

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

US By

CRATON LIDDELL, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
)	72-100c(4)
v.)	
)	
THE BOARD OF EDUCATION)	(EXEMPT FROM CIRCULATION
OF THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS,)	PURSUANT TO H(2278)83)
STATE OF MISSOURI, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

BRIEF OF THE UNITED STATES ON
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 8, 1983, this Court by Order H(2278)83 required the parties to submit briefs in support of their position on the proposed settlement agreement. This brief is in response to that Order.

The proposed settlement agreement in question, H(2217)83, was filed with the Court on March 30, 1983. The report of the Special Master which preceded the proposed settlement agreement recommended that the Court order the parties to report to the Court by April 4, 1983 whether they agreed to adopt the detailed implementation plan as a settlement agreement. On April 4, 1983,

the United States, pursuant to order H(2224)83, responded that we could not, under the circumstances, agree to endorse fully H(2217)83. In that response we noted that the government had not completed a full analysis of each provision of the agreement and stated that we assumed each party would have an opportunity to raise further questions at a fairness hearing.

We applaud the efforts of the parties to settle this litigation, and firmly believe that a voluntary settlement will best serve the interests of the St. Louis area. The agreement represents, in our judgment, a promising step in that direction. Nonetheless, questions remain. This brief highlights three major problem areas raised by the provisions of the proposed settlement agreement. We ~~assume that these~~ concerns, plus questions raised by other interested parties, will be addressed by the proponents of the agreement at the scheduled hearing.

In H(2261)83 we stated that circumstances at this time justified the scheduling of a fairness hearing. We did so because we believe that a fairness hearing is the appropriate forum for the proponents of the settlement agreement to bring forward the evidence which they believe would justify this particular settlement. Such a hearing also affords the non-party objectors to this particular plan a structured opportunity to state their views to the Court.

We believe that the agreement of most, if not all, of the school district parties, and of those plaintiffs who have expressed specific claims for interdistrict liability or

relief, should encourage the Court to give serious consideration to the approval of the proposed settlement agreement. However, because of the concerns expressed in this brief we cannot recommend that the Court approve the proposed settlement agreement in its present form.

We wish to stress at the outset that there are many positive points contained in the proposed settlement. These positive points must be balanced against the perceived problems contained in the current proposal. A voluntary settlement is definitely in the best interests of the St. Louis community. A truly final settlement of this case will alleviate community concerns as to the uncertainty of pupil assignment in the future. The fact that three plaintiffs and at least twenty suburban school districts support this particular settlement is a significant indication that the agreeing parties perceive this settlement proposal as a preferable alternative to current litigation.

A plan which provides that parents and students retain control over the assignment of children to public schools and that desegregation is to be accomplished voluntarily is a definite asset in maintaining broad community support for the public school system. The proposal provides assurance that the current excellent recruitment efforts of the 12(a) plan will be continued. Also, the approximately 3000 students who have volunteered for interdistrict transfers under that plan will have an opportunity to receive a quality desegregated education. Finally, the plan's

extensive magnet school provisions and quality education proposals assure a continuation of the efforts to improve the quality of education in the City schools.

The question for the Court is whether these advantages outweigh specific problems in the mechanics of the plan's operation. We suggest that these advantages are significant enough that the Court should not discard the current settlement proposal. Rather, the Court should give the parties guidance on the changes necessary to reshape this proposal into an acceptable, final settlement agreement that all parties can join and the Court order into effect.

Three major provisions which should be altered before the plan can be approved by the Court must be singled out for special comment. The three provisions are those relating to the nature of the "final judgment" to be given school districts, faculty hiring, and sources of funding.

1. The proposal contains several provisions for school districts receiving "final judgments" (pages II-2, II-3, and XII-1). Some of these judgments would purport to resolve suburban intra-district segregation questions which are not the subject of this lawsuit. The nature, effect, and form of these "final judgments" is not explained. We recommend that a final settlement should be in fact a final settlement. A school district's obligations

should be clearly set out. The Court should gauge a district's compliance with the consent decree by the district's conscientious, good faith efforts to achieve its objectives. While full achievement is the desired result, the settlement should not define compliance solely in terms of reaching some numerical objective. Plainly, a school district receives nothing by a settlement that subjects it to mandatory remedies five years hence notwithstanding the fact that it has engaged in a concerted effort to meet its Plan Ratio, but through no fault of its own has fallen short. Compliance must be measured in realistic terms, based on what could actually be accomplished in the given circumstances and on honest efforts to reach that end; it should not be measured on inflexible and largely arbitrary projections that lock a school district into what ultimately turns out to be an unrealistic student ratio. The current proposal takes the latter approach and should, if it is to be at all meaningful as a final resolution for the school districts, be modified to recognize good faith efforts as full compliance in appropriate circumstances where the failure to meet rigid numerical objectives are satisfactorily explained as due to circumstances for which the school district cannot legitimately be faulted.

2. The Faculty section (Part VI) of the proposed settlement agreement requires many of the suburban school districts to make

hiring decisions based solely on race. A sliding scale of mandatory quotas is imposed on the hiring practices of districts which are not 25% black in their student racial composition (or 16% black in their faculty). No provision is made for those teachers in the City who will be displaced from their jobs if the plan is to work.

The faculty provisions fall prey to the fatal error of attempting to rectify discrimination against one group by discriminating against another in violation of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. This is done in such a fashion as to almost assure future litigation. The proper remedy for hiring discrimination is to assure non-discriminatory recruitment. Subsequent selection for employment from a race neutral hiring pool on a non-discriminatory basis assures that no person is discriminated against because of race. The mandatory race conscious quotas set out in the plan can lead only to one of two alternatives: evasion of the Court's Order or racial discrimination. Therefore, portions of the faculty provisions should be redrafted to provide for true non-discriminatory employment hiring practices where no one is accepted or rejected for employment because of their race.

3. The final area of special concern is funding. The proposal requires the Court to issue orders which distribute the cost of the plan in some unspecified proportion between two non-signatories to the plan. The plan will involve substantial cost. The enti-

ties that are designated to bear the cost (the State and the tax-
payers of St. Louis) have not agreed to bear the cost. Absent
subsequent supplemental liability findings the Court is constricted
in what funding orders it can issue. We are unaware of any basis
that the proponents advance to support a tax increase in the
City of St. Louis. On the present record we oppose such an
increase.

While it is clear that the State was ordered to pay the
costs of the current 12(a) plan, that plan was somewhat more
modest in its potential expenditures. The proposal contemplates
major additional responsibilities being cast upon one of the
parties, the State, which has not consented to the proposed settle-
ment agreement and which, it is assumed, will bear a significant
portion of the costs.* / The proposed settlement agreement cannot
serve as an independent basis for imposing costs on the State,
however. Therefore the proponents must demonstrate why the
increased level of funding must be borne entirely by the State
and why that increase is justified. Moreover, missing from the
record at the time of the drafting of this brief is any estimate
of the plan's cost by one of the proponents of the plan. The

* / Illustrative of this action required of the State which is not
supported by the record is the provision contained in paragraph
B(4) on p. X-3: "The State shall not decrease its level of funding
for education below the amount of funding established for the
1982-83 fiscal year." Presumably, the purpose of this provision
is to prevent the State from cutting back on its current educational
expenditures in order to fund the State's extensive fiscal re-
sponsibilities under this plan. However, since the costs of this
plan would be funding for education, the phrase does not achieve
its purpose.

State has estimated potential cost at being in excess of one hundred million dollars per year. It would seem that detailed proposed budgets would be a necessary precondition to approval of the plan. The proponents should be required to present definite projections as to what it is anticipated the plan will do and will cost, and how the expense is to be allocated among the parties.

Reluctantly, the United States cannot fully endorse the proposed settlement agreement as drafted. The Court should accept the structure of the settlement agreement but require that the specifics be redrafted to provide for a fair, reasonable and adequate resolution.


Respectfully submitted,

Thomas E. Dittmeier
United States Attorney

Wm. Bradford Reynolds
Assistant Attorney General

Joseph Moore
Assistant U.S. Attorney

J. Harvie Wilkinson, III
Deputy Assistant Attorney General



Thomas M. Keeling
Craig M. Crenshaw, Jr.
Jeremiah Glassman
Attorneys
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 633-2192

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I will either personally deliver or place a numbered copy of the foregoing in the United States mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows as soon as the document number is received:

Joseph S. McDuffie
William P. Russell
408 Olive Street, Suite 715
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

John H. Lashly
Paul B. Rava
Lashly, Caruthers, Thies, Rava,
and Hamel
714 Locust Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Brooks Pitchie
Assistant Attorney General
Broadway State Office Building
8th Floor
P. O. Box 899
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Larry R. Marshall
Special Assistant Attorney General
920A East Broadway
Columbia, Missouri 65201

Robert Dierker, Asst. City Counselor
City Hall, Room 314
12th & Market Streets
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Anthony J. Sestric
1015 Locust Street, Suite 601
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

William E. Caldwell
Richard B. Fields
Ratner & Sugarmon
525 Commerce Title Building
Memphis, Tennessee 38103
William Taylor
Center for National Policy Review
The Catholic University of America
School of Law
Washington, D.C. 20064

Thomas I. Atkins
Teresa Demchak
General Counsel
NAACP
1790 Broadway, 10th Floor
New York, New York 10019

Lynn Bradney
Executive Director
Desegregation Monitoring and
Advisory Committee
522 Olive (2nd Floor)
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Joseph Moore
Assistant United States Attorney
Room 414, U.S. Court and
Custom House
1114 Market Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

David S. Tatel
Hogan & Hartson
815 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20006

Ms. Susan Uchitelle
301 Gay Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Frank Susman
Norman C. Parker
Stephen G. Hamilton
Susman, Schermer, Rimmel & Parker
Tenth Floor Aragon Place
7711 Carondelet Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Bertram W. Tremayne, Jr.
Tremayne, Lay, Carr & Bauer
120 S. Central, Suite 540
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

George J. Bude
Ziercher, Hocker, Tzinberg,
Human & Michenfelder
130 South Bemiston #405
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

John Gianoulakis
Kohn, Shands, Elbert,
Gianoulakis & Giljum
411 North Seventh Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Mr. Donald J. Stohr
R. J. Robertson
James W. Erwin
Thompson & Mitchell
One Mercantile Center, Suite 3400
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Mr. Robert G. McClintock
705 Olive Street, Room 722
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Shulamith Simon, Esq.
Husch, Eppenberger, Donohue,
Elson and Cornfeld
100 North Broadway
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

Francis L. Ruppert
Ruppert, Westhus and Benjamin
8000 Bonhomme, Suite 201
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Robert W. Copeland
Suite 600
130 South Bemiston
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Robert P. Baine, Jr.
Baine, Edwards and Wideman
225 South Meramec
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Bertram W. Tremayne, Jr.
Tremayne, Lay, Carr & Bauer
120 S. Central, Suite 540
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

George J. Bude
Ziercher, Hocker, Tzinberg,
Human & Michenfelder
130 South Bemiston #405
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

John Gianoulakis
Kohn, Shands, Elbert,
Gianoulakis & Giljum
411 North Seventh Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Mr. Donald J. Stohr
R. J. Robertson
James W. Erwin
Thompson & Mitchell
One Mercantile Center, Suite 3400
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Mr. Robert G. McClintock
705 Olive Street, Room 722
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Shulamith Simon, Esq.
Husch, Eppenberger, Donohue,
Elson and Cornfeld
100 North Broadway
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

Francis L. Ruppert
Ruppert, Westhus and Benjamin
8000 Bonhomme, Suite 201
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Robert W. Copeland
Suite 600
130 South Bemiston
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Robert P. Baine, Jr.
Baine, Edwards and Wideman
225 South Meramec
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Andrew J. Minardi
Leslie Shechter
Susan Pippa
Assistant County Counselor
County Government Center
41 S. Central
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Henry D. Menghini
Robert J. Krehbiel
Evans & Dixon
314 N. Broadway, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

Darold E. Crotzer, Jr.
Steinberg and Crotzer
230 S. Bemiston, Suite 1010
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Richard H. Ulrich
Shifrin, Treiman, Barken,
Dempsey & Ulrich
11 South Meramec, Suite 1350
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Edward E. Murphy, Jr.
Garry Seltzer
Murphy and Associates P.C.
120 South Central, Suite 938
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Dr. Marion B. Holmes
Director of Vocational Education
Division of Career Education
School District of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19146

Mr. Clide D. Cassity
Director of Vocational-Technical Education
Kirksville R-III School District
Kirksville, Missouri 63501

Dr. Ralph H. Beacham
Executive Director - MCC
12110 Clayton Roady
Town & Country, Missouri 63131

Ramon J. Morganstern
Michael J. McKittrick
Morganstern, Drumm, Soraghan, Snyder,
Stockenberg & McKittrick
7733 Forsyth Boulevard, Suite 2162
Clayton, Missouri 63105


Ms. Eleanor Jones, Chairwoman
Committee on Quality Education
c/o University of Missouri-St. Louis
Department of Administration,
Foundations and Secondary Education
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Kenneth V. Byrne
Schlueter & Byrne
11 S. Meramec, Suite 1400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Michael J. Hoare
John D. Lynn
Chackes, Hoare & Sedey
314 North Broadway, Suite 1010
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

Professor D. Bruce LaPierre
Washington University School of Law
Campus Box 1130
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

This 27th day of April, 1983.



Attorney
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 633-2192