

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF AFRICAN AND AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDIES

INEQUALITY, EDUCATION, AND RACE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF URBAN
EDUCATION IN POST-CIVIL RIGHTS NEW YORK CITY AND POST-APARTHEID
CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA

KAYLA LARKIN
Spring 2012

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in African and African-American Studies and Global and International Studies
with Honors in African and African-American Studies

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Dr. Clemente Abrokwa
Senior Lecturer, African Studies
Thesis Supervisor

Dr. Kevin Thomas
Assistant Professor, Sociology and African Studies
Honors Advisor

*Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to compare urban education in the United States and South Africa. Specifically, it focuses on urban education in post-Civil Rights New York City, and post-Apartheid Cape Town, South Africa. The objective is to determine any forms of inequality that may still exist in the educational offerings and practices in the two cities, due to a history of social inequality on the basis of race.

Following the 1954 United States Supreme Court decision made in the *Brown v. Board of Education* and the end of Apartheid in 1994 in South Africa, educational inequality should have been deemed legally obsolete. The *Brown v. Board of Education* decision outlawed segregation in U.S public schools. Similarly, South Africa witnessed political negotiations and multi-racial democratic elections that brought about an end to its Apartheid regime in 1994, thus legally ending the country's racial separation laws dating back to 1948.

Despite these legal victories, inequality remains a problem in the educational systems of both the United States and the Republic of South Africa, particularly in the provision of urban education. These inequalities have created large achievement gaps between white students and non-white students. Several studies on comparative education have been conducted focusing on educational inequality in these two countries. However, very little research exists that focuses specifically on the inequalities found in the education systems of the cities of New York and Cape Town. This study hopes to fill the gap left by previous research studies.

Data collection for the study will include library resources such as books, newspaper articles, Online journals, Internet sources, video documentaries, and interviews from teachers and university students in Cape Town and New York City.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the study.....	1
Statement of the problem.....	1
Background to the problem.....	2
Significance of the study.....	8
Hypothesis.....	8
Methodology.....	8
Research Questions.....	8
CHAPTER II: Literature Review.....	10
Introduction.....	10
Theories on Education and Inequality.....	10
Theories on Race.....	16
Conclusion.....	22
CHAPTER III: Urban Education in New York City and Cape Town, South Africa.....	23
Introduction.....	23
History of Educational segregation in New York City, pre-1954.....	24
Brown v. Board of Education (1954).....	31
Post-Brown v. Board of Education: Education in New York City.....	38
Analysis.....	50
Conclusion.....	55
Urban Education in Cape Town, South Africa	
History of Apartheid: 1948- 1994.....	56
The Bantu Education Act of 1953 & its Effects on Black Education.....	69
Post-Apartheid Education in South Africa: Cape Town.....	77
Conclusion.....	90
CHAPTER IV: Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications for Further Study.....	91
Summary.....	91
Conclusions.....	91
Recommendations.....	93
Implications for Further Study.....	94
References.....	95

Chapter I

Introduction

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to compare urban education in the United States and South Africa. Specifically, it focuses on urban education in post-Civil Rights New York City, and post-Apartheid Cape Town, South Africa. The objective is to determine any forms of inequality that may still exist in the educational offerings and practices in the two cities, due to a history of social inequality on the basis of race.

Statement of the Problem

Following the 1954 United States Supreme Court decision made in the *Brown v. Board of Education* and the end of Apartheid in 1994 in South Africa, educational inequality should have been deemed legally obsolete. The *Brown v. Board of Education* decision outlawed segregation in U.S public schools. Similarly, South Africa witnessed political negotiations and multi-racial democratic elections that brought about an end to its Apartheid regime in 1994, thus legally ending the nation's racial separation laws dating back to 1948.

Despite these legal victories, inequality remains a problem in the educational systems of both the United States and the Republic of South Africa, particularly in the provision of urban education. These inequalities have created large achievement gaps between white students and non-white students. Several studies on comparative education have been conducted focusing on educational inequality in these two countries. However,

very little research exists that focuses specifically on the inequalities found in the education systems of the cities of New York and Cape Town. This study hopes to fill the gap left by previous research studies.

Background to the Problem

Educational inequality involves access to education of a lesser quality. Research shows that this inequality directly correlates with economic, ethnic, and racial inequality. Closely related to this anomaly is what is known as the achievement gap. According to Education Week magazine (2004), the achievement gap “refers to the disparity in academic performance between groups of students. [It] shows up in grades, standardized test scores, course selection, dropout rates, and college completion rates.” These disparities can also be attributed to socioeconomic conditions (Education Week, 2004).

Similarly, Heather Bennett (2009) states that these disparities in quality of education also manifest in the form of “overcrowded class sizes, teacher shortages, dilapidated buildings, ineffective curriculums, and lack of funding” (Bennett, 2009: 8).

In order to understand the current inequalities found within the education systems of the cities of New York and Cape Town, one must examine the history of social inequality in these cities.

Educational Inequality in New York City

Fifty years after the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, the U.S Supreme Court case that legally ended segregation in American public schools, New York City’s public schools continue to be among the most segregated in the country. The 1954 ruling

brought about minimal changes to the City's educational system, where "the racial composition of schools today almost resembles those in the South of the 1950s" (Robinson, 2004). The city's façade of integration has its roots in 1900, when the last two schools designated for black students in the State of New York were abolished, seemingly ending educational segregation in the greater New York area. Despite this legal decree, public schools in the City of New York remained overwhelmingly segregated.

In 1955, the Public Education Association (PEA) found that approximately ninety-two percent of the City's public schools were overwhelmingly segregated according to race. These schools contained student populations that were either upwards of eight-five percent white or upwards of eight-five percent black and Hispanic (Ravitch, 2000: 251- 254). This segregation was made possible by a number of factors. Firstly, the School Board of New York implemented deceptive policies in an attempt to circumvent the federal desegregation laws (Ravitch, 2000). White insistence, at the resolve of principals, teachers, parents, and school boards, was central to educational segregation.

According to Diane Ravitch:

"There were subtle administrative practices which were as racist in their effect as legal segregation: school-zoning laws drawn to keep minority group children out of white schools; districts gerrymandered into odd shapes to preserve the status quo in certain schools; junior high schools kept white by the arrangement of their elementary school feeders" (Ravitch, 2004: 246).

Despite these findings, the PEA did little to hold the Board of Education responsible for these circumstances. The makers of educational zoning policies were deemed "color-blind" and practical, credited with creating policies that "minimized the distance from home to school, avoided traffic hazards and topographical features, and kept districts similar in size" (Douglas, 2005: 150- 152). In reality these school zones

were drawn along racial lines and exacerbated by residential segregation, an additional reason for the presence of overwhelming educational segregation within the New York City public school system.

According to Davison M. Douglas (2005), residential segregation made educational segregation relatively easy for the City of New York. In 1913 a study of black education in New York City revealed that assignment patterns in the City's elementary schools were generally consistent with residential patterns. The City was deemed innocent of intentional segregation and considered an example for other cities' educational systems. This credit was undeserved, since residential patterns contributed to the City's goal of educational segregation. By 1934, Harlem had thirteen virtually all-black schools due to residential segregation. (Douglas, 2005: 150- 152). This racial segregation was the consequence of:

“Blockbusting by realtors, redlining (banks and mortgage companies refusing blacks loans to purchase homes and businesses in certain neighborhoods), and industries that refused to hire blacks or relegated them to the lowest menial position” (Taylor, 2011: 100- 101).

White resistance and institutional racism thus led a triumphant campaign for residential segregation in New York City at the time.

In addition to the creation of educational segregation, residential segregation also exacerbated the strategic sketching of school district lines in the City. At the same time that the City was being lauded for its unintentional segregation, it was also found guilty of “gerrymandering” district lines “in and around Harlem to preserve racial segregation” (Robinson: 2004), making it clear that educational segregation was, in fact, the objective that the New York City Board of Education and its associated white influential members desired. Residential segregation, and the call for such circumstances by whites, contribute to New York's educational segregation today— a system that ranked third in the country

for black-white segregation in the 2000 census. In the same year, “the typical black student attended a school where only five percent of the other students were white” (Robinson, 2004). In 2010 the U.S census revealed that the City had moved up to second place.

Existing evidence indicates that this segregation is upheld by popular request. First, a 2004 investigation carried out by the Fair Housing Alliance in Brooklyn exposed the efforts of white real estate agents to maintain the status quo of the separation of blacks and whites. For example:

One Corcoran agent [of Corcoran Real Estate Company] reportedly showed a white tester 13 different properties, but showed only one place to a black applicant who had a higher income and a better job (Louis, 2010). Other such investigations carried out under the Andrew Cuomo Administration have uncovered similar attempts at housing discrimination. Black applicants were turned away or informed to submit applications for apartments that whites were immediately offered. Such findings are indicative of “silent covenants among political and business leaders to ignore segregation” (Louis, 2010).

This is clearly indicative of explicit attempts to carry on segregation by officials involved.

Educational Inequality in South Africa

Apartheid, which means “apartness,” refers to the legal segregation of the races under South African law instituted in 1948, with the election of the Nationalist Party, and which ended in 1994, when black majority rule began in the country. However, racial separation in South Africa dates back to the earliest days of colonialism in the 1600s. The Nationalist Party was merely responsible for the legalization of this racial separation.

From the period 1948 to 1994, the Apartheid regime of South Africa created a system characterized by white supremacy. The system created a racial classification in which South Africans were placed into one of four categories: white, colored, black, or

Asian. Apartheid legislation ensured that non-whites were given access to services inferior to those offered to whites.

Educational inequality in Cape Town, therefore, has its roots in the twentieth century through the educational policies of the Apartheid era of South Africa. Specifically, the foundation of the educational inequality in Cape Town schools can be attributed to the Bantu Education Act of 1953, a law that extended the Apartheid system of government into South Africa's educational system. (Kallaway, 1984)

The country's Minister of Education at the time, Dr. Hendrik F. Verwoed, considered by many to be the mastermind behind the Apartheid system, justified the policy in the following manner:

“There is no space for him [the "Native"] in the European Community above certain forms of labor. For this reason it is of no avail for him to receive training which has its aim in the absorption of the European Community, where he cannot be absorbed. Until now he has been subjected to a school system which drew him away from his community and misled him by showing him the greener pastures of European Society where he is not allowed to graze” (Kallaway, 1984: 92).

With racial subjugation at the heart of its purpose, the Bantu Education Act brought black education under the complete jurisdiction of the Apartheid government. This was made possible with the 1949 creation of the Commission on Native Education by the Nationalist government. In order to manipulate black education, control of black schools had to be taken away from “the missionary bodies that were running the vast majority of black schools at that time and placed under the Native Affairs Department” (Kallaway, 1984: 160- 161).

Previously, schools for South African blacks had been run by missionaries with the help of state aid. The new policy promulgated by the Bantu Education Act made this aid conditional on the implementation of the government's educational program, which

was racist in nature and designed to further subjugate non-whites in the South African society. Not surprisingly, most mission schools chose to close instead of perpetuate the ideologies of the Apartheid government. By 1959, nearly all black schools, with the exception of seven hundred Catholic schools, had been brought under the authority of the Native Affairs Department (Kallaway 1984: 162). The new curriculum designed under the stipulations of the Bantu Education Act promoted myths and racial stereotypes in its curricula and textbooks. Furthermore, the separate schooling systems under Apartheid worked to “reproduce social relations” by “reinforcing the concentration of blacks at lower levels of schooling, where the education they received would ensure their position as working class” (Kallaway, 1984: 167).

The Bantu Education Act legally segregated South African schools along racial lines, a policy that was overtly separate and unequal. For example,

“Expenditure on black and white schools was vastly different...Educational provisions for blacks were far from adequate. There was a shortage of teachers, many of whom were poorly qualified, or not qualified at all. School facilities were limited: buildings were usually rudimentary and inadequate, and there were shortages of furniture, books, and other equipment” (Kallaway, 1984: 165).

Like the educational inequality of New York City, educational inequality in Cape Town, South Africa was upheld by an overreaching system of social inequality as Apartheid spread into the country’s educational system. This legal segregation ended in 1994 with the country’s first democratic elections in which Nelson Mandela became the first black president of South Africa. Despite this apparent victory, educational inequality has persisted in South African schools, including those of Cape Town, a city described today as “multicultural and highly unequal” (Centeno and Newman, 2010: 65).

This study aims to investigate the continued existence of educational inequalities, if any, in the two urban cities stated above.

Significance of the Study

The study is significant because it will add to the existing body of literature on comparative education, particularly urban education. It hopes to benefit policy makers, city lawmakers, and the boards of education in the cities of Cape Town and New York. It will also benefit academics, faculty, and students in comparative education, as well as educational organizations working to close the achievement gap and bring about an end to educational inequality.

Hypothesis

Educational inequalities exist in the public school systems of New York City and Cape Town, South Africa due to historical legacies based on racial segregation.

Methodology

Data collection for the study will include library resources such as books, newspaper articles, Online journals, Internet sources, video documentaries, and interviews from teachers and university students in Cape Town and New York City.

Research Questions

1. What contributed to the current state of educational inequality in the public school systems of Cape Town, South Africa and New York City?
2. What is educational inequality?
3. How does inequality affect education in these cities today?

4. What steps, if any, are currently being taken to resolve the problems of educational inequality in New York City and Cape Town, South Africa?

Chapter II

Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the theories on inequality and race as presented in the literature. In order to understand the presence of educational inequality within the urban education systems of New York City and Cape Town, South Africa, it is necessary to discuss the definition of educational inequality, as well as its underlying causes.

Theories on Education and Inequality

Education has the ability to be wielded by those who have control over it as both a means of social empowerment, as well as a means of social oppression. In the former case, education offers the promise of invaluable knowledge and the possibility of social mobilization. In a quote that conjures up the ideals of the American Dream, South Africa's former president Nelson Mandela once said that, "Education is the most powerful tool which you can use to change the world." Mr. Mandela realized that, worldwide, those who are provided an education are provided with the capacity to institute social change.

In its function as a means of social oppression, education serves to curb social change. Access to education is determined by the elites, who manipulate the educational system so that it may reproduce the status quo and maintain the presence of those in power. This abuse of the educational system has been exercised across the United States

and South Africa. The enslavement of blacks in the U.S brought with it the manipulation of the education system. For example, “it was illegal for a slave to learn how to read and write for fear that such education had the power to free him/her mentally, thus allowing them to challenge the master-slave establishment and change it” (Bennett, 200: 7). Future policies of educational segregation would all be formulated for the “[subjugation] of the black population by turning them into the exploited working class of society” (Bennett, 2009: 8). In South Africa, the education of non-whites was designed along similar principles:

“Native education should be controlled in such a way that it should be in accord with the policy of the state... If the native in South Africa today in any kind of school in existence is being taught to expect that he will live his adult life under a policy of equal rights, he is making a big mistake... There is no place for him in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour” (Thompson, 2001: 196).

Educational inequality is defined by access to an education that is inferior in quality, as well as unequal to that of the education being offered to other social groups. This inequality occurs when the quality of one’s education is determined by one’s social group, gender, religion, race, or socioeconomic background, rather than readily available as well as equal for all societal groups. Thus, “in the context of learning pathways, discrimination has to do with the ways in which differential opportunities for progression are made available to different groups” (Centeno and Newman, 2010: 111).

Socioeconomic background plays a large role in the educational inequality found in the urban educational systems of many cities, including New York City and Cape Town, South Africa. Recent studies have found that the achievement gap between high-income and low-income families is greater than that between black and white students in the United States (Ladd and Fiske, 2011). Furthermore,

“Data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress show that more than 40 percent of the variation in average reading scores and 46 percent of the variation in average math scores

across states is associated with variation in child poverty rates” (Ladd and Fiske, 2011).

At the university level, students from the poorest quarter of the population have an 8.6% chance of obtaining a college degree compared to the 74.9% chance that the wealthiest quarter of the population has to complete the same level of education (Brooks, 2005).

Additionally,

“International research tells the same story. Results of the 2009 reading tests conducted by the Program for International Student Assessment show that, among 15-year-olds in the United States and the 13 countries whose students outperformed ours, students with lower economic and social status had far lower test scores than their more advantaged counterparts within every country” (Ladd and Fiske, 2011).

Such statistics have been brought about by the inferior education offered to students from low-income families. In schools characterized by high concentrations of poverty, “it is very difficult to get consistently good results... Teachers tend to avoid such schools. Expectations regarding student achievement are frequently much lower, and the are lower levels of parental involvement” (Herbert, 2011). The inferior and thus unequal conditions of high poverty schools will be more comprehensively detailed in subsequent chapters.

Contemporary educational inequality in the United States and South Africa has its roots in the inequality of the past, most notably “the period when colonialism and segregation, reinforced by racist assumptions, prevailed elsewhere in Africa...and racist ideas and practices were widespread in the United States” (Thompson: 2001, 155).

Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis write that, “The halting contribution of U.S education to equality and full human development appears intimately related to the nature of the economic structures into which schools must integrate each generation of youth” (Bowles and Gintis, 1976: 53). They compare education to the economy, stating that both are

dominated by the “imperatives of profit and domination rather than by human need” (54). In the United States, as well as South Africa, the education system serves to reinforce the given social hierarchy in place and reproduce the subservient status of various social groups “by accustoming youth to the social relationships of dominance and subordination in the economic system” at hand (Bowles and Gintis, 1976: 56). Since the days of slavery, the educational system has been an institution that serves to perpetuate a structure of privilege in the United States, and since the days of Apartheid in South Africa. For example, a study conducted by the Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan from 1967 to 1971 found that whites from high socioeconomic backgrounds enjoyed “returns to education” that were sixty-six percent higher than those of whites from low socioeconomic backgrounds and blacks (99).

The U.S education system has prided itself on “rewarding higher IQ, an attribute significantly associated with higher socioeconomic background” (Bowles and Gintis, 1976: 121). Thus the system presents itself “beneath a façade of meritocracy” (103), masking the reality that schools have been used as a “legitimation of inequality” and as a “mechanism for assigning individuals to unequal economic positions” (101-103). The idea of the education system as what Tom Brokaw calls “the common ground” and “the engine that moves [society] toward a common destiny” is largely symbolic. In reality the system has largely maintained the social structure and moved certain groups towards their relegated place within the hierarchy.

The history of educational inequality found within the South African education system is also largely connected to the nation’s economic history. By the start of the

Apartheid regime in 1948, whites in South Africa had dominated every sector of the capitalist economy with the use of cheap black labor (Thompson, 2001). Two years earlier, in 1946, “white income per head in South Africa was more than ten times that of Africans, six times that of Asians, and five times that of Coloreds” (Thompson, 2001: 156). Furthermore, “the material gap between the two white ethnic communities [Britons and Afrikaners] was closing, but the gap between Whites and Blacks was as wide as ever and more rigid than ever” (Thompson, 2001: 156). In the early 1900s, Britons “virtually monopolized the entrepreneurial, managerial, and skilled positions in every sector of the economy” (Thompson, 2001: 155). Additionally, efforts were being carried out by the South African government to increase the social status and economic opportunities of Afrikaners with the hopes of consolidating white power. The only racial question being addressed in South Africa was the disparity and “ethnic cleavage” between Afrikaners and English-speaking South Africans, even though “the primary division was still the racial cleavage that had [characterized] white settlement, slave importation, and the Khoikhoi incorporation” (Thompson, 2001). The problems that plagued the nation’s Black community were largely ignored by whites (with the exception of a small population of European socialists and a large number of Christian missionaries.) Instead, the South African government worked to aggravate the economic burdens that blacks faced and to solidify the proletariat status of blacks.

Black land ownership was restricted to certain government-designated reserves. Those blacks who lived outside of these reserves were transformed into wage and tenant laborers for white farmers with the help of municipal, provincial, and federal taxes on land (Thompson: 2001). While the government provided “massive assistance to white

farmers” (Thompson, 2001: 164), it did little to nothing to assist African farmers. Moreover, the South African government did not provide education to African children on the reserves, and thus by 1939, “fewer than thirty percent of African children were receiving any schooling at all to equip them to adapt to the new order” (Thompson, 2001: 164). By 1979, the percentage of black children receiving an education in South Africa had dwindled to a little over twenty-one percent. On the other hand, all white children were required to attend school, and thus one hundred percent of children were provided with an education. At the same time, the South African government was spending ten times as much money on white education as it was on the education of black students. Teachers in black schools were less qualified and paid less than white teachers regardless of qualifications (Thompson, 2001). By 1986, the government was spending “more than seven times as much to educate a white child as to educate an African child, the vast majority of Blacks were poor, and several million were unemployed and destitute” (Thompson, 2001: 227). Furthermore, laws such as the Land Act and the Group Areas Act still remained in place, prohibiting blacks from owning land outside of government-designated areas.

Land shortages, population increase, and taxation impoverished black South Africans, most of whom worked in white households, mines, factories, or the fields of white farmers. In both the United States and South Africa, “the categories Race and Class coincided closely: with few exceptions, black people, however able, were subordinate to white people, however feeble” (Thompson, 2001: 155). The master-servant system, and thus the subjugation of the black race, was upheld by the economic system of in place, a system that equated race and class. Much like the case of education, one’s class was not a

representation of ability, but rather one's place in American or South African society as a Black man or woman. The education system served to perpetuate a lower class made up of blacks by providing such individuals with an education designed for subservience and domination. Marxist theories on the 'economics' of education pose that "central to the consideration of schooling in a capitalist state is a theory of the reproduction of labour" (Kallaway, 1984: 163). An individual's position in society could be determined by the type or quality of education provided to them.

Theories on Race

Race is a sociological construct that has long been used by human beings as a means of social stratification, and subsequently as a justification for the subjugation of certain groups. Since its very conception, Western society has played into the idea of an innate social hierarchy. Renowned Western philosopher Aristotle once said that, "From the hour of their birth, some are marked for subjugation, others for rule" (Bennett, 2009: 5). This statement calls attention to the idea that this power structure is considered to be both natural and inescapable.

A number of religious ideologies have supported this social order:

"Combined with the theological teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas, and other Judeo-Christian theologians, the subjugation of people of color, such as Blacks and Native Americans, was legitimized and ordained by God. Jewish philosophers of Spain and Portugal in the early 1600s combined Aristotle's idea of the Natural slave with the belief that Noah's curse of Ham, which is thought to be the descendant of Africans, condemned Africans to slavery and subordination" (Bennett, 2009: 5).

From the start of the slave trade through the twentieth century segregation of Blacks,

religion has been used by individuals to both justify and legitimize this treatment.

Churches such as the one located on Robben Island, an island approximately four miles off of the coast of Cape Town that was long used as a prison, proclaimed that, “there was no room for Blacks in Heaven” (Thompson, 2001: 38) during the Apartheid regime. Long before this period and even before the British takeover at the Cape, Afrikaners considered themselves a “chosen people” and believed that they were “endowed by God with the destiny to rule South Africa and civilize its heathen inhabitants” (Thompson, 2001: 135).

Along the same line of reasoning, upon their arrival to the Cape colony, British explorers sent a statement back to the British government that read:

“We are resolved, wherever we go, that we will uphold the just principles of liberty; but whilst we take care that no one shall be held in a state of slavery, it is our determination to maintain such regulations as may suppress crime, and preserve proper relations between master and servant” (Thompson, 2001: 88).

Although Boers and Britons had different nationalities, they shared many of the same goals, including racial subjugation and the desire to “prevent Africans from dominating South African political systems” (Thompson, 2001: 136). Other such Europeans and colonial powers justified the colonization of Africans by making use of preconceived notions of social hierarchy, as well as creating and perpetuating the notion that the indigenous peoples that they encountered were uncivilized, “barbaric,” and “backwards.”

Upon European arrival at the Cape in South Africa, explorers came into contact with the Khoikhoi, whom the Europeans considered “savage and beastly” (Kruger, 2008) and thus depicted them as such. The journals and records of early European explorers contain such descriptions, and the coinciding portraits of Africans uphold the same distorted representations. One explorer, Hans Magic, described the Khoikhoi as “a heathen lot that stole and plundered and murdered as far as they went,” and referred to

them as “devils” (Kruger, 2008: 84). Soon the Khoikhoi and other indigenous South African groups would be consolidated under the term “Hottentot, a synonym for degradation” that is defined by European dictionaries as “a rough, unmannerly person” as well as “a person of inferior intellect or culture” (Kruger, 2008: 84). Drawings of the Khoikhoi also presented Africans as less than human, despite the fact that most of the artists had never stepped foot on the African continent.

Rooted in Europeans’ fears of the unknown and misunderstandings of other cultures rather than rooted in reality, these caricatures spawned stereotypes that have infiltrated modern conceptions of race. As Anne-Mart Suzanne Kruger states in her essay “History, Storytelling and Orality: The Representation of the Khoikhoi in André Brink’s *Devil’s Valley*,” “our histories and textbooks would reflect these perceptions (2008: 84). Future Western propaganda would replicate the distortments and misinterpretations of that of the early European explorers, as well as echo the sentiments attached to them. The 1915 American film *The Birth of a Nation* is credited as the first film to capture every negative Black stereotype. Based on Thomas Dixon’s novel *The Clansman*, the film portrays Blacks as primitive and of inferior intelligence, much like the journals of European explorers. In accordance with Dixon’s own words, the black caricature is presented as: “half child, half animal, the sport of impulse, whim, and conceit...a being who, left to his will, roams at night and sleeps in the day, whose speech knows no word of love, whose passions, once aroused, are as the fury of the tiger.”

For centuries, negative stereotypes have been attached to societal notions of race and used to uphold a power structure that subjugates Blacks. By portraying black men as rapists and “beasts” *The Birth of a Nation*, and other similar representations of Blacks,

served to justify the lynching of Blacks and legitimize white supremacy (Pilgrim, 2000). Similarly, these ideas of race were used to substantiate the Jim Crow laws of the United States as well as the Apartheid regime of South Africa. The equating of racial stereotypes to fact was exacerbated by the implementation of scientific racism.

John Hartwell Moore defines scientific racism as:

“The act of justifying inequalities between natural groups of people by recourse to science. It is the result of a conjunction of two cultural values or ideologies. First, that natural categories of the human species exist and are of different overall worth; and secondly, that science provides as source of authoritative knowledge” (Moore: 2008).

Science was used to differentiate the races. Racial classifications were created arbitrarily by men such as Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, who believed that there were five races: Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, American, and Malay (Bennett, 2009: 16).

Blumenbach describes the Caucasian race most favorably, whilst placing all Asian peoples under the category of “Mongolian” and denigrating the Ethiopian race as “nearer to the apes than any other men” (Bernasconi and Lott, 2000: 33). Although we will look at the racial classifications set up by the Apartheid regime more thoroughly in the next chapter, it is important to note that such racial lines were also made according to the point of view of the whites who created them. For example,

“The people who whites grouped together as ‘Colored’ differed greatly among themselves. Their ancestors included Khoisan people and slaves from Indonesia, Madagascar, and tropical Africa. They ranged from culturally deprived farm laborers to skilled urban craftspeople. Some were Christians, others Muslims” (Thompson, 2001: 113).

Scientific racism was used to prove the biological inferiority of certain races. Works such as *Types of Mankind* written by Josiah Clark Nott and George Robbins Gliddon examined the physical characteristics of various ethnic groups and attributed

personality characteristics to each race. Findings such as those of Nott and Robbins were based upon personal attitudes towards other races rather than any real knowledge or scientific basis. As both men were of European descent, it is not surprising that their conclusions depicted their race as most superior (Bennett, 2009). They write that, “a small trace of white blood in the negro improves him in intelligence and morality; and an equally small trace of negro blood...will protect such individual against the deadly influence of climates which the pure-white man cannot endure” (Nott and Gliddon, 1854: 68), yet have no evidence to back up such claims. American anthropologist Frederick Starr wrote in his 1897 essay entitled “The Degeneracy of the American Negro” that,

“It is certain that the race differences are real and persistent. Study of criminality in the two races gives astonishing results. Of the total prisoners in the United States in 1890, nearly thirty percent were colored; the Negro, however forms but eleven percent of the population” (Douglas, 2005: 126).

Instead of examining social circumstances in order to understand how such figures might have been produced, Starr condemns such an explanation and states that, “conditions of life and bad social opportunities cannot be urged in excuse,” and concludes that, “the difference is *racial*” (126). Starr’s logic plays into nearly every aspect of scientific racism and goes onto condemn educational equality. “What can be done?” he asks and answers with the following: “Not much. But faith in school-book education as a means of grace must die...Recognition between white men and black men is fundamental” (126).

Economist Frederick Hoffman agreed with Starr’s thought process, declaring that, “We have here abundant evidence that we find in race and heredity the determining factors in the upward or downward course of mankind.” He adds that, “the colored race is shown to be on the downward grade, tending toward a condition in which matters will be worse than they are now.” Hoffman concludes that race is the factor which single-handedly

solidifies a person's fate, stating that "neither religion nor education nor a higher degree of economic well-being have been able to raise the [colored] race from a low and anti-social condition" (Douglas, 2005: 126).

Interpretations of Darwinism's 'survival of the fittest' theory were applied by many whites in the United States to the social hierarchy in place. At the same time, "the burgeoning new 'science' of eugenics lent support to notions of racial superiority" (Douglas, 2005: 126). G. Stanley Hall and G.E Partridge, two prominent educational theorists of the early twentieth century, proposed a "genetic philosophy to education [in which] each race must be educated and governed according to the stage of culture and development to which it belongs." Moreover, Hall and Partridge believed that blacks and whites were exceptionally different from one another in both "body and mind" that "the two races should not be treated alike in any particular" (Douglas, 2005: 126-127).

Conclusion

Institutional racism in both the United States and South Africa has allowed for the perpetuation of the previously mentioned theories on inequality and race. The term 'institutional racism' "refers to the effects of institutional operations that systematically reflect and produce racial inequalities" (Centeno and Newman, 2010: 110). We have seen how the economic and educational systems of each nation created a societal hierarchy along the lines of race and class, which have grown to be interconnected. We have seen how racism manifests itself in the education sphere "[through] the persistence of

significant inequalities of opportunity” (Centeno and Newman, 2010: 111). This chapter has examined the presence of inequality and race in the United States and South Africa. The theories presented in the Literature Review demonstrate the interconnectedness of inequality and race in the United States and South Africa, particularly in relation to educational inequality. With a greater understanding of situations of inequality and ideologies on race, one is able to better understand the circumstances that underlie the urban education systems of New York City and Cape Town.

Chapter III

Urban Education in New York City

And Cape Town, South Africa

Introduction

This chapter will examine urban education in the cities of New York and Cape Town, South Africa. The objective is to address the causes underlying the educational inequalities of the cities. Beginning with the public education system of New York City, the chapter will include historical information on the segregation witnessed in the city's public schools before the 1954 Supreme Court decision to end educational segregation in the United States. The discussion will focus on the *Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka* case of 1954 (hereafter referred to as *Brown v. Board.*) The effects of this decision on the New York City public school system will also be discussed, as well as the present state of the educational system. The section will illustrate the discrepancies between the decrees laid out by the *Brown v. Board* decision and the realities of the New York City public school system following the decision.

The chapter will also detail urban education in Cape Town, South Africa. It will present a discussion of the country's Apartheid regime from 1948- 1994, followed by information on the Bantu Education Act of 1953. The effects of this Act on Black education in South Africa will also be discussed. The state of South Africa's education post-Apartheid education system will also be addressed, along with an analysis of urban education in the city of Cape Town today.

Urban Education in New York City

History of Educational Segregation in New York City, pre-1954

Educational inequality in the city of New York has its roots in the history of educational segregation that characterized the American public school system during the first half of the twentieth century. In 1900 the last two schools designated for black students in the State of New York were shut down by law, thus seemingly ending educational segregation state-wide. Despite this legal decree, public schools in the City of New York remained overwhelmingly segregated even at the time of the *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954, the Supreme Court's ruling which banned racially segregated public schools in the United States which will be discussed in greater detail later on in this chapter. Throughout chapter three, the author will present the numerous inconsistencies between law and practice in urban education.

In the 1820s and 1830s, the debate over the institution of a free schooling system in the United States gave birth to the creation of the American public school system. In the North, a supplemental debate ensued over the inclusion of Blacks into this new educational system. Most Northern states witnessed the following trend: the establishment of public schools exclusively for white students, followed by the foundation of public schools for black students, which were “almost always very much inferior” to that of whites, and finally the creation of integrated schools (National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, 1963: 3). The call for integrated schools by Blacks was most resounding in the 1840s and 1850s. Opposition to “mixed schools” was as great in the North as it was in the South, where “the courts, state legislatures, and mob

violence” worked to prevent their establishment. By 1860 only a small number of integrated schools existed in “a few scattered and small communities.” The majority of schools in larger Northern cities, including New York, were deeply segregated along racial lines (National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, 1976: 3- 4).

According to Davison M. Douglas, “the Civil War did not settle the educational rights of African Americans in northern states” (Douglas, 2005: 61). Legislative efforts of the 1870s that sought to ban educational segregation throughout the United States failed to pass in Congress. However, between 1866 and 1887 every northern state except Indiana that had previously allowed educational segregation had passed laws that either explicitly or implicitly prohibited racial segregation in public schools. The State of New York passed such legislation in 1873, making it illegal for a student to “be excluded from any public school in the state of New York on account of race or color” (Douglas, 2005: 86). This legislation was met with a great deal of opposition in New York’s five boroughs. Although upstate school districts in the state of New York worked swiftly to desegregate the region’s schools, downstate districts in areas such as Jamaica, Queens and Brooklyn refused to integrate their schools. Opponents to integration in New York public schools argued that,

“The 1873 statute...did not require racially mixed schools, only equal educational benefits that could be provided in racially separate schools because [this] legislation had not *explicitly* repealed the 1864 legislative reauthorization of racially separate schools, ... school segregation remained lawful so long as equal school privileges were provided in black and white schools” (Douglas, 2005: 102).

This manipulation of the language of the law was used in a number of court cases in New York City. In 1875 a black student in Brooklyn was denied entrance into a nearby white school by the school’s principal. The court ruled that the 1873 law in question

“merely forbade ‘discrimination against’ black children, not ‘discrimination between’ black and white children...[and that] requiring black children to attend a separate black school constituted no discrimination ‘against’ them” (Douglas, 2005: 102). The decision made even went so far as to assert that “it might be ‘highly conducive to the welfare’ of black children to attend a separate school” (Douglas, 2005: 102). A second court case in the 1880s, again that of a black parent petitioning his child’s exclusion from a white school in Brooklyn, found that this exclusion was legal because the 1873 legislation did not outlaw segregation. When the case was taken to the New York Court of Appeals, a decision of three to two ruled that the law only ensured “equal facilities and advantages for the colored race,” and not integrated schools (Douglas, 2005: 103). The Jamaica section of Queens was another area of the City in which resistance to school integration was fervent; the area was among one of the most resistant in New York State. Here, in the 1890s, a one-room school for black students housed seventy-five students and only one teacher. When parents protested this situation, in the form of boycott and legal action, school officials threatened to incarcerate parents who withheld their children from school. This and other previously mentioned cases helped contribute to the formation of additional anti-segregation legislation, and in 1900 the New York General Assembly, with the support of Governor Theodore Roosevelt, enacted legislation that stated: “No person shall be refused admission into or be excluded from any public school in the state of New York on account of race or color” (103). This law led to the closing of all separate black schools that existed in Queens. However, it left a legal loophole that would carry on into the late 1930s, which allowed rural districts outside of the city to permit separate schools for blacks to stay open (Douglas, 2005).

In 1916, the former mayor of New York, Seth Low, issued a statement to Robert Moton, president of Tuskegee Institute at the time, avowing that, “Race purity is as strong an instinct in the North as it is in the South” (Douglas, 2005: 124). Low’s statement captured a trend of the time: the growing “decline in northern opposition to ‘Southern Racism’” (Douglas, 2005: 124). This mounting attitude coincided with the Great Migration of Southern blacks to Northern cities that took place at the end of the nineteenth century and peaked in the years during and after World War I. Six years prior to Mayor Low’s statement, the state of New York was home to the second largest black population in the North with 120,000 blacks, an increase of more than twenty-five percent since 1900. “This influx of Southern blacks exacerbated racial tensions” in cities across the North. It altered perceptions of integration, and “many white school officials who had tolerated school integration when the number of African Americans was relatively small began to insist on racial separation.” By the end of the 1930s, Northern school segregation was worse than it had been at the start of the twentieth century (Douglas, 2005), most notably due to residential segregation, however there were a number of other factors which came into play, including changing racial attitudes.

Despite an absolute legal decree that legally terminated racially segregated schools in the five boroughs of the New York City education system in 1900, as well as a number of legal victories in favor of integration, educational segregation carried on well into the twentieth century. Legal victories did not reflect a change in racial attitudes amongst Northern whites towards the education system. Consequently, “legal victories did not translate into the eradication of school segregation” (Douglas, 2005: 122). Firstly, in some cases and in some Northern communities, blacks who pushed for school

integration faced retaliation and even violence. White employers exerted economic pressure, in the form of work terminations or refusals to renew leases, upon blacks who fought for an end to educational segregation. The manipulation of court decisions also worked to curb educational integration in the New York City public school system. “On most occasions, losing school boards would grant relief only to the student specifically named in the writ,” citing that the decision “technically commanded the admission of only the one student” and thus did not apply to any other black student seeking admission into the school (Douglas, 2005: 112). For example, blacks in Queens in the late 1890s were forced to file “scores of lawsuits” to overcome this manipulation of court orders. In most other communities, blacks gave up and the court fees that were often required to file a lawsuit delayed or prevented others from maintaining their case (Douglas, 2005: 112).

As previously stated, residential segregation played a large role in the implementation of educational segregation. “The concentration of the Black population in restricted areas of large Northern cities, coupled with prevailing zoning practices, laid the foundation for what has come to be known as ‘de-facto segregation’” (National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, 1976: 7). “De-facto segregation” refers to segregation that forms on its own, without the intervention of law or public policy, and thus refers to the formation of completely or predominantly Black schools “by fact” (National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, 1976: 7). It is important to note that “de-facto segregation” should not be taken to imply an accidental or “fortuitous” separation of the races, but rather should be viewed as very much deliberate, intentional, and what the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials called “frank and avowed.” On the other hand, de-jure segregation is that which is constituted either by law

or public policy.

According to Douglas, “blacks who migrated North during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were confronted with increasing residential segregation (2005: 128), made possible by the employment of a number of public and private tactics. Real estate agents were key players in residential discrimination. Throughout Northern cities such as New York, agents were instructed not to sell or rent property to blacks in sections of the city that had been established as ‘white neighborhoods.’ Secondly, agents made use of a “two-tier pricing structure” in which a realistic price would be given to white buyers or renters while an inflated price would be given to prospective black buyers or renters. Douglas states that, “from 1924 until 1950, realtors throughout the nation subscribed to a national code” which stated the following: “A realtor should never be instrumental in introducing into a neighborhood...members of any race or nationality” (2005: 136). Thirdly, real estate boards learned how to profit off of white fright by making use of a practice that came to be known as ‘blockbusting.’ Agents were handed the task of “keeping blacks from moving into white residential areas haphazardly and to see to it that they [blacks] filled a block solidly before being allowed to move into the next one” (Massey and Denton, 1993: 37). This policy both appeased white residents and allowed for great profits, as “rapid black migration into a confined residential area created an intense demand for housing within the ghetto” by black renters and buyers, and thus created a “marked inflation of rents and home prices” (Massey and Deont, 1993: 37).

Strategies such as these, along with the fact that banks were not prohibited from making racially-motivated decisions on mortgage loans (Taylor, 2011), contributed

greatly to the creation of racially segregated neighborhoods across New York City. This residential segregation was further propagated by the reactions of white renters and homeowners, as real estate agents preyed upon their fears and brought about the perpetuation of this housing cycle:

“Agents would go door to door warning white residents of the impending “invasion” and offer to purchase or rent [their] homes on generous terms. They often selected ostentatiously lower-class blacks to be the first settlers in the neighborhood in order to heighten fears and encourage panic; at times, these “settlers” were actually confederates of the realtor. In neighborhoods of family homes, a realtor might divide up the first black-occupied house into small units, which were intentionally rented to poor southern arrivals who were desperate and willing to pay high rents for cramped rooms of low quality. While white panic was spreading, the realtors would advertise widely within the black community, pointing out the availability of good housing in a newly opened neighborhood, thereby augmenting black demand” (Massey and Denton, 1993: 38).

Although residential segregation played a significant role in post-World War I educational segregation in New York City, specific actions taken by local school officials to preserve racial separation contributed a great deal as well. For instance, local school authorities preserved racial separation through racially gerrymandered school district lines, most notably in Harlem high schools. With the construction of such districts came “discriminatory transfer policies that permitted only white students to transfer to a school in another district” (Douglas, 2005: 146). The U.S Commission on Civil Rights confirms such practices, reporting that, “during the 1930s and 1940s... school zones were made to conform to the configuration of the Negro communities” (National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, 1963: 24). At the same time, “as these communities grew in population, administrations placed new schools within their boundaries rather than transfer Negro children to available space in white schools” (National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, 1963: 24). Closely related to this gerrymandering is the manipulation of optional or neutral attendance zones, which was also used to foster

educational segregation. This exploitation was seen in instances when a school district was changing from being an area predominantly inhabited by whites to one predominantly inhabited by blacks. District officials in these cases would “designate the remaining white portion of the district as an optional zone,” meaning that the parents in that area could choose between sending their children to the local (now predominantly black) school or sending their children to a white school in a neighboring district. However, in these cases such an offer was almost never made to black parents.

The educational segregation in New York City prior to the Supreme Court’s *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954 was made possible by a number of previously mentioned factors, including public espousal of racist attitudes, manipulation of the law and of court rulings at the hands of educational authorities, as well as residential discrimination and segregation. At the time of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, New York City’s public schools remained overwhelmingly segregated, as a 1955 investigation carried out by the city’s Public Education Association would show. With such surmounting evidence of educational segregation in cities across the United States, the enforcement of state policy and the integration of public schools would only be realized with the intervention of the federal government.

Brown v. Board of Education (1954)

Given the prevailing racial separation found in public schools across cities such as New York, the Supreme Court’s 1954 decision in the *Brown v. Board of Education* case seemed to be the resolution needed to ensure integration and equality in the public school

system. Despite New York's existing body of legislation barring school segregation, the enactment of anti-segregation law into practice had yet to be fully implemented in the region at the time of the *Brown* decision. Although the *Brown* case did not directly involve the state of New York, the decision made by the Supreme Court is a substantial component to understanding the continued injustice of such discrimination in the New York City public school system in a post-*Brown* world.

Karen McGill Arrington notes that, "*Brown* was a consolidated case involving school segregation in four states: Kansas, Delaware, Virginia, and South Carolina" (1981: 9). A fifth case involving the District of Columbia, *Bolling v. Sharpe*, is also associated with the *Brown* decision, although it was rendered a separate opinion because the Fourteenth Amendment was not applicable to the District of Columbia (Byrne, 2005: 26). The most famous of these five cases was that of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*.

In 1950, Reverend Oliver Brown, a black man living in Topeka, sought admission for his third grade daughter, Linda Brown, to a local white school four blocks from their home. The Browns' nearest black school, comparatively, was two miles away, requiring Linda to travel via bus. When the school district denied Brown's request, the Reverend filed a lawsuit against the school board of Topeka, Kansas. Local courts sided with the city's Board of Education, having determined that, "the physical facilities, the curricula, courses of study, qualification of and quality of teachers, as well as other educational facilities in the two sets of schools are comparable" (Whitman, 1993: 99). Judge Walter Huxman felt that because Brown's attorneys had not emphasized any sort of unequal nature in the case of the two schools, their argument that "segregation in and of itself

violates...the Fourteenth Amendment” could not hold water. Huxman cited the Supreme Court’s rulings in segregation cases of the past, such as *Plessy v. Ferguson* and *Lum v. Rice*, as his reasoning for the continued upholding of separate educational facilities. Finding that “no denial of due process” had arisen from the operation of a segregated educational system in Topeka, Kansas, Brown was again denied his request.

The *Briggs v. Elliot* case of 1949 started with a lawsuit brought by twenty parents, including Harry Briggs, from whom the case takes its namesake, against the school board of Clarendon County, South Carolina. These twenty-six parents demanded that the county provide bussing for their children to and from school, as a number of the children in question were forced to walk many miles to school. Not surprisingly, these schools were also of a highly inferior quality, and thus the NAACP’s legal team encouraged parents to also file suit against the segregation of the county’s schools. Although the district court ordered the county to “take steps to equalize the public school facilities “promptly” and to report back in six months on the status of such equality, it upheld the “separate but equal” doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, and students were denied admission to the higher quality white schools (Blaustein and Ferguson, 1957: 46- 47).

In the 1952 case of *Belton v. Gebhart*, also known as *Bulah v. Gebhart* after another parent, Sarah Bulah, Ethel Belton and a number of other black parents around Claymont, Delaware area petitioned the Delaware State Board of Education to allow their children to attend a nearby white school, which was not only of a much better quality than Howard High, the overcrowded black school that their children were forced to attend, but also significantly closer in proximity. The commute to Howard High required that the children take an hour and a half-long bus ride to receive an inferior education

(CivilRights.org). Although the Delaware Supreme Court found that the facilities were in fact “substantially unequal” (Hayman and Ware, 2009: 148) and ordered the admission of black students to the local white school, it did uphold the “separate but equal” doctrine of its predecessors and also ordered that Howard High undergo improvements to follow through on this dogma. *Belton v. Gebhart* is the only case under the *Brown v. Board of Education* umbrella to have the local court side with the plaintiff.

That same year, the *Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County* case came to fruition after four hundred and fifty students from Robert R. Moton High School in Farmville, Virginia went on a two-week strike that began on April 23, 1951 in protest of their school’s unequal conditions (Byrne, 2005). Despite being designed for only one hundred and eighty students, the school housed more than twice that number with four hundred and fifty students enrolled at the facility. This overcrowding had forced the school to hold classes in makeshift wooden buildings and even in school buses. This inequality was commonplace in Prince Edward County at the time; all but one of the fifteen schools in the county designated for black students consisted of a wooden structure, as well as wood, coal, or kerosene stoves for heating, and lacked indoor restroom facilities (CivilRights.org). One month later the NAACP filed a lawsuit against the county, seeking to end segregation within the state of Virginia. The district court unanimously rejected the students’ requests, stating that, firstly, “[We] cannot say that the plaintiffs’ evidence overbalances the defendants,” and secondly, that in accordance with federal law, to eliminate segregation in the County’s schools would be “in law offensive to the National statutes and constitution” (Whitman, 1993: 98).

The fifth case associated with the *Brown* decision is *Bolling v. Sharpe*, a lawsuit

initiated by a group of parents who sought to gain admission for eleven black students into John Philip Sousa Junior High School in Washington, D.C in 1950. Sousa High School was a brand new school set to open that year, and of a superior quality to the black school in Anacostia, D.C that the students were attending at the time. Despite the abundance of room available at the school, the students were denied admission and the school was opened as an exclusively white school, thus upholding educational segregation in the District of Columbia (Byrne, 2005: 26).

With representation from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's (NAACP) Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., this collection of cases was consolidated on appeal and brought before the Supreme Court as *Brown v. Board of Education* (Arrington, 1981: 9). On May 17, 1954, the Court came to a unanimous decision regarding educational segregation in public schools across the United States, finding that such segregation was unconstitutional. In his first major opinion as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren posed the following question, "Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race...deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities?" Warren's response, and that of the eight Associate Judges was, "we believe that it does," adding that:

"To separate them [black children in grade and high schools] from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be done" (Patterson, 2001: 66).

The testimony provided by social scientists, educators, and psychologists detailed the adverse affects of racial separation on both black and white students. Experts noted that, racial isolation could result in black children developing inclinations towards escapism, withdrawal, hostility, and resentment. A warped sense of self-esteem could also arise

from as children noticed that segregation was centered on the notion that they were inferior to whites and considered unworthy of equal treatment. This could result in a “defeatist attitude and the lowering of personal ambitions” (Clark, 1963: 245). In the case of white children, the testimony argued that they could suffer from “confusion, conflict, moral cynicism, and disrespect for authority” as a result of being taught the morality and “democratic principles of the brotherhood of man and importance of justice and fairplay” by the very people and institutions who supported prejudiced ideologies and practiced discriminatory policies characteristic of racial segregation (Arrington, 1981: 10).

The justices condemned the Supreme Court’s decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. This 1896 case involved Homer Plessy, a Louisiana man of mixed race, who was refused access to ride a railway car designated for whites only. Plessy’s case challenged the state law requiring “separate but equal” railway cars for blacks and whites. When the Supreme Court denied his request, the doctrine of “separate but equal” was found to be constitutional, solidifying the place of Jim Crowe within the education system of the United States. With its decision in *Brown*, the Supreme Court renounced its former injustice and overruled its decision, stating that,

“Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, this finding [by the Kansas court in 1951 that racial segregation leads to feelings of inferiority and damages the motivation to learn] is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy v. Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected” (Patterson, 2001: 67).

This denouncement of the racial theories supported by the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision was a groundbreaking legal victory for blacks across the United States, as well as an unprecedented judiciary move in the direction of both legal and ideological equality. The opinion stated that educational segregation was a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment, which states that citizens are provided equal protection under the law (Patterson, 2001:

67). The highest court in the land had proclaimed that, “the importance of education to our democratic society...the opportunity of an education...is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms” (Salomone, 1986: 3), removing the Jim Crow approach to education in the public school system and ultimately concluding that “separate but equal” had no longer had any place in the United States education system (Arrington, 1981: 10), as “separate is inherently unequal” (Salomone, 43). The ruling further condemned the manipulation of the education system with its acknowledgment of the role of education in determining one’s place in society by conceding that, “it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education” (Bailey, 1979: 5). This powerful statement touched upon a history of exploitation that, as we will see later on in the work, would not end with the *Brown* ruling.

The *Brown* decision called for “the transformation from a dual to a unitary system” of education “with all deliberate speed” (Arrington, 1981: 10). In New York City, the Board of Education took swift action to demonstrate its compliance with the *Brown* decision. The President of the city’s Board of Education, Arthur Levitt, immediately called for an investigation by the Public Education Association into the city’s education of black, as well as Puerto Rican, students. Levitt was quick to deny that any schools had been intentionally segregated, and at the same time quick to agree with the *Brown* assertion that all-black schools were detrimental to black students. An integration committee was formed to further integration efforts; it vowed to eliminate de facto segregation in New York City with the following mission statement: “We interpret the May 17th decision of the United States Supreme Court as a legal and moral reaffirmation of our fundamental educational principles... Public education in a racially

homogenous setting is socially unrealistic and blocks the attainment of the goals of democratic education” (Ravitch, 2000: 252- 253). Despite embracing a philosophy that clashed with the City’s history of educational segregation and implicit attitudes on racial integration, the school board promised to follow through on the terms laid out by the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling.

Post-*Brown v. Board of Education*: Education in New York City

According to Jonathan Kozol, “when it comes to residential integration and school integration, New York...for the last forty years...has been one of the most regressive cities in America, in many ways unaffected by the Brown decision” (Kozol, 2006). Prior to Brown, the education of black students in cities across the United States consisted of separate schools characterized by “inferior buildings, outmoded secondhand texts, underpaid teachers, and a stigma of inferiority” (Anderson and Byrne, 2004: 4). With the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954 came the legal mandate for such conditions to change; the access to and quality of one’s education was no longer to be determined by one’s race. Although the Board of Education of the City of New York publicly complied with the regulations outlined by the Supreme Court, racial separation very much prevailed within the city’s education system in the years after 1954. Although de-jure segregation had been outlawed, de-facto segregation played a large role in the maintenance of racially segregated schools, as did white opposition to integration and minimal efforts on the part of the city’s educational authorities. Despite the latter’s Brown-inspired conviction to implement racial integration throughout the city’s public school system, ambiguous support was provided for this conviction (Taylor, 2011). In the

quest to meet the standards laid out by the Supreme Court's *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, "from the start board officials dragged their feet" (Biondi, 2003: 247).

As previously mentioned, following the Brown decision, New York City's Public Education Association was instructed to carry out an investigation into the equality of the city's black schools. The last and only existing report of this kind had been conducted in 1915, and the city was eager to quash accusations that had been made by Dr. Kenneth Clark, a Harlem-born associate professor at City College of New York and the first black to receive full-time employment at a city college, contending that underneath the city's façade of liberalism lay a system of separate and unequal schooling for blacks. (Ravitch, 2000). Not only did Clark assert that the school system was racially segregated, but he also charged that policies were being carried out to ensure that the system would remain segregated, and that the Board of Education was very much aware of the pre-existing conditions of inferiority that characterized predominantly black sections of the city, such as Clark's Harlem (Taylor, 2011).

In the fall of 1955, the Public Education Association's report, entitled "The Status of the Public School Education of Negro and Puerto Rican Children in New York City," found that there were forty-two elementary schools in the city's five boroughs with student populations that were ninety percent or more black and Puerto Rican, as well as nine junior high schools that were eight-five percent or more black and Puerto Rican. Out of the six hundred and thirty nine public schools in the city, this group of predominantly black schools constituted a little less than eight percent. The PEA criticized the city's Board of Education for not doing enough to promote integration, but absolved it of accusations of intentional segregation of black and Puerto Rican students (Taylor, 2011).

The report alleged that the makers of zoning policy [had] attempted to be color-blind and that the principles followed in the zoning school districts ignore both the possibility of separation and integration of ethnic groups. The goal of zoning policy was alleged to be one of prudence: “to minimize the distance from home to school, to avoid traffic hazards and topographical features, and to keep districts similar in size” (Taylor, 2011: 253).

These affirmations appear disingenuous when compared to the rest of the PEA’s findings:

“Compared to schools which were more than ninety percent white, the predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican schools were older and less adequately maintained, had a higher rate of teacher turn-over, and had a smaller portion of tenured teachers” (Taylor, 2011: 253). Although the report found similar teacher-student ratios and rates of student expenditure in both sets of schools, “segregated schools did exist and these schools had fewer experienced teachers than did other schools” (253). Conflicting with the PEA’s report was the fact that Harlem, home to the city’s largest black population at the time, had only one high school for the entire community. Schools here lacked libraries and gymnasiums, and offered curriculums inferior to those of white schools. For example, Harlem schools offered over one hundred classes for the mentally retarded, but only three for the intellectually gifted (Taylor, 2011: 102). This statistic is by no means an indication that Harlem housed a disproportionate amount of mentally retarded students, but that the community was in fact a glaring example of the City’s oppression of black students. These curriculum differences ensured that black New Yorkers could only obtain a certain degree of learning, as determined by the Board of Education. Given the city’s history of inequality and failure to apply anti-segregation legislation, it comes as no

surprise that a number of its public schools were found to be both racially separate and unequal, and that the situation was downplayed by the city's Board of Education.

To remedy the system's segregation, the Commission on Integration held hearings over the next two years during which time five subcommittees were formed. Three of the committees were tasked with developing policies to "raise standards within Black and Puerto Rican schools," while the remaining two were to deal with "zoning and teacher assignment" (Biondi, 2003: 246- 247). The Commission soon "discovered that it was easier to issue a policy statement than to find a viable course of action," a tactic that Ravitch writes, "would be repeated often in the years ahead" (Ravitch, 2000: 253-4). While the three committees for raising standards were met with little opposition, the remaining committees for zoning and teacher assignment were met with stern opposition from whites. White parents feared that rezoning policies would lead to long-distance bussing of white children into black neighborhoods and "slum schools," and purposefully distorted rezoning plans, falsely spreading rumors to galvanize parental resistance (Biondi, 2003). Many white teachers also expressed disdain at being placed in "slum schools," and both parents and teachers "openly expressed a belief in the intellectual inferiority of Black students" (Biondi, 2003: 248) at public hearings on the matter, and "spokesmen for both groups threatened that any compulsion by the Board would cause them to flee to the city's safe, white suburbs" (Ravitch, 254). Thus in 1957, when the Commission's reports on zoning and teacher assignments were up for approval, the Board gave into the demands of white parents with its promise that long-distance bussing was no longer a topic of consideration, despite the fact that the Board had previously bussed white students *away* from black schools to predominantly white schools.

Putting the stipulations of white authorities, and the coinciding white paradox of the “neighborhood school,” before the integration of the city’s public schools would become a common trend for New York City’s Board of Education. That same year, the city’s Superintendent of Schools, William Jansen, requested that teachers come forward to be reassigned to the city’s more difficult schools, those located in the city’s poorer and predominantly minority neighborhoods. Out of the city’s forty thousand or so teachers, only twenty-five responded to fill one thousand needed positions. It is important to note that instead of taking a firm position on integration and automatically assigning teachers to these schools, the Board allowed the matter to be optional as opposed to compulsory. This ambivalent attitude towards integration would remain in years to come.

Statistics show that over the next several years the number of schools with Black and Puerto Rican populations of ninety percent or more would increase to twenty-two percent by 1963 (Biondi, 2003: 248). With growing black and Puerto Rican populations, “racial ghettos became denser and bigger” (Ravitch, 2000: 257). Massey and Denton define a racial ghetto as “a set of neighborhoods that are exclusively inhabited by members of one group, within which virtually all members of that group live” (1993: 18-19). Schools in these predominantly black neighborhoods “produced few high school graduates and had inexperienced teachers, decaying facilities, and low academic standards” (Ravitch, 2000: 257). In 1959 overcrowding contributed to what Ravitch calls “the first implementing of the city’s integration policy” (258). Four hundred black elementary school students from the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn were transferred to all-white, “underutilized” elementary schools in the Ridgewood and Glendale sections of Queens. This unprecedented move was met with outrage by white

parents, who again, held firm to the idea of the “neighborhood school,” the post-Brown synonym for segregation, and even took legal action to prohibit the ‘protection of their neighborhood schools.’ (Taylor, 2011). “Reports of juvenile delinquency, gangs, assaults, vandalism, and fire-setting in the schools, which were especially pronounced in slum districts” (Ravitch, 254), further inspired fear of integration into the hearts of white parents. While some of this fear was promulgated by racist ideologies, it also had a class component; Ravitch states that,

“There was also a middle-class fear, common to both races, of sending their children to a school where lower-class behavior predominated, where there was a breakdown of discipline and adult authority, low academic standards, obscene language, and sporadic violence” (Ravitch, 2000:254).

This sentiment harbored amongst middle and upper class parents can be viewed as an implicit realization of the existing inferiority of schools characterized by high levels of minorities and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Thus, motivated by either racism or this knowledge, though most likely both, nearly half of the white families from the Ridgewood and Glendale boycotted the first day of school that Fall. Although the Board refused to remove the black students, it did not publicly acknowledge integration as a motive behind this move out of intimidation of further public outcry (Ravitch, 2000). White opposition to integration was commonplace in the effort to integrate New York City public schools. A similar situation in Flatbush, Queens led white parents to also file a lawsuit claiming ‘racial discrimination’ in response to the attempted the transfer of black students from Brownsville, Brooklyn. Their efforts were successful, and the Brownsville students were denied admission to the predominantly white junior high school (Taylor, 2011). Massive resistance was waged in 1964 by the Parents and Taxpayers Coordinating Council and the Brooklyn Joint Council for Better Education, formed in response to the Board’s plans to bus white and black students into schools

characterized by predominant populations of the opposite race. In the name of the “neighborhood school,” the two groups announced a “full-scale battle plan to stop the transfers.” (Taylor, 107-108) In addition to seeking legal action, 275,638 white students boycotted the first day of school that September, roughly thirty-one percent of the schools’ attendance. In some classrooms, there were no students at all that day.

When boycotts and lawsuits did not stop the city’s Board of Education from meagerly attempting to integrate city schools, whites found a different means of avoiding integration: removing themselves from the system completely. Housing segregation has perhaps been the greatest influence in the segregation of New York City public schools over the last half-century. “In the 1950s the white population had declined by more than eight hundred thousand, while the black and Puerto Rican population increased by over seven hundred thousand” (Ravitch, 2000: 261). The practices instituted by realtors in the years of the Great Migration remained after as well, “guaranteeing racial turnover and re-segregation” (Massey and Denton, 49), and thus continuing the solidification of the color line throughout New York City. By 1970, however, this turnover was occurring more quickly. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, many white families expanded their options of avoiding residential integration by settling into suburbs outside of the city. Realtors were found to have played a role in keeping black New Yorkers out of the suburbs; a study conducted by Rose Helper in the 1950s found that white realtors were making use of forty-six different methods to maintain racial purity in the suburbs, including but not limited to charging higher rents, “flat refusals,” subterfuge (e.g., “saying a unit was sold when it was not”), additional screening, and requiring security deposits for black applicants and not whites (Massey and Denton, 1993: 50).

Around the same time that more and more whites were fleeing the cities, many northern cities such as New York, were experiencing a continued influx of blacks. For example, “between 1950 and 1970, the percentage of blacks more than doubled in most large northern cities” (Massey and Denton, 1993: 45). Despite the coinciding decrease of whites and increase of blacks living in New York City, black spatial isolation had increased. According to data collected by Berkeley University and the U.S Bureau of the Census, by 1970, a little more than sixty percent of black New Yorkers lived in racially isolated neighborhoods, in this case neighborhoods that were over eighty percent black, compared to almost forty-two percent in 1930 (Massey and Denton, 1993: 48, Table 2.4). During the 1950s and 1960s, New York City’s schools “were at the center of one crisis after another: juvenile delinquency, a soaring high school dropout rate, a perennial teacher shortage, . . . increasing racial segregation,” etc. (Ravitch, 2000: 265). The education system consisted of approximately forty-five teachers for every one thousand students in the city. Fred Hechinger, the *New York Times*’ education editor at the time, remarked that, “the great days of city schools predated the development of suburbia,” adding that, “the new great schools . . . are now in the suburbs” (266).

By 1970, “racial segregation in U.S urban areas was characterized by a largely black central city surrounded by predominantly white suburbs,” (Massey and Denton, 1993: 61). Although the Fair Housing Act of 1968 had made the suburbs more easily accessible to blacks, “few blacks attained suburban residence during the decade in comparison to whites” (67). By 1980, approximately seventy-one percent of whites in Northern states lived in suburbs, compared to only twenty-three percent of blacks at the time. In New York, a little over thirty-one percent of whites lived in the suburbs in 1980,

compared to a little over eight percent of black New Yorkers (Massey and Denton, 1993). Of the entire black population of the time in New York, only a little over seven percent were living in the city's suburbs. It is important to note that "suburbs that accepted black residents tended to be older areas of relatively low socioeconomic status and high population density,... typically located adjacent to or near the central city,... and relatively unattractive to white renters and home buyers" (69). Thus residential segregation was being maintained, no matter the landscape. Again, by 1980, nearly eighty-three percent of the neighborhoods of New York City's five boroughs were considered segregated, while a little over seventy percent of its suburbs were so.

Whites's also found solace from integration in the form of private and parochial schools. In June of 1960 a new public school was opened in the upper West Side of Manhattan that was to host students from a local housing project, in addition to students from a newly constructed private development. The student population of the housing project was seventy-five percent black and Puerto Rican, while that of the private development was almost entirely white. When it came time to enroll in the new school, only four of the students from the private development had done so, while the rest had enrolled in private schools (Ravitch, 2000). In Queens, private schools had been established by PTA affiliates in response to the integration of black students in areas such as Ridgewood and Glendale. Other areas witnessed the same trend, sometimes going to unbelievable extremes:

"The Jackson Heights Day School operated in a room of a cooperative apartment building and had eighty students. The Konign Institute in North Jackson Heights enrolled two hundred students who were taken out of the public schools to avoid integration. *The New York Times* reported that some junior high school students in Eastern Queens who boycotted the schools because of pairing were being tutored by retired teachers until a school for them could be established" (Taylor, 2011: 109).

In some cases, white parents were willing to break the law and endure arrest in protest of

educational integration, borrowing such tactics from their Southern counterparts. For example, after the Jackson Height Day School was shut down by the building in which it was housed, parents attempted to return their children to P.S 149, where the children had previously been enrolled. As they were no longer enrolled in the school and yet refused to leave, the principal of P.S 149 had the group of defiant parents arrested.

The resistance of white parents and the subsequent concessions of the city's Board of Education to these individuals combined to enable integration of the city's public schools in an implicit, yet powerful way. PAT and the Joint Council for Better Schools were invited to share their opinions on how best to handle the integration dilemma. Civil Rights groups were also invited to attend the meeting, where the city's Superintendent "said nothing of expanding integration but instead gave PAT and the Joint Committee a way of trying to kill what little effort the board had taken in the integration effort." Of the two Civil Rights representatives present at the meeting, one walked out with a parting remark that summed up the Board's integration attempts: "This is a joke" (Taylor, 2011: 110).

Throughout the 1970s it became evident that the city's busing plans had frightened white parents, and subsequently their response had scared off the city's Board of Education, whose attempts at desegregation dwindled following the hostility towards such plans. At the same time that the Board backed off on its post-Brown promise to integrate its schools, more and more white students left the city's public schools, as a result of suburbanization and the switch to private schools. According to David Vital, "in 1960, almost two-thirds of the city's public schools were white." By the mid-70s, two-thirds of the city's schools were Black and Hispanic. Barbanel writes that "court

decisions limiting desegregation between districts in the 1970's made it more difficult to bring desegregation lawsuits in Federal courts,” adding that the decreasing enrollment of white students within the system, coupled with the vast concentration of the state’s minorities into this single district “made such lawsuits pointless” (Barbanel, 1993). In the 1978- 1979 school year, the U.S Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights reported that the city’s education system had only experienced “limited desegregation.” Instead, “the debate...shifted to insuring that the poorer districts receive more money and to improving the quality of education within those districts” (Barbanel, 1993). Two major lawsuits in the 1980s were filed against the way in which New York State funded its education systems; New York City received thirty-four percent of this state aid, while enrolling thirty-seven percent of the state’s students. A 1987 study conducted by the United States Commission on Civil Rights noted that the level of integration in northern states had increased since 1968; the study also found mandatory busing to be associated with a drop in the level of white enrollment in a given school district (Williams, 1987).

Vital credits the trend amongst white and middle class families towards private schools to, “race and class issues,” including “the resurging controversy over busing to end segregation, and the integration issue itself” (Vital, 1976). The number of whites enrolled in the New York City public school system continued to decrease throughout the 1980s, while minority enrollment continued to increase (Berger, 1991). By 1993, the Board of Education was reporting that less than eighteen percent of students enrolled in the public school system were white; thirty-seven percent were black, thirty-six percent were Hispanic, and the remaining percentage was made up of Asians and American Indians. That same year, a study by the Harvard Project on School Desegregation found

New York State schools to be the third most segregated in the country for black students, with 57.5% of all black students attending schools with a student population of at least ninety percent minorities. The study also found that the state's schools were the most segregated for Hispanic students, with 58.1% attending such schools. Statistics also showed that nearly three-quarters of all black students in New York City attended schools that were more than half minority enrollment; the same was true for fifty-eight percent of Hispanic students in 1993 (Barbanel, 1993). Frank Sobrino, a spokesperson for the city's Board of Education at the time, conceded that, "the [New York City] school system has a policy, still technically on the books, to limit minority transfers to schools that are more than half white, out of fear of white flight to private schools or the suburbs" (Barbanel, 1993). Furthermore, Barbanel stated in 1993 that:

"Efforts to improve the racial balance in school have focused on enticing white families back into the school system. School District 3 on the Upper West Side of Manhattan and in parts of Harlem now receives \$2.5 million a year from the Federal magnet grant program to "reduce racial isolation and bring back white families," said James Mazza, the acting superintendent" (Barbanel, 1993).

Echoing the statements made by Fred Hechinger in the 1960s, New York State Education Commissioner, Thomas Sobol, responded to the 1993 study with the following words: "New York State has two distinct types of school systems—one urban, minority, poor and failing, the other suburban, white, affluent and successful." (Barbanel, 1993).

Although the diminishing number of white students enrolled in the city's education system leveled off in the early 1990s (Berger, 1991), New York City's schools remain overwhelmingly segregated today. Jonathan Kozol states that, "Every five years there's a "solution" to the problems of separate and unequal education" in New York City's education system. However, he points out that none of these solutions addresses the problems of either separate or unequal (Kozol, 1996). Gail Robinson adds that the

racial composition of New York City's schools today "almost resembles those in the south in the 1950s" (Robinson, 2004). As of 2004, blacks constituted thirty-two percent of the students in the New York City public school system, while whites constituted a little less than half that amount at a mere fifteen percent. A study conducted by the Lewis Mumford Center at the State University of New York at Albany in 2000 mirrored the results of the 1993 study by the Harvard Project on School Desegregation: New York City school system was still the third most segregated system in the country in terms of black-white segregation in schools. Additionally, the average black student in New York City was found to attend a school where only five percent of the student population was white, "a sharp drop from 1970" (Robinson, 2004).

Analysis

The educational segregation of New York City's public school system has been brought about by a history of resolute residential segregation. Secondly, weak attempts made by the city's Board of Education to integrate the schools were undermined by the firm resistance of white parents, in addition to their associated move to the suburbs and private schools.

This trend, for whites to flee public schools in the face of mandatory integration, is not unique to New York City. In fact, experts, such as Professor Christine Rossell of Boston University, argue that, "large numbers of whites have removed their children from public schools wherever mandatory integration plans have been imposed." Rossell claims that, "every single mandatory reassignment plan that we can find in a metropolitan

area suffers significant white flight,” citing the city of Los Angeles’ efforts in the 1970s and Hartford, Connecticut’s fledgling attempts in the 1990s (Judson, 1993). Thus, this move can be associated with the push for racial integration. With the given makeup of the student population in public schools, Pedro Noguera, a professor at New York University’s Steinhardt School of Education, remarks that, “there are no kids to integrate with” (Robinson, 2004). Found to be the second most racially segregated city in the United States in the 2010 census, residential segregation continues to undermine any fledgling efforts made by the city’s education system to integrate schools. For example, “at the high school level, the Department of Education established schools with special programs around the city, in an effort to encourage students to leave their neighborhoods”(Robinson, 2004). However, little improvements were made. Additionally, “the city requires that some high schools with special programs admit the same number of students who do poorly on standardized tests as those who score substantially above average,” but far fewer minority and poorer students ever apply to such programs, and the city’s elite schools consistently enroll more whites than blacks and Hispanics (Hernandez, 2008), as blacks continue to score significantly lower than whites on standardized tests (Jairrels, 2009). Furthermore, this practice has found opposition amongst parents, “many of them white, [who] complain that their children are being unfairly denied a place in these schools” (Robinson, 2004). Again, as witnessed in previous decades, many white and middle class parents continue to rally against the idea of the ‘neighborhood school.’

The segregation of New York City’s public schools has reflected not only the separate aspect of segregation, but the unequal nature as well. In 1970 the New York City public

school system staffed approximately four hundred doctors to its students. “By 1993, the number of doctors hired by the school system was down to 23—most of them part-time” (Kozol, 2005). The City blamed the statistic on tough economic times, despite the fact that “the money was never restored when the crisis passed.” Kozol cites schools in predominantly black areas, such as the South Bronx, as being victims of this kind of neglect, such as the following conditions, which Kozol himself observed at New York City’s predominantly minority schools throughout the 1990s:

“Physical conditions in some buildings had become so dangerous that a principal at one Bronx school, which had been condemned in 1989 but nonetheless continued to be used, was forced to order that the building’s windows not be cleaned because the frames were rotting and glass panes were falling in the street, while at another school the principal had to have the windows bolted shut for the same reason” (Kozol, 2005: 49- 50).

As Kozol points out, “these were not years of economic crisis for New York,” but rather “a period in which financial markets soared,” yet “none of the proceeds of this period of economic growth had found their way into the schools that served the truly poor” (Kozol, 2005: 50- 51).

The correlation addressed reflects the fact that the city’s schools have been affected by a “lack of interest and support” on the part of those, “who do not send their children to the public schools and therefore have no immediate and vital stake in them” (Ravitch, 2000: 401). There remain countless indications of the New York City public school system’s disregard for black students. Today, overcrowding in New York City public schools is the highest it has been in ten years. In 2010, half of the City’s schools were deemed overcrowded (Philips, 2011). Twelve years earlier, when faced with the problem of overcrowding, an issue no less severe than it is today, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani chose to downplay the issue and offered no solution. Instead, he expressed confidence that, “Schools Chancellor Rudy Crew would have a better response next

year,” making it clear that his “One City, One Standard” campaign slogan did not include those who faced the brunt of this problem: black New Yorkers (Barry, 1996). Mayor Michael Bloomberg has followed a similar path of inaction and disregard for racial inequality. Despite this surmounting and blatant evidence of segregation and educational inequality in New York City public schools, Bloomberg has failed to delve into the heart of the issue. “[New Yorkers] have never heard Mayor Bloomberg give a major speech, or a minor one, on the subject of New York’s residential segregation” (Louis, 2010).

A lack of services and funding, overcrowding, inferior curriculums, less qualified teachers, and lower expectations have manifested themselves in the achievement gap between white students and their non-white peers, a disparity dating back since the 1960s. As observed in cities across the country, “students in high-poverty, high-minority schools have less access to highly qualified teachers than do students in low-poverty, low-minority schools,” and are also more likely to be taught by an inexperienced teacher. They are twice as likely to be taught by a teacher who is not certified in their subject area (Education Week, 2004). Furthermore, the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress substantiated this statistic, finding that “while 39 percent of white students scored at the proficient level or higher on the fourth grade reading exam portion...only 12 percent of black students did so” (Education Week, 2004). New York City is no exception to these findings; at William Howard Taft High School in the Bronx and Bushwick High School in Brooklyn, both of which enrolled a student population that was ninety-eight percent black and Hispanic, twenty percent of students did not pass the 2003 state Regents test required for high school graduation. In regards to funding, districts with high minority schools such as Taft and Bushwick receive over two thousand dollars less a

year than districts in New York State with less minorities, according to David Jones, president of the Community Service Society (Robinson, 2004). To exacerbate the situation at hand, Jonathan Kozol notes that, “many senior teachers avoid poor, minority schools in the city in favor of richer schools,” making quality teachers more difficult to come by in high minority and poorer schools, like Taft and Bushwick. This could be due in part to the fact that “gross discrepancies in teacher salaries between the city and its affluent white suburbs have remained persistent” (Kozol, 2005); low expectations, which also plague inner city schools, could also be a factor. Either way, it is of no surprise that “schools in New York City with higher test scores tend to have greater numbers of white and Asian students, while struggling schools are more likely to be composed primarily of black and Hispanic students” (Robinson, 2004).

With the widening gap between poorer black students and their wealthier white counterparts, as well as the failure on the part of the city’s Board of Education to both prioritize and remedy the situation of educational inequality, have arisen low expectations for the city’s poorer, black students. Brie Truesdell, a current teacher in the New York City public school system, has observed three different types of schools in Brooklyn over the past several months, noticing the significant disparities amongst the three: a neighborhood school in Bushwick, a private school in Williamsburg, and a specialized high school also in the area. Truesdell notes that in regards to taking the examinations needed to seek admission into one of the cities elite specialized schools, such as Stuyvesant High and the Bronx High School of Science, at the neighborhood school in Bushwick “teachers were mentioning these tests to the kids, but it was clear that they didn’t expect any of them [the students] to get into them [the schools]” (Truesdell,

personal interview: 26 March 2012). Low expectations, coupled with the aforementioned conditions of predominantly minority schools, has solidified the inferiority of the education that New York City's black students continue to receive today.

Conclusion

Educational segregation had plagued the public schools of New York City in the years both before and after the Supreme Court's *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, outlawing such practice across the United States. The segregation of the city's education system today continues to operate contrary to both the separate and unequal doctrines outlined by the *Brown* decision. A history of staunch residential segregation, resistance on the part of white parents, and a general apathy and inability on the part of the city's Board of Education and elite authorities to successfully integrate the city's schools has led to a situation, spanning decades and arguably centuries, in which New York's black students have received an education that is highly inferior in quality to that of whites, contributing to the existing achievement gap amongst such groups.

Urban Education in Cape Town, South Africa

History of Apartheid: 1948- 1994

Contemporary educational inequality in Cape Town, South Africa, like all other instances of inequality in Cape Town and the nation of South Africa at large, has its roots in the Apartheid regime that governed South Africa for nearly half of the twentieth century, from 1948 to 1994. According to James Barber, “Apartheid was both a creed and a set of politics.” While many of the policies put in place served as a continuation of prior segregation, under the regime such policies “were [now] applied with a thoroughness not previously envisaged, and were underpinned by a burning conviction of right” (Barber, 1999: 140). South Africa’s former president and renowned anti-Apartheid leader Nelson Mandela, in his autobiography, describes the Apartheid regime as follows:

“[Apartheid] represented the codification of one oppressive system of all the laws and regulations that had kept Africans in an inferior position to whites for centuries... The often haphazard segregation of the past three hundred years was to be consolidated into a monolithic system that was diabolical in its detail, inescapable in its reach and overwhelming in its power” (Mandela, 1995: 111).

The Apartheid regime officially began with the elections of 1948, which brought the Nationalist party to power. The party’s plan was to establish a society based on the coined term, “Apartheid,” which simply meant “Apartness.” Apartheid, however, quickly evolved from a mere term to “a drastic, systematic program of social engineering” that would become “the most notorious form of racial domination that the postwar world has ever known” (Thompson, 2001: 189). The Apartheid paradigm consisted of four major themes, which included the racial classification of non-whites, white supremacy, or total control over the state by whites, along with the elevation of white interests above the interests of “the subordinate races”, and finally the consolidation of white power. More

specifically, South Africans were divided into four racial groups: Whites, Coloureds, Indians, and Africans. “Whites” were those of European descent. “Coloureds” comprised people of many different ethnic and cultural backgrounds whose ancestors included a variety ranging from the indigenous Khoisan, as well as slaves from Indonesia, Madagascar, and various others parts of sub-Saharan Africa. Some were Christian, while others were Muslim (Thomson, 2011). The “coloured” people constituted a rather heterogeneous makeup of South Africans. Meanwhile, “Indians” were those whose ancestry came from India, while “Africans,” or blacks, were those whose heritage was strictly African. The Apartheid government passed a series of laws early on in the regime to prohibit the intermingling of these different racial groups, including the Prohibition of Marriages Act in 1949, as well as the Immorality Act of 1950, which respectively barred inter-racial marriage and inter-racial sexual relations.

White supremacy was also implemented early on in the regime with the elimination of voting right for Coloureds and Africans, as well as any representation within the South African government, which was entirely restructured to allow only whites to participate. Coloreds were removed from participation in 1956, though allowed white representation. This same occurrence befell Africans in the 1930s, prior to the start of the Apartheid regime. However, their ‘representation’ was completely removed with the Promotion of the Bantu Self-Government Act of 1959, which created a homeland system of governance in which “Africans were expected to exercise any political rights through the homelands,” which were those areas to which Africans had been previously relegated based on ethnicity. This Act served to eliminate the citizenship of Africans within the Apartheid government, who were viewed by the regime in the following

manner:

“It is accepted Government policy that the Bantu are only temporary resident in the European areas of the Republic for as long as they offer their labour there. As soon as they become, for one reason or another, no longer fit to work or superfluous in the labour market, they are expected to return to their country of origin or the territory of the national unit where they fit ethnically if they were not born and bred in their homeland” (Thompson, 2001: 193).

Similar to the Jim Crow segregation of the United States, policies that have been referred to as ‘petty apartheid’ created a separate set of public services for whites and non-whites. Guelke notes that, “white-only buses, railway carriages, ambulances, park benches, beaches, swimming pools, libraries, toilets and even lifts in public buildings were a pervasive feature of public amenities in South Africa’s towns after 1948” (2005: 27). Offices, businesses, schools, colleges, restaurants, theatres, sports fields, and even cemeteries were racially segregated (Beck, 2000). In what has come to be known as ‘grand apartheid,’ the physical state was also reconfigured through policies that fell under the term ‘grand apartheid’; each population group was designated certain “group areas” in which they could reside. These led to the forced removals of non-white racial groups, which would be a recurring move of the Apartheid government; under the notion of “slum clearance,” new townships were formed as blacks were forcibly removed to areas such as Soweto, Indians to Chatsworth, and coloureds to Mitchell’s Plain (Louw, 2004). Where one could live was determined by one’s race (Beck, 2000); non-whites were uprooted from their homes and, almost always, relocated to inferior locations. For example, in one of the most infamous forced removals, residents of District Six, located in the center of Cape Town, were relocated to “the sandy, wind-swept Cape Flats” (Thompson, 2001: 194). The coloured residents of District Six had lived in the area since the early nineteenth century, but under the Apartheid regime, their homes were bulldozed and they were left with nothing. Similarly, the coloured residents of Simon’s Town, a

coloured community bordering False Bay in Cape Town, were forced to leave their views of the ocean for a township paradoxically named “Ocean View,” which was miles from any sight of the ocean. Although the Apartheid government insisted that such moves were voluntary, the term ‘forced removals’ stands with good reason; the removals were anything but voluntary, and any resistance was immediately met with force. Thompson writes that,

“An African woman who had been moved to a Homeland told an interviewer: “When they came to us, they came with guns and police... They did not say anything, they just threw our belongings in [the government trucks]... We did not know, we still do not know this place...And when we came here, they dumped our things, just dumped our things so that we are still here. What can we do now, we can do nothing. We can do nothing. What can we do?” (Thompson, 2001: 194).

Aside from devastating the lives of countless non-white South Africans, the forced removals also intensified overpopulation in racially-assigned areas and brought about the creation of the South African “townships” outside of the nation’s major cities, including Cape Town, Johannesburg, Pretoria, Durban, and Port Elizabeth. These townships still exist in similar form to this day. Despite the fact that, like their parents, non-whites that had been born in these townships were native to South Africa, their citizenship was also not recognized by the Apartheid government (Thompson, 2001).

Again, in the name of ‘slum prevention,’ the Apartheid regime passed a series of laws that prohibited “free-for-all black migration.” A limit was set on the number of blacks who were allowed to live in the cities; only those employed would be allowed to remain, while those who were unemployed would be deported to rural areas, following the regime’s theory that “the presence of Africans in white South Africa should be dependent on their capacity to serve the needs of white society” (Guelke, 2005: 28). In rural areas as well, blacks were removed from “black spots,” areas of land owned or occupied by Africans in white areas. Their land was taken away, as were their rights to

any land in the area, and thus many African farmers were forced to work on white farms to survive (Thompson, 2001). Moreover, black migration was further restricted by the institution of the Pass Laws in 1952, which required all Africans, male and female, over the age of sixteen to carry passes indicating their employment in an urban area, as well as their visitation in such an area for no more than seventy-two hours. If an African could not present a valid pass to the police upon demand, they were immediately arrested. Pass law arrests averaged over 100,000 each year (Thompson, 2001). This number would increase to more than 350,000 during the mid-1970s.

In order to vanquish opposition to the regime, collection of legislation was enacted to silence any resistance. The Public Safety Act of 1953 granted the government far-reaching powers in the event of an ‘emergency,’ while the Criminal Law Amendment Act passed that same year criminalized any protest of the law, incitement of others to protest the law, as well as ‘breach of peace.’ Those who spoke out or acted in protest against the regime in any way would be imprisoned. Additionally, the Terrorism Act of 1967 to interrogate and detain indefinitely anyone “thought to be a ‘terrorist’ or who might have knowledge of ‘terrorists’” (Beck, 2000: 130). The regime’s police force, which became the “best equipped and best trained” in the African continent, served to further eliminate any and all forms of anti-Apartheid resistance. The interrogations of political prisoners and other detainees were characterized by a wide array of torture tactics and brutal violence, along the lines of the following:

“They put a wet sack around his neck and tied the cords until he black out. After reviving him, they made him stand on one leg, holding a stone above his leg while they stuck pins into his raised leg. The soles of his feet were then beaten with batons, and electrodes were placed on the toes with the current flowing. Finally they held him by the ankles out of a window forty feet above the street in trying to get a confession” (U.N Special Committee on the policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, 1964).

The main priority of the Apartheid police force was not to fight crime, but to devastate

the opposition. The growing crime, particularly violent crime, in the townships received little to no attention by the South African Police, and on many occasions, violence in the townships was perpetrated by the police in the name of Apartheid.

Resistance to Apartheid came from whites and non-whites alike. In the 1948 elections, the Nationalist party had received less than forty percent of the vote, and in fact did not win the majority until the election of 1958, an indication that “for much of the 1950s...the majority of White voters opposed the Nationalist Party” (Beck, 2000: 136). White opposition to the Apartheid regime came in the form of religious groups, most notably church leaders, such as Desmond Tutu, an Archbishop of the Anglican Church and recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984 for his peaceful contributions to the anti-Apartheid struggle. White academics, including professors and students, particularly at the University of Cape Town and the University of the Witwatersrand, also protested the Apartheid government. In the late 1950s, rallies were held at these universities in protest of the Extension of University Education Act, a law prohibiting blacks to attend white universities (Beck, 2000). Students contributed a great deal to the anti-Apartheid opposition with the formation of groups such as the National Union of South African Students, which gained black membership in the 1950s. Other intellectual types, particularly authors, editors, and journalists, spoke out against the regime as well. For example,

“Authors such as Alan Paton, Breyten Breytenbach, Andre Brink, Nadine Gordimer, and Athol Fugard wrote passionate descriptions of the suffering and pain caused by officially sanctioned racism and brutal government oppression” (Beck, 2000: 137).

“Historians, economists, sociologists, political scientists, [and] lawyers” also addressed the injustices of the Apartheid regime. However, when creative works, as well as newspapers or journals were found to be “too critical” of Apartheid or were found to

publish material considered “forbidden,” these pieces were immediately banned by the government. “Publishers constantly had to guess where the government might draw the line” (Beck, 2000: 137), as censorship was a popular mechanism used by the regime. The primary goal of such censorship was to “prevent blacks from gaining access to material that might promote anti-Apartheid political action” (Louw, 2004: 83).

Censorship or not, the gross injustices of the Apartheid regime gave rise to a mounting resistance movement that emerged under the leadership of the African National Congress (ANC), led by Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu, and Oliver Tambo, who were elected to the national executive in 1949 (Beck, 2000). The group instituted methods of non-violent resistance methods, launching a Defiance Campaign in June of 1952 with the South African Indian Conference against a variety of Apartheid legislation, including “Pass Laws, the Group Areas Act, Livestock Limitation, the Bantu Authorities Act, the Separate Representation of Voters, and the Suppression of Communism” (139). The campaign resulted in over eight thousand arrests and outbreaks of violence, and thus was terminated at the end of the year. However, the membership of the ANC spiked from 20,000 to 100,000 in that same time. The organization found greater success in 1955 with the formation of the Congress alliance in conjunction with “the South African Indian Congress, the South African Coloured People’s Organization, the predominantly White Congress of Democrats, and the multiracial South African Congress of Trade Unions” (Beck, 2000: 140). In June of that year, some three thousand delegates from each represented party issued the Freedom Charter, which stated that “South Africa belongs to all who live in it, Black and White, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of the people” (140). This proclamation would serve as the

group's platform in their struggle against Apartheid.

The resistance efforts of a host of anti-Apartheid groups triggered further oppressive legislation from the Apartheid government. The regime was also quick to arrest political opponents on charges of treason and conspiracy; Robben Island and a number of other state-run prisons would house countless political activists over the decades of Apartheid. In many cases, non-violent resistance efforts were countered with police violence. In the notorious Sharpeville Massacre of 1960, groups of blacks, under the direction of the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC), an off-shoot of the ANC, peacefully protested pass laws by arriving at police stations without their passes. The police response in Sharpeville, outside of Johannesburg, was to open fire, "killing sixty-seven Africans and wounding 186, most of whom were shot in the back" (Thompson, 2001: 210). The South African government, unfazed, laid blame for the violence upon the protestors (Mason, 2003). Violent reactions became common-place as anti-Apartheid resistance grew. In response to a peaceful march to Parliament in Cape Town, Thompson writes that,

"As disturbances mounted, the government struck back fiercely. It declared a state of emergency, mobilized the army reserves, outlawed the ANC and PNC, and arrested 98 Whites, 90 Indians, 36 Coloureds, and 11,279 Africans. The police jailed another 6,800 people, including the PAC leaders, as well as beating hundreds of Africans" (Thompson, 2001: 210).

In 1960, as a result of such circumstances, the ANC was inspired to alter their approach. Concluding that non-violence would not bring about an end to their struggle, Sisulu and Mandela, among others, as well as members of the PAC, "agreed that South Africa was not like India, where passive resistance had persuaded the British to quit. Resistance leaders emphasized the need for more radical approaches and the use of violent opposition. Mandela was quoted with the following justification of such a

mentality:

“We of the ANC had always stood for a non-racial democracy, and we shrank from any policy which might drive the races further apart than they already were. But the hard facts were that fifty years of non-violence had brought the African people nothing but more and more repressive legislation, and fewer and fewer rights... It would be unrealistic and wrong for African leaders to continue preaching non-violence at a time when the Government met our peaceful demands with force” (Thompson, 2001: 211).

This retreat from non-violence resistance gave birth to a new wing of the ANC known as Umkhonto We Sizwe, ‘Spear of the Nation,’ and also referred to as the MK. In the manifesto outlining the formation of such group, Mandela wrote:

“The time comes in the life of any nation where there remain only two choices: submit or fight. That time has come to South Africa. We shall not submit and we have no choice but to hit back by all means within our power in defense of our people, our future, and our freedom...” (Mason, 2003: 210).

Other resistance groups, including the PAC, followed suit. Beginning in 1961, the Umkhonto planted hundreds of bombs, primarily “near industrial centers, post offices, jails, Bantu Administration offices, and other government installations” (Beck, 2000: 144). Again, the actions of resistance groups were matched by those of the Apartheid regime. The Sabotage Act of 1962 was designed to quell the growing resistance movement; the legislation granted the government “increased power to restrict political activism and to place “communist agitators” under house arrest.” Moreover, “penalties for participating in activities considered dangerous to public safety, health, and law and order ranged from five years’ imprisonment to death.” The General Law Amendment Act of 1963 gave police the power to arrest anyone suspected of political activism against the government without charging them, and to hold them for twelve days of interrogation without access to lawyers or family members. Subsequent legislation would extend this number from twelve to ninety, and eventually and indefinite period of time (Beck, 2000). Anti-Apartheid leaders such as Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu would bear the brunt

of this legislation; in 1962 Mandela was captured and sentenced to five years imprisonment for “incitement and leaving the country without a passport.” The following year Sisulu was found, and with him many secret documents of the MK that outlined the group’s plans. Mandela and Sisulu, along with a number of other notable ANC leaders, were sentenced to life imprisonment on Robben Island, which housed Black male political leaders. The PAC and other resistance groups had followed a similar timeline of exile, as well as incarceration and execution. Therefore, “another decade would pass before the masses confronted the Apartheid regime again” (Beck, 2000: 146), and the next ten or so years became what is considered the ‘high-point’ of the Nationalist party, which continued to pass more repressive legislation, and relocated non-whites “like pawns on a chessboard” (Beck, 2000: 152).

The following decade witnessed a rise in Black consciousness under the leadership of activists such as Stephen Biko. In 1968, then at twenty-two-year old student, Biko formed an exclusively black branch of the National Union of South African Students known as the South African Students Organization (SASO) based around his belief that “all victims of white racism should unite and cease to depend on white organizations that claimed to work for their benefit,” along with the following philosophy:

“Black consciousness is in essence the realization by the black man of the need to rally together with his brothers around the cause of their subjection— the blackness of their skin— and to operate as a group in order to rid themselves of the shackles that bind them to perpetual servitude. It seeks to demonstrate the lie that black is an aberration from the “normal” which is white... It seeks to infuse the black community with a new-found pride in themselves, their efforts, their value systems, their culture, their religion and their outlook to life. The interrelationship between the consciousness of self and the emancipatory program is of paramount importance. Blacks no longer seek to reform the system because so doing implies acceptance of the major points around which the system revolves. Black are out to completely transform the system and to make of it what they wish” (Biko, 1979: 49).

Black consciousness was instilled within urban schools across the nation. In Soweto in June of 1976, thousands of black schoolchildren protested the required use of Afrikaans in their instruction, which they viewed as “the language of the oppressor” (Thompson, 2001: 212). The protest gained national attention after the police response resulted in the death of a thirteen-year-old student, who was shot during the demonstration. The death toll climbed higher as the regime cracked down upon student protesters; by February of the following year, “according to an official commission of inquiry, at least 575 people had been killed, including 494 Africans, 75 Coloureds, 5 Whites, and 1 Indian” (Thompson, 2001: 213), and 134 of the victims had been under the age of eighteen. SASO and its affiliates were subsequently banned that year, many of their leaders imprisoned, including Steve Biko, who died from injuries to his skull sustained during brutal police interrogation, which had caused brain damage. Such events moved thousands of young black South Africans to leave the country and seek military training by the ANC and PAC in countries such as Tanzania and Angola (Thompson, 2001).

This growth in black resistance had contributed to the formation of a “protest culture” within South Africa. The Apartheid regime struggled to maintain its law and order amid countless boycotts, from busses to schools, as well as strikes and various “bloody demonstrations,” incidents between police and township residents, and insurgency. “Incidents of sabotage against state departments, petrol depots, power installations, and railroad lines” and attacks on the police continued to increase into the mid-1980s. Initially non-violent boycotts often turned violent as well. Black-on-black violence increased as well, as vigilante groups and rival gangs competed for control in the deteriorating townships. Additionally, there were many occasions of state-supported

violence in the townships, as “government officials cultivated and gave surreptitious assistance to vigilante mobs” (Thompson, 2001: 229). Meanwhile, the ANC continued its campaign, setting hundreds of explosions in “streets, restaurants, cinemas, shopping centers, and sports complexes in the major cities” (Thompson, 2001: 238). A state of emergency was declared by the government in many areas around the country between July of 1985 and March of 1986, which resulted in what Thompson refers to as a state of “legalized tyranny.” The declaration granted “every police officer broad powers of arrest, detention, and interrogation, without a warrant” of any suspected anti-Apartheid activist, leading to an increasing number of arrests, tortures, incarcerations, treason trials, and assassinations. Censorship also intensified as the government banned any coverage of the country’s unrest in television, radio, and newspaper (Thompson, 2001: 234- 235). In addition to the state of emergency declared by the government, a state of war was issued by the South African Defense Force, which deployed its forces to the townships and arrested, and subsequently tortured during interrogations, thousands of people by February of 1987, including children, in accordance with the “emergency regulations.”

On the brink of a black-white civil war, secret negotiations between the government and ANC leaders began in 1988. In December of that year, Mandela was moved from Robben Island to a “comfortable house” on the grounds of the Victor Verster prison near the city of Paarl, where he was even allowed to receive guests. Mandela agreed to discuss an end to the struggle with a government committee. Conditions were established for a political settlement and an end to armed resistance that included the legalization of the ANC, the release of political prisoners, an end to the state of emergency, and the withdrawal of government troops from the townships. The

negotiations took years to be finalized, all the while violence continued to rage across South Africa, killing thousands of people, largely at the hands of Apartheid forces. Orders to release Anti-Apartheid political leaders began in 1988 and continued into the 1990s with the February 1990 release of Mandela. Despite conflicting ideologies within the ANC on how to handle reconciliation, Mandela was elected president of the ANC in July (Beck, 2000). The following years, the Apartheid government, under the leadership of F.W de Klerk, announced the repeal of all Apartheid legislation, despite its ongoing campaign of violence to undermine the efforts of the ANC. A constitution was eventually drawn up with the input of both the ANC and the Apartheid government in 1993, and in April of 1994, Nelson Mandela was elected president of the new South Africa (Beck, 2000).

After nearly five decades of struggle against the minority rule and oppression of the Apartheid regime, the nation of South Africa realized majority rule under the leadership of the ANC and President Nelson Mandela. However, the legacy of Apartheid endured in the years following democracy. A culture of violence had developed that has yet to be undone. Furthermore, the subjugation of blacks put into place by a vast collection of legislation solidified a state of inequality in all sectors of the society, especially in the education sector, that would remain deeply entrenched within South African society for years to come. The next section discusses the Bantu Education Act of 1953 and its effects on Black education in South Africa.

The Bantu Education Act (1953) and its Effects on Black Education in South Africa

Control over education was a critical element to the Apartheid regime. It ensured not only the perpetuation of the government's ideologies, but also served as a means of preventing the formation of anti-Apartheid opposition. Thus the education system of South Africa under Apartheid reflected the government's philosophies of racial separation and white supremacy. It was designed in accordance with the regime's notions of racial differences:

“The Bantu child comes to school with a basic physical and psychological endowment which differs so slightly, if at all, from that of the European child, that no special provision has to be made in the education theory or basic aims... But education practice must recognize that it has to deal with a Bantu child, i.e , a child trained and conditioned in Bantu culture, endowed with a knowledge of a Bantu language and imbued with values, interests, and behavior patterns learned at the knee of a Bantu mother. These facts must dictate to a large extent the contents and methods of his early education...Bantu education does have a separate existence... because it exists and can function only in and for a particular social setting, namely Bantu society” (Rose and Turner, 1975: 251- 252).

Based on the government's theories of white superiority and non-white inferiority, Whites and non-whites were afforded different educational opportunities and experiences. White students attended compulsory public schools where the language of instruction was either Afrikaans or English, while Coloureds and Indians attended their own racially segregated schools, which were not compulsory under South African law until the 1970s, and not compulsory for Africans until January 1, 1981 (“Compulsory Education,” 1980). The Bantu Education Act of 1953 gave control over the nation's African schools to the Department of Native Affairs. Previously such jurisdiction had belonged to the Department of Education. However, prior to such legislation, the majority of African schools had been run by Christian missionaries; fearing that the education being provided to blacks at missionary schools was turning African students into ‘black Englishmen,’ meaning societal equals to whites, the Apartheid government set

out to create a system that would eradicate the possibility “of an African elite which [would] claim recognition in a common society” (Beinart, 1994: 153). The Bantu Education Act made the establishment of African schools without the permission of the government illegal. Pre-existing African schools needed to be registered with the government, and subsequently approved, “enabling the government to close any educational programs which did not support its aims” (Kallaway, 1984: 171). By 1965, out of a total of some 7,200 African schools, a little over five hundred missionary schools were still operating, compared with the five thousand or so that had been open at the time that the legislation was drawn up.

The government education program, like the Apartheid system as a whole, was designed to reproduce the subjugation of black South Africans. On the subject of black education, Verwoerd, credited as the ‘father’ of Apartheid, stated that,

“The Natives will be taught from childhood to realize that equality with Europeans is not for them... The Native must be guided to serve his own community... Education must train and teach people in accordance with their opportunities in life— according to the sphere in which they live” (Johnson, 1982: 219).

The Bantu Education Act gave the Apartheid government control over every aspect of African education, including selecting and training teachers, as well as determining the given curriculum. According to the vision of Verwoerd, the curriculum of African schools was to exhibit the following properties:

“[A] Native education served to create a class of educated and semi-educated persons... The curriculum, therefore envisages a system of education which, starting with the circumstances of the community, aims at meeting the requirements of the community and which will be given in the mother tongue of the pupils... The economic structure... results in the Natives in large numbers having to earn their living in the service of Europeans. For this reason it is essential that Bantu students should receive instruction in both official languages from the beginning so that they can even in the lower primary school develop an ability to speak and understand them” (Pelzer: 1966, 77).

As mentioned above, the Act stipulated that the educational instruction of Africans up to

Standard 6, the eighth year of schooling, would be conducted primarily in the native languages of the students in the hopes of “cementing ethnic awareness” within African children. Afrikaans and English were to be introduced in higher level classes (Beinart, 1994) in order to ensure that blacks might successfully serve Whites in accordance with South African society. In order to guarantee instruction in African languages, African teachers were recruited by the government. However, they were denied equal pay to white teachers, who did not need to have any background in education or certification to teach in black schools (Finnegan, 1994). Despite qualifications and again, in accordance with Verwoerd’s vision, salary discrepancies were justified with the disparate statuses of white and black pupils within the societal structure of Apartheid:

“The salaries which European teachers enjoy, are not at all a usable or a permissible criterion for the Bantu teachers. The European teacher in the service of the European community and his salary is fixed on a basis of comparison with the income of the average parent whose children he teaches... In precisely the same way the Bantu teacher is in the service of the Bantu community and his salary must be fixed accordingly” (Hlatshwayo, 2000: 64).

By 1976, the salaries of white teachers were between 30 and 50 percent higher than those of black teachers (Burns, 1976). Those teachers who opposed the regulations of the Bantu Education Act would “have no place in the service of the Bantu Education department” (Hlatshwayo, 2000: 64). Although the salary of a black teacher was not a representation of his/ her qualification level, black teachers who were employed under the Bantu system were often also highly unqualified. In 1968, about 87 percent of the teachers in the Bantu system had not graduated from high school. In 1976, only ten percent of the teachers, Black and White, employed by the Bantu education system had the minimum qualifications needed to teach in White schools (Burns, 1976). By 1984, out of the 42,000 black teachers employed in the system, 78 percent were considered “under-qualified,” many not having completed their own primary or secondary educations (Cowell, 1984).

To further the perpetuation of Apartheid ideologies within the education system and to shape the minds of African students in accordance with such ideologies, the Bantu Education Department emphasized that “Bantu parents should as far as practicable have a share in the control and life of the schools” in order to ensure that Bantu children “realize that their parents and the schools are not competitors but that they are complementary” (59). This was part of the administration’s plan to “facilitate the reproduction of the relations of production in a docile form, so that these relations would appear natural and based on common sense” (Kallaway, 1984: 174-175). Additionally, the department called for “active steps be taken to produce literature of functional value,” implementing only textbooks that embodied negative representations of blacks into the curriculum in both history and literary works. Corresponding examinations also expressed the government’s beliefs (Thompson, 2001), as did the fact that blacks were not taught science up until the 1980s, based upon the government’s assertion that blacks “would never need science” (Cowell, 1984).

Despite the discrimination put into practice by the regime’s education system, which would eventually take control over the education of Coloureds, Asians, and Indians, the number of Africans receiving an education increased in the decades following the Bantu Education Act. By 1979, 3,484,329 African students were reportedly enrolled in the state’s education system, even though “African parents and African school boards and school committees [were] required to provide substantial supplemental financing for their children’s education” (Johnson, 1982: 221). However, the education system put into place by the Bantu Education Act was one characterized by inferiority, and the large numbers of blacks attending schools contributed to overcrowding and took

a toll on quality. African class sizes were twice the size of those of whites, and in 1984, the average teacher to student ratio was 65 to 1 in many black schools, compared to 18 to 1 in most white schools (Cowell, 1984). Additionally, ‘double sessions’ were instituted to attend to the education of all enrolled African students. Conversely, this meant that many students only attended half-day sessions of school, so “not only were facilities strained, [but] in addition the school day was shortened by approximately one-third” (Kallaway, 1984: 177). Furthermore, shortages of textbooks and other academic equipment occurred with great frequency (Johnson, 1982), and the quality of school facilities stood in great contrast between the two races (Burns, 1976).

Although teacher quality had been generally low before the Bantu Education Act, “overall, there was a marked deterioration in the qualification levels of teachers under Bantu education” (Kallaway, 1984: 177- 178). African schools provided black students with “a generally low standard of instruction.” By 1978, “only 12,014 Africans passed the matriculation examination or its equivalent (similar to American graduation from high school), whereas three time as many Whites did so” (Thompson, 2001: 196). The quality of African schools, in comparison to those of Whites, reflected the premises that the system had been built upon:

“It is not that the aim is the same and that only the methods to be used are different. The ends themselves are different in the two cases. The education of the white child prepares him for life in a dominant society and the education of the black child for the subordinate society. There are for the white child no limits in or out of school. For the black child there *are* limits which affect him in or out of school. It is no use shutting our eyes to the fact and ostrichlike positing aims for Native education which the very circumstances of South Africa make impossible to realize, merely because these aims are laudable and we should like them to apply to the black people as well. Limits are there which form part of the whole social and economic structure of the country, and it serves no good purpose to act as if they did not exist” (Kallaway: 1984: 168).

To ensure the inferiority of blacks, an inferior education would be afforded to them;

African secondary schools were intentionally constructed as far away from the

homelands as possible to persuade blacks from furthering their education (Kallaway, 1984), and the costs alone kept most Africans out of school. A 1970 study in the townships outside of Port Elizabeth found that black parents had to pay between one-third and one-half of their wages in order to send their children to school (“School Gap,” 1970). The cost of sending children to school, which included fees for textbooks, uniforms, secondary school examinations, and sports activities, despite the fact that schooling was free to whites, was a burden for most African families (Burns, 1976). In 1976, approximately seventy-five percent of all black children between the ages of seven and fifteen were attending primary school. However, less than nine percent of the 3.1 million or so enrolled in schools were attending secondary schooling, and of this nine percent only a mere one percent were graduating; this one percent constituted 9,009 Africans (Burns, 1976). Those blacks who did go on to attend secondary school found themselves unprepared to learn in English and Afrikaans after years of primary instruction in African languages (Finnegan, 1984).

While the literacy rate for Whites in 1976 was 100 percent, that of Blacks between ages thirteen and twenty-two was only 58 percent, and was still characterized by a lower reading level due to aforementioned disparities in education levels amongst the two racial groups (Burns, 1976). A 1979 report found that “40% of the African male workforce in urban areas did not have educational qualifications sufficient to give them functional literacy;” the percentage for such African males in rural areas of the country was 65% (Johnson, 1982). By 1980, it was estimated that only half of the nation’s black children were attending school, and that half of those who did attend school were dropping out after four years of primary schooling, or at the age of approximately eight or

nine. In 1989, fifty-eight percent of all black high school students in South Africa failed their final examinations (Wren, 1989), and of those tested, only one black student had received an “A.” The following year, nearly two-thirds of black students had failed the same examinations, with a mere seven black students receiving an A in all of South Africa, following a “lengthy” teacher’s strike that “paralyzed many schools” (Wren, Jan 1991).

Another deliberate repression on African education was evident in the spending practices of the Apartheid regime, which spent fourteen times as much per capita on White students than it did on African students in 1971, and still seventeen times as much five years later in 1976 (Burns, 1976). By 1980, this figure had jumped from ten to twelve (Finnegan, 1994). Six years later, in 1986, the funding of White education in South Africa was seven times greater than that of Black education. The backdrop of Apartheid further exacerbated the educational disparities between Africans and Whites as many blacks followed the slogan of “liberation before education,” and, in addition to boycotting schools out of protest of their inferiority, left school altogether (Cowell, 1990). Such boycotting, by students and later teachers, disrupted the educational progress of those involved. Response to this indignation, on many occasions, was met by violence on the part of the police force. Moreover, statistics show that the government did little to nothing to improve the quality of education for black South Africans.

By 1991, while a new constitution was being drawn up for the country, black educators sent a memorandum to F.W de Klerk describing the nation’s education system as a “national educational disaster” (Wren, Feb 1991). Although the spending gap between white and black students was now 4 to 1, “white children continued to have

more modern schools, newer textbooks, better laboratory equipment and superior sports facilities,” and the average class sizes averaged to be 16 students for white classes and 41 for those of black students (Wren, Feb 1991). Three years later, in 1994, with the election of Nelson Mandela to the presidency, only 24% of all Black South African adults had received any form of schooling. 37% of this population had attended only primary school, while 22% had attended some secondary schooling. A mere 6% had attended a school of higher education. Although Africans “had gained the dignity of full citizenship, most of them were not equipped to prosper in the country where they now formed the political majority” (Thompson, 2001: 266).

The Bantu Education Act “had some of the most far-reaching and long-term consequences of any Apartheid legislation” (Beck, 2000: 131). The Apartheid regime had created entirely separate schooling systems for Africans and other non-white groups, one marked by an overwhelming character of inequality. In an attempt to both dominate the minds of Africans, as well as relegate them to a subservient social status within South African society, the education system put in place had immensely inhibited the academic potential of Africans in an immeasurable respect. The legacy of Bantu Education in South Africa is one whose effects on educational equality are still playing out today, years after the fall of Apartheid.

Post-Apartheid Education in South Africa: Cape Town

With the fall of Apartheid in South Africa came the possibility for the realization of equal opportunity between black and white South Africans. However, the damage done to the education system since the 1953 establishment of the Bantu Education Act had deeply entrenched the racial and class divide amongst these two groups. Outside of the crisis in education, the new administration was faced with a considerable host of astounding social problems, a population shaken by decades of violence and tyrannical rule, and an enduring legacy of inequality.

In 1991, as negotiations were underway between ANC leaders and the administration in power, members of the white-minority rule agreed to meet with black educational leaders to discuss solutions to the nation's educational segregation and associated inequality. As previously mentioned, at that time the gap in spending between white and black students was 4 to 1, while the average class sizes for each group averaged 16 to 1 and 41 to 1, respectively (Wren, Feb 1991). The number of black students entering the first grade nation-wide in 1991 was greater than that of white students in every grade combined, meaning that the majority of South Africa's most recent generation of students was heading into an educational system that was still providing them with a low quality, inferior education. The government would not announce the move into a unitary system of education until a new constitution had been developed. In March of 1993 this announcement was made, and the new system would be formed the following year (Lemon, 1995). The nation's education system needed to be transformed from being a system that perpetuated inequality to one that promoted equality. The educational goals of the ANC included the following: an education policy

geared towards producing a new type of society characterized by equality, democratic practices governing the activities of students, teachers, and the entire educational community, along with the reproduction of the social goals of a democratic society “in which there is political and social justice for all” (Thobejane, 2005: 12).

Soon after the 1994 elections, the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP) was created to aid this desired “social transformation,” with education declared an utmost priority of the RDP’s Human Resource Development Program, “designed to democratize and equalize all institutions and practices,” or create a “level playing field” for all South Africans (Brook, 1996: 213). Education was viewed as a gateway to combating the nation’s plethora of social problems, such as crime, rape, prostitution, poverty, and drug abuse, as well as a principle means of equipping its black majority to “function as skilled workers and active citizens,” as noted in the Preamble to the South African Schools Act of 1996 (SASA):

“Whereas this country requires a new national system for schools which will redress past injustices in educational provision, provide an education of progressively high quality for all learners... advance the democratic transformation of society, combat racism and sexism... contribute to the eradication of poverty and the economic well-being of society, protect and advance our diverse cultures and languages, uphold the rights of all learners, parents, and educators...” (Motala and Pampallis, 2002: 24).

Thus, by 1995 all South African schools were made available to all students, regardless of race and ability to pay school fees. However, this declaration did not change the racial composition of schools, as the country was still residentially segregated; “non-white schools saw virtually no change and the backlogs persisted” (Brooks, 1996: 213). Faced with a lack of resources and a sizable task at hand, President Mandela encouraged community efforts to aid the rebuilding of South Africa’s education system in what was known as the “masakhane” campaign, meaning “let us build together” in Nguni

languages. School governance was brought into the hands of locally elected school board, consisting of parents, teachers, and secondary level students in the case of such schools, a factor that would undermine future attempts at integration and equality in some cases, despite the national government's instruction for all educational policies to be 'color-blind.' At the same time, a number of actions were carried out on the part of the new government. The South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) called for "ten years of free and compulsory general education," and emphasized the need to have such schools in "disadvantaged townships, farms, villages, informal settlements and rural areas," in order to raise the quality of education that the nation's black students were receiving (Fiske and Ladd, 2004: 67). Class sizes were not to exceed forty students. The South African government committed to investing in the development of qualified teachers and the improvement of school facilities, as well as the construction of new facilities to attend to the overcrowding that characterized black schools across the country, as well as make way for increased enrollment. A new curriculum was also to be developed, with the input of parents, teachers, and students, to replace the racist ideologies perpetuated by those implemented during the Apartheid era. The new national curriculum would be designed to

"Prepare individuals for the world of work and social and political participation in the context of a rapidly changing and dynamic global economy and society, with associated procedures for assessment of student progress and certification, the production of textbooks, and the development of libraries" (Fiske and Ladde, 2004: 68).

Furthermore, the SAQA also called for additional programs in areas such as early childhood education, adult education, and special education, but failed to include specific priorities on such topics. Finally, as the government was already spending 7.3 percent of its GNP funding education between 1993 and 1994, there was to be no increase in this

amount. Schools were encouraged by the national government to “levy obligatory school fees to supplement revenues from the state” (Ladd and Fiske, 2004: 86). The Act also maintained that the provinces would be responsible for instituting educational policies, as well as spending the money allocated by the national government for education (Ladd and Fiske, 2004).

The nation’s provinces were faced with a difficult task of integrating separate educational systems into a singular body. The corruption and inefficiency found in the governments of the former homelands only added to the difficulties of establishing new departments of education in poorer, predominantly black areas. For example, in addition to “charges of official corruption, mismanagement, and administrative chaos,” the Eastern Cape between 1995 and 2002 “[became] a revolving door for heads of education and spent most of 2002 trying to hire a new one” (Fidde and Laske, 2004: 78). That same academic year, school supplies had not arrived in a number of schools throughout the province, setting off boycotts of more than 60,000 students. At other schools, food programs were not being carried out due to suspension of such programs from charges of corruption and mismanagement as well. Thus, many students “had little incentive to go to school,” and those who did found that “their ability to learn once they got there was impaired” from such conditions (Fiske and Ladde, 2004: 78- 79). A lack of proper management in many provinces created a discrepancy between the educational principles outlined by the national government and the actual implementation of them by local authorities.

Although South African students could, in theory, apply to any school that they wished, the nation’s schools remained overwhelmingly stratified by race, given the

inherited geographical segregation of the races from the Apartheid era. However, a study conducted in 1997 by Servaas van der Berg of all provinces, with the exception of the Eastern Cape and Mpumalanga, found that 96 percent of African students were in predominantly African schools, meaning schools whose student population consisted of 99.6 percent or more African students. 77 percent of white students were found to be in schools where the proportion of whites was 90 percent or higher, while 22 percent of white students attended “mixed schools,” or those whose white student body was 70 percent or higher. Thus, virtually no white students attended predominantly black schools (Fiske and Ladd, 2004). Furthermore, 85 percent of coloured students attended schools with a coloured population of 90 percent or higher. It is important to note that a number of schools refused to provide such data, and that many of these schools were located in the Western Cape.

A similar study to that of Servaas van der Berg was conducted in the Western Cape and Eastern Cape in 2001 by Edward B. Fiske and Helen F. Ladd. The researchers were denied racial information from approximately fifty percent of the white schools and thirty percent of the coloured schools in the Western Cape, claiming to be “race-blind.” Of the primary schools surveyed in the Eastern Cape, Fiske and Ladd found that nearly 100 percent of the formerly African-only schools remained African, 93 percent of the formerly coloured-only schools were coloured, and 66 percent of the former white-only schools were still white. Thus, “the former African township schools still only served African students, the former coloured schools served mainly coloured students along with some African students,” while the former white-only schools were found to be the most mixed, with 35 percent of their student populations found to be black (Fiske and Ladd,

2004: 88). In the primary schools of the Western Cape, “79 percent of the African primary students were in former African schools, 94 percent of the coloured students were in former coloured schools, and essentially 100 percent of the white students were in formerly white schools,” with secondary schools in the province following nearly identical patterns (Fiske and Ladd, 2004: 89).

The movement of non-whites into the white schools of the Eastern Cape, along with the lack of movement amongst white students out of formerly white schools across provinces is indicative of the superior quality that continues to characterize such schools. As of 2004, white schools had smaller teacher to student ratios, due in part to the fact that such schools continued to offer more subjects than African schools, and African schools continued to face a shortage of classrooms and staff (Ladd and Fiske, 2004). In addition to a lack of teachers, those working in predominantly African schools were found to earn lower salaries than those of teachers in predominantly white schools. For example, salaries of teachers in black schools in the Western Cape were found to be twenty percent lower than those of teachers in white schools in the region. This discrepancy is indicative of a lower qualification level, as the South African government instated a national “uniform salary schedule” after the 1994 elections, a standard that would reflect teachers’ qualification levels. A recent study found that the majority of teachers instructed under the Bantu system “scored less than 50 percent on a [literacy] test for sixth graders” (Dugger, 2009). A survey found that’s most teachers taught only three hours a day on average, compared with the five daily hours expected, and that “this deficiency was worse in poor and working-class communitites” (Dugger, 2009). Additionally, despite the fact that more money from the national budget is given to impoverished schools, and thus

those that are predominantly black, as well as coloured, more public resources are available to wealthier, predominantly white schools, making total public spending on South Africa's white schools greater than that on African schools. In the Western Cape, for example, there was a 30 percent difference in total public resources available (Ladd and Fiske, 2004). Such conditions were exacerbated in poorer provinces like the Eastern Cape. For example, at the time of this study, the teachers of Mskatini Primary School, located in the Eastern Cape, were forced to take turns using available classrooms, as there were not enough for the 610 students in attendance. The school also lacked toilets and electricity, and had lost their feeding program because of corruption (Fiske and Ladd, 2004). Such conditions, along with "lack of textbooks and other teaching supplies," have been widespread in the educational facilities of the nation's impoverished schools in the years following Apartheid. Tardy, and even absent, teachers who go unpunished have added to the problems plaguing the nation's poorer, minority schools. Thus, Graeme Bloch, an education researcher at the Development Bank of Southern Africa, sullenly notes that, "If you are in a township school, you don't have much chance... Black kids don't really stand a chance unless they can get into a formerly white school or the small number of black schools that work" (Dugger, 2009).

As of 2000, one third of the nation's schools were reportedly "integrated" in some form, mainly because of the decision on the part of black parents to send their students to predominantly white schools, which have remained of a comparatively higher quality in the post-Apartheid era. However, fees have kept many African students out of wealthier, white schools where the educational quality is of a superior quality (Fiske, 2002). Such schools offer a better education, but at a higher price, and one that many impoverished

South African families cannot afford (Swarns, 2000). The “lack of disposable income present in many black families” also accounts for the fact that while an estimated 90 percent of all South African students attended primary school as of 2004, only 62 percent went onto secondary school (Ladd and Fiske, 2004).

Despite the presence of integrated schools, the number of private schools has increased since integration was legalized. In 1995, South Africa had only 550 private schools; four years later the number had more than doubled, standing at around 1,300 (Swarns, 2000). In public schools, statistics have shown that for schools where the black student population was between 50 and 80 percent, as formerly white schools became predominantly black, “the racial mix was likely to continue to change, with white students leaving the school and black students filling empty spaces” between the years of 1997 and 2001. For schools whose black student population was less than 30 percent, such a proportion was maintained between 1997 and 2001, with the use of “informal screening” of English capabilities for black applicants, as well as “discouraging applications” of black students whose English was “inadequate,” as “dissatisfied white parents would have the option of sending their child to one of the private schools that typically tried to maintain the ratio of English speakers to 30 percent” (Fiske and Ladd, 2004: 90- 91).

Aside from efforts to avoid integration on the part of white parents, on the basis of either race or cultural cementation, racial tensions plague post-Apartheid education system. A 1999 survey conducted by the South African Human Rights Commission found that 60 percent of the 1,728 students surveyed had reported that “racial incidents” had occurred at their school, mostly in the form of “name-calling and stereotyping that

sometimes degenerated into fistfights” (Swarns, 2000). The presence of racism has also carried over into the post-Apartheid education system in the attitudes of school officials. Black parents whose children attend predominantly white schools can be faced with the following circumstances:

“My children complain about racism. While they admit black students, our children are not treated the same as white children. My son complains about one of their head teachers who makes remarks such as: “*You coloured boy,*” or “*You black girl*” when referring to our children...” (Ndimande, 2009: 127).

Other documented complaints of black parents include racially separate parent meetings, as well as exclusion through the use of language:

“The principal would start addressing the meeting in Afrikaans, and when you ask him to switch to English so that we could all understand, he would say: “Wait, I will get to English later.” However, when he finishes talking in Afrikaans, he wouldn't switch to English. He will simply say (in Afrikaans of course): “Die vergaardering is klaar en hy sal nie meer praat nie, [meaning] ‘The meeting is over and he is done talking.’ That is why I say white principals are trying to drive us away from these schools” (Ndimande, 2009: 127).

Only a small amount of South Africa's black students attend predominantly white schools, and thus only a small number of South Africa's black students receive quality education. Apartheid's inherited geographical segregation, socioeconomic structure, and legacy of inferior black education has contributed to such circumstances, as has the government's lack of resources and poor management of educational policies, also attributable to the enduring effects of the Apartheid era. Today half of South Africa's students do not finish high school, and the achievement gap between the nation's white and black students remains staggering (Dugger, 2009). Dugger writes that, “thousands of schools across South Africa are bursting with students who dream of being the accountants, engineers, and doctors that [South Africa] desperately needs,” yet the education system continues to fail the majority of the nation's students, “the very children

depending on it most to escape poverty,” as well as the legacy left by Apartheid.

Post-Apartheid Education: Cape Town, South Africa

Known as the ‘Mother City’, Cape Town is located is one of South Africa’s three capital cities and is situated in the Western Cape, one of the nation’s wealthiest provinces, behind Gauteng. Home to nearly three million people, the city is both “multicultural and highly unequal,” bearing “the obvious scars of Apartheid,” including tremendous racial residential segregation, and an extremely unequal distribution of wealth (Centeno and Newman, 2010). The legacy of Apartheid is indeed glaringly evident in the city’s education system. As previously noted, a 2001 study conducted by Fiske and Ladd found that the vast majority of schools of the Western Cape had continued to follow racial patterns from the Apartheid era, with schools remaining extremely racially segregated. With schools of a higher quality, those found in the predominantly white, more affluent suburbs, charging a higher entrance fee, many black families have been unable to afford to send their children to such schools (Fiske, 2002).

Cape Town is a prime example of the economic disparity created under the Apartheid era, a factor that manifests itself in the quality of schools in South Africa. A 2002 study on household income in Cape Town, South Africa found that ten percent of the city’s population was living in “severe poverty,” and an additional fifteen percent where living in “mild poverty.” Two-thirds of people living severe poverty were African, while one third were colored. A little more than half of those living in mild poverty were African, and the remaining percentage were colored. The study also found “African households [to be] concentrated in the poorest third of the city’s population and white

households [to be] in the richest third.” Finally, results showed that income for African households in Cape Town was approximately two thousand Rand per month, which translated into roughly three hundred U.S dollars a month. The mean income of white households was nearly five times this amount (Centeno and Newman, 2010: 67). Like the rest of South Africa, race and class are often interconnected, and linked to such features is the quality of one’s education.

Following the 1994 elections and the subsequent victory of the ANC, the Nationalist Party still held political control over the Western Cape, allowing the Cape Education Department of the Apartheid era to “maintain significant power by providing much of the administrative expertise for the new department” (Fiske and Ladd, 2004: 78). Although the institution of a new provincial department of education occurred more quickly in the Western Cape in comparison to other provinces, “it lacked legitimacy in the eyes of the ANC and its allies” (78). Furthermore, in accordance with the national government’s plan to “equalize resources” across the country, the Western Cape “experienced the largest reduction in teachers of all the provinces,” given its high wealth of income. The province has one of the highest populations of whites, as well as coloureds, the latter of which constitutes more than half of the province’s population. During Apartheid, the region was designated as a “coloured labor preference area,” thus restricting the influx of blacks (Ladd and Fiske, 2004).

Although the province’s managerial capabilities allowed for more integration in comparison to provinces such as the Eastern Cape, as previously noted, in many schools that became overwhelmingly black, many whites began to leave. Fees, as previously

mentioned, also keep many blacks and whites from mixing. A 2001 study of Western Cape school fees found that primary school fees ranged from 45 Rand in formerly African schools to over 2,000 Rand in formerly white schools, while at the secondary level fees ranged from 105 Rand to 2,700 Rand. It is essential to point out that most former African schools were “disproportionately found in the low-fee quintiles,” while former white schools were “disproportionately found in the high-fee quintiles.” The study also found that only 4.1 percent of students in the formerly white primary schools received fee exemptions; in formerly white secondary schools, 5.7 percent of students received full or partial fee exemptions. Thus, formerly white primary and secondary schools in the Western Cape were found to primarily serve South African families with relatively high incomes (Ladd and Fiske, 2004). Given the interconnectedness between race and socioeconomic status in a city like Cape Town, it is not surprising that the majority of students attending higher quality, formerly white schools were in fact white students. Fees can affect school quality “by enabling schools to purchase additional resources, including teachers, that may enhance student performance” (Fiske and Ladd, 2004: 127). At the same time, schools fees serve to preserve both the racial composition of schools, as well as their quality, in a manner that reflects Apartheid conditions, as race and socioeconomic status remain overwhelmingly attached to one another in South Africa. For example, the fee revenue of formerly African schools in 2001 allowed the average school to hire “less than one-fifth of an additional teacher,” in comparison to that of formerly white schools, whose revenue allowed for the hiring of “close to four additional teachers” (127). Similar results were found with secondary schools.

With unequal educational opportunities, it is not surprising that the legacy of

Apartheid manifests heavily within Cape Town schools, specifically those of the townships. Like other poor, black schools, those in Cape Town's townships are the site of overcrowding, inferior facilities, tardy and absent teachers, as well as unqualified teachers, and the "wrenching achievement gap" (Dugger, 2009). In 2005, only 2 out of 1,000 sixth graders in the provinces predominantly black schools passed the grade level mathematics test, while 2 out of 3 students in formerly white schools did the same. Similarly, in 2009, only forty-four percent of students at Kwamfundo High in the township of Khayelitsha passed the national matriculation exams. A teacher at Kwamfundo noted that, "If you say 3 times 3, they will say 6," pointing out that "many children get to high school not knowing their multiplication tables" in areas like Khayelitsha (Dugger, 2009). Parents such as Naz Mostert of Ocean View, a coloured township outside of Cape Town, contends that the schools for non-whites in the region are very much of an inferior quality, and thus they are forced to send their son to a private school in order for him to receive an adequate education (Mostert, personal interview, March 2011).

For both black and coloured students in the Mother City, the post-Apartheid education system, as seen across South Africa, has failed them. Given its significant economic disparities, Cape Town is serves as a prime example of the inherited racial structure of Apartheid and its associated socioeconomic structure. Its schools exhibit the lasting legacy of the Bantu Education system, which afforded non-whites and whites two separate and unequal education systems that have very much prevailed in the decades following the fall of Apartheid. Black and coloured students in the Mother City continue to be afforded an education inferior in quality to that of their white, often wealthier,

counterparts.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the history of educational segregation in New York City, and addressed the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision of 1954, along with its implications for education in the City of New York. It has also discussed the educational segregation and inequality that has characterizes New York City's public school system today. Furthermore, the chapter has discussed the Apartheid era of South African history, and an additional discussion of the Bantu Education Act of 1953. The post-Apartheid education system of South Africa, as well as the city of Cape Town has also been discussed.

Chapter IV

Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications for Further Study

Summary

The purpose of the study was to examine urban education in New York City and Cape Town, South Africa. The objective was to determine if any inequalities existed in the education systems of these two cities. The study was carried out to fill the gap left by others regarding urban education in these cities, as opposed to that of the entirety of the United States and South Africa. Data collection for the study has employed library resources, including books, newspaper articles, Online journals, Internet sources, video documentaries, and interviews from teachers and university students in Cape Town and New York City. Although attempts were made to solicit information from university students at the University of Cape Town, no responses were elicited, as students did not entertain the invitation for discussion.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the study:

1. It was discovered that educational inequality exists within the urban education systems of New York City and Cape Town, South Africa. The inequality manifests itself in the form of lower spending per student, lower teacher qualification, overcrowding, and inferior educational facilities. In the cities of New York and Cape Town, this educational

inequality is most often associated with black students from a lower socioeconomic background. These conditions seriously affect student achievement in terms of learning, retention rates, and discipline within the schools.

2. Educational segregation remains widespread in the public education system of New York City. This has been brought about by a history of residential segregation that continues to characterize the city today, and the legacy of educational segregation being a consequence of the failure on the part of the New York City Board of Education to integrate its schools.

3. White parents continue to undermine the New York City Board of Education's efforts to integrate the city's public schools by sending their children to private schools.

4. The U.S Supreme Court's *Brown vs. Board* decision did little to end the educational segregation of the New York City public school system.

5. Residential segregation stands as a significant obstacle to educational integration in the education system of Cape Town and South Africa in general.

6. An achievement gap between black and white students has resulted from a history of continued educational inequality, in which poor, black students are afforded an education of inferior quality by the public schools system of New York City and Cape Town.

7. Educational segregation is widespread in the urban education system of Cape Town, South Africa, due to the legacy of Apartheid that included extreme residential segregation and the creation of two separate and unequal systems of education under the Bantu

Education Act of 1953. This has resulted in poorer academic achievement for black students as opposed to white students.

8. In Cape Town, black students' access to a higher quality education in wealthier, predominantly white schools is undermined by widespread poverty and the presence of higher fees at such schools.

Recommendations

Based on the research findings, it is suggested that:

1. The composition of New York City's Board of Education should more closely reflect the racial diversity of the City's public school system in order to ensure that the issues faced by the system's students are given more priority.
2. The South African government should play a more active role in the educational offerings of its provinces. The government should conduct a study to assess the present educational systems found within each of its provinces, and follow up with the appropriate steps to enhance educational inequality, particularly amongst its population of Black students.
3. Given the country's extreme residential segregation, the South African government needs to take action to integrate the country's schools.
4. The City of New York should conduct a study into the educational equality of its

predominantly minority public schools.

Implications for Further Study

1. Educational inequality in higher education in New York City and Cape Town, South Africa

2. Educational funding for predominantly black and predominantly white urban schools in New York City and Cape Town, South Africa since 2000

References

- “Achievement Gap,” *Education Week*, September 10, 2004.
- “Apartheid Haunts South Africa’s Schools,” September 2009. *The New York Times*.
Dugger, Celia W., Hager, Emily B. and Silva, Joao. Video Report.
- Anderson, James and Byrne, Dara N. 2004. *The Unfinished Agenda of Brown v. Board of Education*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Arrington, Karen McGill. 1981. *With All Deliberate Speed: 1954- 19??*. Washington, D.C: U.S Commission on Civil Rights.
- Bailey, Stephen Kemp. 1979. *Prejudice and Pride: The Brown Decision After Twenty-five Years, May 17 1954- May 17 1979*. Washington, D.C: U.S Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Education Division.
- Barbanel, Josh. 15 December 1993. “New York Education Chief Notes Disparity in Schools,” *The New York Times*.
- Barber, James. 1999. *South Africa in the Twentieth Century*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Barry, Dan. 15 September 2006. “Giuliani Says Overcrowding in Schools is Overstated,” *The New York Times*.
- Beck, Roger B. 2000. *The History of South Africa*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Beinart, William. 1994. *Twentieth-Century South Africa*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, Heather. 2009. “Education Policy, Race & Social Movements: A Critical Study of the Impact of the Bantu Education Act of 1953 and the Rise of Student Movements in Apartheid South Africa.”
- Berger, Joseph. 3 June 1991. “White Flight From Schools Leveling Off,” *The New York Times*.
- Bernasconi, Robert & Tommy L. Lott. 2000. *The Ideas of Race*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett.
- Biko, Steve. 1978. *I Write What I Like*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Heinemann Educational Publishers.

- Biondi, Martha. 2003. *To Stand and Fight: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Postwar New York City*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Blaustein, Albert P. and Ferguson, Clarence Clyde Jr. 1957. *Desegregation and the Law: The Meaning and Effects of the School Segregation Cases*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert. 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York, New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Brook, Diane L. 1996. "From Exclusion to Inclusion: Racial Politics and South African Educational Reform," *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No.2. American Anthropological Association.
- Brooks, David. 15 September 2005. "The Education Gap," *The New York Times*.
- Brown, Frank. 2004. "The Continuing Search for Quality Education by African Americans: Fifty Years After Brown," *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 73, No. 3.
- Burns, John F. 15 July 1976. "Schools of South Africa are Separate and Unequal," *The New York Times*.
- Byrne, Dara N., ed. 2005. *Brown v. Board of Education: Its Impact on Public Education, 1954- 2004*. Thurgood Marshall Scholarship Fund.
- Centeno, Miguel Angel & Newman, Katharine S., eds. 2010. *Discrimination in an Unequal World*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press
- Clark, Kenneth B. 1963. "Segregated Schools in New York City," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, Vol. 36, No. 6. American Sociological Association.
- CivilRights.org. <http://www.civilrights.org/education/brown/belton.html>
- "Compulsory Education for Blacks to Begin in South Africa on Jan. 1," 11 November 1980. *The New York Times*.
- Cowell, Alan. 21 October 1984. "Education Troubles Haunt South Africa," *The New York Times*.
- Cowell, Alan. 17 September 1990. "In South Africa, a 'Lost Generation,'" *The New York Times*.
- Daniel, Philip T.K. 2004. "Accountability and Desegregation: Brown and Its Legacy," *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 73, No. 3.

District 6 Museum, 25 Buitenkant Street, Cape Town, South Africa 8001

Douglas, Davison M. 2005. *Jim Crow Moves North: The Battle over Northern School Segregation, 1865- 1954*. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dugger, Celia W. 19 September 2009. "Eager Students Fall Prey to Apartheid's Legacy," *The New York Times*.

FindLaw.com <http://www.findlaw.com/cascode/supreme.html>

Finnegan, William. 1986. *Crossing the Line: A Year in the Land of Apartheid*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.

Fiske, Edward B. 15 October 2002. "South Africa struggles to offer quality education to blacks: Nurturing 'expectations in life,'" *The New York Times*.

Fiske, Edward B. and Laske, Helen F. 2004. *Elusive Equity: Education Reform in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institute Press.

Guelke, Adrian. 2005. *Rethinking the Rise and Fall of Apartheid: South Africa and World Politics*. New York, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hayman, Robert L. Jr., and Ware, Leland. 2009. *Choosing Equality: Essays and Narratives on the Desegregation Experience*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Herbert, Bob. 21 March 2011. "Separate and Unequal," *The New York Times*.

Hernandez, Javier. C. 7 November 2008. "Racial Imbalance Persists at Elite Public Schools," *The New York Times*.

Hlatshwayo, Simphiwe A. 2000. *Education and Independence: Education in South Africa, 1658-1988*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenport Press.

Jairrels, Veda. August 2009. "African Americans and Standardized Tests: New Book Urges Going Back to Basics to Close Achievement Gap," *BlackPressUSA.com*.

Johnson, Walter R. 1982. "Education: Keystone of Apartheid," *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, Vol. 13, No. 3.

Judson, George. 6 February 1993. "Expert Links Mandatory Desegregation to 'White Flight,'" *The New York Times*.

Kallaway, Peter, ed. 1984. *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans*. Braamfontein, South Africa: Ravan Press (Pty) Ltd.

- Kozol, Jonathan. Fall 2008. "Our Educational Apartheid," *Race, Poverty, and the Environment: A Journal for Social and Environmental Justice*.
- Kozol, Jonathan. 16 January 2006. "Segregated Schools: Shame of The City," *Gotham Gazette*.
- Kozol, Jonathan. 2005. *The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America*. New York, New York: Crown Publishers.
- Kruger, Anne-Mart Suzanne. January 2008. "History, Storytelling, and Orality: Representation of the Khoikhoi in André Brink's *Devil's Valley*." Port Elizabeth, South Africa: Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.
- Ladd, Helen F. and Fiske, Edward B. 11 December 2011. "Class Matters. Why Don't We Admit It?," *The New York Times*.
- Lemon, Anthony. 1995. "Education in Post-apartheid South Africa: some lessons from Zimbabwe," *Comparative Education, Vol. 31, No. 1*. Taylor and Francis, Ltd.
- Louis, Errol. 7 November 2010. "How Segregation Plagues Bloomberg's New York: Black, White, and Wrong All Over," *The Daily News*.
- Louw, P. Eric. 2004. *The Rise, Fall, and Legacy of Apartheid*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Mandela, Nelson. 1995. *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. Randburg, South Africa: Macdonald Purnell (PTY) Ltd.
- Mason, David. 2003. *A Traveller's History of South Africa*. London, United Kingdom: The Windrush Press.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Denton, Nancy A. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Moore, John Hartwell. 2008. "Scientific Racism, History of." *Encyclopedia of Race and Racism, Vol. 3*. Detroit, MI: Macmillan Reference.
- Mostert, Naz. March 2011, Personal interview.
- Motala, Enver, and John Pampallis, eds. 2002. *The State, Education, and Equity in Post-Apartheid South Africa: The Impact of State Policies*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- National Association of Intergroup Relations Officers. November 1963. *Public School Segregation and Integration in the North: Analysis and Proposals by The Commission on School Integration*. University of Michigan.

- Ndimande, Bekisizwe S. 2009. "It Is a Catch 22 Situation: The Challenge of Race in Post-Apartheid South African Desegregated Schools," *International Critical Childhood Policy Studies, Vol. 2, No. 1*. International Journal of Educational Policy, Research, and Practice.
- Nott, Josiah Scott and Gliddon, George Robbins. 1854. *Types of Mankind*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott, Grambo, and Co.
- O'Connor, Carla, Lewis, Amanda, and Mueller, Jennifer. 2007. "Researching 'Black' Educational Experiences and Outcomes: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations," *Educational Researcher, Vol. 36, No. 9*, American Educational Research Association.
- Patterson, James T. 2001. *Brown v. Board of Education: A Civil Rights Milestone and Its Troubled Legacy*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Pelzer, A.N., ed. 1966. *Verwoerd Speaks: Speeches 1948-1966*. Johannesburg, South Africa: APB Publishers.
- Philips, Anna M. 22 September 2011. "Union Claims Highest Number of Oversize Classes in Decades," *The New York Times: School Book*.
- Pilgrim, David. November 2000. "The Brute Caricature." Grand Rapids, MI: Ferris State University.
- Ravitch, Diane. 2000. *The Great School Wars: A History of the New York City Public Schools*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Robinson, Gail. 16 May 2004. "New York Schools: Fifty Years After Brown," *Gotham Gazette*.
- Rose, B. and Tunmer, R. 1975. *Documents in South African education*. Johannesburg, South Africa: A.D Donker.
- Salomone, Rosemary C. 1986. *Equal Education Under Law: Legal Rights and Federal Policy in the Post-Brown Era*. New York, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- "School Gap Found in South Africa; Unlike Whites, Blacks Pay for Children's Books." 1 March 1970. *The New York Times*.
- Slaven, Robert E. and Madden, Nancy A. 2006. "Reducing the Gap: Success for All and the Achievement Gap of African American Students," *Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 75, No. 3*.

- Smedly, Audrey. 1999. "Race and the Construction of Human Identity," *American Anthropologist Vol. 1- New Series, Vol. 106*. American Anthropological Association.
- Supreme Court of the United States. <http://www.supremecourt.gov/>
- Swarns, Rachel L. 12 November 2000. "Hesitantly, Students in South Africa Reach Across the Racial Divide," *The New York Times*.
- Taylor, Clarence. 2011. *Civil Rights in New York City: From World War II to the Giuliani Era*. New York, New York: Fordham University Press.
- Thobejane, Tsoaledi Daniel. May 2005. "Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Towards Liberation or Equity?" Doctorate of Education. Graduate School, University of Massachusetts, School of Education.
- Thompson, Leonard. 2001. *A History of South Africa*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Truesdell, Brie. 26 March 2012, Personal Interview.
- U.N Special Committee on the policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, 8 December 1964. 1965. *Transition, No. 19*. W.E.B DuBois Institute, Indiana University Press.
- Vidal, David. 19 September 1976. "Private Schools Are No Longer Exclusive Retreats," *The New York Times*.
- Whitman, Mark, ed. 1993. *Removing A Badge of Slavery: The Record of Brown v. Board of Education*. Princeton & New York: Markus Wiener Publishing, Inc.
- Williams, Lena. 20 May 1987. "Desegregation Plans Said to Improve Race Balance in Schools," *The New York Times*.
- Wren, Christopher S. 31 December 1989. "Black Students Lag in South Africa," *The New York Times*.
- Wren, Christopher S. 26 February 1991. "South Africa to Tackle Race Gap in Education," *The New York Times*.
- Wren, Christopher S. 8 January 1991. "South African Black Pupils' Failure Rate Surges," *The New York Times*

CURRICULUM VITA of Kayla Larkin

Kayla Larkin
18 Sequams Lane East
West Islip, New York 11795
Knl5058@psu.edu

EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State University
Bachelor of the Arts in African and African-American Studies, Global and
International Studies
Schreyer Honors College
Minors in History, Spanish
Graduation: Spring 2012

University of Cape Town
Semester-long study abroad program: CIEE Arts and Sciences Program
Spring 2011

THESIS

*Inequality, Education, and Race: A Comparative Study of Urban Education in
Post-Civil Rights New York City and Post-Apartheid Cape Town, South Africa*
Supervisor: Dr. Clemente Abrokwa, African Studies Department

HONORS

Schreyer Honors Scholar
2012 National Model African Union Attendee, Washington D.C
Recipient of the College of the Liberal Arts' Scholarship for African Studies

WORK EXPERIENCE

July 2011- Present
Morgan Academic Support Center
Tutor
University Park, PA

June 2011- August 2011
Child Development and Family Council of Centre County
Child care
State College, PA

May 2010- August 2010
Bethpage State Park
Front desk cashier
Farmingdale, NY

May 2009- August 2009
Law Office of Kathleen Larkin
Secretary/ Receptionist
West Babylon, NY

May 2009- August 2009
Keating family
Part-time Nanny
Verona, NJ

June 2008- August 2008
Oppenheimer Funds, Inc.
Wealth Management Intern
New York, NY

COMMUNITY SERVICE/ EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Spring 2012
4-H: Youth and Families with Promise
Mentor
State College, PA

Spring 2012
Urban Teacher Center
Campus Campaign Fellow
State College, PA

Spring 2009- Present
Starfinder Program
Mentor
State College, PA and Philadelphia, PA

Spring 2011
Brooklyn Chest Hospital
Volunteer
Brooklyn, South Africa

Fall 2008- Present
No Refund Theatre
Secretary- Spring 2012,
Alumni Liaison- Fall 2010 to Fall 2011,
Assistant Director, *House and Garden*- Fall 2009
Actor in 7 shows, Fall 2008- Present

Fall 2008- Fall 2010
Amnesty International

Penn State University Chapter Member
University Park, PA

Fall 2008

Students for Barack Obama

Volunteer

State College, PA

LANGUAGES

Proficient Spanish

Beginner Swahili