PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION
AND
COMMUNITY LEAGUE
Grant School
Middleburg, Virginia

February 6, 1946

Mr. O. L. Emerick, District Superintendent of Schools, Loudoun County, Leesburg, Virginia.

Dear Mr. Emerick:

At our regular meeting held on February 4, 1946, your recent letter written to Dr. Edmead, chairman of our building site committe, wasdread. Indeed, it made us more informative than we had been before. Nevertheless, it was rather shocking to us to learn of your definite decision.

We had been impressed with the fact, as conveyed by you, that our committee would have been informed voluntarily without having had to write to you. You, of course, evaded this point of the agreement.

In addition, at our last gathering at the School Board meeting we had been informed that a plot of land could have been obtained definitely from Mr. William N. Hall at Maxville and that, were we satisfied with this location it would be a foregone conclusion. We definitely agreed to the proposal. Consequently, with your contrary decision and action we are undoubtedly disappointed.

We feel certain that you have taken cognizance of the many disadvantages of the selection of a site in St. Louis. At any rate, may be have the pleasure and opportunity to point out, as we see them, some of the many disadvantages of constructing a school in St. Louis rather than in Middleburg:-

- 1. St. Louis roads are unsatisfactory, and during some winter months they are impassable.
- 2. The land selected is swampy and will require extensive drainage. In short, all lands in St. Louis present this feature.
- 3. St. Louis lacks all of the conveniences of stores, theatre, and denominational churches.
- 4. SSt. Louis lacks Negro leadership and Negro wealth.
- 5. St. Louis will not attract much patronage in case of school functions and activities.
- 6. In any school neighborhood there should be conducive surroundings so as to offset the decoy of youngsters. St Louis does not present this qualification.

- 7. In case of accidents, which undoubtedly will occur, a physician could not be reached immediately, neither could the proper first aid be administered because of the lack of clinical facilities.
- 8. The inhabitants of St. Louis are less progressive and less community conscious than those of Middleburg. Consequently, cooperation will be inadequate and inefficient.
- 9. Building such a school in St. Louis would not improve the panorama of our colored and white citizens. This should be one of our ultimate objectives, especially in this atomic age.
- 10. A building of such anticipated magnitude and architecture should be within the range of sightseers. Therefore, it should be definitely located, if not on, near a macadam road. Such an execution of contemplation and democratic principle shall, without the shadow of a doubt, revere you in the hearts of all Negroes.
- 11. Middleburg has always been the leading centre of the surrounding communities for Negroes. It possesses leadership, wealth, progressiveness, and potentialities.
- 12. St. Louis has always presented a problem in the boarding of teachers --- the homes are limited and are without modern conveniences. The situation will be more perplexing with an increased staff. No one knows any better than you the difficulty in obtaining and retaining qualified teachers, particularly at so critical a time. Hence, we should at least attempt to make the surroundings pleasant for those who are here, those who are to come, and those who will stay.

In short, we Negroes with broad minds and considerable forethought are desirous not only to facilitate improvement of ourselves alone, but for our white brethen as well. It must be borne in mind that a community cannot progress adequately half weak and half strong. We should be able to produce the same impact alike though it may be on opposite sides of the fence.

Now that we have presented our points of view we beg to offer an alternative site --- Mr. William N. Hall's plot of ground at Maxville which is still available. We understand that the price is far beyond the Board's intended expenditure. However, realizing what it would mean to our race and posterity we have committed ourselves to reimburse Mr. Hall the deficit should you and the other members of the Board be so gracious as to grant us our request and conclude the deal.

Conclusively, we, the undersigned patrons, citizens and taxpayers, petition you to reconsider the proposed site and substitute Mr. Hall's plot. Furthermore, we trust that you may be sufficiently open-minded to visualize our predicament as a race to extend to us due consideration and to make such consideration possible.

action. We wish to express our grateful thanks for your immediate

Sincerely yours,

Clarendon ? Gurley St. Wanger Lorraine Dade from tasker Henry page Joseph of Button Habert Lyonglass Seo, S. Jusner. Welly Asopson f.m. Hansborough. mrs Kate Smith Fannie B. Stewart Hora Smuth Ellen Krayson Dorathy & Seath Guella Brow Olivia Read mat Read

fisher Laura M. Haveris. Estelle R, Wades. mrs. Hattie S. Hall Mrs. Mildred Jackson x mr. Flord Will A Lenna Stewart Mrs. ganl Butter miss Sodie Sext Manice BK. Edmad M.D. Million not Jackson Richardork C. O Gook + Son (Wetal not contractors) Billia Cook Williet Haskins Virginia artis Malli Smith Jahmil J. Smith Theodon & Bolden

James Smith Handalph. B. Evans a, P, Smith Edne B. Evans. Edith C. Smith. Thomas C. young Mis Carl Douson Virgie W. young Cauline Trammell mylle M Gerdy Mrs Laura Darwor Mrs moses Grayson Lauise Brooks Mrs. Carrie Donaldson. mr moses graysace Mrs Isabel Grayson Robert & Shapton Mrs Manne Douglass, mis mozell tootcher Mrs. Mary Dodglass mr Wilmer Hatcher om freel Washington M. Christine Bolden Frances m. Wanzer. Lloyd Balls mary of acknown Mrs. Lloyal Hall Mrs. Thury stall Sallie Inring Hannoh Perry Tellian J. Ford Juanita Bushood Figial Thomas UJohn H motion Ethel & Brown tamin B motion Vinckney & Brown. Mollie fr. Evans George & Evans Vosice Richardson Clara & Pylu.

charles H. Smith Emma D Smith Henry artis Flossie Blunder Mrs Josephine Washing tow Somen L Blimba