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This thesis has been written with the purpose of analyzing critically the pros and cons on school busing as they are found in the literature, and to explore the possibility of utilizing other means to supplement or complement school busing to achieve integration and quality education. The most difficult problem was in assessing the impact of busing on children and the achievement of its goal, viz. integration and quality education. All through my thesis I have endeavored to show that in education we are not seeking mere economic progress but full flowering of the human personality which will enable a child to realize his true potential as a human being.
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CHAPTER ONE

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO BUSING

Nearly twenty years have gone by since the first decision by the Supreme Court against segregation in public education. But in an attempt to minimize the impact of total integration, some school districts have passed laws against busing, have operated their schools on a freedom of choice plan or have relied on present residential patterns and zoning to assign schools. And so there appears to be no serious attempt to bring about large scale desegregation of American public schools and there is little awareness of the need to reorganize public education to obtain maximum educational efficiency for all children.¹

Today, even though negroes are not subjected to a system of compulsory ignorance, elementary education has become profoundly differentiated in quantity and quality between white and negro children. They are denied many of the benefits of the developing public school system. They may not be assigned to separate and inferior systems by law, yet their educational accomplishment is very deplorable. The schools attended by Negro children have less adequate educational facilities than those attended by white children.

Thus the problem of race relations in public

education is a complicated one. Men of good will desire that all children have equal opportunity for obtaining the best possible education in line with their aptitudes, abilities and ambitions. Segregation by race is indefensible in education. If de facto segregation is an evil, then all of society is at fault, not merely the educational establishment. The city authorities, real estate interests and the population at large will have to be convinced of the need for a policy of unrestricted integration.

Because only a century ago the black man was a slave, the assumption is still made by some that he is unlikely to contribute to social excellence and so must be segregated. Such segregation, denying as it does equal opportunity for education, money and position to the American Negro because he is a Negro, is the denial of his very civil rights. But many of those with money and position retain a strong emotional attachment to the argument that excellence demands segregation and so stoutly refuse to examine their basis for rank ordering people with respect to an assumed potential for excellence. They see only the possibility of contamination of those social advantages, advantages which they and their fathers before them enjoyed. They are unwilling to abandon completely their idea that in educational procedures excellence requires segregation.

In 1954 the Supreme Court in Brown vs. Board of Education found the separate de jure education inherently unequal and thus violating the equal protection clause. Its decision was based upon information the judges had received
from trained professionals. Research findings of behavioral and social scientists during a thirty year period influenced the judges to state: "Segregation of white and coloured in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the coloured children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating races is usually denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation...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 racially integrated school."2

From 1954 almost all the decided cases have focused upon existing school districts as such and the courts have required remedies within the framework of school districts as they are. Several recent cases reflect a new development which is highly significant. In the recent Detroit and Indianapolis cases, the courts in effect rediscovered that the public education is a state function. Building to some extent upon earlier southern cases, the courts indicated that while the states have in practice delegated the educational function to the local school districts, they themselves bear the ultimate non-delegated constitutional responsibility for providing to all children equality of public educational opportunity. Therefore state officials

may have certain obligations in connection with desegregation. For example, they may be responsible for seeing that their agents, the local school districts, live up to the constitutional requirements. More important if equality of opportunity cannot be provided within school districts as they are presently constituted, the states may be obliged to create new metropolitan school districts, especially where it can be shown that state acts contributed to the racial isolation of the urban districts.

"The courts are still dealing with the issue of how much desegregation is required, but the doctrinal trend seems to be towards racial balancing; secondly, although the choice of techniques is initially up to the school districts, all pupil assignment devices that are educationally sound and administratively feasible must be considered, and lastly state officials must bring about desegregation where local districts fail or more recently where they cannot." 3

Although the Supreme Court has not yet spoken to the question of school site selection and construction in residential racial segregation as illegal, yet numerous lower federal courts have decided that where residential segregation is the product of public or private racial discrimination school authorities have an affirmative obligation to avoid incorporating the effects of such discrimination into their systems. In effect, they must adopt pupil

assignments and arrangements that overcome the effects that such other discrimination would have upon racially neutral assignment criteria.

"The courts have not yet permitted the adoption -- voluntary or otherwise -- of desegregation plans that are themselves racially discriminatory. For example, plans that are based upon one way busing of minority children or the closing of educationally adequate minority schools have been forbidden. Essentially two principles underlie this doctrine. First, plans which unnecessarily inconvenience minority children and parents in order that majority convenience may be served are as discriminatory as segregation itself and hence illegal. Secondly, such plans are unsound from the standpoint of policy in that they risk forfeiting the support of minority community." \(^4\)

Most southern school boards argued that racial designations of schools, faculties and bus routes were legally wrong and racially neutral pupil assignments and other policies would be an adequate remedy. And so the school boards offered and the courts accepted pupil assignment plans based on freedom of choice or neutral attendance zone lines. But plans such as freedom of choice generally and zoning in some circumstances while racially neutral in appearance may accomplish very little in the way of actual

desegregation.

In April, 1971, the Supreme Court answered the broad questions in its Charlotte-Mecklenburg opinion as follows: the remedy for such segregation may be administratively awkward, inconvenient and even bizarre in some situations and may impose burdens on some, but all awkwardness and inconvenience cannot be avoided -- racially neutral assignment plans proposed by school authorities to a district court may be inadequate. In short, an assignment plan is not acceptable simply because it appears to be neutral.

The same court ruled that busing to get rid of the last vestiges of state imposed segregation was constitutional. On the subject of transportation the court further observed, "Bus transportation has been an integral part of the public educational system for years and was perhaps the single most important factor in the transition from one-room school house to the consolidated school. Eighteen million of the nation's public school children, approximately 39% were transported to their schools by bus in 1969-70 in all parts of the country. The importance of bus transportation as a normal and accepted tool of educational policy is readily discernible in this and the Companion case." After analyzing the situation existing in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg district, the court concluded that in the circumstances it found "no basis for holding that the local school authorities may not be required to employ bus transportation as one tool of school desegregation."
By the same token, in the Companion case of North Carolina Board of Education vs. Swann, the court struck down a state statute which forbade assignment of any student on account of race or for the purpose of creating a racial balance or ratio in the schools. Said the court: "Just as the race of students must be considered in determining whether a constitutional violation has occurred, so also must race be considered in formulating a remedy. To forbid, at this stage, all assignments made on the basis of race would deprive school authorities of the one tool absolutely essential to fulfillment of their constitutional obligation to eliminate existing dual systems."^5

Thus most of the new guidelines are contained in the opinion upholding the federal district court plan that requires massive busing for Charlotte and surrounding Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. This controversial Charlotte plan was developed by Judge James B. McMillan after the school board having been urged three times to submit suitable desegregation plans failed to do so. The plan called for cross-town busing to achieve in each elementary school the ratio of 71% whites and 29% blacks, the mix existing in the entire system.

"Desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk in school," wrote Justice Burger. Busing is a legitimate tool of school desegregation, he observed and cautioned

---

lower courts only to avoid busing plans with such long trips that might "either risk the health of the children or significantly infringe on the educational process." 6

As we have already mentioned, Burger underscored the point that busing has been part of the system for years. Busing had been widely used in the south but for the express purpose of maintaining segregation. "In Charlotte, for example, some 23,600 children of all ages had been bused for an average one-way trip of more than an hour. Under the new district court plan the average trip was not over thirty-five minutes at most." 7

In addition to busing, the court said, frank and sometimes drastic gerrymandering of school districts and attendance zones was necessary even to the extent of pairing one district with another across town to achieve a better racial balance within a city. "All things being equal, with no history of discrimination," wrote Burger, "it might well be desirable to assign pupils to schools nearest their homes. But all things are not equal in a system that has been deliberately constructed and maintained to enforce racial segregation." 8

7 Ibid., p. 69.
8 Ibid., p. 68.
In its decision the Supreme Court left broad discretion to the federal district courts. It did not require busing to create the same racial balance in all schools, nor did it require the elimination of every all-black school within a district. But it addressed itself to the problems involved in achieving integration in a school system where segregation through two sets of schools had therefore been a deliberate governmental policy. If busing may be said to be a burden imposed by the plan, it is patently clear that the burden along with the concomitant benefits of an improved educational environment and more and better services and facilities is evenly distributed among all the students.

FACT OF SEGREGATION

Virtually all school segregation in this country is traceable to policies and practices of school authorities and related public and quasi public institutions. The question of what is illegal in school segregation was confused by a largely unexamined supposition that segregation in the south was the product of racially explicit state laws and therefore unconstitutional; whereas segregation in the north, however educationally lamentable, was the result of fortuitous social forces and therefore permissible and legally immune. "Echoes of the analysis are heard today; nevertheless, the federally decided northern cases teach
overwhelmingly that the dichotomy between *de jure* and *de facto* school segregation has been a false one. Upon closer and more sophisticated scrutiny of the facts, most northern school segregation is seen as the product of school authorities, policies and practices no less deliberate -- usually in the sense of being intended always in the separatist consequences being probable and foreseeable than explicit state statutes. There is racial discrimination in the recruitment, hiring, assignment and reassignment, promotion, demotion, dismissal of faculty of staff including administrators.\(^9\)

There is illegal gerrymandering of school attendance zone lines to effect racial segregation of pupil. For example, adjacent black and white schools may be innocent reflections of the neighborhoods they serve; but if one of them is being operated over its capacity while the other has extra space available, the school authorities bear a very heavy burden of persuading the court that they drew a zone line where they did for non-racial educational reasons. Racially separatist pupil transportation practices are common. To relieve overcrowding, children are transported past an underutilized school attended by the children of a black community. Similarly some transportation to relieve overcrowding takes the form of moving a class of children and their

\(^9\) Flannery, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
teacher to an opposite race school, but keeping them intact there as a racially identifiable sub-group within the receiving school. New schools are constructed upon sites that are more segregated than others available. Similarly, existing schools and the use of portables or auxiliary facilities are illegal where the system has less separatist alternatives. A striking example of this practice was seen in Oklahoma where the system flouted its own guidelines concerning the proper size of elementary schools in order to build two half size schools to serve adjacent racially different neighborhoods. There is also the manipulation of grade structures so as to create or maintain greater racial separation of pupils than would be obtained with a different form. Thus HEW has recently alleged that Boston has structured certain secondary grades so as to create racially identifiable sub-systems. They are also using in the south devices like segregated classroom assignments and other intra-school racial discriminations.\(^\text{10}\)

Coleman in his report -- "Equality of Educational Opportunity" -- states: "The great majority of American children attend schools that are largely segregated, that is, where almost all their fellow students are of the same racial background as they are. Among minority groups, Negroes are by far the most segregated. Taking all groups into consideration, however, white children are most segregated. Almost 80\% \(^{10}\text{Ibid.}, p. 12-13.\)
of all white in the first grade and twelfth grade attend schools that are from 90 to 100% white. 

"In the south most students attend schools that are 100% white or black. The same pattern of segregation holds for the teachers of Negro and white students. For the nation as a whole, the average Negro elementary pupil attends a school in which 65% of the teachers are Negro; the average white pupil attends a school in which 97% of the teachers are white." 

Thus Coleman's survey finds that American public education remains largely unequal in most regions of the country, including all those where Negroes form any significant proportion of the population.

"Many large metropolitan areas north and south are moving toward resegregation despite attempts by school boards and city administrations to reverse the trends. Racial housing concentrations in large cities have reinforced neighborhood school patterns of racial isolation, while at the same time many white families have moved to the suburbs and other families have taken their children out of the public school system, enrolling them instead in private and parochial schools..."

"The public schools are more rigidly segregated

___________


12 Ibid., p. 8.
at the elementary level than in the higher grades. In the large cities elementary schools have customarily made assignments in terms of neighborhood boundaries. Housing segregation has therefore tended to build a segregated elementary school system in most cities in the north and increasingly in the south, as well as where de facto segregation is replacing de jure segregation.\(^{13}\)

WHY OPPOSITION

The court has said clearly that de facto school segregation caused by neighborhood housing patterns is not acceptable. In other words, if whites and blacks do not happen to live close enough to each other to enable them conveniently to sit side by side in the same classroom in the same school building, then school officials must devise a plan to make that possible. Nearly always that plan involves busing.

"People who had been working in the schools know how buses have actually been used in the past, particularly in the school districts in the south. They know too well that buses have been a major fixture, like chalk boards and climbing bars, for years. In most large rural districts, virtually every student is bused. In sprawling California suburbs, thousands of students are bused every day to overly large, widely spaced junior high schools and high schools. In every

\(^{13}\)Ibid., p. 467-469.
kind of school district, students are bused daily for special purposes: sports, educational and cultural events and classes for handicapped and the retarded. 14

"As the principal data collector and record keeper on the nation's schools, the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare is a good source of facts on the busing question. Eliot Richardson, then secretary of HEW, told a Senate Committee in August, 1970, that there was more busing in the south to preserve segregation than to implement desegregation plans. An HEW report in March, 1970, had presented some interesting facts. In 300 counties and in six southern states where HEW had given assistance in drawing up desegregation plans, only seven counties would have had to increase busing to carry out the plans; the remaining 293 would have had the same or less busing. In many counties where children had been bused for years to segregated schools, neighborhood schools would have become a reality for the first time. Some counties are busing children even longer distances than necessary to maintain segregated schools. In other words, they were being extravagant with buses." 15

"From this report of HEW two specific examples stand out. Negro children in Sturgis, Mississippi, where there was a white school, were bused 93 miles round trip daily to attend

15 Ibid., p. 28.
a segregated school in Muben. Until about two years ago, Negro children in an Atlanta suburb were bused 75 miles round trip to attend segregated schools. Though these are unusual examples, yet they do represent the extent to which some southern school districts are using buses to keep blacks and whites in separate schools. Yet some parents and school officials in those same districts are talking as though the use of school buses were some totally new and diabolical idea. They say they certainly will not tolerate the use of school buses to put whites and blacks in the same schools.16

So busing is nothing new in the American educational system -- nearly 20 million children or 40% of all United States elementary school children ride to schools for reasons that have nothing to do with desegregation. The percentage of children who are bused for court ordered desegregation is probably only about two per cent (although no one, including the federal government, has exact figures on this.) Yet the opponents of busing want to prohibit its use for desegregation purposes and in the south they want the opportunity to return to the segregated situation that existed before the court orders.

There are more flagrant sources of opposition to effective desegregation of American public education. White citizen groups in the south, parents and tax payers groups in the north and boards of education controlled by whites

---

16 Ibid., p. 30.
who identify with more vehement opposition to change are examples of effective resistance.

Of course the very real reason the bus has come to attract so much attention is that it remains the most obvious and the most expeditious way to achieve fully integrated schools within a school district. Because of the neighborhood housing patterns, the least awkward way to integrate a school is to put in an order for the sturdiest, most dependable school bus on the market.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BLACK AND WHITE SCHOOLS

There are some definite and systematic directions of difference between schools attended by the majority and the minority. It appears to be in the most academically related areas that the schools of minority pupils show the most consistent deficiencies. There are fewer physics laboratories, fewer books per student in libraries, texts are less often in the schools with intensive testing, academically related extracurricular activities are less, the curriculum less often is built around an academic program. In the nation there is considerable evidence that Negro pupils are more likely to be taught by teachers who are locality based in the sense that they are products of the area in which they teach and that they secured their public school training nearby.

"The average number of any minority group attends a school in which the verbal facility scores of elementary
and secondary teachers are lower than for schools attended by the average white. They are less likely to be trained in teachers' colleges, more often are products of colleges that offer no grade training. ¹⁷

Swanson in his book, Struggle for Equality, comments:

"The educational standards were lower in predominantly Negro schools of the area and that the children not only felt inferior but were inferior in academic achievement. These schools did not have enough teachers, counseling or guidance programs. There were too many classes for retarded children and too few for gifted pupils." ¹⁸

"Quality education is unavailable in black schools, not only because of overcrowded conditions, but also because of inadequate development of staff, outdated curriculum and lack of incentive in teachers for developing creativity in our children. Whether the segregation is de jure or de facto, the net result is the same, viz., severe harm is being done to the children. Each year inexperienced new teachers were assigned to the difficult schools in the economically depressed areas of the city, thus further depriving the students of more capable and qualified teachers." ¹⁹

¹⁷James Coleman, op. cit., p.p. 120, 148.


But the greatest disparity between the black and white schools is financial. In our society's present race for spoils, not all runners begin at the same point. Children from higher socioeconomic status begin life with many advantages. That status provides them with a substantial head start when they begin schooling at age five or six. Lower socioeconomic status children begin schooling with more physical disabilities, and less psychological preparation for adjusting to the procedures of schooling. This condition of disadvantage is then compounded by having to attend schools characterized by fewer and lower quality services.

Formal schooling should enable representative youngsters from all social and racial groups to begin their preschool careers with equal chances of success. Representative children of each social grouping should be able to begin their adult lives with equal chances of success in matters such as pursuing further schooling, obtaining a job and participating in the political system. And those children who begin their schooling with the greatest disadvantage must have disproportionately greater schooling and resources in order to equalize the opportunity at sixteen. And so the ability of a local school district to generate revenue from property taxes should not be allowed to serve as the primary determinant of the quality of school services it offers to children. ²⁰

Total level of resources made available as a result of state arrangements for support of schools is related to the socioeconomic status of pupils and that relationship is such that lower levels of resources are associated with pupils being from a lower socioeconomic status household. The means by which revenues are distributed for schools presently reinforces socioeconomic discrimination in the delivery of school services. High socioeconomic status districts spend more money per pupil than do others.

Resource disparities in public education occur primarily as a consequence of two factors: inequalities associated with generation of revenue from local taxation of property and imperfections in state arrangements for directly distributing financial aid to school districts.

Not only do the children of the poor have less money to spend for their schooling, but also their parents frequently pay more for their unequal services. A great deal of evidence exists to the effect that an impoverished early childhood environment leads to educational hardships which tend to reside in disproportionate numbers in school districts that spend lower amounts per pupil on instruction.

The quality of the staff is significantly associated with expenditure levels. Low expenditure districts employ a higher percentage of provisionally credentialled teachers.

Moreover, low expenditure districts employ larger percentages of teachers either with no degree or only a bachelor's degree. Conversely, higher expenditure districts
simply cannot pay as much for highly qualified manpower as can other districts.
Does integration mean merely shuffling bodies of youngsters of different racial backgrounds who are attending separate schools? Or does integration and desegregation mean all those things a school does afterwards to accommodate itself to the new order of people and the variety of needs they bring with them? But the mere physical mixing of pupils from a variety of ethnic backgrounds within one school without changing the structure and content of the educational program to reflect the presence of different cultural groupings through the provision of systematic opportunities for the sharing of these creative differences will never achieve integration.¹

"Desegregated schools must do more than impart academic skills; the fostering of social integration and the development of human values does not have the same priority as traditional achievement activities. Since most of the policies of the schools focus on the achievement of youngsters, they tend to ignore the objective or human component of the school. Instead of desegregation, resegregation is occurring

¹James DeSlonde, "How Can We Really Integrate the Schools" Integrated Education (May-June, 1972), p. 44.
within the school building through several avenues; ability grouping in self-contained ungraded or team teaching units, dual standards of discipline.

"For some integration has come to mean that the skin colour, life style and mores of black people have required that they think and behave white and reject themselves and black masses in order to integrate. Brazier even suggested that they had to exaggerate the behavior of their white middle class counterparts in order to integrate. From this vantage point integration was available only to those blacks who could comfortably 'play white' and were middle-class enough not to remind white people that black students are essentially and ethnically black."²

Even though we can't describe precisely the ideally integrated school, yet certain phenomena that are incompatible with integration can be identified. Extra curricular and similar activities reveal intra-school segregation and discrimination, more subtle than selection processes that maintain segregation of cheerleaders or the newspaper editorial board. Such discrimination surely distorts the learning process and patterns of it will surely be changed. Racially discriminatory disciplinary acts and practices may lead to educational dereliction. Racially discriminatory insensitivity on the part of teachers and administrators is more difficult to deal with than a clear pattern of overt discrimination because it

is somewhat subjective and intangible. Nevertheless, school systems for years have assisted or dealt otherwise with teachers and administrators who are experiencing psychological disabilities. Culturally biased curricula and materials are poor education and at least to the extent that they reflect a failure to eliminate the vestiges of discrimination. Assignment practices that segregate children on the basis of race within schools are illegal. The consequences of discriminatory desegregation may be as dire as those of segregation itself: The foregoing problems and their variations will persist for as long as our mental picture of desegregation remains one of a process whereby some black children are now attending traditionally white schools while some white children are now going to few ghetto schools.  

"Today desegregated racially-mixed schools when compared with the segregated white school differ only to the degree that the numerical presence of black students elicits the fulfillment of the self-fulfilling prophecy through lowered teacher expectation and investment, the strengthening of track system against black youth, the establishment of special guidance classes, the resegregation of such students within classrooms and by classrooms, and the expanded use of vacant space to prevent further desegregation."  

"But true integration means sharing of a mutually

---

3 Flannery, op. cit., p. 13.  
4 Wilcox, op. cit., p. 25.
self-reaffirming educational experience by students from a variety of ethnic, religious, social and economic backgrounds. It embodies curriculum modifications, changes in the school organizations, a redistribution of decision-making roles and a confrontation of the track system. Designed to enable students to learn to establish co-equal relationships and to understand the true nature of the society, it focuses its attention on enabling students to acquire skills, insight and knowledge to participate in solving their own problems and those of the society of which they are a part. 5

So merely placing children from deprived environments next to children from homes where ideas abound cannot by itself bring about equality of educational opportunity. Physical proximity of black children to white children would not in itself overcome the results of past segregation.

Moreover, excellence in education means more than exposure to books that it encompasses, but exposure to all aspects of the world in which the child will spend his years. Failure to have contact with varieties of American life, particularly in the formative years, means that his education is incomplete, his preparation for life insufficient and the consequences of his future role as a citizen most serious.

It is the child who should be our main concern, the child to be educated fully to participate in a meaningful existence. For those whose attitudes are completely set against school integration, leaders armed with facts are

5Ibid., p. 25.
needed to calm their worst fears. For those whose attitudes are attuned only to immediate change, leaders armed with facts are needed to teach the difference between the possible and the desirable. For those uncertain of where the right lies, leaders are needed to raise that banner of decent treatment of all people which is our best heritage for our children.

So it is obvious that desegregation is a necessary but not sufficient condition for integration, for integration involves, in addition to all that is said above, elimination of racism after they get there. True integration is achieved only when schools are neither white nor black but just schools.
CHAPTER THREE

POLITICS OF BUSING

While there has been a general belief that politics and education should not mix, the truth is that in a special sense public education has been embroiled in politics. Politics has operated to shape the form and direction of educational policy. Political parties frequently serve as devices for mobilizing group support and for integrating the organs of government so as to translate private objectives into public policy. The courts got into the issue of busing in the first place because of the long unwillingness of Congress, a succession of administrations and the public in general to address themselves to providing equal educational opportunity to black Americans. As a result of all these failures on the part of the law makers, no issue in the recent history has stirred so much local passion as the busing of school children to achieve racial balance.¹

"Democratic governments function effectively only when the citizen and his elected representatives are able to resolve the differences between them. Seymer M. Lipset once wrote: 'Legitimacy involves the capacity of the system to engender and maintain the belief that the existing political institutions are the most appropriate ones for the society.'

All claims to a legitimate title to rule must ultimately win acceptance through demonstrating effectiveness. On both these counts -- public belief in the system and demonstrated effectiveness of the system -- busing legislation has failed. There is an obvious gap between the information and the experiences of laymen and lawmakers."^2

Politicians as a breed are reluctant to take what they fear to be unpopular positions on highly emotional issues. The result is to create illusion of unanimity. There are two favorite "cop-outs" in the anti-busing demagoguery: quality education and local control. All politicians are enthusiastic about quality education, but segregated schools cannot meet the test. The evidence shows that minority children do better in desegregated classrooms while part of the education of white children should be to know and respect children of a different skin colour.3

Since the fall of 1969 the school busing issue has been a hot one all across the country. State legislatures in and out of the south have passed anti-busing laws. Many top political leaders have spoken out against busing. It reached its climax when in January, 1972, the Richmond, Virginia, school district was ordered by a federal court to devise a plan for busing children, if necessary, across district lines in order

---


^3Carey McWilliams, The Nation (March 6, 1972).
to achieve integrated quality education. That decision marked the first time a court had transcended political boundaries for the purpose of integrating schools. Suburban politicians all over the country agitated against the decision and joined Wallace in condemning busing. In the wake of all that, the members of the Congress had been considering a constitutional amendment no less directed against integration through busing.\(^4\)

**NIXON:**

By default of leadership and by pursuit of his equivocal policies, Nixon has set the stage for the present frenzy about busing. Now he proposes to exploit the angry sentiment which he has done so much to stimulate. In the end, the tactic he has adopted seems to favor the measure which offers maximum opportunity to exploit the prejudice implicit in anti-busing.

"President Nixon in mid-March moved his administration into the explosive national crisis over busing of school children. In a nationwide telecast and a follow-up message to Congress, Mr. Nixon called for far-reaching legislation which would provide: (1) A moratorium on pupil busing orders by federal courts to remain in effect until July 1, 1973, unless broader legislation is passed earlier; (2) New opportunities for equal education with immediate aid of about

\(^4\)Ibid., March 6, 1972.
2.5 billion dollars channelled to schools with large enrollments from poor families. 5

Nixon's proposal, if approved by Congress, would amount to: (1) Assigning students to the schools closest to their homes that provide the appropriate level and type of education; (2) Permit students to transfer on their request from a school in which their race is a majority to one in which it is a minority; (3) Create new attendance zones or groupings of grades without requiring more busing; (4) Build new schools or close inferior ones if needed to desegregate; (5) Use educational parks or other special types of schools to promote integration; (6) Only as a last resort, bus students as means of desegregating schools. Even then increased busing would be barred, in effect, for students up to the sixth grade. And busing orders for older students would have to be temporary and subject to stays pending appeals. 6

When asked how much busing is going on now for the purposes of desegregation and how they would define massive busing, the officials in the Nixon administration answered: "We don't have any break-down...We have no data on miles, distance or times, or what relative amount of desegregation busing and non-desegregation busing amount to." As for the definition of massive busing, the official of HEW said: "We have not used it. It is a descriptive term to describe that

range of cases which seems to us to have exceeded the requirements that the Supreme Court laid down on Swann."
But the tone of the president's radio-television address and his message to Congress afterward surely implied that undue busing had been required by at least some courts and he wanted to end it. But no one in the administration, however, seemed to know how much "massive" busing was going on. Likewise, no one was sure of what the cumulative effect might be, priming the inner city pump with the recycled 2.5 billion. White House reporters, aware of that national studies (particularly the voluminous 1966 report, "Equality of Educational Opportunity" by James Coleman) indicate that extra spending alone does not appreciably upgrade learning, asked if the $300 to $400 per pupil additional expenditure would make a difference and at whose cost.

For all the careful timing and political calculation that went into the president's plan, it produced more criticism and confusion than anything else. Nixon seemed to have achieved his temporary objective of appeasing the anti-busing sentiments of the people. For the most part, his program addresses the courts and the problem itself.?

---

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES AND OTHER POLITICIANS

Anti-busing was to Campaign 1972 what social issues were to Campaign 1970: An attempt to direct attention from real issues. Precisely because anti-busing has distinct

racial overtones, it is emotionally charged and dangerously divisive. Exploitation of such an issue made a mockery of even the rough and tumble debate that went on in the National Campaign. Other issues tended to be set aside for noisy quarrels about the gut issue. Many politicians were deliberately nationalizing and manipulating the issue of school busing in the presidential politics of 1972. Previously there had been much furor locally and regionally over specific busing controversies. Then politics had raised the issue out of its specific contexts. The underlying question has been tragically obscured: how to achieve quality education for all the nation's children during a time of racial turmoil.

First it was George Wallace, rampaging through Florida on a victorious anti-busing campaign in the presidential primary. Then came the so-called liberals. Even the pediatrician and peace activist, Dr. Benjamin Spock, who was running on the left wing people's party ticket came out against busing and in favor of locally controlled neighborhood schools.

Washington's Senator Henry Jackson, the only candidate in the Democratic primaries of 1972 with a child in D.C. public schools, responded to questions on busing with some finesse: "I am opposed to busing purely to achieve racial

---

8 McWilliams, op. cit., p. 25.

balance. I don't believe in sending youngsters from a good school to a bad school just for this purpose," Jackson says, leaving an obvious escape clause.

Senator Hubert Humphrey, a veteran civil rights partisan, played variations on the same theme. "Busing to help improve education, yes," said Humphrey. "Compulsory busing just because you think it is going to solve all your problems, I say 'no'." But on several occasions during his 1972 Florida campaign swing he confessed: "I would be less than frank if I don't add that I don't think that busing is the answer."

Another Democratic candidate, Edmund Muskie, was perhaps a shade more positive. "Like everyone else, I don't like busing. At the same time, we know that separate education is not equal. We are going to have to rely on busing to some extent to deal with the problem."

Even George McGovern, long proponent of school integration, had been shaken by the passionate opposition to busing. Governor Reagan of California does not like it. Governor McKeith of Louisiana has talked of drawing a line in the dust, presumably a line on some back country Louisiana road beyond which buses may not pass. Governor Maddox advocated stealing tires off buses.

Two days before the voting in the Democratic presidential primary in Florida the national black political convention in Gary adopted a resolution condemning busing as obsolete and dangerous.

"But we are not prepared to accept or sanctify that seeming consensus as just or democratic or constitutional."
The Gary convention may have been a history-making event for manifesting a new black power in electoral politics. A model of orderly deliberation and decision-making it was not. It was all too reminiscent of the chaotic New Politics convention in Chicago a quadrennium ago. In the confusion of factional maneuvering, bomb scares, unread documents, delegation walk-outs and last-minute voting, the busing issue was hardly given a thoughtful hearing. Lest anyone seize the Gary resolution as normative for black political leadership, the thirteen-member congressional black caucus only three days later declared: "We strongly reaffirm our support of busing as one of the many ways to implement the constitutional requirement of equal educational opportunities in education. We consider busing neither the exclusive solution, nor the major problem. Properly administered, most schools can be desegregated without massive busing."\(^{10}\)

The function of debate in American politics is not so much to resolve an issue as to encyst it. The more rightward candidates talked of an anti-busing amendment to the constitution on the grounds that it is unconstitutional for the federal government to compel children to attend particular schools on grounds of race. But this did not make for a very successful cyst, because there is a certain difficulty in explaining why a constitutional amendment should be needed to stop something that is unconstitutional. The more leftward candidates began with the constitution, too, arguing that

\(^{10}\)Ibid., p. 29.
it requires that Negroes be given education equal in quality to that of whites which means with whites which in turn means busing. But this logic too transparently revealed its premise which is that a high concentration of black students cannot coexist with quality education.

With the dialectic thus becoming unstrung at both poles, it seemed likely that politicians of every persuasion would cluster in the center, there to line themselves up behind the great cause of the neighborhood school. The objective is not to resolve the issue but merely to neutralize it and for this purpose the neighborhood school idea has happy vibrations. To white liberals it means sending their children to schools with the children of other affluent liberals. To blacks it means the hope that their children will attend schools not infected with the subtle racist bias of white culture. To conservatives it means local control of education.11

CHAPTER FOUR

REACTION TO BUSING IN FEW CITIES

Even though the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that busing was a constitutionally proper tool for desegregation, the American dream of equal rights and equal opportunities has been shattered in the ghetto schools of the cities and it continues to persist even today. Busing has to overcome a series of impressive obstacles all over the country.

On March 4, 1970, in Tamar, South Carolina, a group of 200 whites attacked three buses carrying 39 black youngsters to newly integrated schools. With rocks, bricks and baseball bats the crowd banged on the buses, finally turning over two of them. Amazingly, none of the bus passengers was injured except for minor cuts from flying glass and the brief after-effects from tear gas fired into the crowd by state troopers.¹

"In Denver where a busing program to speed up school integration had been started in the fall of 1969, some bombed and burned 23 school buses. Ironically, some of the buses had been used only to take handicapped children to special education classes. To segregationists the school bus has

become a hated symbol which a few literally tried to destroy. To many parents and to ardent defenders of neighborhood schools, it has become a matter of deep anxiety."²

**CHICAGO:**

Chicago's public schools, under pressure from the state school superintendent and U. S. Justice Department to integrate its schools, are even more segregated in 1973 than in 1972. A higher percentage of black students are attending predominantly black elementary schools and the number of all-black schools has increased. A higher portion of white students attend predominantly white high schools. The Chicago Board of Education has made considerable progress toward meeting its own guidelines for integrating the teaching staff in the schools. But the board did not do so well in 1973 when measured by the stricter faculty integration standard sought by the Justice Department.³

These trends were revealed on November 23, 1973, in the Board of Education's annual racial census of students, faculty and administrators. The racial head count for the 1972-73 school year is based on school enrollment as of September 29, 1972.

"The survey shows that white enrollment fell by 15,169 students or 8% from white enrollment in 1971-72. White students now form 31% of the total student population of 558,825,

²Ibid., p. 27.
down from 32.8% last year.4

"Black enrollment also fell for the first time in the nine years that the survey has been conducted. The number of black students declined 2,822, but the percentage of blacks in the system rose to 56.9% from 55.8% because of the much larger decline in the number of white students. The continuing isolation of black students is reflected by the increasing number of blacks who attend schools where the enrollment is at least 90% black. An analysis of the statistics found that 90.3% of the 238,362 black elementary school students attend these predominantly black elementary schools. About 89% of the blacks attended these schools in 1971-72.5

"The survey also found that the number of all-black elementary schools in 1972-73 rose to 142 from 124 a year ago. About 49% of the white students attend elementary schools where the total enrollment is at least 90% white. In the high schools and vocational schools almost 40% of the white students attend predominantly white schools compared with about 37% a year ago.6

The increased segregation of students also is shown by the failure of all but a few schools to meet the integration rules of Michael J. Bakalis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Only nine elementary schools in the system com-

---

5Ibid., p. 7.
ply with Bakalis' standards this year. Compared with eleven last year. Bakalis has cited Chicago and twenty other Illinois school districts for failing to comply with his desegregation rules and told school officials to come up with a satisfactory plan to meet the guidelines.\(^7\)

**NEW YORK:**

In May, 1969, the New York state legislature passed a law that would have ended mandatory busing to achieve racial balance in public schools. But in October 10, 1970, a three-judge federal panel in Buffalo, New York, declared that the New York anti-busing law was unconstitutional on the grounds that it violated the Fourteenth Amendment which guarantees equal protection under the law. The judge wrote that "the anti-busing law was nothing less than official preferment of segregation as opposed to meaningful efforts toward its elimination." The New York law had actually gone further than forbidding busing. It had specifically forbidden assigning any student to any school on the basis of race, creed, colour or national origin, or for the purpose of achieving equality in attendance or increased attendance at any school, of persons of one or more particular races, creeds, colours or national origins.\(^8\)

\(^7\)"Chicago Schools More Segregated Than Last Year" Chicago Tribune (October 24, 1972), p. 1.

\(^8\)Cooper, op. cit., p. 28.
"The California anti-busing law passed by its legislature and signed by the governor required that no school district shall require any student or pupil to be transported for any purpose or for any reason without the written permission of the parent or guardian. The bill was obviously intended to halt busing to integrate schools and its passage was accompanied by emotional and acrimonious debate in Sacramento. Two events made the debate and effort expended on the bill seem particularly wasteful and self-defeating. First, the bill was signed just two weeks before the New York law on busing was ruled unconstitutional. Second, on the very day the bill was signed, both Pasadena and Inglewood launched mandated busing plans and school officials there coolly told the reporters that they were not requiring anybody to ride the buses, but that students would be expected to show up at their newly assigned schools, using whatever mode of transportation they chose."9

"The greatest success in desegregation through busing seems to have taken place at Berkeley. In September, 1968, Berkeley desegregated its elementary schools by a massive two-way cross-town busing strategy, becoming the first city of its size and racial composition to be totally integrated. The result was that many negative results expected by the critics did not occur. Whites did not leave the community but re-

9 Ibid., p. 29.
mained interested and active in the schools. There was no high teacher turn-over rate; in fact, teacher applications increased. First there was as expected considerable tension among the students and more than normal the number of fights. Increasingly there are signs that after living with desegregation the races are accepting each other and forming friendships; and students are electing racially balanced student councils. The report concludes, however, that the long range social integration of blacks and whites has not yet occurred.\(^{10}\)

As I have mentioned earlier, there was initial resistance in the previously white school, particularly from teachers, though the presence of Negro teachers transferred out of a segregated school and determined to make the plan work was an asset.

"A measure of racial concentration continued through tracking of classrooms and through self-segregation in extracurricular activities. The previously desegregated school was not, however, fully integrated in spirit. Teachers at Garfield, Berkeley, would not take responsibility for discipline outside their classrooms. They did not want to work with under-achieving Negroes; in the words of one observer, "They tried to create a structure for failure."\(^{11}\)

Slowly a significant number of white students realized that they were being exposed to an important reality. The


\(^{11}\) Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 476.
Garfield experience to date supports forcefully at least one conclusion: successful integration requires much more than redistricting, much more than feeding Negroes and whites into the same school. Great efforts must be made to anticipate frictions, provide flexible and motivated staff and prepare all students for the new experience to come. The schools' achievement at Berkeley with regard to integration clearly indicates that well-trained, hard working and well-motivated staff are the indispensable ingredient in beginning to integrate rather than merely to desegregate.

PONTIAC, MICHIGAN:

In Pontiac, Michigan, a federal judge in 1971 found that school districts had been engineered to foster segregation and ordered the Pontiac schools to desegregate for the opening of school in the fall. The vehicle for achieving such integration was the school bus.

"The opposition to busing in Pontiac was evident from the day school opened. White parents by the thousands refused to send their children to schools away from their own neighborhoods. During a wave of hysteria, several school buses were blown up, and some white parents even chained themselves to the gates of a yard where the buses were kept. A former grand dragon of the Ku Klux Klan was indicted for violence. A new organization, the National Action Group, was formed to lead the fight against busing in Pontiac, but its activities soon encompassed the nation when its president, Irene McCabe, walked from Pontiac to Washington, D.C.,
to publicize her cause. One parent, Carl Merchant, refused
to permit his thirteen-year-old daughter to attend school
in the heavily black part of town. He was eventually convicted
of 'educational neglect' and his in-laws were given custody
of his daughter. 1

The case typifies many of the fears and problems
arising out of the school busing question. Merchant, an
auto line inspector, does not consider himself a racist. "I
work with black guys in the shop, and they are as much against
busing as I am," he said. His contention at his trial (he
pleaded guilty) was that he was concerned with the safety of
his daughter. He was supported in that claim by Pontiac's
police chief who told the judge that the girl's school was
located in a high crime area where even the police patrolled
in pairs. "I could not bring myself to let my daughter go
down into that environment," Merchant said. 2

In discussing the subject, busing's opponents do
not usually stress their fear or distaste for integrated class-
rooms as such. They talk rather of the early hours required
by long-distance busing, the staggered schedules, the unduly
long rides across town, the loss of identity with neighbor-
hood schools and the forcing of white children to attend inner
city schools in unsafe locations. "This became evident to me
during a visit to the office of the National Action Group (NAG),

1 Robert Cassidy, "The Pros and Cons of Busing" The
Family Magazine (September, 1972), p. 47.

2 Ibid., p. 89.
now the spearhead of a nationwide movement to get a constitutional amendment prohibiting busing for purposes of racial balance. I talked with several of the housewives who staff the NAG office, which sits in the shadow of the Pontiac auto plant. Corena Meador, who said her four children attended integrated schools even before the court order, pointed out that the fight against busing in Pontiac goes back nearly four years. "We are not against all busing," she said. "It is forced busing for the sole purpose of racial balance that we are opposed to."\(^3\)

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 89.
CHAPTER FIVE

REPRESENTATIVE VIEWS ON BUSING

In a nation divided sharply on many issues, the unanimity of opposition to school busing is startling: black and white, conservative and liberal, rich and poor; in the public street or in the privacy of their homes, the American people are protesting against busing.¹ The whites who oppose busing often do so for the following reasons: "So you force the kids to go to the same school. Then you look around the school. The blacks sit together; the whites are eating together; the Mexicans are off somewhere by themselves. So what is the sense of it all? Or even more demoralizing -- Are they trying to kill all the kids? Look at New York City or Chicago. The kids just form gangs and knife each other. No learning goes on."²

Or the form of the objections has followed a rather consistent pattern with voiced objections taking the following lines: "If they, the blacks, want to better their lot, let them work their way up as we did. Busing will dilute the quality of the white schools, the disparity of experience will be psychologically traumatic; they will be happier in their neighborhood schools and it would be better to spend


the money for improvement in the ghetto school.

There are others who find very subtle ways to oppose busing. Calvin Grieder seems to represent this group when he says, "I believe that busing pupils is treating the symptoms rather than the disease of social and economic discrimination. The two main manifestations of our society's sickness are job discrimination and housing discrimination, which are widely practiced, openly and covertly. I also oppose busing because I believe the money spent for bus purchase and operation should be spent on improving education in substandard neighborhoods. This money would not be anywhere near enough, but it would help. I further believe that children of nursery school and elementary school ages should not be far removed from their home neighborhood and should not be in transit too long or too late in the day. And finally I oppose busing as a means of desegregating schools because I do not believe that children should be used to treat social and economic problems for which they have no responsibility whatever." \(^3\)

Another familiar argument raised against busing is the complaint that their children are being bused miles away into "enemy" territory. If a small child becomes ill, a working mother cannot easily call a neighbor to pick up the child. If the parent is fortunate enough to have both time and car available, there is still the anxiety of learning that the child is ill in hostile surroundings. Furthermore, parents

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 35.
raised in a segregated nation feel uncomfortable driving cross-town through the unfamiliar "enemy camp."  

Prejudice of the whites against the blacks seems to account for a great portion of opposition to school integration through busing of children. The whites living in integrated neighborhoods "have the greatest degree of tolerance and support for racial accommodation school policies." It was also observed that well-educated people seem to be more tolerant towards racial integration in schools than the less educated ones. So it is obvious that the education of the parents is the key to solving the problem of integration.

As long as the parents are left uninformed, they will have, probably, all sorts of ideas and hear various rumors that certainly could create fear. This fear stems from ignorance of the situation. Not every child from the disadvantaged areas is a poor student. The standards of the school will not have to drop. The parents must be convinced that their own children will lose nothing and probably gain from the experience and that the program will be beneficial to the disadvantaged children. If parents realize that their children will have as many or more advantages as in their neighborhood schools, they may agree to busing their children.

**BLACKS:**

Blacks who have until now been chiefly the ones whose

4Carrison, op. cit., p. 225.

5Weinburg, op. cit., p. 297.
children were bused are not too enthusiastic about busing either. The new sense of community consciousness among black people has led many to agitate more for quality education under community control than for massive busing of their children out of their own community. Only the old-line civil rights organizations continue to voice unqualified support for busing. So it is easy to see why so many office seekers consider it safe to speak out against busing.

"In response to the open-ended question -- Why did you bus your children? -- an overwhelming majority of respondents (80%) indicated that they were motivated only by the desire for a better educational opportunity for their children. More specifically, they mentioned overcrowding, lack of individual attention and dilapidated facilities, as the intolerable conditions in the Roxbury schools. Only 7% of the mothers indicated that they were motivated by the desire to have their children attend an integrated school. As indicated, this was an open-ended question and mothers could have included both reasons (quality education and school integration) in their response. Typical among these mothers in favor of busing young children was the one who said, 'Under circumstances (conditions in Roxbury schools) I am in favor of busing the younger children if it means a superior education,' which will help attain the goal -- the full participation of Negroes as Americans."6

Clyde Deberry and Robert E. Agger, in their report

---

6 Teele, op. cit., p. 16.
to the Committee on Race and Education, Portland, Oregon, Board of Education, mention that almost eighteen out of every twenty Negroes in the sample felt that Negro children should go to schools that have more white pupils. "This feeling is shared by Negroes of every educational level. Thus, the Negro citizens think amazingly alike, not only on matters of segregation in housing (neighborhoods), but also on the matter of de facto segregation. Do Negroes want to reduce de facto school segregation in Portland through a policy of busing some children to schools outside of their neighborhoods? Even without being specific as to whether Negro, white or both sets of children might be bused, almost three quarters of the Negro respondents (73%) approved such a policy, two-fifths "strongly". This general disposition to approve such a policy is not shared by one quarter of the Negro respondents, but only one out of twenty Negroes strongly disapproves such a policy. One out of six Negro respondents simply disapprove while one out of twenty-five are uncertain. It is apparent that any such policy to effect de facto desegregation would be met with widespread approval in the Negro sub-community on the basis of the predisposition tapped by this question.

From this study it is evident that the Negro citizen's interest includes but extends beyond the de facto segregation situation. He values education, particularly for his children, in a way that other minority groups have in the past and which some white citizens assert or imply the Negro in the United
States does not. His expectations are not only optimistic but also hopeful in regard to his children's future education.

Among the leaders, especially the black leaders, there are some differing views. While some, like Kenneth Clark, believe that the improvement of the ghetto schools is an important, initial step in the attempt to deal with the problems resulting from de facto school segregation, others, like Thomas Pettigrew, believe that school integration per se is a vital ingredient in the attempt to improve the quality of education for Negroes. The debate between these two schools of thought, the investigators believe, is both necessary and important. Indeed it is a sign of the seriousness of the problem that so many estimable scholars and political leaders as well are debating ways to relieve the problem. Both sides in this debate, however, would undoubtedly agree that their positions are marked by relative emphasis and do not differ in their goals: the ultimate opening of the doors to opportunity for Negroes. Likewise, both sides would probably agree that the do-nothing stance is the worst possible position, vis-a-vis, the racial imbalance problem. 8

TEACHERS:

We cannot expect that an issue like that of school integration and desegregation, so charged with meaning and symbolism to so many, could leave teachers unaffected or uninterested. A change which may be particularly threaten-

8Teele, op. cit., p. 8.
ing to students is that for the first time they may encounter teachers of the other race. The control the teacher can exercise over the student creates anxiety about teachers' actions. Teachers can mete out punishment, offer praise or rebuke and by assigning grades, they can affect both the students' future as well as his immediate relationship with his parents. To the extent that students have negative stereotypes of the members of the other race, the more ominous the prospect of having a teacher of that race may be. 9

"Teachers in New Orleans were subjected to heavy pressures to boycott the desegregated schools and their problems were often the same as those of the white parents. Many of them were opposed to desegregation, some very strongly, others with less fervor. But they were all teachers and loyal to their job, their principal and the decisions of their school board. Inspite of divided loyalties, there was a kind of adherence in the end to professional responsibilities and obligations which was described by one teacher: 'I did not like it, but also I could not walk out on my job. That would be unthinkable.' 10

"In Atlanta one could feel the teachers themselves coming to terms with the problem as citizens, some favorable, some opposed, many in doubt, conflict and ambivalence. But one could also sense in them a deep sense of professional

9Weinburg, op. cit., p. 219.

integrity, of identity as teachers which transcended their private feelings about race. The children felt this, too. We heard few criticism from white or Negro children about their teachers, few complaints of harmful action or expression. Many teachers have been very sympathetic and kind to the Negro children and have attempted to convey this to them and to white children also in some hope that they will be influenced. Others have felt more distant and unwilling or unable to do more than teach in fine impartiality or neutrality. A few have had to deal with serious disciplinary problems and with questions of school clubs and activities, athletics and newspapers, all the various groupings and actions which revolve around the school, even if not part of formal teaching and studying. A school in America is much more than a place where the children learn to read and write.

The philosophy and desires of the teacher cannot be underestimated. It is fairly obvious that a teacher can set many standards and establish many kinds of climates. Some teachers have felt that their work should be pursued with no concern for what happens to the children emotionally, with little active involvement in the way the children of both races get along. "They are in the school; I shall teach them; if there is any disorder in the class I will stop that, but that is as far as I will go."


12Ibid., p. 221.
But there are other teachers who are very much concerned with how their children get along with one another and are aware of how much they can facilitate this with a word here, a deed there. What a teacher can do would affect the children very much either for good or for bad.

The teachers should recognize that their continuing task is to encourage those parts of the person which want to learn, study, cooperate in class, contribute to the school community, and to discharge those inevitable parts of any person which tend to discourage education, cooperative effort and individual acquisition of information and skills. The noisy, uncooperative child, the emotionally disturbed child, the defiant child, all these are but variations in the school population, daily variations, daily challenges, requiring daily decisions affecting the welfare of both these special cases and the rest of their classmates. The entire school's children will be influenced by the way these particular children behave and by the way they are handled by their teachers and allowed to be treated by others. A desegregated classroom in many cities in this period is a specially challenging one to the educational profession. The level of educational achievement may well vary with skills of the teachers in handling some of the problems of human encounter before them.
CHAPTER SIX

IMPACT OF BUSING ON SCHOOL CHILDREN

White parents and educators who oppose busing seem to be concerned with the possible negative effects which transporting a child out of his immediate neighborhood will have on that child's school success. This concern is focused on the elementary student in the urban school. Is this a false concern, or is this concern grounded on reality? Does the fact that a child is transported to a school affect his adjustment to the elementary school environment? Can we assume that transportation per se will affect the school adjustment of urban elementary school students?

Dan A. White in his book, The Effects of Public School Transportation Upon the Overall School Adjustment of Urban Elementary School Students, gives the results of the study of fourth, fifth and sixth grade students of a large urban school to determine significant differences between the transported and non-transported pupils.

"My investigation disclosed that there was no statistically significant difference between the transported and non-transported groups on average composite achievement test scores, on means of the averages, of teacher grades, on average daily attendance, or an average peer acceptance scores. The only statistically significant difference between the transported and non-transported groups was on average group participation
in extra class activities; as one might expect, the non-
transported group participated in more extra class activities.
The finds of this study do not support the degree of concern
which some parents and educators have expressed about the
effects of transportation on the urban student.\(^1\)

This research does not support the contention that
school work will suffer or that attendance will decrease as
a result of busing. Neither does the result support the
contention that transported students will have fewer friends
than their non-transported peers. Indications that transpor-
tation does affect participation in extra class activities
suggests that if a school system considers participation in
extra class activities to be important, the school system
should consider the possibility of providing the transporta-
tion necessary for all students to participate in those activi-
ties.

Another available guide is the book, *Desegregation
Research: An Appraisal*. In it Meyer Weinburg analyzes more
than 500 studies that have been carried out on segregated
and desegregated schools throughout the country. Says Wein-
burg: "The evidence is strong that desegregation improves
the academic achievement of Negro children. The evidence is
even stronger that white children fail to suffer any learning
disadvantages from desegregation."\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Dan A. White, "Does Busing Harm Urban Elementary

"In May, 1969, Todd Scudder of the Denver public schools and Stephen Jurs undertook to determine the effects, if any, on the academic achievement of non-Negro children when Negro children attend the same school and classes.

"Subjects in this study attended six Denver elementary schools during the school years 1967-68 and 1968-69. The experiment consisted of 909 children who attended four randomly selected schools with 70 Negro children during the 1968-69 school year and took the Stanford Achievement Tests in April, 1969. Of the experimental group, there were 292 pupils attending classes with 27 Negro children in grade two; 336 pupils attending classes with 21 Negro pupils in grade three; and 281 children attending classes with 22 black pupils in grade four.

Control groups consisted of 802 children attending the same four schools as the experimental group during the 1967-68 school year when Negroes did not attend these schools. In this group there were 275 pupils in the second grade, 227 in the third and 301 children in the fourth grade.  

"Results: Grade two -- Results at the second grade level showed that in three of the four tests subjects from four schools which were integrated in 1969 performed significantly better over the two-year period than did subjects from the non-integrated schools. In three out of four tests at the second grade level, the presence of Negro children did not significantly affect the academic achievement of their  

3T. B. Scudder and G. S. Jurs, "Do Bused Negro Children Affect Achievement of Non-Negro Children" Integrated Education (March-April, 1971), pp. 30-34."
non-Negro classmates.

"In two of the four tests at the third grade level, children from the integrated schools in 1969 performed better over the two-year period than the children from the two schools not integrated. So the results do not support the hypothesis that academic achievement of non-Negro children would be affected when Negro children attend the same school."\(^4\)

"In two of the four programs (Hartford and White Plains) the academic achievement of the white children has been carefully surveyed by busing each child as his own control and comparing children who have been in classes with Negro youngsters with those who have not. In both studies the results underline the fact that there is no evidence of a drop in achievement among white youngsters when black children are placed in a previously all-white class; in fact, what evidence exists suggests that the opposite may be true."\(^5\)

According to the Coleman report, if a white pupil from a home that is strongly and effectively supportive of education is put in a school where most pupils do not come from such homes, his achievement will be little different than if he were in a school composed of others like himself. But if a minority pupil from a home without much educational strength is put with schoolmates with strong educational back-

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 30-34.

grounds, his achievement is likely to increase. So according to Coleman and others, the mixing factor was more important to raising academic standards and achievement levels of disadvantaged pupils than were good teachers (although these were the second most important), equipment, texts, buildings or other related factors.

**ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF BLACK CHILDREN IN INTEGRATED SCHOOLS:**

The technical report outlining the procedures and detailing the outcomes of the Gulport project strongly suggests that under the conditions of the project, achievement of Negro first graders was vastly higher in an integrated classroom than under conditions of segregation. In reaching this conclusion, factors such as readiness, mental age, sex and socio-economic status were accounted for. In addition, it was shown that the benefits of integration applied under regular classroom conditions as well as under the superior experimental conditions.  

"Days absent are much higher for the low readiness segregated Negroes than their integrated counterpart. These large differences cannot be explained in terms of socio-economic level of children since the mean index is the same for each group. However, there is a substantial mental age difference in favor of the integrated group. This difference must be evaluated in the light of two facts. First, the test on which the study was based was not given until Decem-

---

ber of the school year. In this connection many research studies have shown increases in intelligence test scores due to enhanced conditions, such as participation in well-organized educational programs. Thus, the observed difference in mental age may be part and parcel with the observed achievement differences rather than the cause of them. 7

So there seems to be some indication of black student's assertion of his ability to prove himself even on white, middle-class America's grounds. The most striking data to support this hypothesis come from the bused children themselves. "In a structured interview by a Negro not associated with the project, a random sample of 50 youth bused from Hartford expressed themselves very directly as to their desire to continue to attend suburban schools. They expressed themselves in a manner which the interviewer saw as indicative of much greater self-esteem and self-confidence than was true of the inner city control child, were able to be more specific, felt strongly that they were receiving a better education (frequently referring to siblings or friends in the inner city schools as illustrative examples) and were aware of both subtle and direct prejudices against them. Perhaps most important is the finding that the Hartford youth bused to suburbs show a growth pattern achievement and mental ability that is clearly and significantly superior to their controls in the inner city, including those controls who are receiving intensive, compensatory assistance. 8

7Ibid., p. 50-51.
8Mahan, op. cit., p. 297.
Another most encouraging example of urban-suburban cooperation is Connecticut's project Concern in which 2300 children from five main city ghettos are bused an average of an hour round trip a day to 27 middle class suburban towns. Achievement tests show that the black children who started the program in the kindergarten are performing as well socially and academically as their white classmates.

But recently there are some who disagree with those who favor desegregation as a means to increase the academic achievement of the blacks. "A re-evaluation of the Coleman Report undertaken by a group at Harvard University was published recently by Random House -- On Equality of Educational Opportunity. The studies applying advanced mathematical and statistical methods confirm Coleman's original findings, but say he may have over-stressed the effects of integration. Poor blacks did make gains when put in white classes, but the gains were too small to be of much value. 'The advantage of social class mixing is very clear but very small,' says Moynihan, 'Because schools don't much alter these things.'

"More important," says the Harvard report, "is the effect of family background on education. Economic conditions, number of siblings and parental education and attitude (but not race) were found to be the most important factors in educational achievement for anyone in any school." This fact was found by Coleman and is reinforced now. It implies that governmental efforts to boost educational gains should be directed at improving economic conditions (and therefore the quality of home life) rather than at forced busing. It does
not directly affect the moral, social and psychological reasons for busing."^9

So then opponents of busing argue that if busing does not help the target group educationally, why do it, given all its disruptive side effects. But these critics should remember that there have been other studies, as we have cited above, which indicate that ghetto children benefit substantially from busing to suburban schools, particularly in the second and third year of such busing. And so we have to agree with Dr. Coleman that schools add and don't take away. When a student comes from a home environment of books and magazines and plenty of verbalization, being in school with children who are not from that background does not push his performance down. But for children from deprived backgrounds, being in school with children of higher education does pull the achievement level up.

VIOLENCE:

"One of the most difficult myths to combat is that violence in the schools will drastically increase if they are integrated. Despite the lack of conclusive studies on the subject, my own experiences at Berkeley would indicate that race-based violence at our school is amazingly low. The first year of complete integration at Garfield was tense, but the way the students worked to make it work was amazing. At West Campus also everyone was determined to make the unusual one—

year school work -- and they did beautifully. The second year we had the normal problems expected with first year high school students, but they were not integration problems, not racial violence.\textsuperscript{10}

The greatest outbursts of racial violence occur where no steps have been taken toward integration, or when those taken are so timid, so obviously phony, that the minority race believes the token integration step was taken to prove total integration would not work. If such a thing were done to whites, they, too, would be fighting mad. Those who repeat the "violence myth" ignore the fact that it is the Negro who has been on the receiving end of most interracial violence down through American history. They appear unconcerned about violence done through American history. The myth-sayers appear unconcerned about violence done to the Negro, except as it disturbs the surface calm of our society. However, no matter which side mounts the racial attack, both white and black are the losers. The cure lies in breaking down the ghetto barriers in education, housing and employment. Then the violence will cease.\textsuperscript{11}

SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT:

Another argument put forward by the critics of school integration is that the black children will not be able to


\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 39.
adjust to the white children socially. "But preliminary reports from White Plains indicate that Negro youngsters are making satisfactory peer adjustments. In Hartford the following indices are available:

(a) Sixty eight per cent of project youngsters take part in after-school activities on a regular basis;

(b) On socioeconomic measures, project children in a proportion which is slightly greater than their numerical proportion;

(c) Suburban teachers report 70% of the bused pupils as making superior social adjustment, only 12% making a poor adjustment."

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS:

An education in an integrated school can be expected to have major effects on attitudes toward members of other racial groups. At its best it can develop attitudes appropriate to the integrated society these students live in; at its worst it can create hostile camps of Negroes and whites in the same school.

"A child may develop a true phobia about Negroes because the child has been taught to associate extreme danger and hurt or harm with dark skin. The fear may reflect other problems in the life of the child, or may simply represent the transmission of charged and intense feelings from parent to child. White parents may often be opposed to desegrega-

---

12 Mahan, op. cit., p. 297.
tion, but they consistently note that their children in the desegregated elementary schools get along easily in those schools and the very few who don't come from homes which make such a stand a matter of virtual life and death for the child."¹³

The children fall under three large groups in their behavior and thinking about their new Negro classmates -- a small number friendly, a large number indifferent and the third small group positively opposed to them. We know that every mind has its own style of ideas and actions and we know that skin colour has a wide variety of real and symbolic meanings to white people. But how does all this affect the white child once desegregation is a reality for him? How does he come to grips with his life, his traditions and these changes?

"None of the children (white) have suffered any medical or psychiatric damage during the past year. Regardless of their views, they have all continued in school and graduated or been promoted. Apart from the usual colds and occasional laceration from football, there were no medical problems; and no breakdown in ability to work and study and get along with friends and teachers could be noted. Their parents described their general physical and mental status as normal or o.k. at the end of the year, just as they had at the beginning of the year. The Negro children had not

caused illness of body or mind observable to either themselves, their friends, their family or a physician and psychiatrist."\(^14\)

Among the segregationist children several changed their minds over the year, all attributing this change to what happened at school, to noticing and getting to know a particular Negro child, to thinking about the problem because they were part of a desegregated school, to responding to their friends and their ideas and examples and influences. There are records of obvious emotional change based on new kinds of human contact, but there are also records of unchanging attitudes of dislike for Negroes. Nor do some Negro children lack strong feelings about whites, feelings of hatred, feelings often remarkably similar to those encountered by them from hostile whites.\(^15\)

"A Negro boy told us: 'I hate them, all of them, and when I can help it I try to stay clear of them. They cause trouble whenever they can and they are the ones who are dirty...I am here to claim this school because it is as much ours as theirs...They are going to have to learn to live with us and they had better learn it because they need us. I mean they need our help to civilize them...They are like savages -- that is what they are like, savages.'''\(^16\)

\(^{14}\)Ibid., p. 211.
\(^{15}\)Ibid., p. 216.
\(^{16}\)Ibid., p. 218.
Psychiatrists know that sometimes people express affection with anger, their interests or curiosity with sarcasm and distance, their shame and guilt with rage and hatred. But such knowledge must be carefully translated into practical problems of the school, the classroom and the teachers.

There is also record of failure of emotional change in spite of the human contact on the part of three white children. These three children "have clearly and consistently indicated their strong dislike of Negroes, of their presence in any situation not traditionally accepted as for them. Their attitudes were essentially the same at the end of the year of desegregation, in one case expressed even more strongly and angrily. The chief reasons being mentioned again and again are that Negroes will lower standards; that they are dirty and diseased; that they are like animals; that they are not like white people; inferior, less intelligent, born and made to serve. Themes of betrayal, of being cheated and hurt come to their minds and words. Two of these children experience physical revulsion when near a Negro, like dirt being rubbed on you," one told me, and they try to avoid them with great care and obvious show. 17

But these are exceptional cases. Several of the children with segregationist attitudes changed their minds over the year, all attributing this change to what happened at school during the year.

17 Ibid., p. 217.
CHAPTER SEVEN

COMPLEMENTARY AND SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS

In the seven years since his research on 645,000 children in 4,000 schools, Professor Coleman has not changed his mind about the educational implications of its conclusions. In an April 21, 1970, appearance before the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, he testified that fully integrated school buildings and classrooms were necessary because the most important resource in any school is the home background of the child. After reporting on studies of integrated schooling in several cities, Coleman told the committee that any program of education which results in disadvantaged, racial, ethnic or economic groups attending schools in isolation is very unlikely to provide equality of educational opportunity for these groups. In commenting directly on the busing and neighborhood school issues, he said that it was clear that equality of educational opportunity in the future would require some action which divorces education from residence.

Is there any method other than busing to achieve desegregation? In some cases, yes — a mere redrawing of school-attendance zones will enable children to walk to the newly desegregated schools. But in almost all rural areas and many big cities where large numbers of children would have
to be shifted to get racial balance. The distances are too long for walking and they seem to be getting longer each year. Thus, present trends indicate that segregation will continue to increase unless there is busing in a large number of communities.¹

Critics of busing are now advocating compensatory education under the illusion that this by itself can solve the problems of racial discrimination and poor education for disadvantaged children, eliminating the need for integration of schools. What is meant by compensatory education? "It means pouring money and teachers into poor ghetto schools. The theory is that by smothering these schools in educational goodies -- psychologists, researchers, counselors, top-quality teachers, better school buildings, cafeterias -- we can put all-Negro schools on a par with all-white schools of the best quality. This, the story goes, will make it unnecessary to worry about integration because children of all races will have equal educational opportunities everywhere. There are individual instances of spectacular success when bright ghetto youngsters are given substantial amounts of special help, but there is no real evidence that the mass of minority children can benefit by this technique."²


Moreover, one of the most important ingredients in education -- hope, is not provided by compensatory techniques. Hope for a better future, hope to become an accepted member of society, hope for an end to discrimination -- none of these is satisfied by compensatory education.

Involuntary segregation, no matter how benevolent, is rejection. Segregation is the classic symbol of society's centuries-long tradition of discrimination, and it says unequivocally to black people and other minorities, "You are inferior." Thus, compensatory education, which does have some valuable features, can never be a substitute for integration. Even if the equipment in the ghetto schools is improved and the children get better teachers and special attention, they have no yardstick by which to measure the improvement in relation to what the others or white children are receiving. They cannot be convinced that they are not getting the scraps from the table. Compensatory education can be very useful in helping to make up for the deprivation ghetto children have suffered, but it must be used in conjunction with, not instead of, integration. It should be used to attract the white children to these schools so that integration can be speeded up. Then it will show spectacular results.

As we have already mentioned earlier, exchanging children alone between black and white school districts will

---

not achieve school desegregation or integration. Real integration starts only after the children are bused to the school. It is important to attain qualitative goals in desegregation: genuine equality of opportunity, based on acceptance, mutual respect and cooperation. First, teachers and administrators should set precedents for interpersonal relationships between students. Youngsters watch adults for behavioral clues. If they see the faculty talking together, joking together, eating together and working together, they will likely follow suit. Moreover, the faculty can establish a positive atmosphere by giving equal time and attention to students of both races, not only in class, but in informal settings. Out of class politeness, concern and friendliness are extremely important. Talking with children and fellow teachers, even when you don't have to, sets a desirable pattern for students to follow.

In class teachers can encourage biracial contact that is so essential for the development of attitudes of trust and mutual acceptance.

"The philosophy and desires of the teacher cannot be underestimated. It is fairly obvious that a teacher can set many standards and establish many kinds of climates."④

If a teacher feels that his work should be pursued with no concern for what happens to the children emotionally, with little active involvement in the way the children of

---

④Buchheimer and Arnold, op. cit., p. 221.
both races get along, then that teacher fails in his total function as a teacher.

EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES:

Since busing makes after-school activities harder to attend, bused children should be provided with multiple opportunities to explore their interests. In light of this situation one very reasonable alternative remains--scheduled late buses. On certain days of the week, buses scheduled to arrive at the school an hour or two later than the regular school closing time would provide transportation to various neighborhood points around the district. Several afternoons a week could be designated as club days, giving students with multiple interests the chance to participate several afternoons a week if they wish. From a realistic point of view we have to recognize that many parents object to extra-curricular activities because they feel there is unnecessary mixing of races. Many school authorities will continue to placate these parents, partially because they don't know how best to handle situations which do arise. Many administrators tend to go along with parental objections, but the school officials cannot retreat from their jobs of providing for the social development in the education of young people simply because some people object. It is a challenge -- an educational challenge. And it is the responsibility of the educators to face these challenges and provide for integrated education.5

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT:

For years parents were involved in school affairs and planned their activities around school functions. And the schools have counted on the parents to be interested in school affairs, to vote for bond issues providing needed revenue and to attend parents' meetings and other school-originating activities. Busing or otherwise changing the school attendance from the typical residential patterns will take its toll in this parental interest and cooperation.

"For one thing, parent meetings and parent-teacher conferences are harder to attend when there is a greater distance involved. Because the parents do not actually see some of the activities in which the students are engaged, they lose interest in school support. Bond issues are harder to get passed. School authorities find themselves faced with the problems of educating the public to the school's needs." 6

Skills of the parents can be utilized for the benefit of the schools. These parents also would know the operation of the school, the school personnel and the students. Inevitably their participation would be a direct benefit to the school, since they could serve as school emissaries. They would know the facts and figures involved and could greatly ease the burden of disparate parties in the community. What better way of achieving overall good public relations than

utilizing the one resource which is always available -- parents? Students have a much stronger respect for a school when their parents hold this respect. It is also the best way of breaking the barriers of prejudice between the different races which, in turn, will help integration, not only of the school, but also of the community at large.  

The major ideas proposed above, namely compensatory education, decentralization, cooperation of teachers and parents, are neither alternatives nor substitutes for racial desegregation and integration. "We reject such thinking. Our reading of the evidence to date leads to the belief that to the degree these ideas have merit, they have still more merit in interracial schools. Thus, compensatory programs in integrated schools have frequently attained lasting success in contrast to the typical failure of similar compensatory programs in virtually all-Negro settings."  

---

7 Ibid., p. 439.

8 Schwartz, Pettigrew and Smith, op. cit., p. 65.
IS BUSING A SOLUTION OR EVASION?

Why make the case for integrated schools? Ask members of the new segregationist coalition -- black and white -- if it is impossible to achieve. Even if it is demonstratively by far the most effective approach around which others revolve, is it not foolish and naive to pursue an unattainable goal? Since school desegregation is simply never going to be achieved because of the racial demography of the cities, the segregationists argue why not educate children where they are and replicate in the schools the racial and social class homogeneity of housing patterns.

Even well-intentioned people are critical of busing because according to them "busing pupils is treating the symptoms rather than the disease of social and economic discrimination. The two main manifestations of our society's sickness are job discrimination and housing discrimination which, in spite of constitution and statutory prohibitions, are widely practiced, openly or covertly. I oppose busing as a means of desegregating schools because I do not believe that children should be used to treat social and economic problems for which they have no responsibility whatever. We have all seen pictures and read reports of attacks on
little children, buses overturned, school houses burned, of boys and girls ostracized and victimized by classmates who resent their coming to school -- all the worse because the kids who are bused and their parents have no choice in the matter. Pupil busing is supported by those looking for an easy way out and unwilling to tackle the real, the fundamental problems of social and economic injustice. So the kids become the victims of a society not ready to face up to its problems and to work out the drastic remedies that are required.¹

As is true with most large-scale social problems, the struggle for quality integrated education must be seen within the context of a changing and complex society. The unending quest for quality education will of necessity be intimately related to the efforts to solve many other urban-suburban problems. That quest should not be side tracked by emotional exploitations of the issue of busing. But that quest may require in many places the resort to the instrument of busing as the best available means, for a time at least, to provide good schooling on an equitable basis. Moreover, we cannot wait for the millennium, when economic, racial and social barriers will have evaporated and blacks and other minority groups will be able to get housing wherever they want. If placing low income black children in white, middle class schoolrooms produces a small social gain, it should be done.

¹Grieder, op. cit., p. 35.
"What do our children learn from seeing adults -- in some cases their own parents or neighbors -- overturning school buses, defying legal authority, shouting racial epithets or merely using the more subtle approach of appealing to the need for quality education and long range integration "but not in my neighborhood, please". Children in their basic innocence surely see through this facade. Such behavior by their parents and elders does nothing to reinforce the lesson we wish to teach in our schools -- that the people and government of this country are devoted to the principles of liberty, equality and justice. School children know in their hearts that desegregation is right and we adults should take a lesson from them."

We should also bear in mind that federal judges are not impulsive and uninformed men as some politicians and parents are implying these days. All of their important rulings on school integration have come only after long and thoughtful deliberation, consultation with experts and through review of all relevant evidence. And the overwhelming weight of evidence and expert advice point to the permanently damaging effects of segregated schooling on minority children. Even before the Supreme Court's historic 1954 decision on school segregation, a body of research evidence had been accumulated to support this conclusion. Much of this evidence is reviewed and clearly presented in the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's recent report, "Racial

---

Isolation in the Public Schools*. The report concludes that Negro children suffer serious harm when their education takes place in public schools which are racially segregated, whatever the source of such segregation may be. The evidence seems to suggest that the only way to achieve quality education for all Americans is to send them to the same schools. Some argue that the additional cost of busing is really money well spent, not money misspent that could have gone to improve educational programs.

Majority of the opponents of busing seem to pretend that busing children to school is something new and unheard of. But on the contrary, busing is a familiar long-tested technique; there is nothing inherently unfair or arbitrary about it. Calling it forced or compulsory does not make busing wicked. Parents are forced to enroll school age children in schools. Busing has not been used arbitrarily; virtually in all cases to date it has been used only in those instances where it was the most readily available means of overcoming state-sponsored segregation. Court approved plans are subject to modification and adjustment. It is absurd to say that compulsory busing has failed when it has so seldom been fairly tested. Even so it has succeeded remarkably well in the rural south and in other areas as well. To say it is the least desirable means of achieving desegregation is fatuous.

We should also be on our guard against the proposals made by some black leaders who feel the best hope for Negro children lies in promoting the minority pride and motivation
by giving minority groups control of their own affairs, and some white segregationists who want to escape forced integration favor, instead of busing, compensatory education. The mere fact of isolation from the majority produces a self-defeating sense of inferiority in the segregated black children and it also separates the whites from groups that are vital to our history, culture and economy. By this time we should have learned that separate is never equal. Even if some federal means of financing public schools were forthcoming, separate could still be not made equal. Because the segregationists are opposed to busing children to schools, national political values cannot be abrogated to appease majority sentiment in a particular neighborhood or community. Trying to ward off busing by lashing out against it negatively can at best be only partly effective -- and then at the cost of damage to our constitutional system -- because busing is only a symbol of what we wish to ward off and change.

So finally we come to the question: Is busing the solution or evasion to the problem of inequality in educational opportunity? This question, as we have been maintaining earlier, has geographic, economic and political aspects, but it does seem safe to state that there is no intrinsic reason for busing programs to operate at a token level. The cost of educating a bused child is not excessive when compared with the cost of educating the child in the inner-city school with additional expense of compensa-
tory programs. For most cities the problem which inhibits large-scale busing is not lack of suburban classrooms or lack of funds, but rather it is the political obstacle. The issue is not -- Can it be done? Rather it is usually -- Do we really want to do it?

Busing has created a climate of hope for the families and has resulted in greater self-esteem for the pupils selected. In addition, the evidence of greater motivation for educational development can be interpreted from such items as attendance records, drop-out rates and teacher ratings. Under such circumstances the following conclusions appear justified:

(a) Busing is logically and economically feasible intervention for many cities;
(b) There is no evidence to support claims of psychological trauma among the participants, nor is there evidence that they become alienated from their own community. In fact the evidence available is in contradiction to both of these fears.
(c) There is no evidence that the quality of academic achievement among white pupils is depressed by placing educationally disadvantaged black children in their class. Again, the existing evidence points in the opposite direction.
(d) Black pupils bused into white elementary schools are quickly assimilated socially and appear to hold their own in the area of peer group relationships. This finding holds in spite of the fact that the children are alert to signs of prejudice among some students and staff members. Teachers in
general in white schools experience no particular problem in coping with the educational disadvantages of inner city non-whites when these youngsters constitute less than 25% of the classroom membership.

(e) Pupils transported to white schools show significant gains in achievement and mental ability scores when compared with their own prior performance.

(f) Observer ratings and film illustrate a consistent difference in the classroom climate and teacher-child interaction between inner city and suburban classrooms. It appears that this difference is not easily modified by introducing changes in the ghetto schools.3

These conclusions make a strong case for the effectiveness of busing as a means for moving toward equal educational opportunity. They raise serious questions about the concept of the neighborhood school and homogeneous grouping, both of which appear to be bulwarks for the maintenance of status quo. Yet these conclusions fail to convey the dramatic reality of the human experience which is expressed in a child's discovery that he is somebody because he can do things, or a parent's feelings that things can be better for her child.

So school integration through busing is possible, but we must plan and strive for it if it is to be achieved. Platitudes about school integration being an ideal and ultimate goal are worthless, however, if by our actions we delay

---

or obstruct the success indefinitely. No one claims that attaining school integration will be easy. But it is the right course of action for a nation which calls itself a democracy. And the black child who is promised freedom, justice and equality should be provided with opportunity to develop his human personality so that he could contribute his share to the nation of which he is a part.
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