard, *Brown* was related to a broader civil rights movement to combat racism not only in the educational system, but also in the workplace, public accommodations, housing, the political system, etc. A quality education is worth very little in the United States if it does not translate into a decent job with earnings affording one a choice of where to live, the opportunity to provide one's children a quality education, and so on. None of the above is possible without the political power to make it happen.

The political power underlying the Civil Rights Movement came from the readiness of the black community and its allies to confront the then blatant racism of the society on many fronts—in the courts, in the legislatures, and in the streets. Much of the focus of the Civil Rights Movement was and had to be explicitly racial, as with the abolition of enforced segregation and the enactment of laws prohibiting discrimination, in response to the existence of explicitly racist laws and practices. A factor greatly contributing to those successes was the ability to convince large numbers of people that racial discrimination is profoundly inconsistent with the professed ideals of the society.⁹⁸

James A. Ryan & Michael Heise, *The Political Economy of School Choice*, 111 *YALE L.J.* 2043, 2047-48 (2002) (arguing that, just as suburban political power thwarted the extension of desegregation beyond core cities as well as efforts to equalize school funding, “unless the politics surrounding school choice are altered, school choice plans will continue to be structured in ways that protect the physical and financial independence of suburban public schools...(and) will lead to, at best, limited academic improvement (and) little or no gain in racial and socio-economic integration”).

98. See, e.g., Klarman, *supra* note 47 (arguing that while *Brown* may not itself have pricked the moral conscience of the nation, it contributed to a more aggressive demand for civil rights within the black community and a resultant white backlash in the South that led to violent repression that did prick the nation's conscience and contribute to the passage of civil rights laws in the 1960s).

With the achievement of formal legal equality, which must be vigorously enforced to make it a practical reality, the focus of the struggle for racial justice has shifted to those structural aspects of American society that impede African Americans from being able to share equitably in the benefits of the society. Many of those structural obstacles operate and will have to be addressed in a color-blind manner because they impact not only African Americans but other ethnic groups and segments of the white community as well. Without the combined efforts of all who are adversely affected, it will be impossible to mount the political power necessary to eliminate those obstacles.

Achieving a united front requires an ideological struggle resembling that of the Civil Rights Movement. This requires convincing people that the system in the United States, as structured and as it functions, is inconsistent with principles, such as equal opportunity and the right of all to equitably share in the goods of social life based on their contribution or needs, that are implicit in the society's professed ideals.⁹⁹ Personally, I think a convincing case can be made, although for many, the idea that something is fundamentally wrong with the system is not yet as obvious as was the Civil Rights Movement's case against explicit racism.

Part of the difficulty is that many working class whites still harbor racist sentiments, some of it perhaps subconscious, that impede their willingness to dialogue and join forces with African Americans and other ethnic minorities in pursuit of common interest. These sentiments, as well as suspicion towards whites on the part of African Americans, are fomented and exploited by the power elite so as to divert people's attention from their common interests and impede a united effort—much as employers have often used ethnicity to successfully divide workers.

Overcoming these divisions is essential to the achievement of racial and social justice in the United States. Until they are overcome,

99. Compare Linda M. Keller, *The American Rejection of Economic Rights as Human Rights and the Declaration of Independence: Does the Pursuit of Happiness Require Basic Economic Rights*, 19 N.Y.L. SCH. J. HUM. RTS. 557, 560 (2003) (arguing that the government has "the duty to facilitate the pursuit of happiness by providing minimum economic means," including basic economic rights now widely accepted in the international community to such things as food, shelter, education, employment and health care); CASS M. SUNSTEIN, *THE SECOND BILL OF RIGHTS* (2004) (arguing that Franklin Roosevelt's so-called Second Bill of Rights, including the right to education, a job, a decent home and adequate health care, merits the status of the Declaration of Independence as a statement of society's most fundamental principles).

the black community will likely continue to bear disproportionately the hardships of American life and many whites will not be far behind. Perhaps as the victims of both the racial and social injustices of this society, the historic role of African Americans is to help all who suffer from its inequities understand the necessity for a unified struggle.