Mapping (De)segregation

GRADE LEVEL: Grades 8-10

SUBJECT: Geography, U.S. History

TIME REQUIRED: 90 Minutes
In this lesson students will explore key events and themes related to the desegregation of schools in the U.S. through spatial analysis.

RATIONALE
Spatial analysis (map work) offers students the opportunity to see the content and related data in geographic relations to one another. This often leads to rich conclusions through comparisons or insights about the ways phenomena connect to and across places.

NOTE: While this lesson is intended for a 90 min. class session it could be paced for more time or activities could be cut to accommodate a shorter class period.


OVERVIEW

ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS
1. Why is change difficult?
2. How does a spatially organized set of events help us see them differently?
3. What are regional cultural differences/similarities in the U.S.?

OUTCOMES AND OBJECTIVES
After the lesson students will...
1. Describe the regional geography of the United States.
2. Draw conclusions about the relationship between state leaders’ views of desegregation and key events leading to and beyond Brown v. Board of Education.
3. Demonstrate spatial reasoning during mapping activities.

PREPARING TO TEACH
- Review materials in the materials section of the lesson plan: 1) state leaders’ perspectives on desegregation; 2) map of LDF cooperating attorneys; and 3) Winding Road to Brown and Beyond key events and cases related to the Brown decision.
- Secure access to mapping software. Google My Maps is a free collaborative tool that allows students to build “layers” and add points, lines, and shapes to the map. https://mymaps.google.com/ other tools that might be accessible include ArcGIS story maps and ArcGIS online. This can also be done with a printed out map of the U.S. or on poster paper.
SCAFFOLDS AND ACCOMMODATIONS TO SUPPORT LEARNERS

Reading support

- Working with historical documents often requires tampering with the documents to assure students are scaffolded for success.
  - Set the context for the materials
  - Give a clear goal or purpose for what they are reading
  - Offer everyday language versions of complicated segments of the texts.

Differentiation

- The tasks in this lesson can be adjusted for varied grade levels and skill levels by
  - reducing the number of document sets used as spatial data
  - dividing student groups into teams that are each responsible for a different segment of the data
  - adjusting the tools used for mapping data, if students or teacher are unfamiliar with digital mapping tools some practice with something easy like mapping their route to school could be a great way to quickly learn and troubleshoot digital tool use

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVIES SEQUENCE

1. (10 min.) Quick review of Brown v. Board of Education:

   Short Summary of Brown v. Board of Education 1954

   Brown v. Board of Education was a landmark case in the United States that challenged the constitutionality of racial segregation in public schools. The case originated in Topeka, Kansas, where African American children were required to attend separate schools for black students, which were often inferior in quality to those attended by white students. The plaintiffs argued that this segregation violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, which guarantees equal rights to all citizens.

   The case reached the Supreme Court in 1954, and in a unanimous decision, the Court, led by Chief Justice Earl Warren, declared that state laws establishing separate public schools for black and white students were inherently unequal and unconstitutional. This decision overturned the precedent set by the 1896 case Plessy v. Ferguson, which had upheld the "separate but equal" doctrine.

   The Brown v. Board of Education decision marked a pivotal moment in the Civil Rights Movement, as it laid the groundwork for desegregation efforts across the country and challenged the legal basis of segregation in other public facilities. It played a crucial role in the ongoing struggle for racial equality in the United States.

2. (20 min.) Pre-mapping review of materials.
Students can review the materials provided and discuss in small groups.

- What does each set of materials show or mean?
- What stands out to them? Something they didn’t know or is interesting?
- What questions do they have?

  a. Set 1: State Leaders’ share perspectives on desegregation
  b. Set 2: Map of NAACP/LDF cooperating attorneys
  c. Set 3: Winding Road to Brown and Beyond key events and cases

3. **(30 min.) Mapping work with Google My Maps or other tools**

   Students in small groups (2-3) should first decide on a theme. It would be overwhelming to try and map everything in all three sets of resources. So encourage them to decide on a geographic region (southeast, Midwest, northeast, etc.) OR a conceptual theme they notice in the data sets. This will help them narrow into a smaller segment and manageable spatial narrative.

   - Select the people, events, ideas to map and research additional information online about the places and what happened. These additional bits of information offer rich narrative threads to connect the information and develop spatial insights through telling lesser known stories about people and places.

   - Finish mapping work by placing all possible events, people, images, narrative on the map layers (each my map can have up to 10 layers that can be clicked on and off).

4. **(20 min.) Student groups tell their spatial stories**

   a. How did they approach the task?
   b. What story emerged?
   c. What else would they have liked to include or have available?
   d. What did the spatial aspect of the task tell them about the themes and region of the U.S. they worked on?

5. **(10 min.) Exit ticket / Short response writing prompt responding to essential questions:**

   a. Why is change difficult?
   b. How does a spatially organized set of events help us see them differently?
   c. What are regional cultural differences/similarities in the U.S.?

**ASSESSMENT**

- The mapping work student groups produce and individual exit ticket/short responses will serve as key assessments for this lesson.
- Formative assessment includes observations of student work and conversations throughout the lesson.
MATERIALS NEEDED AND ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR ENRICHMENT

1. Excerpts from reports of various state leaders RE over-all picture of state reaction to supreme court decision; possibility of starting litigation, etc.
Atlanta, May 22, 1954
Archives: Binder 1, pgs. 81 – 86
EXCERPTS FROM REPORTS OF VARIOUS STATE LEADERS
FOR OVER-ALL PICTURE OF STATE REACTION TO SUPREME COURT DECISION;
POSSIBILITIES OF STARTING LITIGATION, ETC.

ATLANTA, MAY 22, 1954

ALABAMA: Mr. W. G. Patton

There was quite a bit of rejoicing on the part of Negroes on the decision. Whites were astounded by the fact that the decision was unanimous. There are a few white "hotheads", but in the main they have been quite calm and sensible. On the other hand, Mr. Patton did not think there would be too much opposition. The Governor of Alabama is taking the attitude taken by many of the governors which is they are going to be willing to accept the decision, although they might require cases in court. Further, Mr. Patton thought that several test cases will suffice for the whole state.

ARKANSAS: Mrs. L. C. Bates

The Governor has stated that he will obey the law. The Governor is in process of appointing an interracial commission for the purpose of studying problems and ways and means of combating them. Suits will probably have to be filed in about three counties. Several counties are already planning to have their schools integrated; Little Rock is also taking this step. Newspaper comments have been good, mostly favorable.

FLORIDA: Attorney William Fordham

One day after the decision was handed down, the Florida cabinet met and at that time it was decided to continue its building program. The Attorney General and State Superintendent of Education issued a statement wherein they adopted the attitude of "let's wait and see what is going to happen." The Acting Governor of Florida has asked for a meeting of governors to decide upon a course of action. Since the Board has met, a news release came out wherein the Attorney General was quoted as saying "the decision will not apply to Florida. Florida will not abide by it."

Mr. Fordham further stated that we will have to press suits in Florida; that the state conference has several clients in the West Palm Beach area who are willing, ready and able to start a suit at any time "we give them the go ahead signal." Mr. Fordham thought that the state will not abide by the decision unless test cases are filed.

Editorial comments have been along the same line -- "we should keep cool heads".
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Mr. Eugene Davidson

Immediately upon learning of the Supreme Court's decision, the Board of Education called a special meeting for the purpose of working out plans to eliminate discrimination in education as soon as possible, perhaps by Fall, if not sooner. The President of the United States has already issued a statement to that effect.

ILLINOIS (Reported by Mr. Marshall)

Suits will probably have to be filed in different counties of this State, with the exception of Wilmington.

MARYLAND: Dr. William A. Boyd

The State's Attorney General has called a meeting for the purpose of devising ways and means of circumventing the decision of the Supreme Court. The Superintendent of Public Education, Mr. Collins has gone on record as being unalterably opposed to desegregation. All persons running for public office have indicated that Georgia will not abide by any decision of the Supreme Court, even if Georgia has to resist alone. It was noted, however, that every major school organization is unalterably opposed to Talmadge's plan of doing away with public education and in the school system of Georgia, each teacher has been asked to contribute $3.00 for the purpose of carrying on a campaign against the Talmadge plan.

Dr. Boyd stated further that the labor unions are in NAACP's corner; that the only course of action, theoretically, in the State of Georgia will be the filing of suits in each of Georgia's counties and some 50 suits in independent schools. The State Conference is willing to assume that "we are going to have to fight and the sooner we get on with the fight, the better".

ILLINOIS: Attorney Billy Jones

The Supreme Court's decision will definitely strengthen NAACP's position in Illinois in view of the fact that the State has a law prohibiting segregation in public education. Mr. Jones remarked however that it is the people themselves (those desiring to maintain status quo) who are keeping Illinois from being integrated.

KANSAS: (Reported by Mr. Carter)

Mr. Carter stated that he had received a letter from Attorney General of Kansas who argued the Topeka case, indicating that although he lost the case, he's happy that he did. Indications are that a number of cities will proceed with integration on their own.
KENTUCKY: (Reported by Mr. Robert L. Carter)

No trouble is anticipated in this State.

LOUISIANA: Attorney Leonard P. Avery

Mr. Avery did not believe that the State will integrate its schools without institution of law suits on the part of NAACP. However, he did not think it would require a large number of suits to effect total integration.

MISSISSIPPI: Dr. E. J. Stringer

Dr. Stringer reported that there is a dangerous element present in that influential people [Negro] are now willing to sit down with the whites and have voluntary segregation. However, the General of the State has announced that he will not file a brief before the U. S. Supreme Court in October.

There has been no violence since the decision was handed down. A special meeting of the Legislative Advisory Board has been called for the purpose of finding ways and means of circumventing the Supreme Court's decision. Dr. Stringer further remarked that no county or school district will accept the Supreme Court decision without a fight. To this end, Dr. Stringer stated that in at least five communities NAACP will be able to secure plaintiffs for suits whenever necessary. At the present time the NAACP has one plaintiff for the law school in Mississippi and especially concerned that the decision of the Court will be carried out and regardless whether Negroes or whites want to maintain segregation, we are going to see that the decision of the Supreme Court will be honored. "We do need a full-time man on the field for this job."

MISSOURI: Mr. Carl A. Johnson

The public education atmosphere in Missouri is very, very good. With specific reference to the Supreme Court decision, the public opinion in Missouri is good. Favorable comments came from all metropolitan newspapers. The Governor of the State of Missouri promptly stated that Missouri would obey and follow the law of the Supreme Court. The Commissioner of Public Education indicated the same compliance. The Attorney General announced that Missouri will follow the law as announced and construed by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Kansas City Board of Education, after Thursday, May 20, and unanimously adopted a resolution to the effect that the Board will immediately go forward and plan for total integration without awaiting a decree resulting from the October arguments. The Board also instructed the Superintendent of Construction to immediately go into a plan to determine whether present locations of proposed buildings would be in keeping with the intended and spirit of the Supreme Court's decision. The Board further instructed the Vice President of Personnel to go into the question of hiring and employment of teachers.
In other areas of Missouri, there may be little trouble here and there in trying to implement the decision of the Supreme Court. Some suits may or may not be necessary to implement the decision.

Mr. Johnson, however, believed there is not going to be a serious fight to get full compliance with the Court's mandate.

Attorney David Crut, also reporting on the Missouri situation, commented that the situation in the major cities is very healthy, although he could not say whether or not a suit needed to be filed in St. Louis that he did not anticipate any trouble in Jefferson City. The Governor of Missouri has announced publicly that he will not attend the conference of Southern Governors.

**NATIONAL (Reported by Mr. Marshall)**

The Governor of this state has announced that he would follow the decision. There is a possibility of having the schools integrated without filing suits.

**FAYETTEVILLE: Mr. J. M. Alexander**

To date, there has been no particular problem of resentment. Organizers have already gone into an integration program. State has already experienced integration on the church level. As far as administrative problems are concerned, school boards are already harking out plans for integration. The Attorney General of North Carolina has advised that he would not attend the meeting of Southern Governors.

Mr. Alexander did not anticipate any trouble in the larger cities. However, he felt the need for low suits in the "black belt" section of the state. He anticipated problems among our "own people".

**ALBANY: Mr. James Stewart**

Although the Governor of this state is the chairman of the Southern Governors Conference, he informed the President of the Oklahoma chapter that he did not plan to call this conference. There is a problem in the state in connection with having separate budgets for white and colored schools. Mr. Stewart stated that it was more a question of finances than whether or not we are going to be integrated.

**UNIVERSITY:**

Favorable comments: Just before the decision was handed down, Dr. Bulloch told the members of the State Education Finance Committee to go out with a statement in which he explored the statement made by Governor Byrnes. Judge Foster of Greenville discussed advisability of decision by whatever decision is handed down by the Supreme Court. Politicians that are presently seeking Negro votes have not come out with any type of inflammatory statements.

Unfavorable comments: Governor Byrnes has already stopped construction on school buildings in the state. Policies that are dependent upon Negro votes have come out with some very inflammatory statements and will try to do everything they can to not abide by the Court's decision.
Legal advice has been requested concerning a petition filed in Charleston by negro parents. The petitioners request that the local high school be retained — not to maintain segregation, but as a matter of convenience in view of the overcrowded condition in the other school.

There are also on file in nine different counties petitions for admission of negro students. In this connection, advice from the Legal Department has been requested as to whether these petitions should be denied. Advice has also been requested in regard to applications for college and whether these students should be encouraged under the present situation to press for admission.

Mr. Lee Lorch

Since the day the Court handed down its decision, comments in the press have been favorable, editorial columns have been good. The Governor of the State has made no adverse comment. None is true of the Mayor of Nashville.

In light of the above, it seems rather likely that in a number of cities there will be no necessity for specific court action. Trouble is anticipated in the western part of the State. The State actually has a case before the Circuit Court of Appeals which can be interpreted as a test case for Tennessee.

Mr. C. J. Tate

Several conferences have been called by the State Commission on Education for the purpose of having a mutual understanding of the problems. Trouble is anticipated in certain areas of the State.

Mr. J. H. Tinsley

In spite of the fact that the Governor is calling together a conference of governors, a committee composed of six governors of Virginia met at which time the Attorney General stated that he felt — in the northern part of Virginia — segregation could be done away immediately.

Dr. Tinsley anticipated trouble in the "black belt" section of the State. Further, Dr. Tinsley urged that conferences be held with officials from various sections where it is felt that the Supreme Court ruling will be put into effect without the necessity of filing court suits; that information of this type could be included in the Association's arguments before the United States Supreme Court in October.

On the other hand, there will be counties in Virginia where suits need to be instituted.

Mr. T. O. Matter

Trouble is not anticipated in this State. The Governor will comply with the decision of the Supreme Court handed down May 17. Mr. Matter did not feel it would be necessary to file suits.
Binder 1, pgs. 106 - 127
LDF cooperating attorneys

Distribution by state of 288 local attorneys who handle LDF cases arising in their localities in cooperation with national legal staff.
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*Left during 1968
The Winding Road to Brown and Beyond

The Supreme Court ruled that in all cases, a federal court cannot impose an inter-district remedy between a city and its surrounding suburbs in order to integrate city schools.

The Court's decision means that schools cannot be forced to merge with other districts in order to achieve desegregation.

The effects of the legal case led by LDF attorney Constance Baker Motley.

1967 Thurmond Marshall is appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court, becoming the first African-American to sit on the bench.

1968 Green v. County School Board of New Kent County (Virginia)
The Supreme Court holds that "freedom of choice" plans were ineffective at producing actual school desegregation and had to be replaced with more effective strategies.

1970 Turner v. Fairchild

The Supreme Court holds unconstitutional Talbot County's (Georgia) requirement of real property ownership for grand juries and school board members.

1971 Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education

The Supreme Court upheld the use of busing as a means of desegregating public schools. Julius Chambers, LDF's first amen and later in Director-Counsel, argued Swann before the Supreme Court.

1973 Hinojosa v. Harrison

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1974 Rehnquist v. Des Moines

The Supreme Court rules that state cannot bar an African-American student from all-white law school on the grounds that she had not attended a predominantly white high school.

1975 Mississippi v. Bradley

The Supreme Court rules that, in almost all cases, a federal court cannot impose an inter-district remedy between a city and its surrounding suburbs in order to integrate city schools.

1976 Bakke v. Regents of the University of California

The Supreme Court rules that schools cannot be forced to merge with other districts in order to achieve desegregation.

1979 Bolling v. Sharpe

The Supreme Court rules that, in almost all cases, a federal court cannot impose an inter-district remedy between a city and its surrounding suburbs in order to integrate city schools.

1980 Jones v. University of Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that schools cannot be forced to merge with other districts in order to achieve desegregation.

1982 Grove v. Ballou

The Supreme Court considers the legality of a school district's affirmative action program.

1983 Grutter v. Bollinger

The Supreme Court upholds the University of Michigan's affirmative action program.

1984 Shelley v. Kraemer

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1985 Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1986 Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1988 Merrell v. Fairchild

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1989 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1990 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1991 Crockett v. Board of Education

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.


The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1993 Grutter v. Bollinger

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1994 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1995 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1996 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1997 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1998 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

1999 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2000 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2001 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2002 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2003 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2004 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2005 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2006 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2007 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2008 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2009 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2010 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2011 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2012 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2013 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2014 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2015 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2016 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2017 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2018 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2019 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2020 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2021 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2022 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2023 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2024 Miranda v. Georgia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.

2025 United States v. Virginia

The Supreme Court rules that states cannot provide free textbooks to segregated public schools established to allow whites to avoid public school desegregation.