

## BOLLING V. SHARPE

Motion for permission to file brief *Ordinarily I perm  
those amicus  
but no objection  
here* amicus curiae

The petr, Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, seeks to file a brief amicus concerning the formulation of the decree to abolish segregation *(in the district)*. The brief does not describe the numerical membership of the Federation, but the group does claim to represent white persons from 57 neighborhood citizens associations embracing almost all of the *(territory of the)* District of Columbia. Their basic contention is that both petr and resp in the D.C. case are in virtual agreement that desegregation in the district is now an accomplished fact, and *(that)* a further decree is unnecessary; they claim that this is not true and that much of the action of the D.C. authorities in ending segregation is without statutory foundation, premature, harsh, unreasonable, etc.

While I don't think the Federation will add much to the knowledge of the Court in ways of dealing sensibly with desegregation, I think they have a valid point in urging that their point of view should be heard. There is undoubtedly much anti-desegregation sentiment in the district, and as things now stand there is no one before the Court to represent this sentiment. In a case of this magnitude, I think the politic thing to do is to permit the amicus here to

file so that no one can claim that a widely held  
view by persons affected by the case <sup>went</sup> ~~did not go~~  
unrepresented.

GRANT

WKJ