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INTRODUCTION

From 1967 through 1977 the D.C. Public School System was intermittently monitored by Federal District Judge J. Skelly Wright to ensure that the system was in compliance with the court decree in Hobson versus Hansen, 1967 and 1971. Julius W. Hobson, Sr., a major plaintiff in the Hobson versus Hansen cases, spent much of this time as a civil rights advocate for the city's poor. Much of his effort was focused on improving the city's schools for its majority Black and poor population. Other citizens were also concerned about the schools and public education, but Hobson's involvement was exceptional because it had been consistent and continuing for nearly 20 years. The divergent interests of Hobson in the affairs of the D.C. schools are reflected in the complexity of issues entailed in the court case.1

1Hobson v. Hansen, 467 Fed. Supp. 401 (1967) addressed the issues of de facto segregation, school attendance zones, educational facilities, school supplies, qualities of professional staff members and the distribution of school resources. Hobson v. Hansen, 327 Fed. Supp. 344 (1971) addressed the issue of equalization of school resources, school financing or how the school district had to allocate school funds per school in Washington, D.C. The school district is required to submit an annual plan to show how funds are being distributed in the system.
Citizen involvement in school affairs to the extent of Hobson's was unusual in the District of Columbia. Opportunities for D.C. citizens to have input into school decisions that affected their children were virtually nonexistent in the 1940's and early 1950's. Members of the Board of Education in the District of Columbia were political appointees. With conservative white members of the federal court system making those appointments, Black appointees who displayed any readiness to fight for a new approach to old problems reportedly never received a second appointment.²

Parent Teacher Associations (PTA) were the major vehicles for citizen involvement in school affairs. For the most part, these organizations legitimized decisions made by local principals, the Board of Education, and the Superintendent of Schools.³ In addition to the PTA's there was a common practice of organizing an advisory committee for the Superintendent to cater largely to his specific needs.⁴

An exception to the general acquiescence of the community was the PTA from the Browne Junior High School community in northeast Washington. A group of parents from the school sued the city and the Board of Education because of overcrowded conditions at the school. Black students had to attend school for half-day sessions, many in dilapidated, poorly equipped classrooms. White students were housed in far better equipped and uncrowded facilities. Although inequality in school accommodations was the main issue in the Carr versus Corning case, the case was dismissed when the D.C. Board of Education found an abandoned building to accommodate the student overflow from Browne.

For Black citizens in the District of Columbia who were politically involved, this situation presented another obstacle in the quest for a better life through formal education in the public school.

---

5 The Writer was a student at Browne Junior High during this period. Students had to walk from 19th and Benning Road N.E. to 24th and Benning Road to get to the main building. An old elementary school, the John T. Blow School was used to accommodate the overflow. Part time classes were also held at Randall Junior High, which had the same problems of overcrowdedness and grossly inferior physical facilities. Other secondary schools for Blacks had similar problems.

system. In spite of all the existing laws for the school system passed by Congress and the courts, most of the citizens in Washington, D.C., were completely disenfranchised and had been since 1878. The public school situation was not very good for the whites in the city who had complete political control. It was much worse for the Blacks of the city who were virtually politically powerless at that time.

Taxation without representation for so many years was partially responsible for public schools in the District of Columbia being found "intolerable" by George Strayer in 1949, especially those for Blacks. The overcrowded schools, half-time, half-educated students, obsolete buildings, and fire and panic hazards were conditions which concerned parents were unable to do much about.

A major factor responsible for this immobilization of parents was that parents in the District of Columbia, unlike those in most American cities, had no official voice in the organization, control, support, administration, or housing of the public schools of the city. Few

---

7Green, The Secret City, pp. 116-117. The Organic Act of June 1978 gave the power to govern the city to three Presidentially appointed commissioners who were in no way responsible to the local public.
9Ibid. pp. 380-381.
citizens in the District of Columbia had an official voice on any matters pertaining to the government. In some circles, the District of Columbia was referred to as "the last colony." The fact that D.C. Commissioners were named by the President of the United States, the Board of Education was appointed by the Federal District Court, and a Congressional committee fixed the city budget undoubtedly had influenced that perception.

Motivated by the fact that they lived in the nation's capital, the citizens in the District of Columbia joined with national organizations to deal with some of the existing social and economic injustices that existed during the 1950's and 1960's. Julius W. Hobson, Sr., along with many others, became an activist in the movement. Hobson initially focused upon the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Congress on Racial Equality (CORE).

---

10 The term the "last colony" was used by activists and political writers in the city to describe Washington, D.C. because many former European colonies had become independent nations while the District still did not have self rule in any form. Concern about this situation led Hobson and others to form the D.C. Statehood political party.
11 This was the term used by civil rights activists, especially the proponents of home rule to emphasize the fact that citizens of the District did not have elected officials.
After a period of involvement on housing and employment problems, Hobson turned his attention to education. Along with members of other minority groups, Hobson and other Blacks moved to the front of the effort for greater citizen participation in educational decisions during the 1960's.\(^\text{12}\) Dissatisfaction with the academic achievement of minority students was a major issue with this group.\(^\text{13}\) They believed that those who were now in control of the schools had been unable to produce acceptable results. They felt that parents, other concerned citizens, and students had been excluded from meaningful roles in the educational policy process. A major goal of this group of reformers was to adjust the structure of schools to encourage the involvement of all interested parties and to give the community greater control over their educational institutions.\(^\text{14}\)

Reluctance by school officials to share the control of the system or to involve citizens in policy decision-making caused serious confrontations between the groups.\(^\text{15}\) Disagreement over school policy led to demonstrations, picket lines, and student boycotts. Confrontations such as those just mentioned worked well for some of the groups attempting reforms.\(^\text{16}\)

---


\(^{15}\)Ibid.

In school districts where citizen participation occurred to any substantial degree, there was usually a community representative with unusual tolerance for frustration and the ability to deal with the closed and ambiguous nature of the school bureaucracy. Nystrand and Cunningham concluded from their study of citizen participation in school affairs that participants who wished to maintain their representativeness must be politicians. As politicians, they had to be able to shape realistic community demands on which there was a chance to deliver, and at the same time, community solidarity had to be established to persuade school officials to act. They predicted that only a few individuals could play such a difficult role.\textsuperscript{17} One of the assumptions of this study is that Hobson attempted to play such a role.

Even when confronted with complex bureaucratic structures and staunch resistance from bureaucrats responsible for their operations, Hobson and other reformers accepted the challenge and pressed for inclusion in the decision-making process of the schools during the 1960's.

Reverend Milton Galamison in New York City emerged as a leader during the early days of desegregation of public schools in that

\textsuperscript{17}Raphael Q. Nystrand and Lavern L. Cunningham, \textit{Citizen Participation in School Affairs: A Report to the Urban Coalition} (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1968) p. 65.
city. He organized the Parents Workshop in Brooklyn, New York, which was responsible for a series of protests against the Board of Education in New York City. In the same manner, Julius W. Hobson, Sr., organized picket lines, boycotts, and protests against the D.C. Board of Education and he became the plaintiff in legal suits against the school system. Over a period of years he moved from the presidency of one of the PTA's to become the prototypic activist for educational change in Washington, D.C. He placed great emphasis on community control and realistic participation in education.

Hobson, as the leader of various civic groups and at times as a private citizen, pressed a relentless campaign upon the D.C. Public School System in the quest for racial and economic equality for all students. Toward this end Hobson initiated several legal suits in court. The inequalities Hobson perceived are embodied in the case of Hobson versus Hansen. Subsequently, election to the Board of Education and the City Council was the means by which Hobson chose to assist personally in the dismantling of such practices. The strategies he chose for dealing with school officials were sometimes labeled outrageous, but Hobson was not deterred. He became a political phenomenon in the District of Columbia, and the case of

---

18 Rogers, 110 Livingston Street, pp. 20-29. Hobson never had the organizational support which Galamison had but there are many similarities between these two who operated almost concurrently in different cities.

19 Ibid. p. 29.
Hobson versus Hansen became his cause celebre.

Several writers have analyzed the 1967 court case of Hobson versus Hansen.20 This case has also been reviewed in many law journals.21 The 1971 court decision which dealt largely with school finance has been the subject of many papers and articles. No one has attempted until now to research and analyze the complete story of Julius W. Hobson, Sr., and his battle with the school system. Hobson, the citizen activist was often misunderstood by the people he attempted to help. He was even more misunderstood by some of the professional members of the D.C. Public School System. This study will attempt to clarify some of the myths about Hobson and what he was attempting to do for the students in Washington, D.C.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to analyze the impact of Julius W. Hobson, Sr., on the formulation of educational policies in the D.C. Public School System during the period from 1967 to 1977. The study identifies the strategies employed by Hobson to persuade the school system to formulate, adopt, and implement educational policies to improve the delivery of educational services to all students in the D.C. Public School System.

21 Articles will be discussed in literature review section.
The study examines those aspects of the life of Julius W. Hobson, Sr., which might have caused him to respond to the D.C. school situation with unrelenting determination.

**Research Objectives**

For purposes of this study, the following research objectives were developed:

1. to develop a political-historical case report which describes Hobson and his relations with the D.C. Public School System
2. to identify strategies used by Hobson which led to changes in school policy
3. to identify environmental changes in the city which either directly or indirectly influenced Hobson's search for new strategies to deal with the school system
4. to identify changes within the D.C. Public School System which made it possible for some of Hobson's strategies to succeed
5. to identify specific educational policies formulated by the D.C. Board of Education because of action(s) taken by Hobson or taken by others in Hobson's behalf
6. to analyze the strategies used by Hobson, either directly or indirectly, to influence educational policies in the D.C. Public School System, and
7. to identify organized interest groups and individuals who pressed for inclusion and participation in the decision-making process of the D.C. Public School System.
Definition of Terms

Wright I — synonym for Hobson versus Hansen, 1967. 469 Federal Supplement, 401

Wright II — synonym for Hobson versus Hansen, 1971. 327 Federal Supplement, 344

equal educational opportunity — existence of a system in which each child of school age residing within a school district has equal access to the educational resources of the district essential to his needs

influence — the capacity to achieve consensus with other members of a group through persuasion without having to give fully adequate reasons (Parsons, Talcott. Encyclopedia of Social Sciences)

political participation — action wherein one goal of the actor is the maintenance of or a shift in the scope of government

political power — the sum of the contributions of political participants to an outcome of a political decision-making process

political influence — the political status accorded the acts of one political participant by others

political system — those interactions through which values are authoritatively allocated for a society (must be able to induce most members to accept these allocations as binding; at least most of the time)
output — only the authoritative allocation of values such as legislative laws, executive orders, judicial rulings, administrative decisions, and all other decrees that are backed by the legitimate power of the state

input — those elements which feed into a political system from the environment which either supports the system or expresses a demand on the system

demand articulator -- person expressing opinions that an authoritative allocation with regard to a particular subject should or should not be made by those responsible for doing so

circumstantial conditions -- conditions in the general environment which have special implications for the functioning of a political system.

strategy — actions designed for encounters with an opponent which will result in political power or influence for the strategist
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The general theme of this review is citizen participation in education. Although this project focuses on an individual's efforts to participate in some educational decisions, the materials reviewed dealt largely with group efforts, as most related research is focused on a group rather than an individual. There are many projects which were designed to examine citizen participation in school councils, school advisory groups, citizen committees, or school study groups.22 A study was not available which focused on the efforts of an ordinary citizen to participate in the educational decision-making in a city similar to Washington, D.C., but there is material on Saul Alinsky.23 Alinsky was a radical community organizer in Chicago who worked to focus citizen attention on many areas of Chicago government. There are some similarities between Hobson and Alinsky, but the main one being that each wanted citizens to have more influence in the decision-making processes which determined their health and general welfare.

What is citizen participation in education? It is strategies, processes, or devices which afford citizens genuine access to and opportunities for relationships with managers of the educational system, including shared decision-making on all administrative levels according to Daniel Barber. This definition might seem a bit idealistic for some, but if citizens are to obtain a more meaningful role in the public education process, they must work unrelentingly for inclusion in the decision making processes at all administrative levels as was suggested by Barber.

Participation is important for another reason. Students need to benefit from the very best ideas which are available. Schools do not have a monopoly on ideas, only on the dissemination of some. Enlightened teachers and administrators do not profess to know everything. The partnership which is necessary to provide the best possible education for students must include citizens, teachers, administrators, and students. Thus, the need for citizens and educators to work together to solve educational problems is a recurring theme in the history of America.

Citizens have been involved in public education since its very inception in this country. In 1647, the governing body of the Massachusetts colony decided that each township of 50 households would appoint one person to teach its children to read and write and would provide monetary compensation to that person for such services. That

---

24 Daniel M. Barber, "Effective Citizen Participation Strategies for Educational Leaders", DCJ 74-24220.
25 Gordon McCloskey, See discussion in Chapter on "Citizen Participation: Competent Advice is Essential - pp. 400-404.
26 Ibid. P. 387.
concept eventually expanded to include larger numbers of families and much larger geographical areas. The resulting system of state, local, and national educational groups have been combining thought and resources since that time to provide the education desired for children.

The processes which allow citizens to exercise this control over public school policies vary with the locale, but there is such a procedure in operation in every state of this country. There has never been a question of the right of citizens to exercise such control.

The constantly recurring question is: What processes, strategies or devices are available which can give citizens genuine access to and opportunities for meaningful relationships with managers of the educational system, including shared decision-making? Barber explored effective citizen participation strategies in 1974. He identified four major strategies which administrators could develop to assist them in the area of citizen participation in public education. Those strategies were (1) public hearings, (2) advisory committees, (4) organizations, and (5) workshops.27 One can find some or all of these strategies operating in most areas. In spite of the availability of these processes, many parents continue to complain that the schools are not including their concerns in critical decisions which affect the lives of both them and their children. Like many

27Daniel Barber, p. 4.
critics of the public schools, Barber blames the school administrators. Barbara Schram, who also examined the question of citizen participation in her doctoral thesis, states that school administrators covertly sabotage the efforts of lay groups if citizens are not aware of how this can happen.28 There are differing opinions as to why this state of affairs exists. A point which must be stated again is that citizens and educators must work together if the schools are to provide the best education for all children.

The exploration of citizen participation in public education is not a new research area. Many studies have been made which describe the involvement of citizens in educational decision-making. A number of manuals which detail how parents can and why they should be involved in the education of their children have also been written. They were not written, as guides to form home-school associations but as guides to show parents how to organize to help influence decisions made in the areas of budget, personnel and curriculum.29 However, there are many more studies which describe the attempts of parents to participate and their failure to make a significant difference in the schools.

Citizen participation in education is a very broad topic. A 1973 annotated bibliography on the topic by Don Davies lists more important works in this area.\(^{30}\) In his bibliography, Davies broke the topic into 8 sections. In addition to hundreds of books, Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) documents and doctoral dissertations are also included. The American Association for School Administrators (AASA) has also compiled a collection of ERIC documents on citizen involvement in the control of schools.\(^{31}\)

Why is citizen participation in education such an all encompassing topic? This can perhaps best be explained by the premise that citizen participation in the policy-making process of public school systems is merely one of many aspects of community intervention.\(^{32}\) Studies concerned with school boards, educational interest groups, educational advisory councils, community control, school governance, and the politics of education are all related to the issue of citizen participation or intervention in education. For instance, Don Davies used 8 categories in his annotated bibliography to treat the subject.

---

\(^{30}\)Don Davies. pp. 1-156.

\(^{31}\)ERIC Abstracts: A Collection of ERIC Document Responses on Citizen Involvement in The Control of Schools. No. ED. 044832

\(^{32}\)By "intervention" is meant the ways citizens attempt to get involved in what is done in the areas of housing, crime, education, health and economic development in cities by forming task forces, serving on advisory boards, etc.
Those topics were: (1) theoretical and historical background, (2) community action, (3) school problems, (4) school politics, (5) community control and citizens advisory committees, (6) community schools, (7) administration and accountability, and (8) guides for citizens. In addition, new works are constantly appearing. The literature usually deals with very specific issues in certain locales. The issues of decentralization and community control in New York City alone are responsible for hundreds of studies, articles, and books on the confrontations that took place between citizens and the schools in the late 1960's. Marilyn Gittell has authored and co-authored many studies and articles on the issues just mentioned. Some of the more widely read articles are "Participants and Participation," "Expanding Public Participation in Urban Education," "Community Control of Education," "Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Education," "Community Participation in Education," and "Professionalism and Public Participation in Educational Policy-Making, A Case Study."  

33Davies, p. 1.  
An advocate of community control and greater citizen participation in public school affairs, Gittell has been joined by others such as Don Davies and Carl Marburger, both of whom decry the quality of input by citizens into the far-reaching decisions made by public school administrators.35

To understand fully the reasons for the controversy over the issue of citizen participation, one must examine the history of that participation. Lawrence A. Cremin, in The Transformation of the School36 and Joseph M. Cronin, in The Control of Urban Schools37 provide the historical background necessary for one to explore or undertake a research project in this area. Cremin's study covers the period from 1876 to 1957, while Cronin's study, which focuses upon governance and actual power within the system, reaches into the late 1960's. Questions related to school governance, the original purpose of public schools, and some subsequent transformations are addressed.

35Don Davies is director of the Institute for Responsive Education in Boston which conducts research and disseminates materials in the field of citizen participation in education. Carl Marburger is Director of the National Committee for citizens in Education. Located in Columbia, Maryland, this organization attempts to help parents and citizens organize, become informed and act to influence public school policies. See introduction in Schools Where Parents Make a Difference, ed. by Don Davis, Published by the Institute for Responsive Education, Boston, 1976. See ERIC abstract Ed. 154-528, "Who Controls the Schools" by Carl Marburger.


Literature concerned with efforts by citizens to become involved in educational decision-making increased tremendously shortly after the historic Brown decision of 1954. Violations of the right to education were particularly important as an issue after the Brown decision, which in effect helped create a mass movement for legitimizing the educational grievances of southern Blacks. These grievances began to include a new demand for parent participation in the schools.

The issue of decentralization produced particular interest in parent participation in public educational decision-making. Marilyn Gittell and Maurice Berube are the editors of a study which addresses the extent of parent participation in New York City in 1968. This work which describes efforts to decentralize the public schools in New York is the subject of Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville: The New York School Strikes of 1968. The collection of documents and analyses provides a record of the circumstances of that confrontation between educators and citizens.

The 1960's witnessed another drive for equality and new rights on the part of previously excluded and oppressed groups. The concept of citizen participation was reworked to fit the needs of the civil

38Don Davies, Schools Where Parents Make a Difference, p. 12.
rights movement. The term "community control" became the rallying call for civil rights activists. Many studies emerged during this period.

Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton in Black Power,\(^41\) and Kenneth B. Clark, in Dark Ghetto,\(^42\) along with others let America know that the oppressed must be allowed to participate in the processes that lead to decisions which determine their destinies. It was during this period that Julius W. Hobson, Sr., wrote The Damned Children, The Damned Information, and "Black Power: Right or Left".\(^43\) Other writers were using similar rhetorical expressions to warn America of the consequences of its actions if changes were not made. In Prelude to Riot, Paul Jacobs, after looking at the public schools in Los Angeles, California declared that education in Los Angeles, as in America, was authoritarian and not democratic, for neither teachers, students nor parents were allowed the opportunity to have an effective voice in school policy. Jacobs claimed that real control of the schools was in the hands of the administrators.\(^44\)

\(^{44}\) Paul Jacobs, Prelude to Riot: A View of Urban America from the Bottom, Sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institution (Vintage Books, New York).
The exercises in participation of the late 1960's were often a political education but sometimes very frustrating for poor outsiders and previously apolitical middle-class parents and professionals. It was even worse for the poor and uneducated. Like the peace movement and recent political party reforms, the poverty wars and the battles that ensued over them taught a good many people how to organize, hold meetings, run mimeograph machines and make trouble even if nothing else really changed for them.45

Why is citizen participation in educational decision-making important? Cahn and Bassett, editors of a collection of studies on programs which focus on citizen participation placed its values into the following categories:

Citizen participation provides:

1. A means of mobilizing unutilized resources, a source of productivity and labor not otherwise tapped.
2. A source of knowledge — both corrective and creative for providing feedback regarding policy and programs and also a source of new, inventional and innovative approaches.
3. An end in itself — an affirmation of democracy and the elimination of alienation and withdrawal, destructive ness, hostility and lack of faith in relying on the people.46

45Don Davies, p. 15.
Gordon McCloskey presents the reasons for encouraging group and individuals participation from a different angle. He states that participation increases individuals' interest in education and their willingness to support good schools; that groups serve as communication media; group norms and relationships influence individual interests, opinions, and values; and that groups function as a mechanism for crystallizing and implementing patterns of public action.47 There has been more than adequate support for an increase in the amount and degree of participation from several sources.

In 1974, Barber engaged in research to identify the most effective citizen participation strategies for educational leaders. He concluded that the advisory committee was the favored citizen participation strategy for most educational leaders, while the workshops were most favored by members of minority groups.48 This research appears to indicate that educational leaders feel the need to control the situation. That position is somewhat understandable. Educators must be cognizant that some groups or group members will impose ideas and solutions that would only harm schools and children. On the other hand most citizens have good intentions and will offer the very best they have to help the schools.

47Gordon McCloskey, p. 386.
48Barber, p. 63.
In view of the fact that members of minority groups preferred the workshop strategy according to Barker's research, this strategy would certainly provide information as well as an opportunity for communication for participants.

Barbara Schram conducted research related to the concept of viable parent participation. In part, her research negates the proposition that lower class parents accept the blame for the miseducation of their children. In fact, Schram's project shows that 19 out of 23 participants in the study rejected victim-blaming attitudes. Schram states that school administrators quickly label groups or individuals as radicals, trouble makers, and militants when citizens do not rubberstamp administrative decisions. She warns citizens of both internal and external sabotage that administrators will employ.

During the 1960's, several experiments were undertaken by public schools in an effort to increase parental involvement in school affairs. Demonstration projects established in New York City led to teacher strikes and the controversial Ocean Hill-Brownsville affair as documented by Berube and Gittell. Several experiments were undertaken in Washington, D.C., also.

49Schram, p. 29.
In 1964, the public schools in Washington, D.C. were involved in an experiment called the Model Schools Project. Gail Saliterman, Assistant Director of the project for two years, is the author of a study in the collection by Cahn and Passett. In the introduction to her case, it states very clearly that the study written by Saliterman is a documentation of the unwillingness and inability of a large urban school system to relinquish management and control or decision-making to individuals who are not poor but are the middle class. Saliterman claims that not a single poor person was chosen for the advisory committee of the Model Schools Project. The project was located in the inner city and was surrounded by thousands of poverty-striken people who were virtually excluded from the project.

In another part of Washington, D.C., citizens were struggling to implement the Anacostia Project. Financed by a federal grant from the Office of Education during President Lyndon B. Johnsons' tenure, this project was supposed to provide another impetus to get parents and citizens involved in the schools. An elected board of citizens was mandated. Citizens were scheduled to receive jobs in the project. The required elections were held, and the Anacostia Community Board began to operate to help influence the operation of schools in Anacostia. Members of the community were hired as planned, but this project was never adequately financed as promised.52 Like

52 Marilyn Gittell, "Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Education", p. 682.
the Model Schools Project, this area became one of six regions in the school system when it was decentralized by Barbara A. Sizemore, in 1974. The Anacostia Project had more control over the hiring of staff but central administration continued to make many of the decisions which could have been handled in the region. The Anacostia Community Board is still in existence.53

Mary Ellen Stanwick conducted a national survey on citizen participation in educational decision-making. Washington, D.C., was one of the cities surveyed in the 1975 study.54 The following are major findings:

1. Administrative decentralization of some kind has been adopted in 14 of the 25 cities surveyed and in 279 of the school districts which responded to the mail questionnaire.

2. School councils for all or some of the schools in the districts have been established in 11 of the 25 cities.

3. Advisory groups are more common than policy groups of the 574 groups identified in the survey, only 88 were reported to have a direct role in the decision-making process.

4. For groups with formal relationships to school systems, parents initiative is reported least often as the cause of their establishment.

53 The writer was employed in a public school which was included in Anacostia Project during most of its existence.
5. Members of groups are elected more frequently in cities than in small districts.

6. Most groups with a formal relationship to a school system are of recent origin. Over 50% were established after 1970. Most groups are small, numbering between ten and twenty members. Parents of children in school constitute the majority of the membership of all groups.

7. A substantial majority of the participants in citizen organizations attempting to influence school policy are women.

8. There is strong agreement that there is too little citizen participation in educational decision-making. Six percent of 1,489 districts responded in this way.

9. Apathy is the most commonly cited explanation for little participation.

10. There is strong support for the prediction that citizen participation will increase in the next two years.

11. Most people believe that increased citizen participation will have positive results.

12. There is strong general support for the idea of citizen participation.55

Starwick also noted that Florida has the highest rate of participation, largely perhaps, because participation is legislated by the Laws of Florida, Chapter 73-338, Section 230.33.56

There are those like Gittell who contend that parents and others do not push the issue of participation because of severe limitations imposed on them by the educators.57 Educational institutions have long been criticized for not being responsive to the needs of their

55Ibid, pp. 7-8.
57Marilyn Gittell, "Decentralization and Citizen Participation in Education", p. 683.
clients. She argues that because participants in the decision-making process for schools are limited, alternatives are also limited and school policy choices are narrowly conceived. Gittell submits that citizen participants have challenged the kind of professionalism which internalizes school politics and closes off the view of those who may have the most to offer in the way of educational change. A restructuring of the schools is advocated to encourage the involvement of all interested parties and to give the community greater control over educational institutions. Any effort to provide quality education without this involvement and participation of the consumers is a serious contradiction, according to Gittell. Frantz Fanon and Paulo Friere were advocates of radical restructuring of public education also. They were, however, dealing with the issue in French Algeria and South America, respectively.

58Ibid, see pp. 683-684.
59Paulo Friere and Frantz Fanon are authors of works considered radical by some on the problems of oppressed people. Friere in Pedagogy of the Oppressed and Fanon in The Wretched of the Earth discuss at length what happens to people who live in an oppressed environment over a period of time.
In an effort to find out why public schools are described as unresponsive or rigid, Harmon Zeigler and several of his colleagues engaged in studies in 1973 which led them to agree that educational decision-makers were insulated from community and client needs and demands. Zeigler further contends that the schools are either unwilling or unable to adapt themselves to the changing needs of communities and clients. In contrast to other bureaucracies, he observed that the key to educational reform lies in an understanding of the fact that educational bureaucracies have much to lose and little to gain, at least in the short run, by becoming "responsive". Zeigler, also the author of *Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts* and co-author of *The Few and the Many* with Thomas Dye, is a political scientist who strongly advocates reform of the educational system after years of collaboration with other researchers in a quest to find out "why" the schools are so unresponsive.

Citizen participation in educational decisions is part of the espoused American democratic tradition. The situation is described by Berube and Gittell in the following statement:

---

61 Ibid.
Essentially, the question is one of making the democratic theory work, for what distinguishes a democratic system is its participatory character, and inherent in the democratic concept is the individual's right to take part in the formulation of policy if he chooses. Therefore, the political system must provide for the opportunity to formulate policy. In urban education, increased participation can be achieved only through decentralization. If school professionals succeed in halting the political drive of the Black communities, we can anticipate the end of public education.62

A point to note here is that Berube and Gittell state that a citizen should have the right to participate "if he chooses." School systems are therefore obligated to find a mechanism by which participation is possible. Schools, therefore, should not consistently be viewed as institutions that make great efforts to block such participation.

Other aspects of the participation issue were examined by Altshuler in 1970.63 Questions concerning community participation in the governance of large cities are analytically approached in this study. Education is not the specific concern of this work, but Altshuler's approach, which asks relevant questions and examines plausible suggestions that have been made for responding to them, gives one a broader perspective on the participation question. The issues underlying the resistance of bureaucracies to the notion of community control show how much of the alarm surrounding the issue is based

62Berube and Gittell, Confrontation at Ocean-Hill Brownsville, p. 4.
on the false assumptions of those who now have complete control of these agencies. In Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities, Altshuler asks for the inclusion of Blacks in the governing superstructures in our large cities. Altshuler, who has examined participation in many areas, does not expect any miraculous changes but does state that some possible outcomes of community control could lead to the following:

......We may hope, however, that community control will help cement the American union by providing an adequate outlet for racial pluralism. We may hope that it will help build Black confidence in the understanding of our political institutions. We may hope that over time it will provide a mechanism for increasing competence throughout the Black community.64

Altshuler contends that the central issues are social peace and political legitimacy, not abstract justice or efficiency. The observation is given that no society adopts fundamental change because its dominant groups have suddenly acquired virtue or become horrified by waste.

It is impossible to adequately review the literature on citizen participation without becoming somewhat involved in writings on the politics of education. A fairly new school of thought has evolved now that citizens realize that participation is a political act and that many political acts take place in the field of education.

---

In *The Political Web of American Schools*, Wirt and Kirst explore the myth concerning the apolitical character of schools and theorize that schools are highly political subsequent to examining several issues in education to show how the political system determined their fate. They use a conceptual framework in the analysis that is based largely on one used by political scientists. The framework is described as a useful device for integrating descriptive institutional data with data about events more powerfully than can be done in a case study. Orientation of this nature provides a dynamic view of the political system and not the static one found in earlier, traditional, legal-institutional analyses.\(^{65}\)

Thus the idea of systems analysis for this project was undertaken in an effort to capture the dynamic view of the entire situation. Wirt and Kirst further suggest that the politics of education be conceptualized in numerous frameworks to capture the dynamic processes that are part of the larger political environment.

In school districts where citizen participation has occurred to any substantial degree, there has often been a community representative with an unusual tolerance for frustration and the ability to deal with the closed and ambiguous nature of the school bureaucracy. Nystrand

and Cunningham note in their study on citizen participation in school affairs that

...Citizen participants who wish to maintain their representativeness must be politicians who help shape realistic community demands on which they have a chance to deliver and simultaneously build the community solidarity necessary to persuade school officials to act. This role is very difficult: at the present time, few individuals have mastered it ...66

The purpose of their study was to determine the six elements of participation: (1) who participates, (2) whom they represent, (3) the forum for participation, (4) the issues considered, (5) the tactics used by participants, and (6) the strengths and weaknesses of the mechanism as perceived by interested parties.67 Recommendations derived from the study encourage the strengthening of existing linkages for citizen participation and point to the need for new methods, especially ones which would involve poor and minority groups. In those cities where mechanisms for citizen participation were working well, Cunningham and Nystrand found that leadership was emerging within the schools as well as in the community.

Michael Lipsky, in "Protest As A Political Resource," provides a theoretical perspective on protest activity as a political resource by relatively powerless groups. The discussion concentrates on the limitations inherent in protest because of the need for protest leaders to

appeal to four constituencies simultaneously. This discussion was of particular importance to this project because of the use of this strategy by Hobson. Lipsky theorizes that protest leaders must (1) nurture and sustain an organization comprised of people with whom they may or may not share common values, (2) articulate goals and choose strategies so as to maximize their public exposure through communications media, (3) maximize the impact of third parties in the political conflict, and (4) try to maximize chances of success among those capable of granting goals.\textsuperscript{68} It is the tensions which occur as a result of the manipulating of these four constituencies that form the basis of this discussion. A major dilemma is predicted for the protest leader who must balance the various group goals and targets to be effective.

When participants manage to become involved Sherry Arnstein warns about the games bureaucracies play on citizens who want to participate. Arnstein, in "Eight Rungs on the Ladder of Citizen Participation," devised a scheme to graphically portray the degrees of citizen power in community projects. With the powers arranged in a ladder pattern, each rung corresponds to the degree of citizen power in determining the plan or program under consideration. Designed to be provocative, this simple ladder describes the steps

\textsuperscript{68}Michael Lipsky, "Protest As a Political Resource", The American Political Science Review No. V. Volume 62, (December 1968) p. 1144.
from non-participation to full citizen control. Following is a copy of Arnstein's ladder.69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of Citizen Power</th>
<th>Degrees of Tokenism</th>
<th>Degrees of Non-Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Therapy</td>
<td>1. Manipulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arnstein feels that citizens have to be informed and persever­
ing if they are to get near the top of her conceptual ladder.

In education, there is a particular force to the demand for par­ticipation. Our political tradition mandates local lay control of the schools, and one characteristic mode of school reform has been citizen movements, some of which were described in earlier sections of this chapter.

In Schools Where Parents Make a Difference, D.C. Citizens for Better Public Education, an important educational interest group in Washington, D.C. is discussed.70 A description of the group's methods of collecting information, studying problems and issues related to education, and its efforts to explain such to the public are discussed.

---


70Don Davies, p. 14.
This review indicated that citizens can and do participate but at varying levels. These levels were found to vary from one of tokenism to one in which parents actually did successfully organize to influence school policy. A critical factor which appeared to affect the influence of citizens on schools is the power of the local administrator. For administrators who are interested, there is much information available to assist them if they wish to change the level of parent participation in the schools.

In spite of the fact that some view the public schools as not very responsive, most parents want their children to be well educated; moreover, for lower-income and minority families, public education becomes the way out of despair and poverty. Many poor, Black families simply turn their children over to the teachers and administrators without any questions.\footnote{Price M. Cobbs and William H. Grier, \textit{Black Rage}. (New York, Bantam Books, 1968). p. 115.} But only some of them insist upon the opportunity to participate in decision-making. The others expect educators to have all of the answers.
CHAPTER III
This chapter will describe the methodology and the related procedures engaged in for this project. It will also examine a set of conceptual reference points which were used to synthesize fragmented data into a coherent unit and to provide a conceptual framework for explaining the behavior and activities of Julius W. Hobson, Sr. and his effect on the D.C. Public School System.

The Value of the Case Study Approach as a Research Method

The research method employed in this study is that of the case study. This approach "is perhaps the most popular serial research method for gaining insight into why an individual acts a certain way and how he is likely to act in the future". The case study approach, usually elicited through a series of unstructured interviews, participant observations, life histories, and personal documents such as diaries, letters, autobiographies etc., is well suited to the present study, since it permits the manipulation of diverse bits of data into a unitary character of the social object.

---

being studied. This is most often accomplished by collecting, at a number of levels of abstraction, a wide range of data about the subject being studied.

The use of the case study approach was advantageous for several reasons. First, the case study approach permitted a longitudinal in-depth account of the individual's growth. Second, the approach allowed the discovery of the individual's experiences, social relationships, attitudes, and behavior in his social and cultural environment over time. Unlike other methods of data collection, particularly present questionnaires and structured interviews, the case study approach was adaptable to a conceptual model requiring a strategy of "discovery" depth and longitude.

The case study approach, in addition, offered another advantage particularly in substantive areas where theory has become a law of diminishing returns in terms of its explanatory power. The approach has the capacity to generate hypothesis, uncover social processes, and sensitize readers to new or problematic aspects of the form and content of social settings. Although the present study is only a single case and therefore not definite proof - the study of Julius W. Hobson, Sr., in relation to the D.C. Public School System can influence the determination of whether a proposed theory is adequate or complete. It also suggests theoretical propositions and hypotheses or merely pose questions concerning the potential negation, modification, or amplification of a theory.
The term "case study approach" can be used to study an individual (as was done in this study), groups, institutions, and communities. A social scientist using the case study approach "tries to see the individual, his situation, and his behavior as the total configuration of factors that affects him through time."

What is here called the case study approach is most often applied in a natural, uncontrolled setting; to a large extent the kinds of hypotheses tested through its application clearly sets it apart from a statistical approach to the same phenomena.

At least three distinct types of hypotheses are commonly isolated: descriptive (the approach used in this study), which states the existence of empirical uniformity; ideal typical, which states the existence of logically derived relationships between the empirical uniformities; and analytic, which states the existence of a relationship between changes in one property and those in another.

Though the first type of hypothesis is most often used, both descriptive and ideal typical hypotheses may be tested by the case study approach. This limitation is imposed because analytic hypotheses by definition are concerned with changes through time and require a larger number of units for valid analysis. Neither of these conditions are fulfilled by the case study approach, thus limiting hypothesis testing to the first two types.

---

73Ibid. p. 74.
Perhaps an example of a specific application of the descriptive hypothesis in research using this approach would best illustrate the idea. Through his intensive participant observation of "corner boys" in a city slum, Whyte was able to substantiate the descriptive hypothesis that "any idea for a group action that is carried out must originate with the top man or be accepted by him so that he acts upon the group." This hypothesis is descriptive in the sense that it merely states the existence of an empirical uniformity verifiable by observation.

The decision to treat data as merely descriptive frees the analyst from problems of presentation and inference. He is no longer bound by rules concerning the proper presentation of independent and dependent variables; he is no longer concerned about investigating causally spurious relations.

Of course, by eliminating these concerns, the social observer may also eliminate precision and the possibility of valid generalizations.

What can the researcher do when confronted by a body of qualitative data—detailed, concrete, and non-metric, descriptions of people and events drawn from direct observation, case studies, participant observation, etc.? In what way can these purely descriptive statements be called hypotheses? Indeed, is it even legitimate to include a methodological approach such as the case

---

study in the realm of social science or education? Reasonable answers to these questions might be arrived at through an examination of a discussion of social science, social systems and social behavior. The primary distinction is that between social science and social observation; the former attempts to establish generalizations about classes of events, while the latter is concerned with particular events and the operation of particular causes (as is undertaken in this present study). Thus, it is in the kinds of conclusions which these two endeavors hope to establish that they differ. In applying this distinction, the case study approach must be classified as a social observational approach. However, its scientific relevance can be interpreted in another light. Just as the physical sciences developed from generalizations of common sense, so did the social sciences develop in part from generalizations of social observers. To quote Barton and Lazarsfeld, the social scientists utilizing the descriptive approach pull together and organize raw observation into a descriptive system for us to gaze upon. This in turn initiates research activities which can lead us to significant advancement of our understanding of social phenomena.

Clearly, the case study approach has a well-defined place in social science. Direct contact with empirical phenomena in their "natural habitat" provided by this approach is one of the best means by which theory might be founded. The descriptive statements that constitute hypotheses at this level are the natural building blocks of more complex statements of relation and change formulated at the analytical level. The case study approach is "...particularly suitable for the exploratory phase of research: its wealth of detailed descriptive elements gives the analyst the maximum opportunity to find clues and suggestions. 79

The case study approach to the study of education as used in this study has several ancestors and a close kinship with several parallel traditions and developments in the social sciences and in

educational research. For instance, there are strong resemblances between the case study approach and curriculum evaluation,\textsuperscript{80} Stake's responsive evaluation,\textsuperscript{81} Parlett and Dearden's illuminative evaluation in higher education,\textsuperscript{82} and the "naturalistic ethnological and qualitative phenomenological" perspectives combined in what Wilson, \textit{et al.}, have referred to as their ethnographic methodology for educational research.\textsuperscript{83}

The common elements that run through the above-mentioned approaches are that the studies are more concerned with a holistic approach than with a partial approach and that they are more concerned with process than with product, assistance of the statistical approach. They are carried out under "naturalistic" or field conditions rather than the more contrived laboratory-type experimental conditions; they often use observation and interview techniques rather than quantitative measurement procedures.

\textsuperscript{81}Robert E. Stake, "Evaluating Educational Programs: The Need and the Response", \textit{A Collection of Resource Materials}, 77:356103 MARC.
PROCEDURES

The field methods of data collection employed in this study represent a hybrid product. In addition to the interview technique, various forms of secondary data, i.e., newspaper accounts, minutes of the D.C. Board of Education meetings, public records, and court records, were utilized.

Since it would be impossible to observe and record everything that affected Julius W. Hobson, Sr., and the D.C. Public School System during the period from 1967 to 1977, the inclusion of pertinent data for this study was guided by the conceptual framework discussed and illustrated in Figure 2. In so doing, the descriptive materials were analytically ordered under the following broad categories, as depicted in Figure 2 (conceptual model).

1. Environmental changes
2. Hobson - political activist
3. Changes within the D.C. Public School System

As Matilda Riley pointed out about the researcher, "In deciding exactly what his data are to be - what kinds of facts he will examine - he is guided by the nature of the case and its properties as defined in his conceptual model." 84

Using the conceptual framework as a guide, key events were isolated or "teased out" and fashioned into chronological order by working from the past to the present.

Data Collection

A letter was forwarded to Julius W. Hobson, Sr., in June of 1973 requesting his permission to base this doctoral research project on his role in the D.C. Public School System. A telephoned affirmative reply from Hobson was received August 1973. The researcher went to Washington, D.C., during the last week in August 1973 and conducted an interview with Hobson in his home. Notes were taken, and a tape recorder was used. Unfortunately, the resulting tape contained too much feedback to be useful.

During that interview, information about the subject, his activities, and the location of materials relevent to the research project were discussed.

The next step was to examine the newspaper files of the public library for the period of this study. Steps were taken to examine all the available articles from the major newspapers published in the District of Columbia. At that time, the local newspapers were the Washington Post, the Evening Star, The Washington Daily News, and the Afro American. The newspaper files were by no means complete, however, there were many articles on the D.C. Public Schools. A number of them concerned Hobson. The file on Hobson was empty because articles on Hobson were placed in the file on the section that carried educational news. As the articles were read, the researcher sought strategies, evidence of outputs and other environmental factors which appeared to be relevent to the case.
Another major task was to examine the minutes of the D.C. Board of Education meetings for the period under investigation. The index to the files is very general, therefore some of the actual documents were used for this study. In some instances, microfilmed copy was used to get pertinent data. This was a long, drawn out process but it provided the additional information needed to place people and events in a more realistic perspective. The records for 1969, the year that Hobson was a member of the D.C. Board of Education, were a major source of information. It was the good fortune of the researcher to be able to obtain the actual transcripts of more than half of those meetings.

The Interview

There are several advantages to using the interview technique as a research tool. It is the method best suited to the assessment of personal qualities, and it provides information to supplement other methods of collecting data. The uniqueness of the research topic made use of the interview schedule a necessity.

Information on Julius Hobson, Sr. and the D.C. Public Schools was secured by an intensive interview with an interview schedule. The intensive interview with an interview schedule is an unstructured technique which is used to elicit rich and detailed narratives in the individual's own terms. The interview schedule is a pre-written list of general contour and character questions that the interview initially takes. In addition, the interview schedule is designed with a series of probes for data not given in the subject's spontaneous
accounts. In effect, the intensive interview with an interview schedule is a flexible strategy of discovery or a guided observa-
tion. This data collection technique allows a more exhaustive study of the attitudes, behaviors, and world-view of the interviewee than does standardized interview schedules or closed questionnaires where the investigator assumes a knowledge of what the important questions are and, more significantly, what the major responses will be. The major advantage of the intensive interview with a schedule, is that it allows the investigator the freedom to explore general topics to be covered and to probe into unanticipated directions. The interviewee is free to express completely his thoughts, feelings, and beliefs, although the direction of the interview is initially and intermittently in the hands of the investigator.

The initial stage of designing the interview guide involved the selection of general topics (as dictated by the conceptual framework of this study) as a basis for the global organization of the subject's history. In order to provide a longitudinal and comprehensive analysis of Hobson's activities, his life space was segmented in basic groupings of his family, his childhood, and his ambitions and goals.

In addition to the topics discussed above, the subject also gave spontaneous accounts on various events and experiences of particular

86 Claire Selltiz, p. 268.
interest to him with limited "conversational guidance from the investigator." Such accounts provided an added opportunity for the subject to express his own views and to delineate the categories of his social and political world.

The major limitations to the interview were the high costs in time, energy and money incurred. The initial interview required an airplane trip to Washington, D.C., from Columbus, Ohio. An afternoon was spent exploring the proposed topic of the research project and where additional information could be sought.

Other limitations of the interview include the influence of stress, strains, and other factors affecting either the interviewer or the interviewee or both. Hobson was extremely ill when he was first interviewed in 1973. The impact of drugs used to relieve his pain could not be determined. The researcher however, found no significant evidence of distortions of facts in the interviews. Perhaps because of the fatal circumstances surrounding Hobson, he appeared to be reflective about his life, ambitions, and goals. This factor was considered by the researcher.

Informal interviews were held with former Board of Education member Edward T. Hancock; Bettie Holton, former Director of the Equalization Project; Carol Smith, former wife and the mother of Hobson's children; and Dr. Benjamin Henley, former Superintendent of D.C. Public Schools. These interviews were taken by telephone; they were made to help clarify statements made by Hobson or in the local newspapers (validity test).
Interviews with Judge J. Skelly Wright and former Superintendent Carl J. Hansen were sought, but because the court case (Hobson versus Hansen) had not been settled, concerned parties were neither free to discuss aspects of the case nor Julius W. Hobson, Sr. The first interview with Julius W. Hobson, Sr., was mainly a conversation led by him with questions from the researcher generally for clarification of statements made by Hobson. For the next interview a semi-structured interview schedule was constructed for the purpose of gathering specific information on the strategies that Julius W. Hobson, Sr. had used over the years in his battle with the educators. Serious deliberations had been included into the structure of the instrument. During the September, 1976 interview, Hobson was confined to a wheelchair, but he was still a very active member of the D.C. City Council. Careful analysis of that interview prompted the researcher to go back to Hobson for clarification on "his" definition of the term "agitation". Two appointments were made, but each was postponed by Hobson's office. The day that the last appointment was canceled, Hobson was informed that he had only a few months to live. No further effort was made to pursue the matter, since the researcher felt that the meaning was adequately understood.

Public Records

The researcher had access to the cumulative file of the Superintendent of the D.C. Public Schools. In addition, a room filled
with material on the Hobson versus Hansen court case was discovered in a room in the Presidential Building at 415 12th Street N.W. in D.C. where the Board of Education is located. Since the objective here was not the court case, the material was not organized, and there was not enough time to go over each document, this material was not used. A file on Julius W. Hobson, Sr., does not exist in the Superintendent's files. Only information on the case of Hobson versus Hansen was available.

The Board of Education records contained only a few references to Mr. Hobson, and they were very useful. Most of the references referred to some highly significant aspect of the Hobson versus Hansen court case.

Court Cases

The lengthy Hobson versus Hansen (1967-1973) court case, which is more than 200 pages long required many hours of study before all of the major issues were clear to the researcher. Several issues of the Federal Register contain portions of the case. The other legal cases that Hobson was involved in were also used to obtain a clearer picture of the man and the legal issues he espoused.

Analysis and Management Techniques of the Data

The collection and partial analysis of the massive data ran concurrently. After each interview and the use of secondary data (e.g., court cases, public records, and newspapers), interpretive notes on the theoretical significance of each piece of information were placed
with the narratives in analytic files. The basic structure of the analytic files involved categorizations of data entitled "Environmental Changes" Hobson, "Political Activist," and "Changes in the D.C. Public School System." As the analysis of the data proceeded, all related items were placed in separate file compartments along with notes designating whether the data obtained conformed to the categories of the conceptual framework. The interpretive notes also contained notations indicating where further probes were needed for information which was sketchy or incomplete.

In addition to the analytic files containing the detailed narratives and notes on the theoretical significance of numerous items, a chronological file (in the order in which the data was originally collected) was kept to maintain the "context" of the data. The chronological file was critical particularly in the final phase of the analysis because items which had appeared irrelevant to the analytic framework initially became theoretically meaningful in the context of the full data.

The final stage of analysis involved a process of putting the theoretically significant pieces into a coherent whole, i.e., an overall analysis of the impact of Julius W. Hobson Sr., on the D.C. Public School System. This phase involved laying out a chronological account. Hobson's political activities were interspersed with characterizations and explanations on the nature, types, and influence of Hobson on the D.C. Public Schools.
Limitations

In qualitative methods, the researcher is necessarily involved in the lives of the subjects. Because of the enormous amount of time spent on the subject and his strategies with the school system, it would be difficult to say that the researcher has been completely objective, but the effort to be objective was made. The researcher was acutely aware of the importance of objectivity in the scientific research endeavor and hopes that all biases have been eliminated from the final draft.

Another limitation of the methodology is the narrow focus of the study; this makes it difficult to duplicate. In addition, the representativeness of the study is limited.

Theoretical Framework

The first part of this section will be concerned with the social system conceptualizations used in this study. The next part of this section considers the nature of a social system and the individual as a subsystem. It is believed that such considerations will lead to a better understanding of this project.

Systems analysis was utilized as the conceptual framework for this study. In so doing, the framework provided a specific conceptual tool which deals with the relationship between the social system and its environment. The use of a systems approach as an analytic tool for the study of complex problems of organizational
life is not new. Past studies concerned with problems of morale and motivation, productivity and effectiveness, power and control, and leadership and change processes in large-scale organizations have essentially dealt with what is now called systems analysis.

In addition to a systems theory of organization, the researcher used the concepts and ideas derived from theories of symbolic interaction (social psychology).

Social System Conceptualizations Used in the Study

The conceptual framework for this study is based on a model of legislative change designed by Phil Meranto.\(^7\) Meranto used the systems analysis approach as depicted in figure 1 to describe and explain how the Education Act of 1965 became a federal bill. The ideas used by Meranto were borrowed from the theoretical and conceptual ideas of David A. Easton.\(^8\)

The need for an explicit model to describe the social changes perceived by the researcher for this study resulted in the adaptation of Meranto's (thus Easton's) model with changes and modifications in line with the theoretical basis of this study, (see Figure 2). This conceptual framework is obviously an adaptation of many of the existing concepts concerning social change as well as some very specific ideas of the researcher for this project.

FIGURE 1*

A Model of Legislative Change

ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

A. Circumstantial Conditions
   1. The Rediscovery of Poverty
   2. The Metropolitan Trend
   3. The Civil Rights Movement

B. Major Demand Articulators
   1. Constituents
   2. Organized Interest Groups
   3. Political Parties
   4. The President

CHANGES WITHIN THE LEGISLATIVE SYSTEM

A. Alteration of Party Ratios on House Education Committee
B. Change from Barden to Powell as Chairman
C. Enlargement of House Rules Committee

FIGURE 2*

The Political Influence of Julius W. Hobson, Sr.
Upon the District of Columbia Public School System: A Conceptual Framework

ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

A. Circumstantial Conditions

1. Affects of the 1954 Brown Decision on the D.C. Public Schools
2. The Civil Rights Movement
3. D.C. Public Schools 1953-77
4. Appointed School Board

B. Major Demand Articulators

1. Constituents
2. Organized Interest Groups
3. Local Press

CHANGES WITHIN THE D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

INPUTS

CONVERSION PROCESS

HOBSON Political Activist

OUTPUTS

Hobson v. Hanson 1967

OUTPUTS

Hobson v. Hanson 1971

OUTPUTS

City Council Legislation

NEW OUTPUT

A. An Elected School Board
B. Tracking System Abolished
C. Racial and Economic Discrimination Ordered To End in the Public Schools
D. De Facto Segregation Abolished
E. Equalization Hobson V. Hanson, 1971 Formula Imposed Upon the School System
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The search for a theoretical framework resulted in the acceptance of Meranto's model because it contained the categories which were of major importance to the ideas of the researcher and because it was concerned with political behavior.

The critical categories in Meranto's model were (1) circumstantial conditions and (2) major demand articulators. Meranto's model identified them as critical in describing environmental changes which impacted on the U.S. Congress at a specific time. The factors discussed under these categories helped Meranto to explain how specific events encouraged changes within the legislative system and resulted in the Education Act of 1965.

Application of a similar model has been applied to the D.C. Public School System to help explain Julius W. Hobson's impact on the system. A basic theoretical premise of this study is that the D.C. Public School System is a political subsystem. Another premise is that Julius W. Hobson, Sr. can be viewed as a subsystem of that larger political system. The fact that Hobson was perceived as a political figure in a political system is another reason a framework based on political science concepts was chosen. Social psychology concepts were used to assist in the scientific study of the experience and the behavior of Hobson in relation to the social political situations he encountered with the public school system.

A framework which utilized the systems approach was chosen because it also allows a wide range of data to be included in the analysis. In viewing Julius W. Hobson, Sr., as a unit for study and
analysis, the project took into consideration many of the variables in both his public and his private life that could be identified as having had some effect on him and his subsequent relationships with the school system. Another major area examined was that of the environment which existed during the period of investigation. The last major area of concern was the outputs of the system which resulted at least in part as a result of Hobson's influence. In this project, output refers only to the authoritative allocation of values such as state laws, executive orders, judicial rulings, administrative decisions, and other actions that are backed by the legitimate power of the state within the systems approach. 89

Hobson's political activities in relation to the D.C. Public Schools were another reason for the researcher using a model from political science for this study. The politics of education at the federal level was the concern of Meranto in his study, while the politics of education at the local level is the concern for this study. A critical task for the researcher was to adjust the framework used by Meranto to the scope of this study.

Why is a systems approach used in this study? Easton states that a system focuses on interrelationships among political actors and institutions. He contends that the central question is whether it helps us to understand and explain some aspect of human behavior of concern

89 Philip T. Meranto, p. 9.
to us. Thus the project concern was Hobson's behavior as it related to the D.C. Public School System. In other words, the structural elements as well as the flexibility required were available in this approach to allow for the necessary integration of the empirical references.

To be more specific, another critical task of this study was to attempt to isolate and analyze that portion of Hobson's behavior which was most directly related to the authoritarian allocation of values in order to assess his impact within the school system. Therefore, very specific variables were sought which appeared to hold the most promise for explaining events that occurred which could be assessed in that manner. The fact that this particular approach has merit as an organizational scheme also influenced the decision to adapt the framework.\(^90\) The systems approach, while basically descriptive in nature, does more, it also attempts to explain the internal functioning of the system.

There are several criticisms of this approach which must not be overlooked. One criticism is that there are methodological weaknesses with the approach because this kind of analysis is not suitable for empirical research and that it betrays and perpetuates a conservative bias. Another criticism is that one cannot speak of the system unless the boundaries can be identified or unless the variables which constitute the system can be stated. The argument is that a system is an

\(^{90}\) Philip T. Meranto, p. 8.
abstraction and can only be specified in an arbitrary decision.

While systems analysis is used often as an organizational scheme it is not used as the only research tool in a study of this nature. The complexity of the model requires so many kinds of data that any one type of empirical research is likely to fall short of theoretical requirements. So with this study the effort was made to use a conceptual framework based on the idea of the systems approach but with the assistance of the case study approach.

The Nature of a Social System

The concept of a system has been defined by David Easton as any set of variables regardless of the degree of interrelationships among them. Talcott Parsons described a system as a concept which refers both to a complex of interdependencies between parts, components, and processes that involve discernible regularities of relationships and to a similar type of interdependency between such a complex and its surrounding environment. The ideas of both men were examined because Easton based his work on that of Parsons. Parsons developed the idea of a social system, and Easton promulgated the concept of a political system. Inherent in the two social scientists discussion

---

of a system is that a system as a whole is identifiable, although to a limited degree, as independent of related systems. From this point of view, a system has a boundary which even if not always well defined, separates it from its environment. Inputs that cross this boundary are subject to some conversion processes within the system (through input). These conversion processes change the input elements into output elements. Thus, a system can be assessed by the differences between its inputs and its outputs or by the differences between the interaction of an organization and its environment.

The nature of many systems and their inputs and outputs reveals the variety of relationships that an organization or part of an organization can make with different parts of the environment and also with itself.

It should be noted that the relatedness of parts (structure) of a system can be found in an interrelated set of events which return upon themselves to complete and renew a cycle of activities. What is important to note is that it is the events rather than things which are structured so that a relatedness of parts (structure) is a dynamic rather than a static concept in any analysis of a social system.

The Individual as a Sub-System

An individual may be seen as an operational system just as an institution. He exists and can exist only through the process of inter-

---

action with his environment. Cases of prolonged isolation in childhood suggest that ego formation beyond the stage of a perceived body dependency depends upon interaction with other persons who are members of a social and linguistic community. Almost all the theoretical explanations of socialization and child development acknowledge the interaction of man and his environment. 94

The major premise of Charles H. Cooley's "looking glass self" is that the individual becomes largely what he is based upon the perception of his friends, acquaintances, and others with whom he interacts. 95 Cooley suggests that the looking glass self has three main components:

1. our perception of how behavior appears to others (in the language of system approach, input),
2. our perception of their judgments of this behavior (conversion processes or through put), and
3. our feelings about those judgments (output)

Essentially, individuals evaluate themselves partly in terms of the impressions that they perceive that they are making on others, especially whom they consider to be significant. As a result, they learn to see and judge themselves as they imagine others see and judge them.

Mead's theoretical formulation made Cooley's concept of the "looking glass self" more explicit by stating that the child's self concept is influenced by his imitation of the reactions of significant others and by their reaction to him. Specifically, the attitudes of those significant others are internalized, via the role of the "generalized other" into the individual's own ideas and behavior. Thus, the individual's conception of self is adjusted to what he perceives to be the conception within the organized society with regard to him, and he then assesses his own behavioral conduct and self-concept by those judgments.

Commenting on ego or self development, Sherif and Cantril state that

Our major psychological activities—our perception, judgment, remembering and so on—take place in referential frameworks. The ego is no exception to this general rule. We learn (or sometimes determine) what values, goals, standards, or norms are desirable for us. These become incorporated as our values, our goals. The referential framework of the ego is therefore these values, goals, standards or norms which have become our major attitudes, which have become so large a part of what we refer to as me. These values, goals, standards or norms which become our attitudes are represented by, set by, or created by group activities and social situations that form the constellation of our social relationships with which we come in contact. Major attitudes are thus derived from groups to which we learn to relate ourselves or which we regard ourselves as members of like reference groups or membership groups. My identification and allegiances, my status and position are determined with respect to these reference and membership groups.

Accordingly, the self concept which is anchored in one's reference groups may be responsible for checking and controlling the conversion of the input activities, inspecting the outputs, and then giving direction to action or other means of expression relative to the outputs. In other words,

The unique formation that takes shape as the self or ego of the human person consists of a set of components that define his statutized bearings in relation to the physical and social surroundings. They define his ties, his reciprocal expectations of his rights and responsibilities, and his motivational emotional claims relative to objects as well as other persons, groups and institutions. They define his stands and commitments relative to the social issues that count in his scheme.98

Since an individual is not just a single activity system, he is capable of multiple activities. Therefore, the individual develops the capacity to mobilize himself at different times and simultaneously into many different activity systems. Only some of these activities are relevant to his behavior during any particular period or issues at any particular time. Those activities that are ego-involving to the individual are directed to fulfill some specific purpose. Thus, for this study, the research was only interested in the empirical references of Julius Hobson which related directly or indirectly to the D.C. Public School System. As Sherif and Sherif noted,

98Ibid.
We are surrounded by literally millions of objects, scenes and events that could be singled out, perceived, judged and acted upon...But he can only attend to only a few items at a time. Necessarily he selects from a myriad of potential stimuli in any particular situation. Psychological selectivity refers to the screening process that eliminates all but a few of the potential sources of stimulation at a particular time.\(^{99}\)

With the realization of this essence, the schema developed in Figure 2 proceeds with the following variables: (1) environmental changes (inputs), (2) Hobson as a subsystem (his inputs from the environmental changes and his outputs), and (3) changes within the D.C. Public School System. These three classes were examined in the context of the theoretical model which describes the inputs and the outputs on the D.C. Public School System. Figure 2 is a diagram which shows the D.C. Public School System and the critical empirical references which impacted upon it during the time under investigation.

As the D.C. Public School System was the focal point of demands of Julius W. Hobson, Sr., other environmental conditions became either demands or supports to the D.C. Public School System. The output may

then be viewed as the changes within the D.C. Public School System brought about by the demands and input of environmental conditions and Julius W. Hobson, Sr.
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The results of tasks of the analysis and the integration of the data collected for this research project are in this chapter. As in most case studies, a mass of data is reviewed by the researcher to assist in the clarification and classification of empirical evidence. The important material is the core of this chapter. This is an essential process because the researcher was constantly analyzing and synthesizing material at the beginning of the study.

The analysis is presented first as mini-cases on the major components of the conceptual framework. Following is a discussion of the analysis as it applies to the systems approach.

An Introduction to Julius W. Hobson, Sr.

Julius W. Hobson, Sr., was born on May 29, 1922, in Birmingham, Alabama. He was the son of a small businessman and a teacher, who was also an elementary school principal. While many of his classmates spent more than half of their school days picking cotton, Julius, an only child, attended school.100

Like most boys and girls in Alabama who were enrolled in public schools at this time, Hobson attended segregated schools. He graduated from Parker High School, which was formerly Industrial High School. The school was not really a high school; it was more an industrial arts institution. Nevertheless, he did acquire a basic education. While he was in high school, Hobson worked as a library janitor. Having access to so many books marked the beginning of a hobby which remained with him — a love for poetry.101

In 1946 Hobson received a B.A. degree from Tuskegee Institute. It was during his years at Tuskegee that he joined the U.S. Army Reserves.

Shortly afterwards, during World War II, he joined the U.S. Army. According to the Army Times, in 1944, Hobson flew 35 sorties in Europe and was awarded 3 bronze stars and a number of other medals.102

After being released from the army, Hobson went to Columbia University in New York. Disenchantment with the large classes in graduate school at Columbia and recognition of the need to improve his academic skills led Hobson to Howard University. He had heard that at Howard University he could get the desired course work in

101 Ibid.
102 Ibid.
history, economic, and political science as well as individual attention from the professors. The experience at Howard University however, was different from what he had expected:

The attitude was, 'we're not going to hire these niggers anyway for a job, so let them study anything they want to study.' We had a lot of visiting professors at Howard University, like Paul Sweezy from the University of New Hampshire, who is one of the leading Marxists in the country. We had Otto Nathan, who was the executor of Einstein's will, a man who's written quite a bit in economics. Corliss Lamont came down and taught philosophy from Columbia University...103

There were many other scholars at Howard during his study; several of them were fired from the University during the McCarthy era, but not before Hobson had taken time to engage in lively discussions with them in the small, informal classes.

Hobson's Howard University Graduate School experience helped to pave the path to his next job as an economic researcher with the Library of Congress. While waiting for members of Congress to request information on economic matters, Hobson had time to increase his knowledge of social, political, and economic matters. He remained in that position from 1950 to 1959, at which time he began to work as a social science statistical analyst in the Social Security Administration.

Aroused by an acute interest in social, political, and economic matters, Hobson began joining what became a long list of

103ibid.
organizations. When the need arose, Hobson sometimes organized his own groups. The following list includes many of the groups he joined or organized.

1. President, Slowe Elementary PTA
2. President of Woodridge Civic Association (1950-1953)
3. Vice President of the D.C. Federation of Civic Associations (1955-1957)
4. NAACP—Member of the Executive Committee of the D.C. Branch (1956-1959), Lifetime Member
5. Chairman of the D.C. Chapter of the Congress on Racial Equality (1960-1964)
6. Member of the D.C. Urban League
7. Member of (ADA) Americans for Democratic Action
8. Founded ACT (Associated Community Teams) in 1964
9. Founder and Director of the Washington Institute for Quality Education (1968)
10. Founder of the D.C. Statehood Party

While associated with the aforementioned organizations, Hobson's agenda was usually concerned with the quality of education and racial or economic discrimination. Always the activist, he usually held a leadership position within the organizations.

During the years he worked with CORE, he joined 85 picket lines at downtown stores and businesses and negotiated nearly 60 agreements with employers which led to widespread hiring of Blacks.¹⁰⁴ As he moved from issue to issue, Hobson's face and his name was presented to the public by the media almost daily. The constant transition from one situation to another caused some

members of the press to label him a "maverick" or a "gadfly."

At one time, he led at least 3,000 people to the District Building to demand fair employment and fair housing regulations. Legislation was enacted shortly thereafter.

While he was chairman of the D.C. chapter of CORE, Hobson filed a suit to get home rule for residents of the city. This was not a successful strategy, but it presented the issue of home rule for District citizens to a nationwide audience.

Why choose education and schools, as a primary target when there were so many other issues in need of attention? Hobson's explanation of his interest and later involvement in education, as it was told to Jerome Contee, follows:

I became involved in public education in the District of Columbia because I was born Black in the South and had been subjected to a very poor education. I came from a background of poorly educated southern school teachers where the average teacher had spent two years in colleges such as Alabama State and Tuskegee and other very poor schools of the South.

Coming out of World War II, I decided that I wanted to go to Wayne State to study engineering. It really wasn't Wayne State, it was Wayne City College at that time. I had difficulty competing against high school boys despite the fact that I was almost a college graduate coming out of Tuskegee. It made me kind of sit up and take notice about education.

I thought about all the segregated education in the South, second hand books, and the lack of curriculum which I really didn't learn about until after I had gotten out of those schools.
After coming to Washington and rearing my children here, I saw my children being placed in the same position in this segregated educational system. That's what engendered my interest in public education.  

In addition, Hobson had expressed strong feelings about the white principal of his son's school before the 1954 Supreme Court decision. He had become aware of the fact that several principals in his neighborhood had lobbied against integration. Hobson, already disgruntled by his educational experiences in Alabama, did not take this lightly. In 1964, Hobson had been forced to resign from CORE. Although he had served as director for 4 years, his views on Black Power non-violence and socialism led to his removal from that organization. He now had more time to spend on the issue of the quality of education offered by the public school system. 

Before 1954, students in the D.C. public schools could enroll only in the appropriate racially designated schools, i.e., for Blacks or for Whites. The 1954 Supreme Court decision on racial separation in schools mandated a change in school policy. Public schools in D.C. now had to integrate the races. 

Hobson soon became upset by a policy that the school system had devised to achieve integration:

---

106 Telephone conversation with Mrs. Carol Smith, exwife and mother of Mr. Hobson's children, and the writer April 17, 1977.
There was bussing going on. In fact, I had to bus my little boy around a white school that was one block down the street across to Brookland School in Northeast. And I just got involved in the PTA and went from the PTA to the civic association.\textsuperscript{107}

The desegregation conflict became a critical community issue. The controversy which arose over school integration stimulated a wide variety of previously uninvolved individuals to seek some influence in shaping educational policy.\textsuperscript{108}

Julius Hobson was not sold on the idea of integration, for he later stated that he was opposed to bussing until something was done about the "psychological ills" which existed in white communities.\textsuperscript{109}

He became PTA president of the newly integrated Woodridge School. At the first meeting of the "integrated" Woodridge School PTA, he found the white parents to be in a panic. "What would happen to their school now with all those little savages coming in? Would there be rapes and muggings in the second grade? Would discipline disappear? Would their daughters all end up marrying them?"\textsuperscript{110} In a PTA meeting Julius made the following reply:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{107}William Raspberry, "Julius Hobson: A Goad for Change."
\textsuperscript{109}Ibid., p. 68
\textsuperscript{110}An Evening to Honor Julius Hobson, November 14, 1972, p. 5.
\end{flushright}
My boy washes with the same Ivory soap your kids use. He brushes his teeth with Colgate, just like you. His color won't rub off, and he's coming here for the same reason your kids do, to get an education.\textsuperscript{111}

Concerned with providing quality education for all students, Hobson decided to let the whites settle their own problems with school integration, while he moved on to other issues.

During this time, Hobson involved himself with educational issues as an indirect part of his many tactics that dealt with fair employment practices, housing, social practices and benefits and other areas of racial and economic discrimination. During this period, he led many boycotts and demonstrations to help end the discrimination in these areas.

His tenure as Chairman of CORE and his work with the NAACP was a training ground for the skills he would need to deal with the D.C. Board of Education. After losing the Chairmanship of CORE, Hobson began to devote most of his time to the public schools in the District of Columbia. His children were now older, and a problem arose concerning a tracking plan that had been implemented by Superintendent of Schools Carl F. Hansen.

Angered first by the administration's bussing policy and then by a new ability-grouping policy, he took his children out of

\textsuperscript{111}\textit{Ibid.}
the public school system. Sensing that there was something inherently unjust about the tracking plan, he began to research the issue. With the assistance of John Sessions, a longtime associate and friend, data concerning the implementation of the tracking plan were collected.

Hobson and Sessions attempted unsuccessfully to arrange a meeting with the Superintendent to discuss their concerns. The public school administration did little to encourage citizens to express their concerns about educational matters.

In the District of Columbia, there was minimal participation in educational decision-making by the people most affected by the policies being set. Citizens had the opportunity to work with PTA's, the Federation of Civic Associations, and other groups but only in an advisory capacity. PTA's spent much of their time and efforts supplementing the neighborhood school budgets. Civic associations were largely concerned about educational facilities, their location, and the eventual impact on the neighborhoods. While many school buildings were delapidated and posed health and safety hazards, little more than the usual rhetoric was directed toward the problem.

The case of the Shaw Junior High School illustrates this point. The school was cited in 1949 in the Strayer Report as being useless for educational purposes.\textsuperscript{112} Although citizens in

this section of the city consistently petitioned for a new school, their demands were always pushed aside in favor of other school system priorities. A new facility to replace the old Shaw was not opened until 1977. In the 28 years following the recommendation by Strayer, schools were available in other parts of the city, while students in the Shaw area had to continue to use an inadequate facility.

Although racial and economic discrimination in employment and housing dominated Hobson's attention during the early 1960's, he continued to agitate school administrators for policy changes as the need arose. Hobson and Sterling Tucker, then President of the Urban League had been greatly concerned about school administration policy, although they felt that Superintendent Carl F. Hansen was attempting to solve some of the problems of the system.113

In 1964, Hobson proposed a boycott of the public schools. The object of the protest was "inadequate facilities" rather than de facto segregation, although he said that the latter was also a problem in Washington, D.C. "Schools are overcrowded and have inadequate libraries and laboratories as well as poorly trained teachers."114

By April 1964, CORE described the school system as a system that meted out "calculated inequality." Citing Evans and Deal junior high schools as examples, CORE claimed that both schools were given the same allocation for books but that Deal already had an average of nine books per student while Evans had only one book per student.115

The school boycott was supposed to take place in May. Hobson called for "Seven Days in May," a boycott to paralyze the D.C. government that the city would never forget. Opposition came from everywhere. "Seven Days in May" was one of the well-known strategies devised by Hobson that claimed the attention of many D.C. citizens and the press. Critics accused him of using children to attain his questionable objectives. A big rally was planned to be held on the Washington Monument grounds, but the boycott did not work; only a couple of hundred students and others joined Hobson on the Monument grounds.

What could have happened to cause such a massive effort to end so unsuccessfully? "...[Actually] I have never called a boycott and let it get to the boycott [stage], because I knew it was going to fail."116

115Evans Junior High School opened in the fall of 1963 and it had an almost all Black student population. Deal Junior High School was considered one of the best schools in the city and it was located in an almost all white community.
Hobson seemed never to lack the nerve to call for a boycott or a rally. The fact that he wanted it to fail was a well-kept secret. The supporters of the school system fell into the trap of disagreeing with Hobson and issuing press releases in opposition to his plans. Thus Hobson usually gained the attention that he was seeking. The students remained in school, but the public was made acutely aware of the conditions in some of the schools. Although the press focused on the boycott, the undergirding issues had been the lack of adequate educational facilities and qualified teachers in the city. The administrators of the public schools continued to ignore Hobson.

Frustrated by the lack of response from the Superintendent of Schools, Hobson began to assemble a group of associates to work with him on the problem of the "tracking" system in the city.

"The biggest scandal in town was the school track system. Most poor Black children were automatically assigned to the basic track and in many predominantly Black schools there simply was no honors track. Everyone believed—but no one had proven—that expenditures per child from the regular budget were higher in the more affluent areas."117

The group that Hobson assembled consisted of friends and acquaintainces who could provide legal, financial, and academic assistance.

117An Evening to Honor Julius Hobson, p. 6.
One person who donated money to the cause later decided it was a loan and attempted to sue Hobson.\textsuperscript{118} Much has been said of the circumstances and events preceding the filing of a lawsuit by Hobson and others on behalf of their children. A question was, -- what was the motivation and the source of money for the project? What is more important is the fact that Hobson was abandoning his strategy of activist protest and turning to the legal system for assistance in his efforts to gain equal opportunities for all students in the D.C. public schools.

When ACT was founded in 1964 by Hobson, the motto of the organization was "Research and Destroy." Given the accurate information on the conditions being investigated, Hobson systematically and carefully planned ways to reveal that information to the public and to city officials. This was often done in a grandiose or sensational manner. He usually acted purely on intuition and bluffed the press and city officials into thinking that he had the upper hand when he did not have all of the facts. It was sometime impossible to gather the data that was needed because city agencies did not always keep accurate records; nevertheless, Hobson worked diligently to gather this data to stay ahead of the city officials.

\textsuperscript{118}Interview with Hobson in August 1973.
Public schools in the District of Columbia were racially segregated by the Organic Act of 1906 until the Supreme Court declared this practice to be unconstitutional in 1954. The Organic Act of 1906 had prescribed public school organization in the following manner:

The Board shall appoint one superintendent for all the public schools in the District of Columbia. The Board, upon the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools, shall also appoint one white assistant superintendent for the white schools and one colored assistant superintendent for the colored schools.¹¹⁹

The dual school system in the District of Columbia was similar to other racially segregated school systems in America during this time.

Anticipating that the Supreme Court might rule against the separation of the races in all public schools, members of the Board of Education expressed a desire for system planning toward desegregation to begin before the 1954 Brown versus Topeka decision.

On December 17, 1952, Mr. Tobriner, a member of the Board of Education, proposed that the board invite leading citizens of the District of Columbia, members of the clergy, and civic group representatives were to give the Board the benefit of their views on two subjects: (1) the mechanics of integration should it be ordered and (2) educational preparation which might be deemed necessary in order to make integration work.\textsuperscript{120} After extensive discussion on the pros and cons of such a move, a motion was passed by the majority of the Board members to begin plans for the meetings.

At the next regular board meeting in January, 1953, Superintendent Corning suggested that a better way to handle this situation was to request individuals and groups to respond in writing. He and his staff would review the recommendations and decide which individuals or groups would be invited to make presentations.\textsuperscript{121} The intent of Mr. Tobriner's proposal to give citizens a forum appeared to be lost. The meetings were finally held, but civic organizations eventually monopolized the proceedings held by the

\textsuperscript{120}\textit{Minutes of the Board of Education, Washington, D.C., A.30, December 17, 1952.}

\textsuperscript{121}\textit{Ibid.}
Board to set into operation a plan to deal with the problems of integration. Little attention was given to individual concerns and not much more was actually given to the groups which testified before the Board.

The suit filed by D.C. parents which challenged the separation of the races in D.C. Public Schools, Bolling versus Sharp, had been included in the famous Brown versus Topeka decision. As a result of this suit, a plan for integrating the public schools, which had been held in abeyance by Superintendent Corning, went into operation after the 1954 decision. However, the politics of this period in the history of the D.C. public schools are difficult to assemble. This difficulty exists because of the "games" that were played by so many of the characters involved. Some of the characters were known, while others were content to use their power to pull strings behind the scenes.

Differences in backgrounds and political motivation created a political arena for members of the Board of Education and Corporation Counsel lawyers. The lack of a single purpose and poor communication were other factors that frequently left the Board almost completely out of the picture in legal matters. Other influential local citizens expressed their concerns, sometimes even the President of the United States or influential members of Congress.

In addition, before May 17, 1954, the day the Brown versus Topeka decision was announced, those in the educational arena of the District of Columbia found it difficult to present a united front to the
The District of Columbia still carrying legal codes which permitted segregation of the races in both public and private areas of society, was a refuge for segregationists. To those familiar with the history of the city, it is no surprise that Jerome Contee made the following observations in his study of the desegregation years:

...The Board of Education was trapped between petitioner Bolling and the Corporation Counsel; it was now in a position where it had to act as opposed to continued planning [for integration]. The Board chose to equivocate. First, the Superintendent spoke and admitted that he was aware that a brief had been filed but denied having given any approval. Then a Black Board member stated that the Board was unaware that the Corporation Counsel was planning to take a position defending the dual system. Finally the Assistant Corporation Counsel told the Supreme Court Justices that the president of the Board had assured him that Board members were one hundred percent in favor of being represented by the Corporation Counsel. However he did not state that they were one hundred percent in favor of the prosegregationist stance, nor did he state who specifically authorized the filing of the brief in the first place. 122

After Brown versus Topeka, the task of merging the two separate school divisions fell on the shoulders of Dr. Hobart Corning, the D.C. Public School Superintendent. Black and white administrative units under one superintendent, white, had been the organizational structure of the system since 1906. Division I served only whites and Division II was the unit for Black staff and students. Although neither division was ever considered to be exceptional in quality,

the division for Black students was far less advanced than the white division because of years of neglect by the Board of Education.

D.C. officials, with the sanction of influential interest groups, used many strategies in efforts to delay school integration. The influential Metropolitan Board of Trade was able to manipulate the conservative Federation of Citizen Associations to file a suit in opposition to the court ruling, but it was of no avail. In 1956, following this effort, Congress used its power to call for a special investigation into the problems of the D.C. Public School System. This was good news for constituents of the Southern congressmen but did little to help the plight of the D.C. Public School System.

However, by June of 1955, Superintendent Corning reported that 75% of all schools, from elementary school through the teachers colleges, contained pupils of both races, and one school in five had racially mixed faculties. Workshops on human relations and integration were held throughout the city for teachers and parents.

The Corning plan was in full operation but it had one component which later led to serious problems. Students had the option to transfer to another school if they were experiencing psychological stress in their integrated schools. White families took advantage of that option, and soon the whites who did not move into private schools or to suburban Maryland or Virginia were again concentrated in schools with majority white populations.

To ease the difficulty of mixing students from such diverse backgrounds and abilities, the school system, under the direction of its next superintendent, Dr. Carl F. Hansen, adopted an ability-grouping plan based on intelligence quotients and test results. Eventually, the lowest scoring group, labeled the basic track, was comprised almost completely of Black students. Although the plan called for adequate testing and reassessment of students, this rarely occurred.

Students in the basic track usually stayed there for the rest of their school years. This group of students, who needed special assistance, was virtually ignored. Students in the honors track (college bound) were the recipients of most of the special assistance available. In some schools with a predominantly Black enrollment, an honors track was never established. Black students who otherwise qualified for this special placement were denied the opportunity if their parents could not afford the expense of transportation and money for lunches to schools outside of their neighborhoods. For many Black parents who viewed education as the main hope for their offspring to improve their economic and social conditions, the track system was a major obstacle.

The inflexible nature of the tracking system devised by Carl F. Hansen, which became known as the Amidon Plan came under fire. Parents criticized the lack of testing and the length of student placements, especially in the basic track.
During Carl F. Hansen's tenure as Superintendent of the D.C. Public Schools, grievances from parents and community groups were low on his list of priorities to be dealt with. The fact that Hansen did not respond to the Urban League's concern in 1964 about the schools is discussed earlier in this paper.

By 1967, the President of the Federation of Civic Associations forwarded a resolution approved by that organization requesting the Board of Education to draw a summary plan of the educational policies it intended to put into effect and to hold public hearings to obtain the views of parents, teachers, and other interested persons. Principals were informed that they could establish a Parents Council if they so desired. The membership was to be strictly voluntary. The effect of such a move on the Board of Education and the Superintendent was minimal, and neither proposal went very far.

The press did not help the situation by portraying some of the schools as dens of violence which needed constant surveillance by local policemen. Violence and disorder in the public schools increased, and the administrators in the system appeared to be unable to resolve the problems without the placement of policemen in the schools. The issue of violence in the schools was prevalent in many large cities during this period. Members of the Washington Teachers Union and

---

others in the community, opposed such a move but eventually the policemen arrived and continue to remain in many schools, especially the junior and senior high schools.

Overcrowdedness had helped to create some of the disorder. Although some classrooms were vacant, schools in the Black communities were still overpopulated because new facilities had not been built to accommodate the influx of Blacks from other areas and the increase in birth rates in the city.

A fight among students at the Robert F. Kennedy Stadium during the city's High School Championship Football Game on Thanksgiving Day in 1962 brought the problem of violence in the public schools to the attention of Congress. An investigation into violence and crime in the D.C. Public Schools was conducted by that body. Although the hearings were supposed to be secret, some of the testimony leaked to the press. There were racial overtones to the entire episode.

A call for corporal punishment to be restored in the schools was made by Hansen. He also appealed for parents and teachers to assist the school system with its discipline problems.\(^{125}\)

Caught in the middle of a massive whirlwind of problems, Hansen proposed to do the following to improve the situation:

\(^{125}\text{Washington Star, February 1963.}\)
1. Improve the education of children from deprived homes
2. Reach slow learners
3. Reorganize personnel management so that teacher turnover would decrease
4. Construct new buildings just to get the children off the streets
5. Lower the pupil-teacher ratio, and
6. Obtain more sums of money for additional textbooks and supplies.\textsuperscript{126}

However, Hobson advanced other demands. He and other citizens demanded changes in the curriculum to make it more relevant for Black students. A call for the teaching of Black History and Swahila came from student organizations. It seemed paradoxical that just a few years ago Black History had been taught to some degree in schools comprising Division II, the region for Black students but was dropped from the curriculum when all D.C. public schools had been integrated in 1954.

It was during this time when the school system was overwhelmed with administrative problems related to social and economic problems of the student population that Hobson decided to go to the courts to seek relief from the problem of racial and economic discrimination in the D.C. Public Schools. Superintendent Carl F. Hansen, found himself in a precarious position. It was 1966, and for the next year, Hansen had to spend a great deal of time preparing answers for the

\textsuperscript{126}Washington Post, January 4, 1964.
Court. The suit Hobson versus Hansen, against the school system had been brought by Hobson and others. An abrupt end came to the tenure of Hansen when the Court ruled in favor of Hobson on May 25, 1967.

Education Interest Groups in Washington, D.C.

Like most other large cities, Washington, D.C., did not have a real partnership between the school system and groups interested in devising school policies or in developing educational goals. A study by Harry T. Passow, an education professor from Columbia University which was completed in 1967 contained little more than the George D. Strayer Report of 1949 pertaining to positive citizen involvement in D.C. Public School affairs. The school system sometimes reacted to isolated incidents brought to its attention by outsiders, but there was no initiative taken by the leadership to find ways to improve communications with the public. Nevertheless, several interest groups did exist.

The United Planning Organization (UPO) came into the picture as part of the "War on Poverty" to assist in establishing the Model School

---

127 Harry T. Passow, *Toward Creating a Model Urban Education: A Study of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967), p. 79. Dr. Passow was hired by the D.C. Board of Education to conduct this study which also contains recommendations to improve the system. A team of researchers from Columbia University worked with Dr. Passow on this project. Recommendations which had been made about citizen involvement by George D. Strayer in 1949 had not been implemented in 1967 when Passow conducted his study.
Division in the school system. The extent of cooperation between the agencies consisted of the school system presenting plans for UPO "approval"; there was no joint planning. The Model School Division eventually became a permanent part of the school system and was considered an exemplary project by many. The focus was upon project personnel much more than citizen involvement. Members of the division became "experts" in urban education and were subsequently invited to many other areas as consultants.

D.C. Citizens for Better Education, Inc., was organized in 1964 in response to increasing public unrest about the school system. Composed mainly of upper-middle and middle income Blacks and whites, the purpose of the group was to study on a continuing basis the problems of public education in the District of Columbia to stimulate interest in the public schools. In addition, it attempts to encourage participation in volunteer programs in the public schools, to promote such changes in the organization, management and methods of the public schools as may from time to time be deemed desirable. Equipped with adequate funds and an office and staff, this group has conducted several studies of school policies. Their last project looked at the

128Passow, Toward Creating a Model Urban Education, p. 80.
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way the school system implemented the equalization order of Hobson II, 1971. This is a reference to Hobson versus Hansen which will be discussed later in this chapter. D.C. Citizens for Better Education, Inc., tended to react to situations in the school system rather than to take the initiative to request or to demand changes in school policy. It tended to work through an informal network of associates to accomplish its goals. The organization has not been the advocate of any changes implemented by the school system to date. Its members often testify before Congress on behalf of the school system. Because so many members are considered to be influential, this organization serves their special interests.

Civil rights groups in the District of Columbia have always expressed concern about the quality of education for Blacks and the poor. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was the influence behind the parents in the Spottswood versus Bolling case which was enjoined with Brown versus Topeka in the 1954 Supreme Court case to abolished segregation in Public Schools in the District of Columbia. CORE and the Urban League were extremely active in the District of Columbia during the early 1960's, but they did not join with Hobson when he sought relief for Black students through the courts.

In 1964, CORE removed Julius Hobson from the leadership position of President because of his desire to focus on matters unrelated to
the goals of the organization. Hobson's explanation for leaving CORE was that his concern about education, history, economics of the city, employment, and other related topics aroused suspicions that the national body would lose money from generous D.C. contributors if he was allowed to explore such an agenda. CORE reports said that Hobson was suspended as President because he was accused of violating the constitution on procedures of election and membership and for running a one-man show. Hobson's response to that charge was "You can't run a revolution by Robert's Rules of Order." CORE did not care to get involved in the D.C. school problems.

ACT was organized by Hobson after he left CORE. Described by Passow as the most militant citizen group—and probably the one with the smallest membership—it was designed to accommodate Hobson's philosophy on how our society should operate. ACT was often referred to as the Organization of the Militants, an activist-research group. The motto of ACT was "Research and Destroy." ACT was

---

131 Washington Post, "A Goad for Change."
133 Harry T. Passow, p. 81.
... not a civil rights organization in the classical sense but a revolutionary one in the American tradition. It has no desire to involve the poor in sporadic, massive demonstrations and arrests but to involve them daily, where they live, in their own neighborhoods, in articulating their frustrations and anguish and finally in recognizing and mobilizing their own vast latent power to crush poverty and oppression.\textsuperscript{134}

It was while serving as Chairman of ACT that Hobson was the plaintiff in Hobson versus Hansen. ACT brought the most immediate demands before the Board of Education for consideration and response. This was an unusual stance for an organization to take with the Board of Education. Other civil rights groups did not join Hobson in the suit. Baratz implied that Hobson was so obnoxious personally that other people did not want to associate with him, nor his ideas.\textsuperscript{135} Hobson claimed that the other groups opposed what he was attempting to do and refused to become associated with the issue.\textsuperscript{136}

Nevertheless, ACT, which never had more than 35 to 40 active members and was described by its founder as a paper tiger with teeth that could hold its convention in a phone booth, served as a vehicle for change in the D.C. public schools.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{135}Baratz, "Court Decisions and Educational Change," p. 18.
\textsuperscript{136}Interview with Julius W. Hobson, Sr., September 1976.
\textsuperscript{137}Washington Star, 6 April 1967.
The Washington Institute for Quality Education is another organization which was founded by Hobson to work for the development of strategies to use in the court case against the school system. Described as a research organization to assist in the monitoring and financing of Hobson versus Hansen, 1967, the chairman was always Julius W. Hobson, Sr. Although the Board of Directors consisted of some influential people, the active membership was always small. This organization served as a funnel for grants and legal and academic assistance for Hobson. Its headquarters was located in an office on M Street S.W. in D.C. for two years. After Hobson became ill, the headquarters was moved to his home.

The press in Washington, D.C., is probably more influential than any of the groups mentioned thus far. Hobson properly credited them with making him a local figure. In response to columnist William Raspberry's question: Have you ever run a successful fraud on the people or on the press? Hobson replied:

I would say most of it was fraud, if you call a successful fraud a claim that you are going to bring out numbers and that these numbers are going to respond to your call.

It was psychological warfare really and the people who made it was the Washington Post, the Evening Star when they saw fit to write about it, and the Washington Afro-American with Chuck Stone.
There was a real belief down here at the Washington Post that Hobson could:

— Clog up Route 40;
— Release river rats in Georgetown; and
— Mobilize hundreds of students for the May Day boycott. 138

The press was absolutely essential in the style of confrontation politics engaged by Hobson. Awareness of the power of the press was a tremendous asset to this man, who could never seem to muster a large group of followers until after his election to the D.C. Board of Education. Enormous amounts of space in the local newspapers were devoted to Hobson and his conflicts with public schools.

Hobson versus Hansen, 1967

One cannot simply decide that (s)he wants to sue a state government and proceed to do so. There must be reasonable evidence of an adverse issue before the judicial system will entertain a citizen's complaint. When Hobson decided that the only recourse left him was to go to the courts, he discovered that a good lawyer would not handle the case because he did not have credible evidence of any wrongdoing. No one would take his word alone that the schools were in violation of Bolling versus Sharpe. The following judicial expression on this issue was stated by Judge J. Skelly Wright at a later date during his discourse on the Hobson case:

Courts are bound to adjudicate only those lawsuits which have an authentically adversary character, and issues presented must not only assume legal dress but must be susceptible to resolution by judicial methods rather than by considerably freer choice between competing policies which characterize legislative and administrative decision making. 139

In an effort to diminish the uncertainty of the outcome of his new venture, Hobson had to develop a new strategy when he decided to use the judicial process in his battle with the public school system. Unaware of the politics and finances needed to support the new venture, he did not realize that he also did not have adequate evidence for a case. With this realization came the necessity to develop strategies to get the financing and the evidence required before he could continue.

In an almost desperate attempt to find a way to gain entry to the courts, Hobson sought help from Representative Adam C. Powell, who was chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. Congress, House of Representatives. In Representative Powell he found a sympathetic friend whom he persuaded to conduct an investigation of the D.C. Public Schools but only after being told,

"Well, Julius, in the first place you don't have a following that's big enough to fit in a telephone booth; in the second place, you're not a leader in the community. I can't use my House Committee to hold hearings on the District schools just for you. However, if you can go back and get a whole lot of those preachers and those other idiots who are loud in the community, who are known and who are 'respectable' to ask me for a hearing, I'll do it."

Hobson followed Powell's advise and those hearings became the basis for the Hobson versus Hansen case. The politically sophisticated Powell advised Hobson on how he could effectively conduct the investigation. The magic word at that time was "poverty." Hobson and Powell contrived the plan to investigate the D.C. Public School System as it related to the "War on Poverty".

The study investigated the procedures for appointing members to the Board of Education, the condition of plant facilities, and the instructional program. Recommendations made by the study requested new procedures for choosing members of the Board of Education, the reorganization of Board operations, and the discontinuance of the "tracking system."

141Ibid.
The study found serious problems in many areas, but it was most critical of the instructional programs as is indicated in the following excerpt:

In the District of Columbia, without money and without a faster shift in basic premises, evaluations, and methods of reaching 'basic' pupils and uplifting general track pupils, disappointment is inevitable. However, after ten years experience, no matter how inadequate the results appear, it seems likely that the school system is at a point where funds for poverty's children—the educable mentally retarded, the remedials, the underachievers, the unconfident, and unambitious—would produce a faster then usual payoff, provided they are accompanied by realistic policy carefully administered and adequately supervised . . . the track system should be dropped and some other method developed to deal with ability grouping without stigmatizing a youngster for the rest of his life.143

Armed with this legitimate additional information on the condition of the public school system, Hobson again sought help from lawyers. This time he was successful.

There are several versions of how Hobson was able to get his case into the courts. One has just been described. Another is that there was a group of white liberals from Boston who used Hobson to

143Ibid., p. 64.
sue the school system on their behalf. Hobson did have friends from Boston such as Patricia Saltenstall who provided some financial assistance.\textsuperscript{144} He later accepted $8,000 from the Episcopal Church also.\textsuperscript{145} Hobson collected friends who were sympathetic to his causes. People who had skills in research, law, or fund raising were embraced by Hobson if they were willing to assist.

The lawyer finally chosen by Hobson was William Kunstler. Kunstler had a reputation as champion defender of civil rights activists. Having the appropriate lawyer was also part of Hobson's strategy. Funds for legal aid were nearly non-existent, but Hobson, who said he had to borrow from a loan company, eventually spent more than $25,000 on the court case.\textsuperscript{146}

With the backing of the Powell congressional investigation, Hobson filed a suit on January 13, 1966, against the D.C. Board of Education and its superintendent, Carl F. Hansen. The major charge was

\textsuperscript{144}According to Hobson, Patricia Saltenstall gave him $10,000 to assist in his legal battle. She later said the money was a loan and made efforts to sue Hobson but eventually dropped the charges.\textsuperscript{145}A controversy arose when the gift became known to members of the church because Hobson claims to be an atheist. Note from interview with Hobson, August 1973.\textsuperscript{146}From interview with Hobson in August 1973.
... Racial discrimination by the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education of the District of Columbia in the administration of public schools in the District. Plaintiff alleges that these defendants are not only violating the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution, but are also failing to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court in Bolling versus Sharpe, 347 U.S. 497, 500, 74 S. Ct. 693, 695, 98 L.Ed. 884 (1954) 'that racial segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia is a denial of the due process of law guaranteed by the fifth Amendment of the Constitution.147

The plaintiffs, described as Negro parents, individually and on behalf of their minor children, also charged that

1. Racial discrimination by the defendant school superintendent and school board members not only deprive them of educational opportunities equal to those provided white students in the public schools in Washington, but also "foster and encourage the juvenile delinquency of the infant plaintiffs and their classes."

2. Racial discrimination is alleged to be effected through the use of a so-called "track system."

3. School district boundaries are gerrymandered.

4. Public revenues are used to improve public schools with predominantly white pupil populations.

5. Negro school teachers and Negro administrative personnel are discriminated against by defendant school superintendent and board members in work assignment and promotions. And finally . . .

6. School board members and the school superintendent are holding their offices illegally, being appointed by the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia pursuant to Title 31, District of Columbia Code, Section 101, which statute is said to be unconstitutional in that it places executive power and duties in the judicial branch of the government.\textsuperscript{148}

The compilation of this list of charges by plaintiff Hobson marked the beginning of a lengthy court case.\textsuperscript{149}

The petition gave Hobson an advantage in his battle because the school system would have to defend itself against the charges in the cases. The school system, which had been reluctant to answer Hobson's queries, now had no choice in the matter.

The charge cited last became the first complaint to be addressed because Hobson requested a motion for a summary judgment on the

\textsuperscript{148}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{149}Sections of this court case are found in 256 Federal Supplement 4, 265 Federal Supplement 902, 269 Federal Supplement 408 and 327 Federal Supplement 844.
matter. The plaintiffs asked that a three-judge District Court be convened, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2248, to hear and determine the action and to issue a permanent injunction restraining the judicial defendants from enforcing 31 D.C. Code § 101 and restraining the defendant board members and superintendent of schools from discriminating against Negro children and teachers in the administration of the public schools in the District of Columbia. 150

Arguing that it was unconstitutional for D.C. judges to appoint members to the Board of Education as required by the Section 31 of the D.C. Code, the plaintiffs were given a chance to be heard on the matter. Judge J. Skelly Wright decided that neither plaintiffs nor defendants had been able to cite a case in which functions similar to appointing a school board had been assigned the courts in the District of Columbia by Congress. 151 He also stated that "none of the cited cases considered the question whether a court in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, may, without violating due process, be required by Congress to appoint members of a board with duties unrelated to the judicial function, when in so doing the court may be called upon, as it is in this case, to sit in judgment, under its Article III power, of the actions of that board with respect to the constitutional rights of citizens." 152

151 Ibid., p. 7.
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Judge J. Skelly Wright, Circuit Judge assigned from the U.S. Court of Appeals because of the legal question concerning the District of Columbia judges, decided to refer the case to a three-judge court as requested by the plaintiffs.\textsuperscript{153}

On March 25, 1966, the three-judge court ruled that the actions of the judges in selecting board members was not unconstitutional as claimed by the defendants. Judge J. Skelly Wright dissented. His dissenting opinion was an attack upon Section 31 of the D.C. Code.

Stressing the point made in Brown that education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments (Brown versus Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686 L. Ed. 873 [1954]), Judge Wright continued by adding that "the power to control the character of the school board is a lever to affect the community profoundly."\textsuperscript{154} He argued strongly against the practice of D.C. judges appointing local officials by claiming a misinterpretation of the Constitution.

The court continued with plans to hear the next charges in Hobson versus Hansen. Hobson was willing to take the issue of the appointed school board to the Supreme Court. He did not have to go that far. Someone must have read carefully the judicial opinion of Judge Wright.

\textsuperscript{153}\textit{Ibid.} p. 8.
Soon afterward, the members of congress responsible for D.C. affairs sponsored a bill for an elected Board of Education for the District of Columbia. Losing a part of the court case had little importance in comparison with winning the jackpot in the end. What was important was the fact that citizens of the District of Columbia would have an opportunity to elect school board members for the first time since 1878. They would be the only elected officials in the city.

During Superintendent Carl F. Hansen's administration, Federal Judge George Hart, Jr., and his colleagues habitually appointed elderly Republicans of both races, creating a board of five whites and four Blacks who—except for an occasional maverick—complied with Superintendent Hansen's decisions.155 Previously the whites generally held a six to three majority on the board. By 1966, the majority of students in the D.C. Public Schools were Black, and as long as Board members were appointed, whites continued to hold the majority of the seats on the Board. Judge Wright cited the fact that judges had to spend valuable work time responding to issues related to appointing members to the D.C. Board of Education:

... In weighing appointments to the School Board, the District Court has frequently been beleaguered by the appeals of civic groups lobbying for or against candidates, or espousing standards for the court to apply in making appointments; the committee of the District Court judiciary which screens nominees has sometimes actively solicited recommendations. The court has been the subject of editorial commendation and rebuke, depending on the papers' estimation of the qualifications of the appointees and those of the judges to serve as public school overseers.156

The politics at this point become clear. It seems almost ironic that Judge George L. Hart, Jr., was the sponsor of the resolution presented in June of 1967 from 14 judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia which requested Congress to rescind the 61 year-old law requiring them to appoint members to the D.C. Board of Education.157

An act cited as the D.C. Elected Board of Education Act was passed on April 22, 1968. The new act, Public Law 90-292, authorized a school board composed of 11 members to be elected on a nonpartisan basis. Three members were to be elected at large, and eight members were to be elected from election wards established under Public Law 90-292.158

After a court decision rendered against plaintiff Hobson on the issue of the appointed Board of Education, both the judges involved and the Congress enacted a law which claimed its purpose:

Findings and Declaration of Purpose [Sec. 2] The Congress hereby finds and declares that the school is a focal point of neighborhood and community activity; that the merit of its schools and educational system is a primary index to the merit of the community; and that the education of their children is a municipal matter of primary and personal concern to the citizens of a community. It is therefore the purpose of this act to give the citizens of the Nation's capital a direct voice in the development and conduct of the public educational system of the District of Columbia; to provide organizational arrangements whereby educational programs may be improved and coordinated with other municipal programs; and to make District schools centers of neighborhood and community life.159

Julius W. Hobson, Sr., was one of the first D.C. citizens to collect petitions to run for the elected Board of Education. And, as was stated elsewhere, he won an at-large position with more votes than any of the other candidates. In January 1969, Mr. Hobson was sworn in as a member of the first elected Board of Education in Washington, D.C. He became the first elected official for the District of Columbia since 1878. However, the court case, Hobson versus Hansen, was not over yet.

The task now is to review the other charges in the court case. Those charges were (1) racial discrimination by the Superintendent
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and the Board of Education of the District of Columbia in the administration of public schools in the District; (2) racial discrimination . . . [which] deprive them of educational opportunities equal to those provided white students in the public schools in Washington [and] also "foster and encourage juvenile delinquency of the infant plaintiffs and their classes;" (3) racial discrimination . . . through the use of a so-called "track system;" (4) racial discrimination by gerrymandering school district boundaries; (5) racial discrimination by using public revenues to improve public schools with predominantly white pupil populations; and (6) racial discrimination in work assignments and promotions for Negro school teachers and Negro administrative personnel.160

Dr. Hansen and his staff were obligated to collect information for the court to answer the charges brought by Hobson. It took almost a year to hear all of the witnesses and to collect evidence from the schools. On June 19, 1967, the District Court Judge J. Skelly Wright held that Superintendent and Board, in the operation of the public school in the District of Columbia, unconstitutionally deprived Negro and poor public school children of their right to equal educational opportunity with white and more affluent public school children.161

Dr. Hansen and his staff were not completely surprised by the court's findings for Dr. Harry Passow of Columbia University in his in-depth study of the school system had identified and made recommendations for many of the issues in the court case.

Exactly what did the court order the school system to do? The decree issued by Judge Wright is as follows:

**DECREE**

It is ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that the defendants, their agents, officers, employees and successors, and all those in active concert and participation with them be, and they are hereby, permanently enjoined from discriminating on the basis of racial or economic status in the operation of the District of Columbia public school system.

It is FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the defendants be, and they are hereby, permanently enjoined from operating the track system in the District of Columbia public schools. It is FURTHER ORDERED that on October 2, 1967, the defendants file in the record in this case a report of their compliance with this order of the court.

It is FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that on October 2, 1967, the defendants herein file in the record in this case for approval by the court a plan of pupil assignment complying with the principles announced in the court's opinion and the instructions contained in the part styled REMEDY thereof.

It is FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the defendants, beginning with the school year 1967-68, provided transportation for volunteering children in overcrowded school districts east of Rock Creek Park to underpopulated schools west of
the Park. It is FURTHER ORDERED that on October 2, 1967, the defendants file in the record in this case a report of their compliance with this order of the court.

It is FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that beginning with the school year 1967-68, the following optional zones be abolished: Wilson-Western-Roosevelt; Cardozo-Western; Dunbar-Western; Gordon-MacFarland; Gordon-Banneker; Powell-Hearst. It is FURTHER ORDERED that on October 2, 1967, the defendants file in the record in this case a report of their compliance with this order of the court.

It is FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the defendants, beginning with the school year 1967-68, provide substantial teacher integration in the faculty of each school. It is FURTHER ORDERED that on October 2, 1967, the defendants file in the record in this case a report of their compliance with this order of the court.

It is FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that on October 2, 1967, the defendants file in the record in this case for approval by the court a plan of teacher assignment which will fully integrate the faculty of each school pursuant to the principles announced in the court's opinion and the instructions contained in the part styled REMEDY thereof.

It is FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the United States be, and it is hereby, invited to intervene in these proceedings to assist in the implementation of the decree, to suggest amendments to the decree, and to take whatever other steps it deems appropriate in the interest of public education in the District of Columbia. It is FURTHER ORDERED that the United States be served with a copy of this decree in the manner prescribed by Rule 4 (d) (4), FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE. The parties, of course, may suggest amendments to this decree at any time.162

---

In addition, the court required the school system to file a compliance report by October 2, 1967. Consultants were hired by the Superintendent to assist in developing the plans required by the Court. When the Board of Education refused to appeal the court decision with him, Dr. Hansen resigned. The responsibility for planning the compliance report fell to Benjamin Henley, Acting Superintendent.

The decree presented here represents only a small portion of the outcome of the case. The 1967 case decision is nearly 200 pages long. Thousands of pages containing evidence and testimony from both plaintiffs and defendants were submitted to the Court.

Another matter for concern was that courts traditionally had not acted on issues such as grouping of students. Issues of that nature were generally the exclusive domain of educators. Judge Wright was well aware of his step into new territory and expressed this concern before closing the case with the following:

It is regrettable, of course, that in deciding this case this court must act in an area so alien to its expertise. It would be far better indeed for these great social and political problems to be resolved in the political arena by other branches of government. But these are social and political problems which seem at times to defy such resolution. In such situations, under our system, the judiciary must bear a hand and accept its responsibility to assist in the solution where constitutional rights hang in the balance.\(^{163}\)

\(^{163}\)Ibid.
Judge Wright was not the only person to question the role of the court in school affairs. Others in both the legal and the educational arenas questioned the steps taken by Judge Wright. A discussion of this concern is included later in this chapter.

The Board of Education and its administrators had to respond to the decree. This was a new position for the school system. Long accustomed to conducting its business with little, if any, interference from any one, except a few parents, the system was now strapped by court orders that had to be executed.

The person urgently needed by the school system to implement the mandates in the decree decided to resign from his position. That was Superintendent Carl F. Hansen. Dr. Hansen had virtually run the school system alone for many years. He alone had decided which items to put on the agenda for the school system. For several years, he had been the target of Julius Hobson's attacks. Hobson perceived Hansen as a competent administrator, but he did not agree with some of his policies. Hobson protested loudly when Hansen was considered for reappointment to his position as Superintendent in March 1967. Realizing that he would probably not be allowed to speak during the Board meeting, Hobson had a friend, a Mr. David Ruff, request to speak that night. Mr. Ruff gave his five minutes to

---

165 Interview with Julius W. Hobson, Sr., 1973.
Hobson. The press reported that Hobson told Hansen that he had "consigned poor and Black children of the community to the economic and social junk heap." Hobson not only attacked the track system but also accused Hansen of spending more money on the rich white community across Rock Creek Park than on the poor Black community in the inner city. Mentioning the same charge of racial discrimination cited in his pending court case, Hobson pleaded with the Board not to rehire Dr. Hansen. Dr. Hansen had some other opposition but the vast majority of citizens who were concerned enough to express their views wanted Dr. Hansen to stay. So Dr. Hansen's contract was renewed, but after the court decision on June 19, 1967, and the Board of Education's refusal to appeal the decision, Dr. Hansen resigned.

Julius W. Hobson, who at one time was a member of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee, was now considered to be an arch enemy of the school system. Few educators realized that charges made against the schools by Hobson when he was working for CORE and NAACP were embodied in the Hobson versus Hansen case.

If Dr. Hansen perceived this continuity of purpose by Hobson, he chose virtually to ignore it. Opposed to the court's interference,
Hansen later gave the following as reasons for believing that Judge Wright's decision was not in the public interest:

1. It is a bad thing to use children to achieve social reforms that to date adults have been unwilling to accomplish.

2. It is the purpose of the schools to educate the young for adult decision making rather than to reconstruct society in the image of Washington's utopian dreamers.

3. The system of local control of public education has proved to be the surest guarantee of liberty, and court decrees that improperly vitiate such local control endanger American democracy.

4. From the utilitarian point of view the court has arrived at a constitutional conclusion that cannot be enforced, because it treats a symptom rather than a cause and is, in addition, so clothed in vagueness that no board of education can carry out the mandate without producing chaos.

5. All-embracing judicial decisions, as in the case of the Wright opinion, which circumscribe local control of education ought to be fully evaluated by the appellate courts, including the Supreme Court, before they become the law in any jurisdiction.

6. The Wright decision proposes a continuing exercise of control upon the D.C. Board of Education, and by citation to other jurisdictions that is limitless in time and scope, and hence is a threat to free public education, not only in Washington, but throughout the country, and not only now but forever.168

---

Dr. Hansen, aided by some of his friends on the appointed Board, filed an appeal but lost the case. Since the D.C. Board of Education did not participate in the appeal, there was little ground for Dr. Hansen, no longer the Superintendent but just a private citizen, to prove the charges or to answer the charges cited by the motion. Acting largely out of a concern to keep the school system out of unnecessary legal involvement, the court had taken the case so that there would be no further cause for redress from citizens about the decree in Hobson 1967.

Dr. Hansen had viewed the court case as an attack upon him personally, and in addition to filing to appeal the decision of the court, he wrote a book about his years in the city. Danger in Washington: The Story of My Twenty-Five Years in Washington, D.C. was written by Hansen shortly after he resigned as Superintendent of D.C. Public Schools. Many of the pages portray an angry man, but perhaps the best example is cited here:

The people who say that God is dead are wrong
He is currently sitting on the Federal Bench
in Washington, D.C. His name is J. Skelly Wright.170

Obviously dissatisfied with the court decision, Dr. Hansen attacked the changes required. While the changes perceived by Hansen

170Hansen, Danger in Washington: The Story of My Twenty-Five Years in the Public Schools in the Nation's Capital, p. 91.
were described as unworkable and unwanted by many citizens, he included one statement which even Hobson may have agreed with:

> Nothing has come upon the political horizon in this country more ominous and threatening, or possibly, depending upon the point of view, more promising than the new controls and changes affecting American public education contained in the Wright decision. A careful analysis of the effect of the sweeping Wright decision may be the foundation upon which the citizen may rebuild the crumbling structure of his inalienable rights.\textsuperscript{171}

The school system, now headed by Benjamin Henley, Acting Superintendent, was forced to move quickly. Mr. Henley had worked for the system for many years in various positions. He was the first Black to head a large urban school system, and the stress added to the system by the court order did not make his job any easier. A special task force was established to assist with the implementation of the decree. Plans were eventually developed and submitted to the court as requested.

Subsequent to the submission of data requested by the court and the implementation of approved plans, the school system appeared virtually to ignore the decision except during the period when Hobson was a member of the Board. Hobson, of course, constantly reminded the Board that it could no longer discriminate against students because of racial or economic circumstances.

\textsuperscript{171}Ibid., p. 96.
By September 8, 1969 the Board was discussing the matter of filing a motion to vacate the decree in the case of Hobson versus Hansen. The basis for the motion was that the Board had complied substantially with the 1967 decree. In view of all the discussion about the Wright decision during July and August of 1969, it is amazing that such a move would come from the Board. Hobson refused to participate in the voting on the matter. The motion passed. The Corporation Counsel had filed to vacate the decree with the consent of Board President Anita F. Allen. Mrs. Allen had also requested additional time in order for the Board to hold a special meeting with the court.

The last official board meeting attended by Hobson was January 21, 1970. A memorandum, "The Board of Education Proposes and the School Administration Disposes," was submitted by the outgoing board member. It contained a severe criticism of the way the school board had to operate in face of obvious limitations imposed by the administrators. Blaming administrators with failure to implement policies approved by the Board, he suggested that Board members would probably have to become experts in administration if they were going to ever be assured that their policies were implemented.

Specifically dissatisfied with the performance of Dr. William Manning, the new Superintendent he wanted replaced, Hobson asked his
fellow board members:

Look at the record of items in the transcripts of our meetings over the past year. They are all policy on paper. How many of these policy statements can the Board say are policy in fact?\(^\text{172}\)

Hobson, of course, was not the only member of the D.C. Board of Education concerned about administrative response to school policies. Hobson versus Hansen, 1967 was reviewed by several law schools. Those responses provided interpretations which school districts in similar circumstances could easily understand. For instance, the 1968 Harvard Law Review in the article "Hobson versus Hansen: Judicial Supervision of the Color-Blind School Board" predicted a major change in judicial involvement in school affairs. The following statements summarize the article:

The opinion of Judge J. Skelly Wright in Hobson v. Hansen may presage a period of increased judicial scrutiny of educational policies which although discriminatory in form and purpose, nevertheless fail to respond adequately to the educational needs of Negroes and other disadvantaged minorities. After closely examining the school system of the District of Columbia, the Hobson court provides remedies for a variety of educational ills. It orders the school board to reduce de facto segregation . . . These results are made possible by the court's adoption of a strict standard of review. The court holds that educational policies must be subjected to a thorough search for justification whenever they adversely affect a disadvantaged minority regardless of their nondiscriminatory intent.\(^\text{173}\)

\(^{172}\) Memorandum to the D.C. Board of Education dated January 21, 1970.

The *Albany Law Review* for the most part agreed with the Wright Decision. The one focal point for criticism was the court's rigid attitude toward the track system as a violation of equal educational opportunity for the Negro and poor children.\(^\text{174}\) The reason given underscored the fact that only the type of ability grouping used in D.C. was cited as a violation of equal educational opportunity and not ability grouping procedures in general. Quoting from Hobson versus Hansen that "even in concept the track system was undemocratic and discriminatory", and "... is undeniably an extreme form of ability grouping" the review stated that the decision was justified.\(^\text{175}\)

The reviewer was optimistic however, about what would happen in the District of Columbia in the following statement:

> Now the educators in Washington, D.C. must develop a system more compatible with the constitutional guarantees of the deprived. This in no way means that the quality of education previously offered to white students must suffer. It is generally acknowledged that when economic and educational improvements take place in a community, the I.Q. scores of children from the same community, and largely from the same families, tend to rise significantly. This encouraging discovery seems to demand the action taken in the instant case.\(^\text{176}\)


The Stanford Law Review explored two of the issues in the case and then discussed the connection between idealism and reality as they could be applied. The issue of de facto segregation was explored in relationship to the separate but equal theory. The review stated that if the rule of actual equality had to be used then what was under scrutiny was a right of critical importance, hence those responsible may be required to "alleviate disparities". But the remedy imposed by the court, allowing Blacks to be bussed to white underused schools was meaningless as remedy, stated the review, for the mass of children subject to the deficiencies of slum schools so amply documented by the court.

The constitutionality of ability grouping was viewed as an effort by the state to classify its citizens. The District had erred when the method used [the track system] was judged to be inaccurate because for many students placement was based on traits other than those on which the classification was supposed to be based.177

The review also claimed that the court had no way to really be sure that implementation of the remedy occurred. It suggested that the court should have insisted on better educational programs and improved facilities. Noting the gap between everyday realities and court ideals, it further states that the decision raised as many questions as it settled.178

178Ibid., p. 1250.
The *North Carolina Law Review* examined the legal and constitutional issues in the case, the practical effects of the decision on the D.C. school system, and the impact of the decision on the national level, particularly as it relates to the development of educational policy in the urban public schools. The separate but equal theory and the matter of an equal educational opportunity v. equality in the distribution of resources were discussed as they were applied by Judge J. Skelly Wright in this case.

The review stated that the primary area in which the opinion would have national impact was in the present day civil rights movement. The argument of integration or separate and equal facilities was the basis of this opinion.

Critical of the way Judge Wright interpreted some of the facts in the case, this review claims that the judge prepared to go to the Supreme Court with the matter. The claim is made that the decision was intended to be a catalyst for change on the national level and to spruce action in legislative bodies and school systems which had long bypassed the problem of de facto segregation. The review concluded that there was an "inherent rigidity" in the case concerning the attitude about integration that was out of tune with reality.

---

Peter Rousselot, an attorney was hired by Julius Hobson to represent him when he returned to court with Hobson in 1971. He was already familiar with the major issues of the case because he had indicated this when he authored a long article, "Achieving Equal Educational Opportunity for Negroes" in the George Washington Law Review. The Hobson case had been referred to several times in the Rousselot article. Hobson had carefully chosen someone whose philosophy was similar to his on the schooling issue.

Hobson versus Hansen, 1971

During the year that Hobson was a member of the Board of Education he made numerous requests of the school administration in an effort to see if the court order was being followed. There was a Board committee assigned to oversee implementation of the court decision. With Hobson serving as chairperson, the committee often requested information. It sometimes took a long time for the school system to amass the requested information. At one point, the administration submitted data which had not been analyzed. Hobson requested that they keep it until someone interpreted it for them. Minutes of Board meetings

---

reveal that the struggle for information continued. The search for information on this period led to a complicated chart devised during this period to obtain information for the committee.

No one in authority had information on the status of issues related to the court decision; in fact, no one had been given that task in the school administration. Hobson's frequent requests and the administration's response to those requests led him to believe that the system was out of compliance with the court order of 1967.

On May 19, 1970, a few months after Hobson left the Board of Education, he filed an amended motion for both further relief and enforcement of the 1967 judgment and decree in the Hobson versus Hansen decision.\textsuperscript{183} He noted that in the face of an existing injunction against further racial and economic discrimination in operation of the school system, examples of such discrimination were significantly prevalent.

Evidence to reopen the case showed that the D.C. elementary schools which had 74% white enrollment had 15.5% smaller pupil-teacher ratios and 9.7% greater teacher expenditure per pupil than did elementary schools which had 98% Black enrollment.\textsuperscript{184} Despite conten-

\textsuperscript{183}Hobson v. Hansen, 327 F. Supp. 845.
\textsuperscript{184}Ibid., p. 844.
tions that such discrepancies were beyond the defendants' control for technological reasons, the Court again eventually ruled in favor of the plaintiffs.

This time it was ordered that per pupil expenditures for teachers' salaries and benefits in no elementary school should deviate, except in cases with adequate justification, by more than 5% from mean per pupil expenditure for teachers' salaries and benefits at all elementary schools in the District. The order was based on the request made by Hobson and his lawyers. The concept of equalization was in the court order of 1971 as desired by Hobson and his associates to insure that such discrimination would not creep into the system again.

By this time, Judge J. Skelly Wright was beginning to tire of this continuing and complicated case. He reprimanded both defendants and plaintiffs for allowing their lawyers to adjust statistics to reach preconceived results. In an attempt to find a workable remedy, Judge Wright emphasized the responsibility of the Court in the matter. He cited the 1967 case in which he had stated that:

If whites and Negroes, or rich and poor, are to be consigned to separate schools, pursuant to whatever policy, the minimum the Constitution will require and guarantee is that for their objectively measurable aspects these schools be run on the basis of real equality.

---

185 Ibid.
186 Ibid., p. 859.
Referring to the opinion of law section in the 1967 case, Judge Wright made reference to Section III, Separate But Unequal. From data collected in 1967, the court discovered that the median per pupil expenditure in the predominantly Black elementary schools had been a clear $100 below the figure for predominantly white schools and $182 below the schools west of Rock Creek Park.188 In 1970, Judge Wright had been faced with the problem of what to do about an even larger increase in the difference between expenditures for Black and white schools.

Analysis of Hobson 1967 revealed that the subject of equality in the distribution of educational resources had been discussed at length during the court hearing. One of the complaints in the case had been that the school administration repeatedly favored white schools west of Rock Creek Park, while shortchanging schools primarily attended by Blacks and especially the Black poor.189 From testimony submitted to the court, discussions on the following areas were included in the Judge's findings:

1. Age of buildings
2. Physical condition and educational adequacy
3. Library books, libraries, and librarians
4. School congestion

188 Ibid.
5. Quality of faculty (experience, education and the matter of temporary teachers)

6. Textbooks and supplies

7. Per-pupil expenditures

8. Curricula and special programs, and

9. Individual schools in transition (from white to Black majority).\(^{190}\)

Careful analysis of the data revealed in each of the categories listed above that where students were poor and Black, they were getting fewer of the resources available. Judge Wright, however, did not agree with the plaintiffs who saw this as discrimination. Instead, he concluded that

The causes of the inequalities are relatively objective and impersonal. School officials can be faulted but for another reason: that in the face of these inequalities they have sometimes shown little concern. It is one thing to be precise when crowded residential conditions shut Negro children and them alone out of kindergarten in the nearby schools; it is something else when school officials acquiesce in the situation once it arises by standing passively by, circulating promises of more adequate school buildings years hence.\(^{191}\)

Familiarity with economic theories helped to heighten the awareness of Hobson on this issue. Whenever the issue of distribution of

---

\(^{190}\)Ibid., pp. 431-441.

\(^{191}\)Hobson v. Hansen, 269 F. Supp., p. 442
resources in public education arose, Hobson took note. Perhaps re-
membering the inadequate educational facilities for Blacks in Alabama,
Hobson had once said;

I became . . . very angry about the whole
question of the distribution of resources in
public education. The Americans for Democratic
Action and CORE decided that they would do a
joint study called the CORE-ADA paper. We
charged discrimination based on race as a
reason for distributing money and teachers,
supplies, books and equipment and proved it.
I sat on the Superintendent's Advisory Board
at that time. When we finished the report,
we presented it to him, hoping that he would
take it into consideration. However, like
most advisory boards, the Board proposes and
the politicians dispose. So they just took
it and put it in the wastebasket.192

And so it was no surprise to those familiar with the 1967 Hobson
case that equalization was the critical issue in 1971.

Examination of the files of the Board of Education revealed that
little on equal distribution of resources went to the Board for
action. A file system is maintained by the D.C. Board of Education
in important matters. From 1968 to 1973, only three file cards were
available on the subject of equalization. On one card, under the
heading "Equalizing Schools," it revealed that a report was made to
the Board on plans to redistribute materials, supplies, and equipment
to coincide with enrollment shifts resulting from boundary changes
adopted by the Board. That was on May 15, 1968. On the same day,

192Contee, "The Politics of Educational Decision-Making for K-12
the Superintendent was supposed to schedule a conference to discuss equalizing schools. This conference was supposed to discuss the quality of the instructional program in all schools by September 1968. On June 26, 1968, a progress report on equalizing schools was made to the Board. What happened in 1969 is discussed later.

A new Superintendent of D.C. Public Schools was appointed to replace William Manning, the educator from Michigan who came after Carl Hansen resigned. The equalization plan which was presented by Superintendent Hugh J. Scott involved the mass movement of teachers. The Board of Education later ordered the Superintendent not to move any teachers or students for equalization compliance until he could present a plan which guaranteed advance notice to any pupil or employee affected by movement under the plan. That order was given on November 15, 1972. The next notation in the file is for December 28, 1973, at which time the President of the Board of Education was to assign the problem of "equalization" to a standing committee of the Board or to appoint an ad hoc committee to work on the problem.

Then there was another notation of a memorandum issued on November 21, 1972. This was all after Hobson went back to court for further relief on his original petition. The file noted that Board directed the Superintendent to update files on "equalization." The Superintendent was ordered to remove salaries of teachers on leave

---

193 Teachers were involuntarily transferred to other schools. Many were moved during the middle of the school year. Protests came from the Washington Teachers Union and principals. See the Appendix.
for a year or more from the equalization plans which were submitted to the court. He was also directed to submit to the court all information available and to give a report on its progress.

The matter of a plan for equalization also merited mention again in the Board of Education files. On that card, dated July 6, 1972, it was revealed that the Board had directed the Superintendent to prepare an "equalization plan" based on teachers' salaries. A preliminary projection of the plan was to be presented at the regular July board meeting. The Superintendent was also requested to inform the court of the Board's intention to equalize all funds from the regular budget at the elementary level by September 1973. The next notation is dated March 21, 1973. A progress report on an alternative equalization plan was presented to the Board for its information. Another report was given to the Board on June 4, 1973. There were no other notations on an equalization plan, although plans were submitted to the court each year after that time.

Evidence indicates that neither the Board nor the administration took the concept of equalization of expenditures seriously until 1971 when the court order was handed down. The school system was so sure that it was in compliance and could dispose of the matter that it attempted to get the court to vacate the 1967 decree in August 1969 on the basis of substantial compliance by the Board with the Wright decree.194

194See reference to D.C. Board of Education files dated 8-22-69, in the Appendix.
Hobson refused to agree with this step although the Board could have moved without his consent or knowledge of the matter. Hobson disqualified himself when Mrs. Swaim, Board of Education member, made the motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Rosenfeld. The motion passed. Hobson ended his year on the Board and then took immediate steps to petition the court again.

A closer examination of compliance with the court order must be undertaken. The school system developed plans for compliance with the 1967 court order in the following areas: (1) the cessation of discrimination based on economic and social factors; (2) bussing on a voluntary basis; (3) the abolition of optional zones; (4) the integration of faculties; and (5) the abolition of the track system.\textsuperscript{195}

The plans for compliance in area 1 showed evidence of the awareness of the need to do something about inequality in the school system. A task force was set up to deal with the problem. It is not clear what steps were taken between October 1967 and August 1970. Proposals were made, but there is little evidence that such procedures were ever enacted by the school system during that period.

The lack of such evidence was one of the main reasons Judge Wright cited as cause for finding the school system in violation of the 1967 decree when Hobson went back to court in 1971. The court

had deferred any specific remedy for inequalities in per-pupil expendi­
tures in the 1967 decree because it had assumed that compliance
with other items would have had a secondary effect on the system and
remedied the situation.196 As this did not happen, the school system
found itself bound by a continuing equalization order in 1971.

An Office of School Equalization established in May 1968, had
been given specific objectives. Those objectives were:

(1) to promote equal distribution of personnel, supplies, textbooks, and equipment in all secon­
dary schools according to enrollment projection resulting from school boundary changes

(2) to coordinate the efforts of principals in order to insure that the curricular course offer­
ings selected by secondary pupils were equally available in any school that they might attend

(3) to coordinate with the D.C. Transit System, incorporated ways and means of providing efficient transportation of secondary school pupils in the 1968-69 school year; and

(4) to coordinate efforts of secondary school principals in order to provide adequate orienta­
tion programs for pupils, parents and communi­ties affected by the changes in secondary school boundaries.

After completing this assignment, the School Equalization Office was
abolished on November 30, 1968.197

If the school system had been able to accomplish the tasks listed above with a larger degree of efficiency and had maintained adequate records, the 1971 court case might not have been initiated. But the proposals and projects referred to in the records must largely have been conceptual or very ineffective. If records of such actions were presented to the court, they were not accepted by Judge Wright.

At one point, after the 1971 equalization court order, Julius Hobson was given permission to establish an office within the confines of the school administration to assist them in the implementation. Hobson actually moved into an office in the school headquarters to help the administration. He complained that persons with statistical ability were not available to assist him. After receiving funds to accomplish such a task, Mr. Hobson became ill in late 1971. His illness prevented him from completing the establishment of procedures which he hoped would guarantee compliance with the court order for the school system.

After Hobson's illness was diagnosed as terminal, Bettie Holton, an employee of the school system, almost singlehandedly dealt with the issue of equalization. She worked without an assistant for several years. It is no surprise that progress in this direction was slow. It took all of Miss Holton's time to try to keep the schools in compliance with the 1971 court order. There was neither sufficient staff nor money available to fully support the task.

---

198 Interview with Hobson in 1973.
An understanding of this 1971 equalization order is vital to this entire study. Analysis of this decree will reveal the design developed by Hobson and his lawyers to guarantee some measure of equality in the spending of school funds.

In 1971, Hobson made a specific request for the equalization of school expenditures, and it was granted by the court. The court was very specific in its instructions to the school system. Following is a copy of the 1971 court order handed down by Judge Wright.

Wherefore it is ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that:

1. On and after October 1, 1971, per-pupil expenditures for all teachers' salaries and benefits from the regular District of Columbia budget (excluding Title I ESEA funds, UPO funds, and in general, all funds not from the regular congressional appropriation) in any single elementary school (not administrative unit) shall not deviate by more than five percent from the mean per-pupil expenditure for all teachers' salaries and benefits at all elementary schools in the District of Columbia school system as that mean is defined in this paragraph. The five percent limit may be exceeded only for adequate justification on an individual school basis shown to this court in advance. 'Adequate justification' shall include provision of compensatory education for educationally deprived pupils at certain schools or provision of special educational services for the mentally retarded or physically handicapped at certain schools or for other 'exceptional' students. It shall also include a showing that variance above or below the five percent limit is accounted for solely on the basis of economic or diseconomies of scale. For purposes of this order, the 'mean' shall be computed after excluding from the computation total expenditures for all teachers' salaries and benefits and total average daily member-
ship at all schools for which permission to exceed the five percent limitation because of compensatory education or education of 'exceptional' students is sought and granted.

2. By October 1, 1971, by June 1, 1972, and by October 1 of each succeeding year thereafter, defendants shall serve on plaintiffs and file with the clerk of this court information sufficient to establish compliance with this order for equalization of perpupil expenditures for all teachers' salaries and benefits. At a minimum, such information shall include, in tabular form for every elementary school (not administrative unit), data in the following categories: (a) name of school; (b) income level of the neighborhood from latest available United States census data; (c) average daily membership; (d) total number and percentage of students of each race as of a date not more than 30 days preceding the filing deadline; (e) building percentage over and undercapacity and surplus or deficit of seats based on data filed in answer to category (c) above; (f) total number of teachers (for purposes of this calculation the only teachers to be included shall be those whose salaries and benefits are included in items (j) and (k) below; (g) pupil-teacher ratio (item [c] divided by item [f]; (h) total operating expenditures from the regular District of Columbia congressional appropriation only; (i) per-pupil operating expenditures from the regular District of Columbia congressional appropriation only; (j) per-pupil expenditures for all teachers' salaries and benefits from regular District of Columbia congressional appropriation only; (k) total expenditures from impact aid funds; (m) per-pupil expenditures from impact aid funds; (n) total expenditures under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; (o) per-pupil expenditures under Title I of ESEA; (p) total expenditures from UPO funds; (q) per-pupil expenditures from UPO funds; (r) total expenditures from all sources; (s) per-pupil expenditures from all sources. The tabular form shall also include the mean as defined in paragraph 1 above, together with the upper and lower dollar bounds from that mean computed by adding to and subtracting from that mean five percent of that mean.
3. In each report filed and disseminated pursuant to the requirements of paragraph 2 above, there shall be prominent and specific identification of the respects, if any, that the methods of computing the data in that report differ from the methods used in computing the comparable data for the preceding year.

4. At some future time, the Board and the school administration may adopt specific, measurable and educationally justifiable plans which are not consistent with the present order. At such time, upon a prima facie showing that the plans are reasonably designed in substantial part to overcome the effects of past discrimination on the basis of socioeconomic and racial status the court may modify the present order.\textsuperscript{199}

The matter of how this order would be implemented was left to the discretion of the Board of Education and the Superintendent. The method chosen was selected from alternatives developed by consultants hired by the school system. The process as mentioned earlier has centered upon the transfer of teachers to maintain compliance with the order. This method has resulted in chaotic school openings and some teacher dissatisfaction. Confined by the court order and without a suitable alternative to present to the court, the D.C. Public School System was faced with a real dilemma then and is still trying to resolve the matter.

A ray of hope was spotted on the editorial pages of the \textit{Washington Post} on March 26, 1977. Former Superintendent Vincent E. Reed planned to present to the Board of Education a proposal which would equalize all basic services and class sizes throughout the city school system.

\textsuperscript{199}Hobson v. Hansen, 327 F. Supp., pp. 863-864.
from pre-kindergarten through high school. There is a critical need for this type of plan. If this is done, the efforts of Julius W. Hobson, Sr., who died on March 23, 1977, may result in additional tangible gains for the poor students in the D.C. Public Schools.

Member Of The Board Of Education — 1969

In 1962, when Hobson became an elected member of the D.C. Board of Education, it had become evident that he was serious about the welfare of all students in the public schools. True to form, he continued his colorful rhetoric, but hoaxes on the public declined. However, the ability to analyze issues resurfaced and greatly assisted him in efforts to work with the Board. He was in the position to oversee the efforts of the school system to implement the remedies imposed upon it by the 1971 Court decree. No longer in need of attention-getting gimmicks, he approached his tenure on the Board with the demeanor of a researcher and an economist. He was the first elected official in D.C. in many years and that was quite an accomplishment to him.200

This was a critical period in the development of Hobson's understanding of the school system, how it operated in relation to

200During the interview with him in 1973, he pointed this out as one of his major accomplishments.
other local government agencies, the functions of the Board of Education, and what was really being done for the students in the school system.

A microstudy of Julius W. Hobson's behavior while he was a member of the D.C. Board of Education indicates that his strategies changed as he developed. His strategies became more sophisticated and legitimate. He did not have to create attention getting gimmicks for recognition from the community. His intent and ardor remained constant.

After winning an at-large position on the newly elected school board in the fall of 1968, he was both optimistic and naive about what the board could actually accomplish. He first promised that the new school board would be more open in the conduct of its activities than previous boards had been. Then he observed that whoever knew the school administration and understood school business would have the real power on the board.

In answer to a query concerning the relationship of the Board of Education to the appointed City Council, Hobson stated that Joseph Yeldell (a member of the appointed D.C. City Council) was probably the most excellent public official in town but that:

... We must get one thing straight. If we [The Board of Education and the City Council] have a joint meeting, we will set the time and place for it. We won't let the atmosphere be set by a bunch of Johnson-Nixon appointees.
As the first elected officials in 90 years, we won't be at the beck and call of Mayor Washington—he'll be at our beck and call. And if they [federal officials] feel we will march peaceably to the concentration camps, they have another thought coming—otherwise it would be no longer respectable to be alive.201

Hobson would discover before the year was over that nothing was quite so simple as it appeared in the local bureaucracy and its politics. He would experience great frustrations when attempting to get information needed to make decisions with the rest of the Board members. Information from the city government and school administration was usually delayed.

Eager to share with the citizens a perception of the role he would play as an elected official, Hobson told the press;

I don't have any intention, not the slightest thought, that I am now a member of the power structure. I'm an interested citizen who's interested in education. When they voted for me, they weren't voting for any change in my methods—if they were, they were wasting their votes. I haven't run across any whites, even in my work in the federal government, who require me to be an Uncle Tom. Negroes just assume that role.202

---

201 Washington Star, 8 November 1968.
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Confident with knowledge of the nature and scope of this new challenge, Hobson set out to do the required homework. His first move was to get an expert from one of the universities to provide all board members with a history of boards of education, their purposes, limitations, powers, and a distinction between policy-making and administration. His handling of this assignment was an early indication of how Hobson would carry out his future responsibilities on the Board. He refused to operate without the data needed for action on the issue, and repeated requests were made to administrators for necessary information.

In January 1969, shortly after the swearing-in ceremony for the newly elected members, Hobson discussed some questions he had prepared to present to the entire board. Supposedly, the questions were designed to persuade a majority of the members to look at the schools in the same way that his lawyers persuaded Judge J. Skelly Wright to look at them in 1967. The questions were to provide a framework for general decision making by the new board as well

203 Interview with Hobson, August 1976.
as a standard to be used when the board began to make decisions on money, teacher and pupil distribution across the city. One of the first questions was how much is spent per-pupil in each elementary, junior high, and high school. Finding that those averages were not made public, Hobson wanted the administration to answer. His concern was that most of the school board's discretion with funds was in the area of special projects and experiments. The other funds could not easily be shifted, so he wanted to know that money was not being wasted but was going where it was needed. The other questions were similar in nature. The act of formulating such in-depth questions was another indication of how Hobson planned to operate as a board member.

Much of what Hobson planned to do as a board member created a continuous conflict with board member Anita F. Allen. Their disagreements soon became the "main attraction" during the public meetings. Both Hobson and Allen wanted to be President of the Board. Allen had been a member of the appointed Board. Neither Allen nor Hobson were able to get sufficient votes to become the President,
so the position went to Reverend James Coates, with Allen as Vice President. Both Hobson and Allen were dissatisfied with the election of Reverend Coates and they did not attempt to conceal their feelings about each other. Sharp exchanges between them during board sessions drew constant attention from the press. Being the only elected body in the city, their antics fed the misconceptions that many had about self-governance by citizens of the District of Columbia.

Because Hobson was not able to control the Board as he had probably envisioned, the stage was set for a new strategy. The strategy was to use his research skills and dialectic approach to problems to overwhelm other board members and the school officials. Board meetings, which traditionally devoted much time to management problems, grew longer as questions flowed from Hobson on almost every issue presented. Discussion among members of the Board was excessive and sometimes heated.

The first official meeting of the D.C. Board of Education was a masterful example of how newly elected members of boards of education operate. Treading in territory almost completely foreign to them, the members had to absorb a great deal of information or become overwhelmed by it. For Hobson, this meant that he would have to expend enormous amounts of energy to be an effective board member.
Because they had been insulated from meaningful public scrutiny for so long, school officials appeared to be unprepared or unwilling to meet the demands of the elected board. They were already hostile toward Hobson because of Hobson versus Hansen, 1967 so feelings toward board member Hobson were somewhat prejudiced. Outward resistance to Hobson's queries was minimal, but a more deadly type of resistance was obvious in the lack of action on or the very slow responses to inquiries by the Board. There is evidence of this in the transcripts of the Board meetings for the first six months of Hobson's tenure.

During the first regular Board meeting, which was held on February 19, 1969, Hobson's concern with the 1967 court decree manifested:

Mr. Hobson: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

President Coates: Mr. Hobson.

Mr. Hobson: I know at the last meeting of the Board there was an item mentioned in which we said that we were going to get rid of racist books; that we were going to concern ourselves with books that are racist books. Now, as far as I am concerned, the racist book is a book that has not Black pictures in it or does not include Black people in it, and I would just like for Mr. Manning [D.C. Superintendent between Carl F. Hansen and Hugh J. Scott] to point out any one of these books on the list and tell me something about it. You have got a whole big list of books here. Are there any racist books that you know of or any books on there that do not have Black pictures in them, ...
flect Black experiences or would be counter to the resolution passed at the last Board meeting about the students?

Dr. Manning: Well, I think, first of all, Board Member Hobson ...

Mr. Hobson: Just pick out any book.

Dr. Manning: I am sure there would be a division of opinion.

Mr. Hobson: Just answer my question about whether or not there are racist books in here. Can you make a statement that there are not racist books in here, Dr. Manning?

Dr. Manning: I do not believe that there are any racist books in these.

Mr. Hobson: Have you looked at them?

Dr. Manning: Not every one. [1] Based recommendation on a textbook committee report.

Mr. Hobson: Could I continue my line of questioning please?

President Coates: It might be that we would want to hear from the committee about these books.

Mr. Hobson: I would like to hear something.

President Coates: Alright.

Mr. Hobson: Is there anyone present from the committee who would vouch for this textbook list?

Discussion — Reading of excerpt by Mrs. Taylor — Reads reference to the South in 11th grade text giving out of date attitudes about the South and Blacks.

Mr. Hobson: In light of what Mrs. Taylor has just read and since we do not know how many books are in this list like this, I think that we ought to table it until there can be some kind of an examination of these books. I have looked through some of the books myself, which I do not think it is necessary to look at here, and I would say that they are just as bad in some other areas. I would like at this point to sug-
until we find out about some of the books on here. Mrs. Taylor was too nice to say this, but that is sickness that we are handing out here, and how many of these books on the list are like that, and if we comply with this book it would be a contradiction of what we passed at the last Board meeting and the student resolution. So, I would like to move that this be tabled, pending an examination by a committee appointed by the chairman to look at these books more carefully.

The motion to table pending the report from the committee (all hands raised excepting Mrs. Allen).

President Coates: The vote is ten and one. The motion is carried.

Problem of textbooks, especially social studies, is discussed by Dr. Manning.

President Coates: The purpose of the committee is to determine the extent to which by number, by appropriate indication of authority in title and other pertinent data, what books there are on the list which in the opinion of the committee are racist by definition. 'Racist' is defined as any book that does not have reference to the participation of Black experience in the world.

With the aid of Dr. Sessions, who had requested the report, and Mrs. Mattie Taylor, Hobson persuaded the Board to form a new committee to examine all textbooks before taking final action on the report from the committee. Pointing out the availability of textbooks which contained the "Black experience," Hobson added that he was about to publish a book on Black history in March of 1969.
The meeting continued with Hobson firing questions to the Superintendent and his staff on almost every item on the agenda. During following meetings, the same approach to agenda items was used. Unafraid to express ignorance on many matters which appeared before the Board, Hobson continuously hammered at the Board for information to assist members so that they could make intelligent decisions.

If school administrators were concerned about the new position of Hobson, they did not display their distress. Larry Cuban, then Director of Staff Development for the D.C. Public Schools, stated:

I was Director of Staff Development between December 1968 August 1970. Not once in staff meetings with the Deputy Superintendent, the number two man in the system, was the Wright decree an agenda item. Only in July 1970, when the court ordered the Board to supply memoranda, was I directed to compile data about compliance with the decrees.

---

206 Ibid. The researcher had access to the actual transcripts of the first six months of meetings by that first elected D.C. Board of Education. The regular minutes are mainly summaries of events and discussions. The discretion of the executive secretary of the Board is powerful in terms of how board members are portrayed in those minutes.

207 Additional excerpts on that meeting and others are in the Appendix I.

As a member of the Board of Education, Hobson was limited in what he could do about the implementation of the decree, but he reminded other board members constantly of their obligation to comply with the decree whenever it was deemed appropriate.

With the elected Board of Education came a new phenomenon — community meetings. Eager to listen to members of the community express their concerns about the schools, the board agreed to hold meetings in the various school election wards once a year. The community meetings became the arena for obnoxious behavior for many dissidents in the city. Having never had the opportunity before to speak so freely to education officials, some of the citizens behaved outrageously. Shouting, cursing, screaming — everything but actual fistfights — took place during those meetings.209

Washington had never seen its Board of Education so viciously attacked by citizens. Hobson, who appeared to switch roles from legitimate board member to civil rights activist, now had a chance to view the plight of powerless citizens from another perspective.

209The community meeting at Evans Jr. High School that year was used by citizens and teachers to expose the administration of that school. Pictures and damaging information was presented to the Board. That meeting was the beginning of a series of events which led to the dismissal of the principal of the school. I know because I was a faculty member at Evans Jr. High School that year.
Several newspapers commented that it was time for Hobson to make up his mind which side he was going to take. The *Washington Post* and the *Washington Daily News* wrote editorials on this issue. Hobson had been on the Board of Education for less than one month when these editorials were printed.  

An excerpt from the *Washington Post* editorial follows:

> Julius Hobson appears to be undergoing some sort of identity crisis. Is he, as he used to be in years gone by, a relentless foe of the educational establishment, forever charging, lance leveled, like a contemporary Don Quixote, at the windmills of School Board complacency? Or is he, as many who elected him to membership on a democratically chosen School Board hoped he would become, a public official accepting responsibility and seeking to influence policy through persuasion and leadership?

The editors of the *Washington Post* should not have expected the traditional Hobson persuasion and leadership strategies. Hobson was still the activist.

The *Washington Daily News* editorial staff did not review the statements uttered by Hobson when he was elected, or they would not have written the following:

---

210 Board of Education members were sworn in during the last week of January 1969.

Few people were in a position to do as much for the District of Columbia this year as Julius Hobson, the man who, as a private citizen, changed for better or for worse the whole shape of the public school system and who now, as an elected school Board member and therefore an integral part of that system he helped create, seems bent on helping it fall apart.

Mr. Hobson wants the schools to start teaching the Swahili language and other African culture courses at once, without further study or delay, and if they don't, he says, 'I'll go to the schools and urge the children to strike.' ...Mr. Hobson's barbaric yawn begins to pall. He keeps saying he wants to get on with the serious business of educating children, which is, after all, what schools are for. We congratulate him on grasping the basic principle. If he thinks it can be accomplished by encouraging children to rebel against the school establishment, of which he, himself, is a major part, then we think he is badly mixed up.212

Julius Hobson had stated in November 1968, after winning one of the at-large positions, that he had no intention of changing his outlook or his methods.213 He had kept his word thus far but the press was looking for a different man. Hobson had gained a new position which he used to be more effective as an activist, but basically he was still the same person.

During a board meeting in May 1969 when the issue of dissension among board members was discussed, Hobson's response to the matter was

213Evening Star, 8 November 1968.
... Unity in the name of unity can be stupid. We aren't trying to be unified. We are trying to get to the heart of the matter. I'm not interested in peace and tranquility. You can be stupid and kill people in the name of peace and tranquility and unity.

We want to unify on issues to educate children and not just for the case of presenting a front to the this community.

Sure you got the sense and you got eleven different minds. So you're going to have dissension in this kind of Board if you're going to have a Board worth itself. We ought to unify when educating but we should not sit up here and present an image of a lie of being together on all issues. You don't need us as a Board if we do that. We all have minds and we all think.214

Board Member Hobson did not appear to lose sight of his major objective, namely, to encourage the school system to accommodate the needs of poor and of Black students. Conflicts among board members continued during meetings. Hobson was adamant in conveying the attitude that disagreement was not a crime. He believed that it was important to deal with critical issues and to leave personalities out of discussions if possible.

Following are some excerpts taken from the transcripts of the Minutes of Board of Education meetings for the year during which Hobson was a member:

214Board of Education Minutes, May 7, 1969, p. 75.
On responding to community concerns--

We have here, Mr. Chairman, the community. Now, we can always get around the community with Robert's Rules of Order. So let's take up this business about Takoma [new school facility] if we want to have a Board meeting. All of this crap about rules! You can always find a rule to get around it. Let's take this up tonight if we are going to have a meeting. Otherwise, we won't have a meeting.215

On the Government of the District of Columbia--

... And it is a good and legal argument about whether or not we should request the District Government to do this. I would hope that we can move with this motion as it is and let the District Government take the initiative here.

I think this is a confrontation which appears to me to be necessary with District Government if the Board of Education is really [being] the only elected body, is really going to represent the people.

I am opposed to going to 'Nixon's boy' and asking him anything in connection with the D.C. Public Schools.216

On the Wright decree--

I am speaking now to the motion to reallocate the money. May I point out to the Board, for what it is worth, the danger of voting not on the reallocation of money, but the allocation of money in the light of the fact that we are functioning under a decree which points out to us that it is unconstitutional to pour money into areas that may be richer than others areas in the city. We have an unequalization in this city.

... I would merely caution the Board of Education that technically if you vote to allocate funds, without knowledge of where they are going or what the economic conditions are, how much money is already spent there, you would be in contempt of court. 217

On receiving grants for D.C. Public Schools—

I am curious about this acquisition of $22,000. Is there any procedure about who solicits money for public education in the District of Columbia? Who authorized for you to seek $22,000 from the Meyer Foundation? [to Mr. J. Weldon Green] What is the policy, Mr. Superintendent, on soliciting funds? What would keep me from going out tonight, soliciting $50,000 from a private foundation in the name of the District of Columbia Public Schools? There must be some regulation on that ... I really think we ought to have some clear-cut policy on who can ask for money in the name of the public schools.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think I need a motion. Could I ask you to ask the chairman of the Legal Committee to give us a policy statement on acceptance of funds or the resource policy statement on acceptance of funds? 218

On the issue of a formal observance to honor Dr. Martin Luther King and Malcolm X in the public schools—

217 Ibid., p. 49.
218 D.C. Board of Education Minutes, March 24, 1969, pp. 33-44.
I would like to amend it. Martin Luther King was a great boy and I am for him and I have got other heroes myself, and I am sure there are other heroes here who made equal contributions who are dead—Malcolm X for one—and I would like to amend that to include the memory of Malcolm X, who made a tremendous contribution to this whole question of Blackness. He is not a popular hero because he was not understood. But in proper circles, certain circles, he is indeed alive...

Hobson's persistent stance on equity in the allocation of available resources was seldom relinquished. He requested and received volumes of information on the operation of the school system during this period. Dissatisfaction with the progress made by the school system toward implementation of the decree that resulted from Hobson versus Hansen, 1967, sent him back to the courts in 1971. For Hobson, 1969 had been a year of intense observations and data collection.

The year as a board member was spent largely in an almost desperate effort by Hobson to insure that the Wright decision was being implemented. Unaware that he would lose his bid for reelection in the fall, Hobson pursued this course as if the job had to be completed right away. As Chairman of the Committee to Study Implementation of the Wright Decree, Hobson was not impressed with

\[219\]Ibid., p. 53.
efforts made by the school system to comply with the court order. In July 1969, Hobson sent a scathing memorandum to the other members of the Board of Education. He warned the members in a memo of the danger they were in:

It is apparent from this preliminary data that the school administration has failed or refused to implement what is now the law of the District of Columbia—the Skelly Wright decree in the Hobson v. Hansen case upheld by the United States Court of Appeals. I can not begin to impress upon the members of the Board of Education the danger of functioning outside the law.220

The committee established to oversee the implementation of the Wright decree never met weekly, either with the full Board of Education or alone. Sufficient information to act upon was simply not forthcoming from the administration. The newly elected board was heavily taxed by the time and effort required of them. Board meetings were more frequent than they had been when the members were elected and they lasted much longer.

Hobson, who was chairman of the Committee to Study Implementation of the Wright Decree, devoted a great deal of time to issues related to the court case. Working with him on that committee was Edward Hancock and Mattie Taylor. Hobson came to committee meetings with

220Memorandum from Hobson to the Board of Education, July 7, 1969. See Appendix.
agendas and proposals already written, just as he did at Board meetings. The committee, however, was stymied by the lack of response from school administration. They were either very slow in responding, or when they did, much of the information provided was found worthless by Hobson.

Interest in special projects and funds from sources other than the regular budget led to the development of a massive study which undertook to describe all special projects in the school system.221 Never before had the D.C. Public School System been so knowledgeable about the distribution of special budget funds. This collection of data assisted Hobson in identifying additional inequities in the allocation of resources in the District of Columbia.

Statistical reports had been submitted to the Board by the school administration, but Board members could not correctly assess the information because of the difficult language and the lack of analysis and recommendations. The Board moved on to other matters when promises from the administration that data control, hence distribution of books, equipment, and supplies, would improve.

In September 1969, Hobson pointed out to the other Board members that although there had been ample opportunity to implement the Wright

---

221Tables referred to were too large to reproduce for the appendix. Copies were found in the Office of the Superintendent of D.C. Public Schools. Bettie Johnson, a long time employee in the Superintendent's office shared them with the researcher.
decision, nothing had been done. He also added the following:

There has been a division set up to deal with the Passow report, but not the Wright Decree. The Wright Decree dealt with the question of distribution of books—that has not been corrected. It dealt with the question of expenditures per pupil—and that has not been corrected. It dealt with the distribution of equipment and supplies, and that has not been corrected.222

While Hobson was accusing the school system of failing to implement the 1967 court decision, some others blamed him. Anita Allen said that the committee never returned a report or recommendation to the Board during the year he was a member. Evie M. Washington, Hobson's replacement on the Board, also said that there had been ample time to move on the matter.223 A different perception of the situation however, caused Hobson to return to the courts.

Impact of Hobson versus Hansen on D.C. School Policies

The political systems operating in the environment were discussed in the previous sections of this chapter. The influx of demands by Hobson and other environmental factors placed a great deal of stress upon the D.C. Public School System during the decade under discussion. The demands by the court for the D.C. Public School System to provide

222D.C. Board of Education Minutes, July 26, 1969, p. 15.
223Evening Star, 16 February 1970.
an annual report of compliance forced the school system into the
development of policies acceptable by the court. Hobson, who declared
himself to be a Marxist economist, had agitated the school system for
information about how funds were distributed in many areas. In some
instances, he had received the answers.

Outputs or results of such actions have been translated into
many school policies. Vincent E. Reed, Superintendent of schools in
D.C. from 1974-1980, produced a plan which he thought would be the
acceptable alternative plan the court said it would accept from the
school system. The document cites specifically those policies in
operation which were developed because of the Hobson versus Hansen
cases. The plan, "An Alternative Plan for Equalizing Educational
Resources" is cited in a memorandum to the Board of Education as a
plan [which] meets the criteria of the court that it be "specific,
measurable and educationally justifiable" and "reasonably designed to
overcome the effects of past discrimination on the basis of socio-
economic and social status."

The document, which is divided into 2 sections, presents a list
of administrative and legislative actions which have already been
enacted for compliance with the decree in Hobson versus Hansen.
Following is a list of major areas of policy impacted by the 1967
decree as cited in the document:
The plan was clearly rejected by the court - if it was ever submitted - because the school system continues to submit the required annual reports. The lengthy document does more to explain what Hobson versus Hansen has already caused to happen than anything else.

The plan fails to detail the what, when and how components which should be a part of any plan considered for acceptance by the court. The constant criticism that the school system must comply with Title I guidelines as well as the court demands is apparently not a good reason for the court to remove itself from the role of monitor for the school system.

CHAPTER V
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The conceptual framework suggested by Meranto assisted in the identification of people and events which influenced the actions of Hobson. It is difficult to verify causal relationships with a great deal of scientific confidence in a case study. However, there were several major factors which appeared to influence Hobson. These factors were; (1) his childhood and young adult life in Birmingham, Alabama, (2) his acceptance of some of the economic theories he studied at Howard University in the early 1950's and (3) his high regard for research and statistics to support his observations.

Life in Birmingham, Alabama, for a young Black male during the 1920's and 1930's was justification enough to question seriously the meaning of his existence in this country. An early move was to become a lifetime member of the NAACP. This organization provided insight into the legal approach to fight racial discrimination. At an early age, he also became acutely conscious of the inadequate and inferior schooling he had received. He became increasingly aware that he was educationally unprepared to compete with students from better schools. During the first interview with Mr. Hobson, he said that he had aspired to obtain more formal education, but the lack of skills to complete
a program at American University successfully had changed his mind. Analysis of his protest and court actions reveal an almost personal concern that all students receive the best public school education that could be offered to them.

A concern almost always present was for equity in the allocation of available resources for students. His last significant endeavors concerning the schools involved the equity and quality of education. The equalization court order of 1971 and the educational accountability act sought by Hobson in 1977 are both tangible indications of this concern.225 He agitated the school system until it responded to the concerns he had about equity and quality in education.

For the purposes of this study, agitation is defined as the composite of those things Mr. Hobson did to force the school system to respond. Perusal of the literature on Marx, socialism, and communism will indicate common usage of this generic term. The "agitation" probably evolved as a result of Hobson's acquaintance with these materials he read while working in the Library of Congress or as a graduate student.226 Just as Hobson used the term in a very general way, so it is used in the literature reviewed on Marx. Deeper analysis reveals that the term could mean any number of strategies used by radicals or revolutionaries to achieve desired objectives.

225See Appendix for excerpts of the Education Accountability Act of Hobson's which was introduced to the City Council in January 1977. 226Analysis of the last taped interview with Hobson revealed the term "agitation" as his description of most of his strategies. After the cancellation of several appointments by his office because of illness, efforts to contact him again were not made before he died in March.
In addition to the personal aspects, other conditions in the environment which are cited as circumstantial conditions, in the Meranto framework [as depicted in figures 1 and 2 on pages 164 and 165] affected Hobson.

Circumstantial Conditions

1. Affects of the Brown Decision

The 1954 Brown Decision provided Hobson with the "equal educational opportunity" issue. The 1954 case which initiated the "equal educational opportunity" phrase, became a cornerstone for the major legal arguments used by Hobson when he went to court in both 1967 and 1971.

For instance in the 1967 case the decree states on the first page that the District Court, J. Skelly Wright, circuit judge held that [the] Superintendent and Board, in operation of the public school system in [the] District of Columbia, unconstitutionally deprived Negro and poor public school children of their right to equal educational opportunity with white and more affluent public school children. The basic question in the 1967 Hobson case and in the 1971 Hobson case centered upon equality of all available resources for public school students.

Even the interpretation of the phrase was broadened by Hobson versus Hansen. Instead of resorting to busing, as many districts had to do, the District of Columbia which has an almost all Black student population had to equalize teachers, supplies and all of the other
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resources referred to in Hobson I and Hobson II.

Hobson, who had already spent a lot of time trying to desegregate public places and to eliminate racial discrimination in housing and employment took advantage of the opportunity to use his time to search for inequalities in the public school system. Then he sought legal means to correct the inequalities found.

2. The Civil Rights Movement

The civil rights movement of the 60's was a training vehicle for Hobson. He moved from one activist group to another and even found several of his own to do that which he felt was necessary. Experience gained while picketing, boycotting, organizing, rallying and using the media became ordinary acts for Hobson.

The Urban League, CORE, the NAACP, ACT and ADA were some of the organizations with which Hobson became involved. During this period, Hobson was so involved in various movements that even the FBI sought him out for information. However, following Hobson's public complaints about FBI harassment the FBI declared that Hobson himself should be under constant surveillance.227

3. D.C. Public Schools 1953-77

The D.C. Public Schools were undergoing dramatic changes during this entire period. To the extent that was possible, D.C. Public

227Tina Hobson, his second wife, stated that Julius frequently spoke of his civil rights discussions with FBI agents while working for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
Schools became integrated. Communities were so firmly patterned in segregated units that it was difficult to integrate very much. Dr. Carl Hansen, Superintendent of Public Schools developed the infamous tracking system to help alleviate problems encountered after integration became necessary. Enrollments of schools which were previously for white students began to swell with large numbers of Black students. D.C. Public Schools enrollment became 99% Black during this period. This pattern is just beginning to change.

With the election of the Board of Education in 1968, more black citizens became members. A Black Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Hugh J. Scott was chosen in D.C. for the first time in 1971. The push for homerule in D.C. increased with the founding of the D.C. Statehood Party. Hobson was the founder of this party and used it to move to a seat on the first elected city council in 1974.


Many other Blacks in the city were able to move to higher positions in government and private industry. Although a large number of Blacks remained impoverished, it was not nearly as bad as it had been before. Food, housing and health subsidies made it possible for them to exist with better health and more self-respect. Opportunities tied in with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made some of these changes possible. Hobson, along with many others had demanded an end to the discriminatory acts which prohibited poor people from an opportunity for better employment, housing, and education.
Other groups in the city were simultaneously demanding many of the same changes sought by Hobson. But it was Hobson whose persistence and willingness to stand up and demand to be heard that made for some of the difference in the response from the power-structures in D.C. Hobson, who acted virtually alone, had no difficulty with initiating a legal case when he felt the need. Other groups used collaborative strategies to try to bring about change.

This study has attempted to isolate and analyze a particular portion of Hobson's behavior, that segment most directly related to his activities with the D.C. Public Schools. Examination of those behaviors were integrated into an assessment of his impact on the D.C. Public Schools.

The results were placed into two major categories: (1) Hobson's strategies, and (2) the policies of the D.C. public schools system which resulted from such actions.

**Conclusions**

The most important question addressed in this study is how Julius W. Hobson, Sr., made such a dramatic difference in the operation of the public school system of the District of Columbia when other people and groups had expressed concerns similar to those he articulated with little or no results. The answer to this question surfaced when two tasks were completed. First, during an interview with Mr. Hobson, he identified his main strategy as that of "agitation." Before the researcher could meet again with Hobson so he could elaborate on his personal conceptualization of this term, he died. The
second task was to conduct a careful analysis of the other interviews and the vast amount of related data with the intent of identifying the strategies concealed within the term "agitation."

It was the constant agitation, the variety of strategies used by Hobson, which made him more effective in his assault upon the school system than others had been. His strategies ranged from those which could be labeled simple, ordinary, or uncouth to those which were sophisticated and complex. It was this sustained effort, countered by a variety of strategies, that separated Hobson from the other individuals or groups that sought to change the tracking system and other policies of the school system.

His success can partially be attributed to the idea that Hobson never considered himself to be too middle-class to use whatever tactic he thought, would suit his needs. It did not matter to him as much what people thought, as it did that they did think about what he was doing. Thus unrestrained by real or imaginary limitations, Hobson was free to employ whatever strategy he could find to fit the circumstances. An exhaustive list of activities by Hobson was the inevitable result.

Because Hobson did not impose social restrictions upon his activities, he was sometimes shunned by members of the Black "middle class" in the District of Columbia. However, he was embraced by white liberals and other activists in the area. This lack of restrictions did not mean that Hobson engaged in immoral or illegal activities. It simply meant that he used all of the ordinary strateg-
ies such as letters, meetings, and picket lines as well as threats, coercion, profanity, and the courts to get his views across to school officials.

Sensing the lack of organization and coordination of activities within the bureaucratic structure, Hobson decided to show school officials exactly what he had been arguing for and expecting to happen as a result of Hobson versus Hansen, 1971. He obtained permission to establish an office in the school headquarters. His efforts to work with Dr. Hugh J. Scott's administration to show the school system how to stay in compliance with the court order was brief. It was during this period that he became ill.

One of the research objectives of this study was to identify the strategies used by Hobson during the period under investigation. The case study methodology assisted in the identification of strategies used by him in his persistent involvement in school affairs. It also included the intensive examination of many public documents, minutes of the D.C. Board of Education meetings and the lengthy Hobson versus Hansen court cases. Interviews were held with Mr. Hobson and other individuals active during this period to assist in clarifying issues that arose during the research process.

The strategies were identified as actions taken by Hobson during the period under investigation. When listed together, his actions can surely be described as "agitation" of the public school system. Each of the strategies will be discussed in relationship to the research questions and objectives presented at the beginning of this study.
1. **Organized picket lines**

Hobson did not hesitate to organize picket lines to protest Board of Education actions. Board minutes, of course, do not reflect any action of this nature, but through conversations with Hobson and others, it was affirmed that on several occasions, especially during the tenure of Dr. Carl F. Hansen several lines were organized. The renewal of Dr. Hansen's contract as Superintendent was one issue that prompted such action from Hobson.

2. **Disorderly conduct**

Public records of the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Police Department indicate that Julius W. Hobson was arrested on several occasions. Metropolitan Police records show that Hobson was arrested for disorderly conduct in July of 1965. Conversations with Hobson indicate that he was arrested at that time for jumping on a table during a Board of Education meeting to protest an action of the Board. Arrest records indicate nothing except the time and cause of the arrest. This occurred during the height of the controversy over Dr. Hansen's reappointment. Before Hobson's frequent appearances, Board meetings were never the scene of such outrageous demonstrations by citizens. His was the beginning of a long series of arrests for similar acts by other citizens during Board of Education meetings.

3. **Exhortations**

Research efforts revealed many speeches that were capable of inciting strong feelings or actions during the 1960's. Hobson was
keenly aware of the power of speech, and he often relished in the fact that he "could whip up a crowd" without great effort.

During a Board of Education meeting on March 15, 1967, Hobson spoke out against the reappointment of Dr. Carl F. Hansen as Superintendent of D.C. Public Schools. Speaking directly to Dr. Hansen, Hobson said, "I want to say to you, Mr. Hansen, that you have consigned the poor and the Black children of this community, through your basic and your general tracks, to the economic and social dump heap." This statement became the by-line for articles in every newspaper in the city. Although it was expressed differently on other occasions, Hobson continued to criticize the tracking system used in the public schools until it was abolished by the Hobson versus Hansen case in 1967.

4. Collaboration with organizations

Hobson joined the NAACP while still a young man. When he later became a member of the Urban League and CORE, he used these organizations to help him challenge the city and the school system over the education of youngsters. His concern with education led to his dismissal as President of CORE. He later organized ACT and the Washington Institute for Quality Education to further assist him.

5. Threats

Hobson's threat to lead students and citizens in a massive boycott against the school system was one of his hoaxes that he hoped would work. They drew the attention of the press and the educators. Apathetic citizens were his real target, but he was never very
successful at organizing large numbers of citizens. The "Seven Days in May" scare tactic drew attention from the entire city. A couple of hundred of people rallied on the grounds of the Washington Monument that day to hear some speeches, but it did not draw thousands of people as Hobson had predicted.

Hobson would not only threaten school officials, but he would go as far as to do whatever he said. He was not always successful in getting the Board to change by using this strategy.

6. Positions with establishment organizations

Early in the 1960's, Julius W. Hobson, Sr., became a member of the Superintendent's Citizens Advisory Council. There are no records available as to what the council accomplished, but it is known that Hobson became disgruntled after sitting with this group for a while and quit. He also worked with PTA's in his community in an effort to improve the schools. In addition Hobson became a member of the Police Advisory Commission. Somewhere along the way with these groups, Hobson decided that he would not be able to accomplish much. Records indicate that he was very concerned then with inequities he saw in the distribution of resources and with the lack of response from the school system administrators. But the purpose of such organizations indicated to him approval of the status quo — not the implementation of radical change in the school system.

7. Congressional hearings

Hobson was the force behind Adam C. Powell in 1965 when hearings were held to investigate the effects of poverty on the schools in the District of Columbia. He encouraged other citizens to join him in
requesting this hearing in hopes that he would collect enough evidence to build a court case against school administrators. Not only did he use a congressional hearing to collect adverse testimony about the schools, but later also appeared before Senator Mondale's Committee on Inequalities in School Finance to present testimony, some of which he had used in Hobson versus Hansen, 1967.

8. Research on issues of concern

Hobson sometimes inflated statistics in order to get changes in hirings and promotions for Blacks, other minorities, and the poor, but he was usually prepared with substantial evidence. A need for statistics to present as evidence to the authorities was always present. Hobson refused to take word of mouth reports from school officials. He knew that the officials would have to scramble to come up with the requested statistics. On occasion, when the statistics were presented minus an analysis and recommendations, Hobson showed much displeasure.

9. Judicial procedures

When Hobson decided to file for legal action against the D.C. Public Schools System in 1966, he had been engaged in agitating activities for many years. The move to the judicial system was a big one. He had decided that picketing, sit-ins, threats, and everything else had not caused the slightest concern among the educational establishment for citizens concerns. He was totally committed to the idea of winning his case. Even when he returned to court in 1971 to petition for further relief in the case, Hobson was self-
assured that the school system was out of compliance with the order of 1967. Hobson versus Hansen, 1967 and 1971, led to several critical changes in the D.C. Public Schools System. The changes were discussed in the sections on the court cases. The full impact of Hobson has not been fully explored by anyone yet. There is reason to believe that additional research will reveal many other areas affected by the decree.

10. Election to the D.C. Board of Education

The decision by Hobson to campaign for a position on the D.C. Board of Education in 1968 was not a surprise to anyone. The irate citizen was now going to have the opportunity to sit on the other side of the table during Board meetings. After an easy victory—he was the only candidate who did not need a run-off election—Hobson eagerly anticipated his new position. Many so-called "radicals" abhor the establishment and refuse to leave the ranks of activist or agitator, but Hobson insisted that he would not change his attitudes and actions. Analysis of the minutes of the Board meetings during the year indicate that he kept much of his word. Newspapers accused him of not knowing which role to play, but Hobson insisted that the people who voted for him did not ask him to change into an "Uncle Tom." "If they did," he said, "they had wasted their votes."

There were occasions during this time that the meetings became heated and police were called in to help maintain order. But the meetings during this historical first year of an elected School Board were mild in comparison with meetings witnessed by the researcher
during the administration of Superintendent Barbara A. Sizemore, which came several years later. Citizens, no longer content to sit and wait for recognition by their representatives, were quick to disrupt meetings and to demand recognition for their concerns. Hobson, however, had no problem dealing with activists such as Rufus "Catfish" Mayfield and others when they clamored for attention. In fact, it was the action of this first elected Board which created "Community Meetings" of the Board of Education. But during that first year, the Board of Education listened to citizen grievances and responded when they could. Analysis of Hobson's actions on the Board reveal his critical concern for equity in the business dealings of the Board. As is documented in Chapter IV of this study, Hobson played the role of agitator in insisting that the Board always remember that it must consider the economic effects of its actions upon the entire system.

11. Use of Personal Resources

It was not until after a decision in Hobson versus Hansen was made and the case became widely acclaimed that Julius Hobson began to receive financial assistance of any substance. Several legal organizations, such as the Young Lawyers for Civil Rights, provided assistance to Hobson for virtually no financial compensation. Attorney William Kunstler and his assistants were probably paid nominal fees. Hobson borrowed initial funds for his case from a local finance company. Eventually, he was to spend nearly $25,000 on his court case, much of it his own money. During an interview with Hobson in
August 1973, when he supposedly had less than six months to live, a collector from the finance company came to pick up some money. Hobson explained that he had gone to the finance company because no bank would have given him the money he sought. Hobson used his government retirement to help establish the Washington Institute for Quality Education.

12. *Acquisitions of Resources from Private Organizations*

During the summer of 1969, Hobson was given a grant of $30,000 to establish and operate the Washington Institute for Quality Education. It was not established who gave Hobson money, but Edward Hancock, a board member who served on the Committee to Implement the Wright Decision with Hobson, said that Hobson showed him and fellow member Mattie Taylor two checks for $15,000 each. The money was used to aid Hobson in overseeing the implementation of Wright decree. The Institute was established in a small office in southwest Washington, D.C.

Funds from several other sources were applied to earlier lawsuit costs: Hobson obtained $8,000 from the Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia and $10,000 from a wealthy supporter, Patricia Saltenstall. Controversy over both grants arose, but Hobson did not have to return the money.

13. *Founder of Associated Community Teams (ACT)*

Hobson's rejection by CORE in 1964 prompted him to organize his own group, Associated Community Teams. This group remained small,
with Hobson at the center of its operations. While it was considered an extremely radical group at the time, its main strategy was to deceive Hobson's opposition. It was a front for speeches, letters, demonstrations, and attention in general. However, it worked just as Hobson wished. No longer backed by legitimate groups willing to let him decide most of the moves, Hobson created his own organization. He was able to move on any issue he wanted to oppose or to support without fear of reprisal from his associates.

14. Publications

The Damned Children and The Damned Information are cited as examples of strategy used by Hobson. The semantics make the titles eye-catching. "Damned" children and "damned" information have two very misleading titles. The contents are actually directed toward citizens who could follow in Hobson's path if they truly desired to create change in their communities. One publication is about schools and information, while the other explained the Freedom of Information Act.

15. Expert Consultants

In an effort to make decisions based upon reliable information, Hobson sought assistance from personnel at some of the leading universities in the country. With citizen activism a popular movement at the time, this was not a difficult task. Hobson was now well known in certain academic circles. He requested a study on the role of boards of education when he first began to serve on the Board. He later requested help with his legal and economic problems with the
school system. The public schools had to rely mainly on personnel untrained in the kind of planning and management information the university people possessed.

16. Working for the D.C. Public School System

During Superintendent Hugh J. Scott's administration, Hobson convinced the Board of Education that he could develop a formula or plan to insure constant compliance with the 1971 court order. He obtained permission from the Board and a grant from some organization to finance the project. He was actually working with the school administration for a brief period to develop such a formula, but his terminal illness surfaced at this time. The Board was emphatic about not hiring Hobson, but it did give him the opportunity to move inside the system to begin to test his theories.

17. Hiring of foremost attorneys

The hiring of William F. Kunstler to head the team of lawyers working on Hobson versus Hansen was a strategic move. Kunstler was already one of the most sought after attorneys for cases involving civil rights. With additional legal aid from both Black and white lawyers who knew the city and the issues, Hobson must have calculated that Kunstler would almost surely win the case.

Before Peter J. Rousselot came to represent Hobson in 1971, he had done extensive work in the area of de facto segregation and had written about the issue in law journals. Not many ordinary citizens have the privilege of the careful selection of legal representation that Hobson used.
18. **Election to the City Council in the District of Columbia**

Julius Hobson advocated full statehood for the District of Columbia. Residents of the city were not allowed to elect governing officials until the Home Rule Act was passed in 1974. That act provided for the election of City Council members. Although ill, Hobson campaigned from his wheelchair and won an at-large position. He became chairperson of the Education and Youth Affairs Committee.

19. **Manipulation of the media**

The media was always ready to respond to Hobson after his tirade of boycotts, picket lines, and hoaxes concerning discrimination in employment and housing during the 1950's and early 1960's. Hobson called press conferences, issued statements, and wrote editorials in the major newspapers in the city. Hansen called him "a creation of the media." Hobson carefully manipulated the press when he could.

The ability to use the press to his advantage is one of the major reasons that he often succeeded in his efforts to obtain coverage for almost any issue he tackled. Hundreds of pages of coverage were devoted to Hobson and his antics in the local newspapers. The activist who dared to question any official on matters concerning civil rights was given television and press coverage in excess of that given to the officials he agitated. The school issue was probably the one given the most coverage.

20. **Legislation**

The following legislative items related to education were enacted as a result of Hobson's initiative:
1. An Act for an elected Board of Education for Washington, D.C., in 1968

2. The Educational Accountability Act—a proposal for the D.C. City Council, 1977

3. The School Cost Center Reporting Resolution, proposed for D.C. City Council, 1977

4. The Home Rule Act for the District of Columbia received a lot of backing from Hobson and the Statehood Political Party he is credited with founding.

21. Public pressure

It became obvious during the search for these strategies that public pressure played an important role in determining the success of Hobson's strategies which he identified as psychological and guerrilla warfare. He was given the name "The Great Gadfly" in a series of articles in the Washington Post. He was evasive and secretive about his meetings and his plans. Some of this was intentional and some was not. But for Hobson it worked in many cases to get public attention for issues he was concerned about.

In spite of the variety of strategies developed and used by Julius Hobson to deal with the school system, it is difficult to assess them. Assessment of the court case depends on one's point of view. Surely, changes have taken place in terms of supplies, equipment, and better educational facilities in impacted areas of the city. But many people—both professional and nonprofessional—argue that the watchdog effect on the 1971 decree has hampered progress in the city. Joan C. Baratz in "Court Decisions and Educational Change: A Case History of the D.C. Public School, 1954-1974" concluded;
While the courts have not been able to radically transform educational practices, they have provided the forum in which questions of fundamental importance to the ultimate nature of our public educational system have been debated.228

There are still many D.C. citizens who are not given the educational assistance that should be available to them. A new plan for the allocation of resources will be of little value if citizens teachers, and school administrators do not jointly plan for the best use of the resources.

Parents are still being denied access to meaningful information on what is happening in the public schools. They continue to receive ambiguous home reports on student progress. D.C. students are still behind similar students on national standardized tests.

The system must respond to the various educational philosophies of each new superintendent. There is just effort enough from many career employees to assure that they will continue to remain in permanent, tenured positions. Instructional and fiscal accountability continue to be concepts to be dealt with at a later time.

What is needed is an active citizen group to check on the operation of the school system. Ideally members from this group would comprise the D.C. Board of Education. This would change the posture of the board from that of corporate executives overseeing an empire to responsive activist leaders safeguarding quality equal

education for all of the children of the District of Columbia.

But in reality, it is the local administrators and teachers who are left to perform the daily duties which can make a difference in the education of the students. Efforts are being made to improve the situation, but in the District of Columbia you literally need acts of the U.S. Congress to make many decisions for D.C. residents.

Julius W. Hobson, Sr. and the politics of education in Washington, D.C., amply merit special study. How many individuals can be pointed out who have assumed so many roles; that of parent, Board of Education member, consultant, plaintiff in a major court case against the school system, chairman of the Education and Youth Affairs Committee of the D.C. City Council, and more within a 10 year period? Another citizen with involvement of this quality and quantity cannot readily be found in the District of Columbia.

The nature of Hobson's involvement also makes him unique. Always an agitator for better education, Hobson's use of outlandish as well as ordinary strategies seems to have given him the chance to keep the school system on the defensive. It is fairly easy to attack or to criticize any number of traditional bureaucratic organizations and institutions in our society today and to find legitimate grievances. When a traditional bureaucratic organization is placed in a defensive position, unless it is unusually adept at management, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to collect adequate legal justification for some of its practices. So it was with the D.C. Public School System during the period of this study.
The view of social scientists that changes imposed on an organization or system from outside are not likely to be accepted seems to be somewhat true in this case. Although the court order mandated overt compliance, resistance to accept the changes remained noticeable within the schools for a long period of time. Hopefully the move by former Superintendent Vincent E. Reed to equalize all basic resources in the schools will facilitate the court order of 1971. The court order has already had the school system moving in that direction since 1972.

Less than five years ago, the Superintendent of the D.C. Public School System, Barbara Sizemore, advocated shared decision making at every level of operation in the school. She advocated two major ideas which were (1) the administrative team concept for top officials in the system and (2) the idea of a partnership of parents, administrators, the community, teachers, and students (PACTS). Those concepts are no longer mentioned, and substitutes for them have not been developed. Except for some fragmented effort by local administrators, the ideas have been pushed aside. Important decisions continue to be handed down to local schools and parents.

This action or lack of interaction or consideration eliminates a vital access route to participation in educational decision-making. Parental involvement in the schooling of the majority of students in D.C. Public Schools is needed if the students are expected to improve their academic skills.
Parents of students in the District of Columbia now have far more access to school officials and opportunities than they had when Hobson first became involved in the 1960's. But if that access is still in meaningless roles and areas, then more quality access is needed.

Recommendations For Further Study

1. There is a need to collect data from Judge J. Skelly Wright, former superintendents, especially Carl F. Hansen, to compare and contrast their perceptions of Hobson's influence on the District of Columbia Public School System.

2. There is a need to examine other major city school systems to see if other persons, similar to Julius Hobson, have had the same kind of impact or to determine if Hobson was a unique individual.

3. Some other actor or group of actors should be the focal points of other studies on the D.C. Public School System during this same period of years to determine whether the impact of Hobson on the school system remains consistent when other actors are the primary focus.
Epilogue

On March 23, 1977, Julius W. Hobson, Sr., died of cancer. Thus passed one of the most colorful personalities in the history of civil rights activism in Washington, D.C. His record stands as testimony to his devotion to the cause of racial and economic justice and human dignity. Seldom does a man who has chosen civil activism as a life's work combine daring excellence and intelligence in the achievement of progress for his people. If there is a formula for civil activism, then certainly Julius was in possession of it.

In spite of the cancer that was slowly killing him, Hobson, founder of the D.C. Statehood Party, ran for the City Council in 1974. He won an at-large seat on the new governing body and became Chairman of the Committee on Education and Youth Affairs. From this position, Hobson continued to push for better schools and education in the District of Columbia. A few days before he died, he sponsored several bills in the City Council that requested fiscal accountability from the schools. He also wanted the citizens of the District of Columbia to have the opportunity to petition for the recall of elected officials if they felt that this was necessary, and such a bill was pending when he died.
A. Excerpts from Minutes of D.C. Board of Education Meetings
BOARD DIRECTS SUPERINTENDENT TO SUBMIT ANALYSIS OF DATA AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION WITH REGARD TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WRIGHT DECREES, AND THAT HE BE EMPOWERED TO SECURE LEGAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Hobson presented a report of the Committee on the implementation of the Wright Decree in memorandum form stating that he had been unsuccessful in calling a meeting of the Committee but had met with Mr. Roots and the memorandum had been read by Mr. Hancock. Contained in the report is a proposal for summer implementation of the Wright Decree.

(Enclosure 4)

A motion was made by Mr. Hobson and seconded by Mrs. Swaim that the Board adopt the report of the Wright Decree Committee with the exception of the first two paragraphs at the top of page two, relating to scheduling of meetings.

Mrs. Swaim asked whether the Superintendent had any parallel proposals or any specific suggestions about how to proceed with the textbook reform. Also if her understanding was correct that principals were due back to their post of duty on August 18 at which time they are to prepare the plan which was proposed and approved the previous week.

The Superintendent replied that most principals and directors were on vacation at the present time and would not be available. The matter had been explored in terms of getting some additional personnel in the summer to do some of the work.

The Superintendent added that there had been a plan that was adopted by the past Board of Education for the implementation of the Wright Decree. That proposal had been made by the Administration, presented to the Board of Education, and the Board of Education acted upon it. The Administration had been adhering to that policy matter relating to the implementation of the Wright Decree and consequently, each month there had been some statistical reports prepared.

With respect to the data on textbooks, equipment, etc., the Superintendent stated that the Administration was in the process of preparing for the Board's consideration a proposal to indicate the redistribution of some of the equipment and books; also to do away with some of the obsolete books, as well as those books that are patently racist.

Mrs. Swaim was also informed by the Superintendent that he hoped to have the textbooks redistributed by next September. He added that with the data processing equipment, there will be much better control of equipment, books and supplies.
Mrs. Allen stated that the Committee had sent to the members of the Board from time to time very thick documents of figures and statistics, but with no analysis or specific recommendations. It was her contention that it should now be put into narrative form giving the meaning and analysis of the data. Specifically, she wanted to know whether or not the Administration had been analyzing the facts which had been turned over to them and if the Administration knew what the figures meant.

The Superintendent replied that it was his hope that the data would have been presented to the Board of Education by the Committee with some analysis made by the Committee, and he understood that was being done. In addition the Administration would then be able to make some reaction to it.

Mr. Hobson pointed out that there had been opportunity to implement the Wright decision, but nothing has been done about it. There had been a division set up to deal with the Passow report, but not the Wright Decree. The Wright Decree dealt with the question of distribution of books -- that has not been corrected. It dealt with the question of expenditures per pupil -- and that has not been corrected. It dealt with the distribution of temporary teachers, and that has not been corrected. It dealt with the distribution of equipment and supplies, and that has not been corrected.

Mr. Hobson said that the reports of the administration are reports promised.

In reply to President Coates’ question as to what is meant by equalization as suggested in the report citywide; were there justifiable differences between a vocational school and an academic school or an elementary and a secondary school, Mr. Hobson answered in the affirmative. He added that elementary is compared with elementary; high schools with high schools; junior highs with junior highs; and vocational schools with vocational schools.

President Coates stated that it was this type of question that he would like answered on the analyses of data.

Mrs. Allen commented that the Board had to concern itself not with just equalization of books, material, and equipment, but equalization of opportunity, and so far as she was concerned, that would automatically mean an unequal distribution of books, materials, equipment, and quality teachers, because educationally disadvantaged children in the city would require far more expenditure per pupil than the children who are more advantaged.

The other concern, Mrs. Allen continued, was not only the legality or illegality of not following the Wright Decree, but also the illegality of equalizing school expenditures using categorical Federal aid. The Board is subject to court order if that is done.
So, Mrs. Allen said, she would like to see an analysis of the data, since it is evident that there are uneven allocations of resources.

A substitute motion was made by Mrs. Allen and seconded by Mr. Rosenfield that the Board employ a Civil Rights type educator to assist in the analysis of these data as soon as possible.

Mr. Hobson stated that the Board had set up a Committee to do an analysis and he had primarily asked in his memorandum that the School Administration get started on the matter of redistribution of books at once in order to be ready for the start of school in September. At this point in time, the school administration does not have a plan to do anything about the redistribution of books. The Board of Education should direct the Superintendent to implement this plan or substitute another plan to do something about equalizing books.

President Coates asked Mrs. Allen if the substitute motion would preclude adoption of the report of the Committee as presented tonight with respect to recommendations and equalization of textbooks.

Mrs. Allen answered that she did not know on what basis the Superintendent would be equalizing. She said the books that have been bought with Title I ESEA funds must stay in the schools that are Title I ESEA schools and if, in equalizing, redistribution was made of those books that would be in violation of the law.

Mrs. Allen said the sense of her motion was to reconfirm the Board's intent to implement the Wright Decree and to direct the Administration to do the same and to bring in as soon as possible outside expert assistance to work with the Administration in developing an interpretation of the data and make recommendations to the Board for action.

Mr. Hobson stated he could not understand why the administration did not have the people who could interpret their own data.

In reply to Reverend Coates' question, Mr. Hobson stated that he had not looked into the question of categorical funds in terms of the law, however, the Federal Government, regardless of the funds it provides, could not contribute to the inequity and discrimination which the United States Court and Court of Appeals have said existed.

Mrs. Swaim stated it was her understanding that it was the responsibility of the School Board for making up the difference that may or may not be created in the school system by the use of Federal funds in areas that have heavy concentration of deprived children. She said she was interested in seeing the Board follow through on the regular budget appropriation process in the interests of making what at one time was considered something available only for Title I schools -- that it should be the operating rule for all of the schools in the city.
Mrs. Swaim added, she was concerned that the Board do something about the textbook reform before September 1. She added that she would like to see the Superintendent make a specific proposal in the area of textbook reform possibly sometime in the beginning of August. If some special kind of outside assistance is necessary for the Superintendent to accomplish that within a month and a half, she would support that. She was also concerned about the standards for retirement of obsolete books and what will be done for replacing books that are retired.

Therefore, Mrs. Swaim stated she would like to see the Board adopt the motion of the Committee as amended by Mrs. Allen's substitute motion.

Mrs. Hobson explained his motion as meaning to adopt that report as a report from the Committee to give the Superintendent and it is so stated in the report that the Superintendent could give the Board a substitute plan to show how he was going to implement the question of equalizing books.

Mrs. Allen explained that her motion meant, simply, to ask the Superintendent to come forward with some recommendations, analysis of the data, and recommendations for action, adding that he would be empowered to get, on behalf of the Board, some expert assistance.

President Coates explained that if the Board adopted the substitute motion, it would in fact adopt the two actions recommended by the Committee, as well as the factor of legal consultation.

Mr. Hobson pointed out that when Mr. Duncan was the Corporation Counsel he reported to the Board of Education that it could not hire counsel.

The substitute motion was put and carried, with Mr. Hobson voting NO.

**BOARD TO CONSULT WITH SUPERINTENDENT AND SCHEDULE A SPECIAL MEETING ON THE MATTER OF TEXTBOOKS FOR THE END OF JULY**

President Coates stated that it was the understanding of the motion that the Superintendent was to bring recommendations on textbooks for discussion and action at the next meeting.

After discussion it was agreed that the Board would meet by the end of July for this purpose.
BOARD REQUESTS CORPORATION COUNSEL TO REPRESENT BOARD OF EDUCATION IN CIVIL ACTION NO. 8266 AND TO CONSIDER FILING TO VACATE THE DECREES ON BASIS OF SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE BY BOARD WITH THE DECREES

Acting President Allen pointed out that there was an action against the Board in the case of Hobson versus Hansen.

A motion that the Board of Education request the Corporation Counsel to represent it in Civil Action No. 8266 and that the Counsel be requested to consider filing to vacate the decree in the case of Hobson versus Hansen on the basis of substantial compliance by the Board re the decree, was made by Mrs. Swaim and seconded by Mr. Rosenfield.

Mr. Hobson said that he thought the Counsel had already filed a motion to vacate the decree and a motion for additional time. Mr. Hobson stated he would like to disqualify himself from voting because he originated the motion. He said that he had received from the Court a copy of the motion filed by the Corporation Counsel for additional time. Therefore, the Corporation Counsel is already representing the Board. Mr. Hobson requested that the record show that the Board of Education met August 22 to vote to have the Corporation Counsel represent it. However, the Corporation Counsel had already filed papers in the Court in the name of the Board of Education.

Mr. Hobson further disqualified himself from the proceedings with an additional statement, that the Board of Education, individually and collectively, the Superintendent or Acting Superintendent, whoever he may be, are technical defendants in this case.

At this point, Mr. Hobson explained the phrase, "technical defendants." He said, "it means that no individual is guilty of anything nor are we trying to prove that."

"No matter who sat on this Board, if you have a brand new Board tomorrow, they would become technical defendants."

Mrs. Allen asked Mr. Hobson to sit through the vote in order to maintain a quorum, even though he had disqualified himself and would not be voting.

Mrs. Allen then explained that the Corporation Counsel had called her, as Acting President of the Board, a couple of weeks ago. They reminded her that there was only a day or two to indicate the intention of the Board. Due to the fact that the Board had not had an opportunity to act on the matter, Mrs. Allen, acting as Chairman of the Board, had asked the Corporation Counsel to request additional time in order for the Board to hold a special meeting.
July 7, 1969

MEMORANDUM

TO : The Board of Education

FROM : Julius W. Hobson, Chairman
       Committee to Study Implementation of
       the Wright Decree

Subject : Proposal for Summer Implementation of the Wright Decree

At the request of the Committee to implement the Wright Decree, we have received a series of reports from the school administration dealing with (1) expenditures per pupil, (2) special projects in the public schools, (3) essential equipment in the public schools, (4) curriculum change in the public schools, (5) books per pupil in the public schools, and (6) availability of library facilities in the public schools.

It is apparent from this preliminary data that the school administration has failed or refused to implement what is now the law of the District of Columbia -- the Skelly Wright decree in the Hobson v. Hansen Case upheld by the United States Court of Appeals. I cannot begin to impress upon the members of the Board of Education the danger of functioning outside the law.

The school administration has had since June 19, 1967, to implement this decree. We do not hold the Superintendent responsible for decisions which occurred prior to his contract; however, Mr. Manning has had more than a year to outline a decisive course of action and has failed to do so. I therefore feel that this administration should not be given another year to continue its inertia, ignorance and indifference in this matter. As a member of the Board of Education, I am now in the position of being a defendant in my own case and am therefore subject to the same penalties as can be imposed upon the administration for their apparent contempt of United States District Court. In light of the lapse of time in this matter, I make the following motion:

THAT THE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEET A MINIMUM OF ONCE A WEEK THIS SUMMER AND AS MANY TIMES AS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THIS DECREE.
(Enclosure 4 continued)

I suggest that the schedule of these meetings be set up by the Secretary of the Board of Education. I propose that Mr. Manning bring to the Board each week a plan for dealing with the inequity in each of these areas. In turn, I will request the remaining data outlined in my February 4 memorandum by July 6.

The following is an example of the type of plan which should be developed and proposed by the Superintendent and discussed and approved by the full Board. I propose that this plan together with the Superintendent's proposal be discussed at the first meeting.

TEXTBOOK REFORM (EMERGENCY)

In order to correct the extreme disparities and inequalities in textbooks in the school system, I make the following motion:

1. THAT Department Chairmen in all schools are order to work for one full week after the closing of school taking full inventory of all books in use.*

2. THAT the Supervising Directors of each Department fully cooperate with the Department Chairmen in dividing the books into the following categories:

   a. Books with racist content -- all such books should be condemned.

   b. Books in American literature and American history which contain no selections about Black people -- all such books should be retired as textbooks and should be used only as reference or supplementary books.

3. THAT the Supervising Directors of each Department be responsible for reporting the following information to the Board no later than August 1, 1969, the results of the survey in the following terms on a school by school basis:

   a. Names and numbers of books to be condemned.

   b. Names and numbers of books to be retired, as textbooks.

*It must be understood that Department Chairmen are to be compensated for the extra week's work.
c. Names and numbers of books needed to replace retired or condemned books.

d. Names and numbers of books needed to bring all schools with a below average pupil-book ratio up to the city-wide average.

4. THAT after the reports from the Supervising Directors have been received, the Board establish an emergency fund to institute the suggested book reform in conformity with Judge Wright's Decision in Hobson v. Hansen.

The Elected School Board members cannot violate the law another year or allow the administration to remain haphazard and apathetic. We must provide a sound and equitable basis for immediate constructive change.
STATEMENT BY JULIUS W. HOBSON BEFORE THE D. C. COALITION ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND LOCAL NEEDS

During the past few weeks new stories have highlighted violence in the D. C. public schools. Increasing disrespect, hostility, physical threats and destruction is a reality. However, unlike city officials and some educators, I cannot advocate punishing young people -- graduating at the rate of over 5,000 a year -- for being unable to function in our society. It seems far more reasonable and right to jail city fathers, School Board Members and school administrators who failed to support the abolition of inequity in public education, the tract system, and special privilege.

The Chairman of the City Council, Mr. Gilbert Hahn, during his long years as a resident of the District never offered to lend his prestige, money or support to helping students read, learn to count or secure sufficient books and resources to find a positive role in society. How he, and men like him, are offering to help control "violence" in the schools when they failed to indicate any prior interest in the welfare of students. What is the point in locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen? We are too late with too little.

Thousands of students have been destroyed or pushed out by the ruinous educational practices of the District. These students are returning to the only real place they know to vent their hostility and frustrations -- the schools. Many of them are still school age -- but are "push-outs," "drop-outs," or part of the nearly one-third daily "absentee count" -- an indication of the growing malaise of the system.

The "answer" to the problem is not Hahn's City Council oppressiveness like wall-to-wall police at School Board meetings nor is it the Superintendent's suggestion (without plan) of community cooperation. The crisis will not be averted until the following first steps have been taken. Unless these actions are immediately initiated, I can only predict an educational holocaust, a rebellion by the young against the existing inequities and incarceration characterized by increasing student strikes and destruction. Any "answer" is twofold -- "long range" and "short range."
Short Range Requirements: The District should identify emergency funds to:

1. Work with the United States Employment Service in D. C. to establish a special counseling and employment service at each high school. Young people not enrolled at the school should be directed to special counselors. Rather than slamming doors repeatedly in the face of the jobless youth, high school and employment and counseling offices should offer continuing services and direction to drop-outs and graduates (similar to college placement offices). Former students should be welcome and assisted with job information, enrollment in city youth programs, and help with special health or welfare needs.

2. Select, train and employ a Hall Patrol Official in every high school, junior high school and designated elementary schools. This person should be employed full time by the school system to patrol the halls—providing directions and assistance to students (with hall passes) and adults. Young people not enrolled in the school should be directed for help to the special counseling office. Individuals selected for hall patrol duties should reside in the neighborhood and relate to young people—they might be retired from other jobs. They should not be armed or uniformed.

3. Force the Justice Department to design an intensive program to combat the illegal drug traffic ranging in the city schools rather than concentrating their resources on the persecution of political dissenters. Neither the community nor the local police alone can deal with the highly organized interstate and international aspects of drug traffic.

Long Range Requirements:

1. As I have emphasized during my year on the Board, drastic educational reforms are urgent. To relieve crowding and other problems, the District should immediately investigate and develop plans to convert to a year-round educational system similar to the Atlanta Plan. Work-study and employment programs should be scheduled on a year-round basis rather than forced during the summer months.

2. Any young person under the age of 21, should be encouraged to complete his high school education at public expense at evening schools sponsored by the Board of Education. Vocational education must be expanded to all schools rather than crowded into special schools.

Retraining teachers, redistributing decision making, equalizing books and resources, streamlining the budget, and improving administrative techniques are needed to avert an educational disaster. However, as long as "special privilege" remains the modus operandi of the school administration, then tragedy cannot be avoided. Special privilege and unequal treatment have brought us to the brink of disaster and will push us over unless we shift our attitudes and priorities.
MEMORANDUM

TO: The D. C. Board of Education

FROM: Julius W. Hobson, Member

SUBJECT: The Board of Education Proposes and the School Administration Disposes

In the District of Columbia we have an eleven man Board of Education that officially meets from 7:30 to 11:00 p.m., two nights a month. At these meetings the Board attempts to run a 150 million dollar corporation with 18,000 employees 200 school buildings and almost 150,000 children.

The Board of Education in 1970 is essentially the same as it was when it was established in 1906. In 1906 it was comprised of "the middle class" doctors, lawyers and anyone else who could afford to give a couple of hours a month to public education. In general, boards of education were formed out of church committees and were designed to run the schools to educate "the college bound." In 1970 board members still consider themselves middle class. School boards now can be compared to a crew trained to float the Mayflower and then wakes up one morning to find itself on the deck of the Queen Mary. In other words, problems in education have changed but boards of education have remained the same.

Operating in the large cities in the United States, school boards find themselves unable to represent disadvantaged clientele. They are forced to operate with primarily self-seeking, dishonest school administrators. Facing these dishonest bureaucrats, the work of school board members becomes a full-time job. Since the revolution in education in the early Sixties, when we moved from educating only the college bound and tolerating the rest, to attempting to educate everybody, the boards have found themselves obsolete.

The D. C. Board of Education is a clear example of the turmoil and confusion that can exist in a school system when those charged with leading it are tied to an out-of-date organization structure.

The attitude of the school administration toward the antiquated Board of Education that theoretically leads it is not difficult to show. For example, on May 9, 1969, Superintendent Manning made one of his rare statements before the Board. He said, "The Board has avoided the fact that you aren't born to be members of a Board of Education." In other words, board members had a lot
to learn and, as he went on to say, one of the things they had to learn was to stay out of those areas which the school administration ran.

Although Dr. Manning was a little obvious, there have been plenty of signs that his attitude toward the school board was really characteristic of the school administration. The record shows that the Board proposes and the Administration disposes. Unless there is a drastic change in the school administration, board members are going to have to learn to be experts on administration as well as policy making in order to assure the implementation of their policies.

Unfortunately, the Board cannot measure its accomplishments just by listing the items it voted up or down, because it has no way of telling how or if its decisions were implemented. For example, on May 7 the Board voted to abolish corporal punishment in the schools. Even though the Board knew that corporal punishment had been banned long ago, it was still going on. Do we know now that it has really and finally ceased? On May 10, Mr. Manning read to us Superintendent Circular No. 278, dated 2/12/69, on the procedure to be followed in suspending children. Asked if the school system had followed this procedure, Mr. Manning made a very characteristic reply: "I can't document that this procedure has been followed. This is a very large school system."

That is a quote which should be engraved on the wall of this Board room. He was not talking about whether every teacher in every classroom was carrying out some technical policy to the letter. He was talking about whether his principals were carrying out a major policy, and he seemed unembarrassed at not having the faintest idea of what was going on. The Board eventually adopted another policy on suspensions. What assurance does anyone have that it is being carried out? Is the Board prepared to settle for the answer "it is a very large school system."

The Board should insist that the administration not bring in proposals at the last minute and say that any postponement will kill the program, we have to vote right away. Reports from the Superintendent's office (or any other source in the system) should summarize the negative aspects, or at least indicate their existence, as well as explaining why approval is wanted. That is, the administration should not appear before the Board as lobbyists, pushing hard for a given point of view and pretending no problems or alternatives exist.

Above all, what this Board needs is some way of finding out how and when its policies have been implemented. If there are problems in implementation,
or insurmountable barriers in getting information on implementation, then the Board should expect to be told this promptly, and not six months later when violations are brought to the Board's attention from the community.

Look at the record of items in the transcripts of our meetings over the last year. They are all policy on paper. How many of these policy statements can the Board say are policy in fact?

Board Meeting
January 21, 1970
B. Teacher Transfer Policy
PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
Presidential Building  
Washington, D. C. 20004  

Superintendent's Circular No. 218  
April 14, 1971  

TO ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL:  

TEACHER TRANSFER POLICY  

A. Two major factors are to be considered in the administration of teacher transfers between schools for September, 1971:  

1. The Agreement between the Board of Education and the Washington Teachers' Union.  

2. Legal requirements as prescribed by the Wright Decision.  

B. Article IV of the Teachers' Agreement, "Teacher Transfer Policy" spells out certain conditions for transfer. Anyone requesting a transfer should read the total article. Of special significance in Article IV are the following:  

1. Teachers must submit transfer requests to the Assistant Superintendent-Personnel not later than May 15, 1971. A copy must be given to the present school principal (simultaneously). Teachers must provide the information shown on the attached Teachers' Transfer Request Form. (This form may be reproduced in the various schools.)  

2. Each teacher must list a minimum of two, a maximum of six, schools in order of preference, and indicate his or her basic reason for requesting the transfer.  

3. Transfer requests are first reviewed in the Department of Personnel for certification eligibility, and then forwarded to the Assistant Superintendent of the level involved.  

4. Notification and publication of lists of teachers being transferred will be made available at least ten days prior to the close of school in June.  

5. When a transfer request is not granted, the teacher will be notified in writing with the basic reason specified.  

6. In cases where more than one teacher indicates the same choice and are equally eligible, preference shall be given the teacher with the greatest number of years of teaching service in the D. C. Public Schools.
7. Teachers reaching permanent status must serve an additional year in the school in which the permanent status was awarded before becoming eligible for transfer requests.

C. The Board of Education has taken a firm posture in directing compliance with Judge Wright's decision in Hobson vs. Hansen. In order to achieve a better racial balance of faculties the following conditions will apply to all transfer requests for the 1971-72 school year:

1. The race of the individual and the racial composition of the schools must be known. Racial data will be used solely for purposes of meeting the court's demands and shall not become a part of the individual's basic records.

2. Transfers will be granted only to "non-target" schools or those in which persons of the race of the applicant are in an exceptional minority. Non-target schools are those where the proportion of Black personnel is within ten percent, in either direction, of the mean for the school level. Black target schools are those where the proportion of Black teachers is more than ten percent below the mean. White target schools are those where the proportion of Black teachers is more than ten percent above the mean. The "target" status of the schools is indicated on the vacancy lists.

3. Attached is a list of anticipated September, 1971 vacancies as of this date. All vacancies are dependent on the final organization of schools based on budgetary considerations, population and boundary shifts, etc.

D. The proper form to use in requesting a transfer is attached. (This form should be reproduced in the various schools.) The provision of all of the information requested will greatly expedite the processing of requests.

E. Vacancies will be filled first from transfer lists.

F. Only permanent teachers who have three or more years service are eligible for transfers.

Very sincerely yours,

HUGH J. SCOTT
Superintendent of Schools

Two attachments:
1. List of anticipated vacancies for September, 1971
2. Teacher Transfer Request Form
C. Memorandum from Hugh J. Scott, Superintendent
January 8, 1973

To the Board of Education
of the District of Columbia

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In response to the November 21, 1972 action of the Board of Education directing me to modify the data used for compliance with the equalization mandate in Hobson v. Hansen to exclude teachers on leave and include their temporary replacements, I am forwarding herewith a plan for compliance which does not require the transfer of any regular classroom teachers.

Upon updating the equalization file as directed by the Board, sixty-five schools were found to be out of compliance with the decree of May 25, 1971 as amended August 1, 1972. These schools are listed on the accompanying worksheets along with recommendations for modification of existing programs which only entail the assignment of additional classroom positions where needed and the reassignment of special teachers. In recommending changes in subject matter services, consideration was given to the following factors:

1. The dollar amount of these services
2. The school's preference for these services
3. The schedules of the individual subject matter teachers.

Upon advise of counsel and to avoid further delay, I am forwarding to you the plan for compliance without the supporting charts required by the Court. These charts are being prepared and upon completion will be forwarded to you immediately. Following Board approval, the plan for compliance will be submitted to the Court. The additional data will be filed when completed.
To the Board of Education of the District of Columbia - 2 January 8, 1973

In addition to the compliance report which was generated by the computer, I am sending copies of the worksheets detailing the changes recommended for the schools out of compliance. A copy of the final assignment of teachers by schools has been placed in the Board Office for your perusal.

I recommend that the Board approve the attached plan for submission to the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Hugh J. Scott
Superintendent of Schools
D. Memorandum from Vincent E. Reed, Superintendent
To the Board of Education
of the District of Columbia

Ladies and Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN FOR EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

Attached is an Alternative Plan for Equalizing Educational Resources which details the exponents of the approach to distribute educational resources in a manner which will ensure equal educational opportunities for students in the D. C. Public School System. The Superintendent believes that this plan meets the criteria of the Court that it be "specific, measurable and educationally justifiable" and "reasonably designed to overcome the effects of past discrimination on the basis of socio-economic and racial status".

Essentially, this Plan

- Incorporates the procedures established by the Office of Education for receipt of Title I funds
- Adds a promise that no school may vary more than five percent from the system-wide mean by program
- Extends these procedures to senior high schools,

This document has been compiled in two parts:

Part I, Education Resource Allocation Plan, is a documentation of the method by which resources will be distributed and how the plan will be monitored.

Part II, Administrative and Legislative Actions for Compliance with the Wright Decree, gives the historical perspective with respect to the 1967 decree.
Parts I and II can be used together or separately as the Board may require. This will allow the Board maximum flexibility in determining its legal strategies.

The Superintendent recommends that the Board of Education approve the Plan for implementation by the Administration. It is further recommended that the Board request the Corporation Counsel, on its behalf, to petition the Court to relinquish further jurisdiction in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent E. Reed
Superintendent of Schools

Attachment
E. Excerpts From D.C. City Council Legislation
A BILL
In the Council of the District of Columbia

Councilmember Julius W. Hobson introduced the following bill which was referred to the

To require the Board of Education to establish a program of Educational Accountability to improve the quality of education in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, That this act is entitled the "Educational Accountability Act of 1977."

Sec. 2. Legislative Declaration. The Council of the District of Columbia finds and declares

(a) That students in the Public School System of the District of Columbia perennially score significantly below the national norm on standardized tests of verbal and mathematical skills;

(b) That evidence exists indicating that graduates of the public School System frequently lack the skills and competencies necessary to gain meaningful employment or to gain admission to the colleges and other post secondary institutions of the student's choice;
(c) That finding a means to improve the quality of public education is a matter of legitimate, immediate concern for the people of the District of Columbia;

(d) Therefore, that it is the responsibility of the Board of Education to develop and implement a program of educational accountability for the Public School System of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 3. **Definitions.** For the purposes of this act:

(a) "Competency" means the possession of sufficient skills and knowledge to enable a person to carry out a given task adequately;

(b) "Educational Accountability" means the process by which 1) the goals and objectives of the educational system are defined; 2) responsibilities are defined in relation to those goals and objectives; 3) execution of those responsibilities is assessed regularly to provide information on the progress of the system toward those goals and objectives; and 4) the results of the assessment are made public.

(c) "Goal" means a specific statement of the intended outcomes of student performance to be achieved by a particular educational activity.

(d) "Objective" means a specific statement of the intended outcomes of student performance to be achieved by a particular educational activity.
(e) "Standard" means the measure of particular skill which a student is expected to exhibit in a particular activity before he or she is determined to have completed successfully a particular educational activity.

(f) "Student" means any person enrolled in an elementary or secondary school of the Public School System of the District.

Sec. 4. Duties of the Board of Education. In developing the Educational Accountability program the Board shall provide for these primary elements:

(a) The articulation of goals at all levels of public education in the District of Columbia, and the establishment of a program for the continuing examination and updating of these goals;

(b) The establishment of procedures to assess the current needs, abilities, and interests of students in the District;

(c) On the basis of the assessment described in (b), the identification of specific objectives to achieve the goals articulated;

(d) The development of a curriculum for the elementary and secondary schools designed to integrate acquisition of skills in communication, computation, and analysis with general cognitive and affective competencies;

(e) The establishment of standards of achievement as requirements for student advancement and graduation;

(f) The development of a thorough plan to test and assess student performance in relation to the achievement of
skills and competencies at each level of education;

(g) The establishment of procedures to evaluate the performance of each school and institution in the Public School System in relation to the system-wide goals and objectives;

(h) The development of plans and procedures describing the means by which schools exhibiting deficiencies in achievement are to seek assistance and take corrective action;

(i) The establishment of such rules and regulations as may be necessary to implement the program of educational accountability.

Sec. 5. Reporting Requirement. By August 15 of each year, the Board shall make an annual report to the Mayor, Council, and citizens of the District incorporating specific data with respect to:

(a) Student performance;

(b) Individual school performance;

(c) Progress of the whole system toward achievement of its stated goals and objectives;

(d) Identification of deficiencies and plans for corrective action;

(e) Recommendations for further legislation.

Sec. 6. Implementation. a. Within six months of the effective date of this act, the Board shall present its plan for educational accountability to the Mayor, Council, and General citizenry.

b. If, within 30 days of receipt of this plan, Council does not adopt a resolution disapproving the plan, it shall
be considered approved. If the Council does adopt a resolution disapproving the Board's plan, such resolution shall contain an extended time period for the Board to redesign the plan.

Sec. 7. **Severability.** If any provision of this act is held invalid, the remainder of this act shall not be affected.

Sec. 8. Effective Date. This act shall become effective according to the provisions of section 602(c) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act.
To COUNCILMEMBERS

From Julius W. Hobson, Chairman, Committee on Education, Recreation, and Youth Affairs
July 1, 1976

Subject P.R. 1-206, "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution" Report No. 1

PROBLEM

The Deficiencies of the District's budget and Accounting systems have been well known for many years, but District residents have been powerless to take any corrective action prior to the election of local officials. P. R. 1-206, "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution" which I introduced on April 20, 1976, addresses the issues of continuing fiscal accountability and improved cost information in the D. C. Public Schools -- questions which have been repeatedly raised by the Congress, the General Accounting Office and, most importantly, the taxpayers of the District of Columbia.


Because of other priorities in past years when citizens had no voice in the District government, these problems were tolerated and compounded annually in every budget cycle. No longer can we permit the continuance of inadequate and inaccurate reporting. We join the Congress and the citizens in their insistence that meaningful information on expenditures be reported regularly and in a timely manner: where does the money go and what does it buy? Therefore, the Committee on Education, Recreation and Youth Affairs has for report to the Council the first step toward fiscal accountability for the public school system -- P. R. 1-206.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

July 20, 1976

COUNCIL ADOPTS HOBSON'S SCHOOL COST CENTER REPORTING RESOLUTION

Today the Council of the District of Columbia unanimously adopted Councilman Julius W. Hobson's "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution", P.R. 1-206. Designed to provide detailed cost information on a school-by-school basis, the resolution calls for quarterly reporting by the Mayor on all expenditures for the D. C. Public Schools from both regular operating, federal grant and other funds.

For the first time, citizens will have access to full information on the cost of the operation of each school -- where does the money go -- what does it buy?

Compliance with this resolution will be relatively easy for the Executive Branch since it requires reporting by city accounting codes which are used by all agencies for budgeting and accounting purposes.

Support for this resolution has been enthusiastic. Both the D. C. Public Schools and the Executive Office of Budget and Management Systems have critically commented and worked closely with the Committee on Education, Recreation and Youth Affairs on
the development of the "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution". The Office of Budget and Management Systems has concurred with the reporting system, "The Education Committee of the Council through its meetings and staff work, had developed a reporting design that seems to be most useful ..."

Provisions of P.R. 1-206 permit the reporting format to change as the existing accounting codes are improved or streamlined. Introduced on April 20, 1976, the "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution" anticipated and closely parallels the recommendations for school-by-school cost accounting which was outlined in the Arthur Anderson report.

"This resolution is a direct culmination of my efforts during the last decade to assure that equal expenditures are made for the education of each child in the District of Columbia," stated Hobson. "The Cost Center reporting require­ment carries that process to its logical conclusion: the establish­ment of a system to provide accurate and timely cost information for each school in the District of Columbia."

For further information, contact: Ms. Patricia Evans Miner
724-8014 or 724-8089
Council of the District of Columbia
Memorandum
District Building, 14th and E Streets, N.W. 20004 Fifth Floor 724-8000

To Councilmembers
From Julius W. Hobson, Councilman-at-Large
Date January 3, 1977
Subject Educational Accountability Act of 1977

The "Educational Accountability Act of 1977" is a commitment to the young people of the District of Columbia that public education can and will provide each student with the reading, writing, communication; and mathematical skills to effectively compete in today's world. Public Education's failure to measure up to the public trust has seriously crippled more than 60,000 D.C. Public School graduates over the last ten years. This act, introduced on January 3, 1977, will begin to hold the schools accountable for student achievement and require the Board of Education to establish minimum standards for promotion and graduation.

THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION

For more than a decade the Public Schools of the District have been criticized for the poor quality of the educational produce which they deliver to their students.

Much of the criticism has come from graduate of our schools who suffer the consequences of poor education. Employers' doors shut on them; admission to and retention in the colleges of their choice is a struggle.

My "accountability" bill is designed to support and enlarge upon the efforts of the D.C. Public Schools to effect curricular and other educational change in order to improve the quality of education in the District. This bill deals with educational accountability specifically with regard to the learning outcomes of educational processes. Fiscal accountability for education was addressed separately in the "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution of 1976," approved by the Council of the District of Columbia on July 30, 1976. Resolution I-343 required a school-by-school financial plan and quarterly accounting of all obligations and expenditures for the operation and administration of the public schools.

HOW THE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT WORKS

"The Educational Accountability Act of 1976" calls for the Board of Education to design within six (6) months and immediately implement an educational accountability plan for the D.C. Public Schools. The bill asks the Board to articulate the specific goals
and objectives of education in the District of Columbia so progress can be evaluated. For instance, one state, Oregon, as part of its accountability plan requires that graduating seniors demonstrate knowledge of a sufficient reading vocabulary to function in common community, business and social activities.

Moreover, educational accountability demands that, if the objectives of the system entail the demonstration of competency in specific skills at certain levels of education, then a student should not be promoted from that level until competency in the skills has been acquired. Therefore, the bill provides for the Board to set minimum standards at each level against which to determine the student's achievement of the competencies required to be demonstrated for promotion and graduation.

Key to the operation of the program is a plan for regular testing and evaluation of student performance -- as directed by the Board of Education -- coupled with the public reporting of the results. Such testing is necessary to determine both individual student progress as well as the progress of each school. With the results of this testing, deficiencies in the system can be identified and remedied.

The final, and perhaps most critical "accountability" feature of this bill requires the Board to make annual reports to the Mayor, Council, and general citizenry. These reports will discuss student progress, individual school performance, progress of the school system toward achievement of its stated goals, identify deficiencies, and offer plans for corrective action. Such reports should serve as a spur to action to correct deficiencies and to gain public support.

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The District of Columbia is not alone with its crisis of education. The decline of SAT scores, grade inflation, and the virtual illiteracy of some high school graduates have been repeatedly identified nationwide. As school districts, board of education and state legislatures attempt to combat such educational problems, they are confronted with sociological phenomena, conflicting psychological theories, and irate taxpayers tired of "experiments" and lack of standards. Issues of authority, responsibility, and economic control are entwined with questions such as: What factors engender learning? What is the effect of the home environment? School environment? Teacher influence? What does it mean to be educated, and by whose standards?

In response to citizen concern for the quality of education, over 30 states have already enacted legislation to render their schools and school systems accountable for their educational activities and results thereof. Some of these states include New Jersey, California, Georgia, Maryland, Florida, Arizona and Oregon. We have
reviewed the relevant legislation of each state in developing the attached "Educational Accountability Act of 1977".

In general, these accountability laws seek to establish a correlation between quality education and the development of a dynamic process of articulating goals and objectives, implementation, evaluation, corrective action, and communication of results publicly. Some of the programs focus on management of schools, while others focus on performance of students or/and of teachers and employees. Whatever the thrust of the program, the public reporting of data from testing and evaluation of student performance is the major "accountability" element of most of these programs.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

This bill is designed primarily to provide an impetus for the school system, led by the Board of Education to pursue actively a well-defined plan to improve the quality of education in D.C. starting immediately. Such plan will not, in itself, spontaneously create quality education. The plan is but the framework through which the community commitment to improved education is to be effected. The establishment of achievement levels and performance standards for our students is critical in terms of holding the Public Schools financially accountable for its goals. Educational accountability is also essential in assuring the trust of the taxpayers that quality education will be provided to all of the young people in the District of Columbia.

The cornerstone of educational accountability is communication, not only of financial information and test scores, but also the communication of expectations, from teacher to student, parent to teacher, and citizens to "system." I urge your support and comments on this most important piece of legislation.

Attachment
To COUNCILMEMBERS

From Julius W. Hobson, Councilman at Large

Date April 16, 1976

Subject School Cost Center Reporting Resolution

On Tuesday, April 20, 1976, I will introduce the "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution," which is designed to provide continuing financial accountability for the District of Columbia Public Schools.

THE URGENT NEED

The 1971 Hobson v. Hansen decision was the first step toward a complete planning, accounting, and budgeting system for the D.C. Public Schools. By focusing on economic equality at the individual school level, the 1971 court decree recognized the importance of school finances in the battle for equality of educational opportunity. However, repeated reports from Passow, the Nelsen Commission, Baratz and D.C. Citizens for Better Public Education, have underscored the lack of detailed information about students, teachers, and resources. School critics and, indeed, school board members and administrators have repeatedly cited the need for a central information system which contains all data -- not just teacher salaries -- on a school-by-school basis.

In the Congressional hearings on the FY 1973 Budget, the Superintendent of Schools admitted that he did not know how many persons were employed in the public schools due to inadequate management information. Recent research on the implementation of equalization in the schools has reinforced the need for school-by-school accumulated expenditure reports, as well as annual financial reports to the parents and citizens for each school in the District of Columbia.

In compiling school cost information for the 1971 Hobson v. Hansen motion to amend the 1967 court decree, because of the lack of a systematic data base, considerable difficulty was experienced in collecting school-by-school data to examine the disparities in per pupil expenditures across the city. In the 1971 decree on the Hobson v. Hansen case, Judge Skelly Wright required that "per pupil expenditures for all teachers' salaries and benefits from the regular D.C. Budget in any single elementary school shall not deviate more than plus and minus five percent from the mean of all elementary schools," with certain exceptions for special education and
similar specialized programs. In his order, Judge Wright indicated the Court's willingness to modify the equalization order and invited the Board of Education and the school administration to "adopt specific, measurable, and educationally justifiable plans which are not consistent with the present order" and return to the Court for a modification of the decree. Because of the lack of accurate and timely data, the school administration has never been able to return to court to petition for modification of the equalization process.

In 1971, the Superintendent of Schools set up a Task Force on Local School Budgeting, which recommended that school-by-school budgeting be instituted so that each school and community could review its particular needs and make budgetary requests; that policy was approved by the Board of Education in the Spring of 1972. Although this policy was adopted, four years later it has not been implemented because of the lack of a suitable financial reporting system.

In response to my inquiry, Superintendent Vincent E. Reed has informed me that the "City is designing improvements in the accounting system which would permit the accumulation of expenditure data at cost center level (school)." Furthermore, he has indicated that the school administration is making efforts to automate and consolidate all local school expenditure data and solicited my support in developing these programs and supporting services from the District. This resolution which I am introducing on April 20, 1976, was designed to support this type of effort.

PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY

The School Cost Center Reporting Resolution" calls for a detailed financial plan and quarterly accounting of all obligations, and expenditures from operating, federal and other funds used in the operation and administration of the public schools. The financial data requested on a school-by-school and accountable office basis will enable the Council, the District government and citizens to make informed decisions relating to the expenditures of each school, office and cost center within the public school system. Such information will allow analyzing school finances by student services, student achievement levels, and the distribution of available resources.

Section 448 of the District's Charter invites the Council to request from the Mayor such financial reports as the Council determines are necessary. One continuing responsibility of the Council is evaluating whether the Schools' budget is being utilized in an effective manner. Detailed financial data on a cost center basis will serve as the nucleus of a management information system as well as for Council review purposes.

While many educational programs and services are difficult to evaluate in terms of their contribution to student achievement, an analysis of the pattern of allocation of financial resources, obligations, and
expenditures will reveal the relative priority placed by the public
schools on its operation of specific educational programs and various
supportive services. Furthermore, some of the information required by
this resolution will provide, on a timely basis, cost data on services
provided by other city agencies for the public schools, e.g., mainten-
ance and repair costs, trash and refuse collection, and so forth.

The only way to hold any agency's performance accountable
to the citizens is to systematically review all available data. The
creation of a uniform data base for all units within any organization
is the first step for systematic review and analysis.

PROPOSED REPORTING PROCEDURE

No new accounting classes are required. The requirements of
this resolution are built on existing records of the city. Using this
framework, it will be easy to generate the requested information from
available financial records.

Specifically, the resolution calls for detailed listings of
all costs from all sources for the operation of the D. C. Public Schools.
These costs will be broken down main and sub-object accounting classifi-
cation codes, as detailed in Mayor's Memorandum 75-86, July 1, 1975.
These accounting codes are currently used by all District agencies to
report financial plans, obligations, disbursements, and expenditures.
The object classification is essential for accountability in reviewing
the school's expenditures, because obligations and expenditures can only
be made in terms of established categories, i.e., main objects and sub-
objects.

IMMEDIATE BENEFITS

The information requested by this resolution can be used to
provide expenditure information for Council, parents, citizens and admin-
istrative use. Trend data will become available over a period of time on
federal, District and private expenditures. Such data will indicate rela-
tive cost discrepancies between school units, and other resource discrep-
ancies which could measure equity in spending patterns. From this data the
Board of Education can determine more precisely if its priorities are being
implemented in the actual expenditure of funds, as opposed to the adopted
financial plan. Finally, such information on a regular basis will pro-
vide a warning device for management when financial problems emerge.
Ideally such information should be available on a monthly basis for manage-
ment and school principals; however, for purposes of Council review,
quarterly reports are sufficient.

The greatest potential users of the information requested in
this resolution are parents and citizens. For the first time, regularly
issued detailed information will be available on a school-by-school basis.
This will enable parents and citizens to view the full array of resources
available at the local school level.
There have been a number of recent innovations in the area of better financial accountability for schools. Recent court cases following Hobson v. Hansen (Serrano v. Priest, Rodriguez v. San Antonio Board of Education) focusing on inequality of resources available for public education and recent legislative reforms have increased national interest on school financial issues. For example, Florida has legislatively authorized local school site budgeting which has encouraged significant educational reforms; California has enacted legislation which facilitated a per-pupil-dollar tracking system in the development of an educational voucher system.

School-by-school-financial information does not intrinsically cause changes in educational programs and student achievement, but it constitutes the pivotal step toward assuring that both schools and the community have sufficient information with which to make significant educational decisions.

OVERVIEW AND OPERATIONAL BENEFITS

This "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution" is not a qualitative measuring stick of education or goal achievement. Identifying school-by-school line item expenditures for all educational costs is the solid foundation for a future budget/financial reporting system that stresses services, activities and goals rather than things or items bought. Before the development of any budget approach that stresses program planning and achievement levels it is necessary to know the complete present costs of education. The "School Cost Center Reporting Resolution" is the first step in instituting a financial/learning accountability approach to education incorporating a budget and financial reporting process that stresses independent financial management at each cost center (school). As a result, educational priorities can be centered around people, programs and pre-planned goals.

At this time our educational system is the only producer of goods and services that holds the consumer, the children, responsible for the quality of the product, learning and achievement. The next logical step after completion of a systematic budget and financial reporting process is the establishment of achievement levels for our students and holding the Public Schools financially accountable for those goals.

When legislators fully understand a department's task, its objectives, its pattern of resource allocation and its problems, the appropriation achieves its full meaning as a contract between the executive, the legislative branches, and the people.
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