

Comparison: Trade Schools
and Junior Colleges

1. State officials responsible. In our proposed decree, we do not name any particular state officials as responsible for discharging the obligation pertaining to trade schools or junior colleges. This means that the responsibility would fall on all the defendants named in the introductory paragraph of the decree. Plaintiffs' proposed decree, on the other hand, specifically places the responsibility on the State Board of Education.

2. Corrective action required. We do not ask for any state officials to formulate a desegregation plan respecting the trade schools and junior colleges. Instead, we embody the substantive requirements in the decree itself. Our proposed decree provides that no person shall be denied admission to any trade school or junior college on the basis of race; that no person shall be subjected to racial discrimination in his application for admission to such schools; that the dual attendance zones based on race for trade schools and junior colleges shall be abolished; and finally, that the faculty of trade schools and junior colleges shall be desegregated. Plaintiffs, in contrast, ask the State Board to cause the formulation of a "comprehensive plan for the desegregation of students and faculty" at the trade schools and junior colleges. Plaintiffs' proposed decree provides that this plan must be prepared within 60 days from the entry of this decree and that the plan "shall provide for students and faculty assignments which disestablish the racial character of each such school."

3. Trade Schools and Junior Colleges covered. Under plaintiffs' proposed decree the desegregation plan is to cover "all trade schools and junior colleges within the State of Alabama." In contrast, the pertinent provision of our decree covers only those trade schools and junior colleges "administered by the Alabama State Board of Education."