

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
9/24/1945	? News Gazette	Douglass Center Hails Sponsors At Dedication	This is an article on the dedication ceremony. Richard R. Edwards, Chairman of the the Advisory Committee; The Civic Foundation is cited as holding the title to the DC; Erma Bridgewater is the DCs first acting director. There may be more to this article. Get the source, maybe it's on the flash dirve already.	
5/1/1946	? News Gazette	Douglass Center Advisory Group Election Held	"DC Advisory Group Election Is Held"; Richard R. Edwards is still Chairman; Dr. H.D. Ellis died recently; Alvin G. Foxwell, whose term expired was elected to take Ellis's place; There is a resolution to ask "the United Servie Organization to share in the expense of he center's operation after June 30 when federal funds will cease"; "The DC has been given \$300 by the Champaign Civic Foundation,a non-profit corpoeration adminstiering philanthropic gifts and bequests, to be used in landscaping the grounds"	
8/8/1946	CU	USO TO Give Center \$200 Per Month	"The USO assistance will offset the loss of federal aid, which was halted June 30." "City Clerk john P. Hill Saturday recieved formal notice of the termination of federal assistance, which has been recieved since December 1943 for he Douglass Center and its predecessor, the Lawhead school center. At the same time federal authorities called on the city to return \$92.22, which is the balance remaining fro federal funds previously allocated. Hill said that since 1943 the city recived \$12,958.77 in federal funds, which were expended for the colored recreation program."	The loss of federal aid is most likely related to the drop in black soldiers in the area. At this point DC is making the transition from a miliaty center to a comunity center. Change in funding, change in programs. "Colored recreation program" frames the DC as raced space in the eyes of the local gov't. This is also indicative of the shift in fed funding in the post WWII era to other supports for GIs that black soldiers did not have access to.
9/19/1946	? News Gazette	Douglass Center One Year Old	Dc is one year old; Taylor Thomas is DC director; "Attendance at the center has averaged between 800 and 1,00 persons each week, Director Thomas pointed out"; Get this article on film or check it flash drive for it. It's cut off	
9/20/1946	News Gazette	Plan Douglas Center First Anniversary	"The public is invited to attend the program which marks the end of the first year of operation of the center which was built with community support."	What community is being referred to here? Is this euphamistic for blackfolk or CU at large?
4/30/1947		Diffay, Scott Are Re-elected	Re-elections and appointments. Mention of the \$35,00 Community Chest contribution to DC	Edwards is mentioned as a holdover board member, but not indicated as chairman.
5/27/1947		Douglas Board Elects Officers	"Richard R. Edwards was re-elected chariman of the Douglas Park community center's advisory board." "Mrs. [Odelia] Wesley was named chairman of a special committee to plan a fall and winter program aimed at enlisting widespread adult interest and participation for events held at the center."	This advisory board seems very black middle class. Look to see if this feeds into the class conflict as evidenced in the Movement historiography, eg Countryman.
4/27/1948		Douglas Board Re-elects Two	"Alvin G. Foxwell and Richard R. Edwards were re-elected to three-year terms on the advisory board..."	
5/24/1948		Douglas Baord Renames Slate	"Mrs. Charles S. Pinkston...met with the advisory board to assist in drafting plans for a summer program for adults. Ordinarily the center is closed in the summer while the recreation program proceeds outside on adjacent Douglas park. The board hopes to keep the center open this summer, however, for the purpose... adult program."	Here is explict mention of adult programming at the center

Date	source	Title	summary	notes	
5/27/1948		Edwards Re-elected Douglas chairman	"Lighting for the Douglas park softball diamond for night games is under discussion."		
10/5/1948		Douglas Center Post to Nelson	Earnest F. Nelson...has been named acting director of the Douglas Park community center..." "He replaces Taylor thomas, who resigned to join the Danville public school system as a teacher and coach	This is the first change in directorship of the center, even with all the changes in the advisory board. The center directorship is more of a "bridge leader" role, as there is more direct contact with community members who utilize center plans.	
10/4/1950		City Takes Title Reluctantly. Douglas Park Community Center to Champaign.	"Title to the Douglas Park community center...has been transferred by the civic foundation to a reluctant city of Champaign." "City officials demurred at acceptance of the title of the building, but officers of the foundation...proceeded with the transfer..." "Fear of incurring additional liability for expense of maintenance and for its possible replacement in the event of fire or some other disaster was advanced by municipal officials in arguing against the transfer. They suggested instead that the structure be turned over to the board of education." "the city is, in effect, already bearing the expense fo maintenance and operation through the recreation dpartment." "Built with Community Chest funds, the building was intrusted to the Civic foundation; a non-profit corporation, with the idea of keeping it as free of politics as possible. Dissolution of the Civic foundation became necessary when its attorneys were unable to obtain from the bureau of internal revenue a favorable ruling on the tax exempt status of gifts. Without such a ruling, the foundation has little prospect of fulfilling its original purpose as a vehicle by which gifts could be made to the public for charitable, educational, religious, and civic uses."	"Reluctant"; "fear"; "resentment" are some words used to describe the city's stance on taking the DC title. The original point of the civic foundation was to keep this thing apolitical. Now it's anything but.	
11/1/1950		City to Accept Douglas Center Title Transfer	"Transfer of title to the Douglas Park Comminity Center...will be accepted by the city of Champaign, councilmen said Tuesday." "The [civic] foundation, a non-profit corporation which has held the title to the center since it was opened in 1945, has been dissolved." "Mayor Goerge J. Babb said he feels the center is 'doing a good job' and that the city will have to hold the title. Council members have been reluctant to accept responsibility for the building on the groud of incurring more expense."		
9/30/1951		Douglas Center Season Opens	"James T. Jones, acting director of the Douglas Center, will outline to the audience the program of activities for the fall and winter months."	The only mention is recreational programs. Here's another acting director. Why the high turnover rate?	
5/27/1952		Raymond Scott Heads Board	"Raymond Scott was elected chairman of the advisory board of the Douglass Park Community Center...Scott Sceeds Richard R. Edwards who headed the board since its organization in 1945	This is the first change in advisory committee leadership.	
9/23/1952	CU Courier	Douglass Center Marks 7th Anniversary	Picture of 7th Anniversary celebration of the the DC. Pictured: Mrs. Helen Hite, Dir. of Adult Services; State Rep. Corneal Davis of Chicago (guest speaker); Mrs. T.L. Gregory of the Advisory Board; R.M. Scott, Chairman of the Advisory Board; James E. Jones, Director of the DC.		

Date	source	Title	summary	notes	
11/13/1952		Jones Resigns Douglass Post	"James T. Jones is submitting his resignation as director fo the Douglass Park Community Center...Jones succeeded Earnest Nelson as director of the center in July of 1951." "Lee Cary...is assistant director."	Thomas, Nelson, Jones...Carey	
11/28/1952		C. Lee Cary Acting Head of Douglass	C. Lee Carey...has been promoted to be acting director of the Douglass Park Community Center...He has been assistant director." "The new assistant director on an acting basis will be John Cleo Johnson..."	Both Carey and Johnson's military service is offered as background in the article. Is this John Lee Johnson, or a namesake?	
10/1/1953		Douglass Park Board Elects Three Members	"Vacancies in the advisory board of the Douglass Park Community Center...have been filled by special election."		
10/31/1953		Douglass Park Board Re-elects R. M. Scott	Raymond M. Scott has been re-elcted chairman of the advisory board of the douglass Park Community Center..."		
1953-54	Tiebout papers		There is a list of "Douglass Center Projects." It's not clear it these were implemented, but they were at least proposed. "#7 Parlimentary Uses and Public Speaking Class"; "#8 Spelling and Writing Class"; "#9 Elementary Reading Class."		
6/16/1954		White to Head Center Board	"Authur White has been elected chairman fo the advisory board of the Douglass Community Center." "The board recieved the resignation of Mrs. Charlotte Fowler as the director of adult education."	So there were adult ed programs, or at least a bureacarcy in place to oversee those programs. Also, it's Douglass with "2 s's" here	
9/3/1954		Douglass Center Board Appoints Lee Carey	"Lee Carey has been appointed by the Douglass Center Advisory Board to replace Authur White, who has resigned as assistant director. At its meeting this week the board also voted to return unused funds to the Community Chest. Center has been removed from the chest's list of recognized agencies."	White lasts six months as chair? What's up with that? And the Community Chest ceases funding? What's th reason?	
9/4/1955		Douglas Aide Is Appointed	Mrs. Cecil [Erma] Bridgewater is named assistant director of the DC. She "will be in chage for all activities for women and girls at the center."	Here is some gender politics. Did she want the diredctorship in the first place, back in 1945? Why the specific curtailing of her duties to women and girls? Might this be indicative of braoder Movement issues and male leadership? Check her oral history about this.	
9/4/1955? 1956		Recreation Programs Set Beardsley, Douglass Centers Open Tuesday	"Programs for adults are planned from 1 to 3:30 each day. Activites for boys and girls will begin at 3:30 p.m. Evening programs will included events for adults, young adults, teenagers and junior high school age groups."	No specific mention of programming at DC here.	
4/18/1956		Kuhn Bequest buys Douglass Center Floring	\$750 from the bequest will be used to buy flooring for the addition to DC, which was donated by Hartwell Howard.	Has the addition already been built?	

Date	source	Title	summary	notes	
9/17/1956		Douglass Program Opening. Schedule for Fall Activities Announced	"Paul Hursey is the director and his assistant is Mrs. Erma Bridgewater."	Again, Erma gets passed over for directorship. There are no specific educational/rhetorical programs mentioned. There is an "adult social hour" which is scheduled twice a week. Most other programs are either athletic, craft-based, or recreational.	
? sometime between 1958 and 1961		Douglass Park Restroom Idea Seen Faltering	"Proposed \$6,000 restroom building in Douglass Park 6th and Grove Streets, is expected to be dropped by the Champaign Park board in deference to oppositoin from members of the Douglass Park Adult Council." "The members of the Adult Council...said they would prefer to have the park continue to depend on the restrooms in the Douglass Center." "Some criticism was heard of the expenditure of \$5,500 to acquire an additional acre of ground for enlargement of Douglass Park on the ground it will inflate real estate prices in the area."	Here's the intersection of issues: Washington School's population will increase, after it's enlarged, from 700 to 1,00 students. This will tax the existing park facilities. But the Douglass park Adult Council (center or park reps?) "said they would prefer to have the park continue to depend on the restrooms in the Douglass Center."	
				Much of the CU record on the DC up to this point is on (black) middle class leadership. It's not until the 1960s that land issues really come into play. This is right in line with the Movement.	
10/26/1968		Douglass Park Strip Added	Plot purchased from Mrs. Catherin Alagna is funded by sale of land to the School district for the enlargement of Washington School in 1958. Reported by Robert H. Milne of the Park District.	After this point, there is a shift in the relationship between the community and the locl goverment that is indicative of the broader transistion from Civil Rights to Black Power. The community consciousness of the North End as a "think unto itself" becomes more apparent to all involved in the issue over the center.	
12/5/1973	CU Courier	Urbana's park board snubs Champaign. Rejects Champaign idea on Douglass Park	"The Urbana Park Board has criticized suggestions by two members of hte Champaign Park Board that Urbana should contribute \$200,000 to the construction of a new recreation facility at Douglass Park." "Helms and Davis asked that Urbana... contribute...to the construction of a new Douglass center because, they said, '25-40 per cent of the participants at Douglass center are from Urbana.'"	Past cooperation and shared costs between Urbana and Champaign are cited. This is really a question of ownership. If the Center was not situated in the North End, would Champaign even ask for the money? This is further evidence that the North End does not belong to either city.	

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
				<p>Between 1973 and 1975 is highest level of community activism around the center. At least two picket protests. Demands for black employment in the building of the center. Demands for community input in the design of the new building. Demands for programming that is relevant to the needs of the community. I think I can frame this period in terms of the shift from civil rights to black power.</p>
2/5/1975		Photo	caption: "This Douglass Center will be torn down and another built on the site, with work to begin April 1."	<p>Where is this article on the timeline? Before or after the revision of plans?</p>
4/30/1975	CU	Panel to protest current Douglass Project formed	<p>"Black residents of Champaign's North side formed a committee Tuesday night to protest the demolition of Douglass Center and to seek alternative ways of building a comprehensive recreational complex...Nearly 200 persons attended the meeting Tuesday night. It was scheduled after the Champaign Park Board decided last week to build only a 'shell' on the site. No library or senior citizen's room was included in the final plans."</p>	<p>There is more here. This is the article where the issue becomes "racialized." There is a listing of the committee members as well. Jahn Lee, Vernon Barkstall, Roy Williams of the "Black Coalition", Irma Bridgewater. Seems like a who's who of local rabble rousers. Interesting to note that there is white support of the protest in Barkstall and the Urban League. This might be a thread to follow. What was Barkstall's rep in the North End? The library (read: literacy) is also part of the issue here. That a library is not included in the Parks Dept's original plans is part of the contention. The issue of Urbana's contribution to the DC is also in play here. The move by Helms to get Urbana parks to contribute financially really speaks to the issue of the North End being part of both towns, and thus accepted totally by neither.</p>
5/2/1975	Courier	Injunction sought to halt demolition	<p>"A petition for an injunction to halt the Douglass Center project... was filed by Henry Matthews, on behalf of an organization called Resident Owners United together against the Champaign Park District."</p>	<p>A filed injunction on behalf of the protestors is evidence of a situated literacy practice. they are speaking the dominant discourse here, following the franchised route to deal with the power structure. JL Johnson also reiterates that the library is part of the issue.</p>

Date	source	Title	summary	notes	
5/9/1975	Courier	Confrontation threatened over Douglass demolition	"Angry Blacks and an angry park commissioner...threatened the Champaign park board with a confrontation if the present Douglass Center is demolished. About 50 blacks and park commissioner Richard Davis Jr. walked out of the park board meeting...to protest plans to tear down the present structure and replace it with a gymnasium. The blacks have been asking for a comprehensive recreational facility, but the park board has said it can provide only a basic building containing only a gymnasium because of lack of funds. Davis told the park board that he would be the 'first one to go to jail' if the contractor appeared at Douglass Center to tear it down."	Here is a protest/walkout during the meeting, with the consent of the the commissioner.	
5/15/1975	Courier	Douglass demolition protest set	"A committee of concerned residents has said demolition will be blocked unless the Champaign Park District board "recognizes" the needs of the black community and provides a comprehensive recreational facility. Bids on the demolition will be open Tuesday."	What's up with the last sentence? After reporting the threat of protest, the paper announces that the bidding is open. That's asking for conflict.	
5/17/1975	Courier	Group demands 'complete' center	"The Frederick Douglass Community Center Citizens Steering Committee issues...a 'position paper' which calls for the construction of a comprehensive recreational center."	Where is this position paper? At least 6 points are quoted in this report. Cross ref the dates to May 1975 and see what this says. One point of comparison might be the demands put forth by the different community organizations on what the center should be.	
5/21/1975	Courier	New Douglass demolition contract is approved: Community leaders angry, threaten violence	"[Kenneth] Stratton reminded park commissioners of the Kent State University violence saying, 'We've been patient, and you are trying our patience. The day you send the bulldozers to Douglass Center, it will be the day we will be beyond our patience. You're creating another Kent state.'"		
6/12/1975?	News-Gazette	Windows Get Bullet Holes at McCabe's	"Reports indicate that 13 bullet holes were found in plate glass windows of the office...Until McCabe Brothers defaulted on its contract with the Champaign Park District Tuesday, the firm was to have demolished the old Frederick Douglass Recreation Center... But some community opposition developed as a result of a vow by the Douglass Center Steering Committee that demolition would be prevented until a larger recreation center is planned. McCabe's business has been picketed for the past two weeks by steering committee members and their supporters...He [owner Don McCabe] had requested an extension to begin demolition 'as soon as safe conditions exists.' The park board Thursday night denied his request."	McCabe's request for an extension is an acknowledgement of the pressure put on him by the DCSC and the black community, bullets or no. The denial of McCabe's request for an extension by the park board allows them to justify moving the new DC site, and thus not honor the request to build an all-inclusive space. This is a projection tactic. "They didn't do our job, so we can't do ours." double check the date on this article and make sure it fits the timeline. The shooting could have happened Thursday night, but story would have had to appear after the meeting on the 13th.	

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
6/13/1975	Courier	Douglass Center site shifted	<p>"The new Douglass Center will be built, whether the old one goes down or not, the Champaign Park Board voted Thursday night." McCabe Bros. defaults on the demolition contract, "[...] threats by members of the black community apparently caused McCabe to change his mind." "The board directed architect E. Hedric Clay to make arrangements to build the structure west of the existing building, between the existing center and the Douglass Annex... Blacks have been protesting the demolition of the old center, saying the park board should make a commitment to build a full recreational facility. The full center would include a senior citizens room and an activity room. Current plans call for only a large gymnasium with supporting facilities...The board's decision to build the center elsewhere in the park angered blacks who were at the meeting....'This community will see hell in the morning,' Mrs. [Elsie] Easley [member of the DC Citizens Steering Committee]... Earlier in the meeting [Richard] Davis [Park Board commissioner, and sole dissenter in the vote to move the site] took the floor and attacked the park board...Davis said the board acted with 'no respect for the black community.' He said the board simply wants to put up a building somewhere without solving the real problem." The article also indicates that Davis "introduced a resolution asking that a commitment be made to build the full center from'... (allocated bond money) and as additional funds become available the expansion be completed in phases ultimately.' His motion died for lack of a second."</p>	<p>The attempt to move the location of the unwanted center rather than compromise is an interesting move on the part of the park board. Like, "you're gonna take what we give you, and you're gonna like it." The DCSC fulfills the role of "ungrateful recipient," however. Roy Williams the DCSC Chair, was also noted as carrying a big bass drum into the meeting. Despite prodding, he did not beat the drum in this instance: "He did not beat the drum, at the request of the park board." Were they egging him on? Gotta get a photo, as this meeting sounds like blood, sweat, and tears.</p>

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
6/13/1975	News-Gazette 1-3 (N-G staff writer Steven Hershberger)	Park Board Votes to Build New Douglass Center	<p>This article also conveys the outcome of the park board meeting. the 4-1 vote, the denial of McCabe's request for extension. A different angle is taken, in this write up, though. "You are in deep trouble on your other contracts,' warned attorney French Fraker when asked about the distict's status with the Englih Brother Co., which holds the general construction contract for the basic building. 'It involves a substantial amount of money,' Fraker continued. 'You'll be in default of your own contract if you don't build it and the public stands to lose a substantial amount of money.' 'I have no choice,' [Com. Donald] Bresnan said in explaining his vote. 'I have done all I could. There is no other choice (except to move the construction site) to prevent losing a substantial amount of money."</p>	<p>Contracts and economic concerns are the main focus in this version of the report. Though Bresnan situates himself as "having no choice," the obvious choice is the build the center that the DCSC and community want. And there is still the issue of \$279,00 of "pad money" that was unallocated from the 1972 bond, which is the same source of funding (\$742,000) for the basic DC building. Whereas Bresnan frames the picketing of McCabe as a form of intimidation, "Davis immediately took issue Bresnan's statement about intimidation. 'It is a legal right to picket that is protected by the constitution of the United States,' Davis said." Now, is Davis a member of both the park board and DCSC? If so, this he embodies the inside/outside positionality of this whole issue. As such, he is attempting to speak to power in its own terms, by his vote, his motions, his evocation of the US Constitution.</p>

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
6/19/1975	Courier	Douglass being shorted	<p>This is a letter to the editor penned by the DCSC, which takes the lack of funds back to the 1972 bond, which suffered low returns because of inflation. "The problem now is the direct result of poor planning on the part of the board. In order to fulfill its promises to other parts of the community. Frederick Douglass Center is being shorted. The decision of the four commissioners to short Douglass Center is based strictly along racial attitudes and political consideration. There is no consideration of community priorities or need." "For at least six months during 1973 the park manager, the architect, staff, park commissioners and the Douglass Community met developing program needs in order to give the architect direction to develop a plan for building the center. A list of 36 program needs were accepted. The architect developed five plans to satisfy these needs." The old center is identified as inadequate to address the needs of the community. However, "The new center as planned would correct the serious deficiencies. The new center would allow for participation of senior citizens whose very presence would assure a new decorum at Douglass. It would give staff opportunities to expand programs to lifetime recreational habits. When the only recreation learned is physical activity, the child when he grows past the physical, can only turn to barrooms later in life. A good well-rounded recreational program must include soundly established values that are redeeming past the point of immediate entertainment.... Compromises were made and the plan that would have satisfied all 36 program needs was dropped in favor of a plan that included only 15."</p>	<p>The claims made in this letter bring race and racial disparity to the fore. This also helps define the perspective of the DCSC as one of representing black interests and the black community. That funds are being promised to "other parts of the community" situates the North End as a marginalized part of the whole (hooks), but at the same time the black community as a marginalized has its own concerns and issues to be dealt with relative to the center. The 1973 planning meetings are right in line with the CDCs that Wilkins addresses. There is also a strong connection between the rhetorical and the spatial, in that discussion of need was the catalyst for the building designs. There is also a broad range of input here as well, such that solutions to issues are granted multiple perspectives. The changing role of recreation is also considered here. (JLJ, Defremery Park, Craz)</p>
6/19/1975	Courier (by Les Somogyi)	Douglass Center move is costly	<p>EHC conveys to the facilities committee of the CPD that, while possible, moving the DC to a newly proposed cite would be costly. "Commissioner Richard Davis, Jr., who is not a member of the facilities committee, said Wednesday that a political solution should be found to the problem. he urged the committee, as he urged the board previously, that the construction of a structure west of the existing center would not solve the problem. he urged the board to meet with the citizens committee on the Douglass Center 'before this park is messed up by another building.'" He received no response from committee members."</p>	<p>Davis is essentially saying what EHC cannot say, as it is beyond the latter's mandate. The best Clay can do, and still get paid, is what he does. I really don't think the CPD is morally behind the stance they are taking. There has to be some "we're gonna teach you nigras a lesson" going on here.</p>

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
6/20?/1975	News-gazette, 1-3 9 (N-G staff writer Steven Hershberger)	Park Board Shifts Site	<p>"The Champaign Park Board...instructed architect E. Hedric Clay to redraw his building plans to accommodate the new site for the Frederick Douglass recreation Center that will now be squeezed between the old center and the annex." This is the first of the three options presented by EHC. Again a 4-1 vote with Davis dissenting. "Bresnan termed moving the building site a 'political decision.' [Com. Morgan] Powell lamented the new site as a poorer one, but said the park commissioners has little choice since the North End community prevented the old center from being demolished." Davis identifies the decision as "very bad park planning." EB and other contractors are offered "indefinite extensions," however once work is started on the site it needs to be completed in one year.</p>	<p>Is Bresnan throwing Davis's words back at him? Cold! Here again, Powell is framing the CPD's position as one of not having a choice, when in fact they are unwilling to compromise</p>
6/21?/1975	News-gazette, 1-3 9 (N-G staff writer Steven Hershberger)	Architect: Don't Move Douglass	<p>EHC "outlined to the CPD building and grounds committee three options in placing the building on the new site, just west of the old center." However, he does not support that move. "'I, as your architect, cannot recommend moving the building,' Clay said. He criticized the park board for making the decision without first consulting him and getting a detailed appraisal of the problems in moving the site." Each of the three options is fraught with problems. In the first, "A 12-foot alley would be created...The rear entrance would be here and thus could cause major supervision problems, he warned. The front entrance...would face the back side of the annex with its trash cans and the like, Clay said." This first option would also only afford expansion of the DC if the annex was torn down. "Placing the building on the new site will create additional flooding and water seepage into the annex..." The second option would situate the DC such that it would "overlap the outdoor basketball court, which would have to be moved or taken out...It would also straddle a sewer line, which would create additional problems..." Option three "would be to simply flip the building [which would] take a considerable amount of time and cost much more money, since most of the building plans would have to be redrawn. Construction could not begin for two or three months under this option, Clay said."</p>	<p>Check the difference in the considerations of spatial contexts and environments by ECH. The site for him is more than just a location, its a relationship that exists between the buildings and pre-existing infrastructure. Also, EHC checks the CPD on its lack of consideration for him as a professional. This move on his part might respond to Wilkins' and Curry's understanding of the position of black architects in a white-dominated field. Also, I need to go back and look at how he got the gig.</p>

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
7/11/1975	Courier, Les Somogyi, p 3	\$100,000 more voted for Douglass Center/Would go for senior citizens facilities	Within weeks of Clay's presentations for moving the DC (against his better professional judgment), the park board, in "what was the first unanimous vote in connection with the project," agreed to allocate an additional \$100,000 to the DC project for the purpose of including the senior center that was part of the original request. The money was a surplus from another major park project that came in under the proposed bid. In what was labeled a "fine gesture" by Com. Davis, the park board diverted the money to the DC project. While the additional money left the board another \$100,000 under the original budget estimates for the complete center, it seemed for a moment that the funds might be enough to move the park board and the DCSC beyond this impasse. One board member committed to move that the original location for the DC be reconsidered. Reports also indicated that funding analysts had been contracted by the board "to look for extra funds from local, state, or federal sources" with a report due on the findings in a matter of weeks.	
7/15/1975	Courier, Les Somogyi, p 2	Impasse over Douglass Center remains/ \$100,000 offer fails		
7/21/1975	Courier	Parks won't ask city for more money: Helms	This report indicates that Helm's's statement was composed and then read over the phone to local newspapers. He outlines the DCSCs rejection of the 100 grand for the senior citizens for want of more "quiet space" in the new center, and that the funds were inadequate to meet the spatial demands. Helms also conveys that city council is unwilling to offer more funds for the project. As Helms did not directly inform the DCSC of the statement, there was no response issued by the group. The article also notes that DCSC "halted picket lines around the firms involved in the construction project during talks with the Park District."	Interesting the Helms goes to the papers with the statement without issuing the DCSC a copy. This might be the instigation of Williams's "communicating through the papers" quip. If the message is directed at the DCSC, why not give them the message? What is the purpose of having them read it in the paper?
7/21?/1975	NG	Pledge Douglass Site-Helms	Park Board Pres. William Helms calls on the DCSC "to pledge its support for building the planned recreation center on its original site." Helms criticizes the DCSCs request for more space, in the wake of the park board's issuing \$100,00 more for the senior citizens. Helms notes that in his meetings with Mayor William Bland, it was conveyed that city council will not support more funding for the DC.	So, even though earlier claims stated no money, the park board comes up with more money. Now, Helms has to get the Mayor to validate the claim the second time, as new monies were allocated.

Date	source	Title	summary	notes	
7/23/1975	News-Gazette (letter to the editor by Patricia Leonard, VP of the Champaign Park Board	Park Board Officer Replies	This editorial is particularly critical of Kenneth Stratton and Dickie (Richard) Davis for, first, taking "devious" vacations and calling off picket efforts while the DC issue is still in play. The estimated cost of the DC is quoted here at \$900,000, almost \$200,00 over estimates presented elsewhere.	Stratton is framed as an "ungrateful recipient" here, promoting what that author refers to as Stratton's diagnosis with "'instant gratification syndrome' in black culture, a social pattern easily explained in terms of the historical subjugation of black people, [as] one of the major roadblocks to the current social progress of disadvantaged black persons." Leonard also distinguishes the black male participation in the conflict from that of women and the elderly. If I get into discussing the Annex, I might have to draw on this point.	
8/1/1975	Courier, p 22	Steering unit should cooperate with board (editorial by Kenneth Stratton Jr., Steering committee spokesman)	Stratton urges the DCSC to take the park board's offer of the extra 100 grand. He acknowledges that the original allocation of the 1972 bond has been doubled to more than \$800,00 for the new center.	Stratton is trying to garner DCSC support here. He wants to build on the old site to maintain the possibility of extending the center as future funds become available. This might be a tie in to current concerns-have there been additions to DC? His is also a more moderate view.	
8/3/1975	Courier, p 3	Douglass panel to air new plan	the DCSC calls a meeting with the park board to present the compromise, will be presented by board member Richard Davis		
8/3/1975	Courier, p. 37	Douglass plan overdue (editorial by Kenneth O. Stratton, II)	This editorial is framed as a response to Leonard's attack on Ken Stratton, quotes the language of Leonard back to her. Draws on personal experience from the writer's life: "In 1955 I was seven. Douglass Park was a green spot in an otherwise unpleasant area. It reflected that unpleasantness, even though the green was as lush as a fairway. The park board cared more about the grass than the people. There were tennis courts without nets and a center without balls or racquets. There was one basketball court, inside, that spawned the nucleus of a near state champion. It was always two deep in teams waiting to have their moment in North End deadened adolescence." The author contrast his experiences at Douglass Park with Scott Park, which was closer to his parents' house: "...even at age eight I could tell the difference. I can also tell the difference between the historical subjugation of black people and the hysterical subjugation of black people The Douglass Center Project as proposed by Stratton and Davis is needed and long overdue."	Is this Jr.'s son? The personal recollections of the disparities in park services is good background, historical, spatial memory. There are also some staunch criticisms of the park board's lack of concern for the people of the North End. The "historical/hysterical" might come from Gil Scot-Heron and Brian Jackson's "Bicentennial Blues." Interesting that this reply to a letter published in the News-Gazette is published in the Courier. Stratton Jr. indicates that the Courier is in support of the new DC. Does the News0Gazette take a (proclaimed) side in the issue?	

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
8/4/1975	Courier, p. 3	Park Board has \$194,576 left In uncommitted bond funds	A report by General Manager Robert Toalson, which was delayed "for some time by William Helms Jr., president of the park board," reveals this amount not committed to 1972 bond issue projects. While the park district "'over-committed' itself on by \$135,763 in various projects," it will see \$330,339 in projected incomes, part of which will come from "a Community Development Grant from the City of Champaign for Douglass Center." HUD, a Bicentennial Grant, and grant from Parkland College also contribute to This report also foreshadows the DCSC offer to the park board, although "The board's latest offer of \$100,000 for a senior citizens center has been the only sign of compromise."	This article hints that there has been money to fund the building of the space the DCSC wanted in the first place.
8/6/1975	NG (Steven Hershberger), 1-3	Douglass Center Impasse Ends	DCSC "formally dropped its opposition to tearing down the older dilapidated structure in northeast Champaign. The citizens' group urged the Champaign Park Board to 'build on the present site of the Douglas Center,' which is what park commissioners have wanted to do all along. One stipulation of the DCSC proposal states, "The work force to be used on the Douglass Center building should reflect the racial character of the neighborhood surrounding the proposed facility." Another stipulation calls for quiet space for the elderly, "However the proposed wing on the gymnasium runs contrary to the wishes of the Douglass Center senior citizens, who want their own separate facility by renovating the Douglass Annex, formerly Gagliano's Grocery Store...Helen Hite, president of the elderly group, said members remain adamant in seeking a place for themselves. She said she had been out of town and had not seen a copy of the proposal although she is a member of the steering committee. Mrs. Hite said, 'They (committee) are using us to get what they want. The park board gave us (Douglass Center senior citizens) the \$100,000. Now the committee wants to add it to their building. We want to be to ourselves and not be bothered by kids running through.'" In response to the question whether the 90 percent black work force is possible, Roy Williams responds, "Yes. In fact, I'll be of service to local trade unions to find workers We hope to get as many in the neighborhood involved as possible Douglass stands as a symbol of what blacks can do when they come together."	Framing this action as 'what park commissioners have wanted to do all along' overlooks the fact that the inadequacy of the originally proposed building was the issue. This particular phrasing conveys that all the protests were for nothing, which is untrue. The seniors' demands are set up in contrast to the DCSCs. Williams's framing the DC as a symbol is CRUCIAL."Coming together" in space and ideology is a central idea.

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
8/6/1975	Courier (Les Somogyi), p. 3	Douglass Center group pares building requests, Senior citizens addition could be smaller	DCSC "reduced its requests for a senior citizens addition and other center improvements, offering a new plan for resolution of the Douglass controversy...Shifting from a previous request for 5,000 square feet of space in a new senior citizens addition, the new Douglass committee plan requested only ad addition that could be built at a cost of \$100,000. Com. Richard Davis states the 90% figure "actually means 'as many as possible.'" Pres. Helms declines to give his initial reaction to the proposal. Com. Bresnan "questioned why the Douglass committee wants the senior citizens facility attached to the base building," even as DC seniors stated that they want the DC Annex remodeled. Kenneth Stratton, identified as DC committee spokesman, reveals that he has not spoken with the senior constituency. While things seem positive all around at this point, the relocation of the DC has not been called off, as "Protests by Douglass area residents have prevented the demolition of the existing structure."	I wonder if the DCSC concessions come out of the suggestion of a change in leadership. Also, the old folks are really being kept out of the loop here. Bresnan is right to question motivations for attaching the center. Interesting how Helms has no response even though the proposal was presented at a park board meeting.
8/13/1975	Courier, p. 3	DC dispute may end today	"several commissioners have questioned the Douglass committee request that 90 percent of he Douglass Center project work force be black. Powell said today that he thinks the 90 percent goal is 'virtually impossible' to reach."	That the request is even put in by the DC committee shows they recognize the power component. They want input not only in terms of programing and building design, there is also input on the building contract and employment.
8/13/1975	CO	Donated Office may house Douglass Library (3b)	Discussion as to whether this new site is viable, and if so, if it's a temporary or permanent location for the DC library.	There is a bit of an editorial gloss on the lacking Urbana contribution, who at this time contributes less than 1/3 to the DC library budget.
8/14/1975	Courier (Les Somogyi, p. 3b)	Douglass center demolition OK'd if...Board requires protests must end	Protests have delayed the center demolition to this point. The park board insists on "a firm commitment from the Douglass area community to allow demolition of the old structure," as picketing lead to McCabe Bros. default on the original demolition contract. There is also still some internal debate whether to add the senior center to the DC or remodel the annex. Helms supports the remodeling, while Bresnan is "concerned about building special interest centers." The board also rejects the DCSCs request of a 90% black work force, and while Bresnan is "sympathetic..the board can't do anything about it."	McCabe Bros. had the contact for the demolition first, but defaulted due to the delay caused by the protests. English Bros. was awarded the new contract. The DC committee's demands for the remodeling/demo are at issue. Interesting also that both the DCSC and the park board claim not authority to enact a specific demand made by the other group. DCSC can't guarantee a protest-free demolition, and the park board can't guarantee a 90% black work force. So while each group is representative of a constituency, that representation stops short of dictatorship. DCSC can't control the black community, and the park board can't control white contractors' hiring practices.

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
8/14/1975	Courier, p.3b	Donated office may house Douglass library/Urbana contribution awaited	This donated space may be used "for at least the temporary relocation of the Douglass Center library." The Douglass library is presently in the old DC, which is scheduled to be torn down.	The question is whether remodeling of the space will be done as permanent or temporary. If the space is temporary, then as the new DC is completed the library should be part of that space. If the space is permanent, then the space of the new DC will not hold the library. How does this speak to the identity of the space? How much does the library contribute to the identity of the DC?
8/17/1975	Courier, p. 6	Douglass committee responds to board	The DCSC "met Saturday and wrote a reply to a written request by the Champaign Park District for assurance the group would not oppose demolition of the present Douglass Center." The DCSC refuses to release details of the letter until the park board receives it. Com. Patricia Leonhard states, "The committee can either acquiesce or we can build the new center on the new spot. We have no choice."	Helms' request of a written reply is met, and the two groups, at least for the time, consider writing the official medium. No verbal correspondences with intermediaries. When Leonhard says "We have no choice," she really means, "You have no choice." Her framing her still misrecognizes the issue that is most important to the DCSC-getting the space that best serves the community.
8/19/1975	NG (Daniel A. Tichenor)	Douglass Group Seeks Meeting	"Not satisfied with the Champaign Park District's response to its list of proposals, the Douglass Center Steering Committee asked to meet with the board Tuesday night...In the letter, Stratton reaffirmed the committee's support for building the new Frederick Douglass Recreation Center on the site of the old center and asked for a face-to-face meeting to work out an understanding on the details of the steering committee's four-point proposal.	So the DCSC agrees, in writing to the new Dc being built on the old site. The only one of the four proposals (what are they?) that has not been met is the 90 percent black work force. But the park board assures that all contractors will adhere to federal affirmative action laws. I wonder if those handwritten apps in the EB files were an attempt to conform to this measure. Richard Davis, while a serving member of the park board, is also critical of the board's treatment of the DCSC and the north end. From his perspective, if the interest group calls for a meeting, there should be no issue.
8/19/1975	Courier (Les Somogyi)	Dispirited park board to try again on Douglass: Tempers get raw over Douglass Center issue	This report conveys the reluctance on the part of the park board to meet again with the DCSC. William Helms is especially reticent, going so far as to say, "We should stop all nonsense now. We should have no more meetings." The four-point proposal is also explicitly outlined here. In addition to the 90 percent, to which the park board says it cannot comply, both sides have agreed to "the allocation of \$100, 000 to the senior citizens of Douglass Park, the deletion of plans to vacate 6th Street in order to save more money and the addition of activity space to the basic building." "Commissioner Morgan Powell was still seeking an guarantee of no harm to construction workers on the site. Davis said he could not make such guarantees."	

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
8/20/1975	Courier (Les Somogyi)	Douglass expansion in jeopardy	<p>Helms and Williams both walk out of the 1 1/2 hour long meeting. "Commissioner Donald F. Bresnan also raised his voice for the first time since the controversy began. 'I made a pledge that I would attend every meeting that I'm invited to. I hereby withdraw that pledge. I see no sense in any more meetings. I've had it,' said Bresnan. 'There isn't going to be a building if this continues. The electrical contractor has already been scared off by public opinion.'" This article also reveals the source of the extra \$100,000, which "was allocated after bids on the Centennial Park recreation center came in unexpectedly lower than architect's estimates." Location is still an issue as well, as there is some dispute over whether to add the senior center to the new DC plans or remodel the annex. "An internal split developed among the black interest group when Mrs. Hite accused the committee of leaving the senior citizens out of decision-making. Mrs. Hite is a member of the steering committee. She said that she had not been invited to the meetings and 'our opinion has not been asked.' Stratton told Mrs. Hite: 'I don't like to express disagreement in a public arena.' Stratton also accused the park board of deliberately dividing the steering committee by offering the \$100,000 project to the senior citizens." The 90% black work force issue is also on the table. At the time this article is published, no new negotiation meetings had been scheduled.</p>	<p>Bresnan's evocation of public opinion glosses the fact that he's talking about white public opinion. Stratton's suggestion that the money was used by the CPD to divide the DCSC has a ring of truth to it. It's an effective strategy, anyway. The seniors are totally advocating for themselves, even in the face of presenting a less than united front. As elderly, and (probably mostly) women, this group is even further disenfranchised in this discussion. As such, can they be viewed as being out of line by taking the money? Relative to Stratton's reply to Hite, when is it okay for a disenfranchised group to express dissent? When is it okay for inter-group conflict to be expressed? If you ask Stratton, he might say, not in front of white folks.</p>
8/20/1975	NG (Daniel A. Tichenor)	Douglass Panel, Park Board Deadlocked	<p>"[...]a new deadlock emerged from park president William Helms' insistence, the the committee's refusal, on a pledge that steering committee participants would not interfere or encourage others to interfere with contractors' work on the building site. Faced with the refusal of the written pledge he demanded, Helms left the meeting Tuesday night....However, the steering committee is asking that 90 percent of the labor force for the project be black. But if the committee goes on record not to interfere with contractors, that statement may tie its hands in working for minority membership on the work force. DCSC member Roy Williams supports the 90 percent as a mark of tradition at the DC: "The staff a the park has, as long as I can remember, always been black." "He said the board would be going against its own tradition of an all-black work force and staff at the park if it does not agree to the 90 percent request...if the building was built by a black labor force the kids in the neighborhood could have pride in the building and point to it and say, 'That's the building my daddy helped build.'" The board is also split over whether to add the senior space to the new DC or use the \$100, 000 "to remodel the existing annex...However, Mrs. Helen Hite, president of the senior citizens' group at Douglass Center, said the elderly want a separate area away from the youngsters."</p>	<p>Helms' insistence is based on the notion that the DCSC can 'control' the black community, effectively doing the work that law and law enforcement cannot do. The demand for black labor on the project is another attempt to control the definition of the new DC, as built and designed by black hands. Where did this additional 100 grand come from? This is the first we've heard from a distinct senior citizen's constituency. And they have their own feelings about space. "The board also resolved to add facilities to the new center as money becomes available." Again, where is the funding coming from all of a sudden?</p>

Date	source	Title	summary	notes	
8/24/1975	Courier, p. 36	D.G.S.: It's time to settle the controversy (editorial by D.G. Schumacher, editor)	This editorial recalls the major points of conflict thus far between the DCSC and the park board. The editor recommends "the best action for the steering committee is to help the park district build what the park commissioners vote. The committee can save some face by giving the commissioners assurance that they will attempt to prevent picketing. That will require the various leaders of the citizens group dealing with any dissention in their own ranks...It is time to turn off the Douglass Center protest and come to terms. Otherwise; some folks who really didn't intend to may look like the villains."	The Courier is still framed in support of the new center, but its loyalty is being tested by the changing stance and leadership of the DCSC. It acknowledges the failings of both DCSC and the park board, wants the community interest to be served and sees the conflict running counter to that.	
8/24/1975	CO	Douglass committee reorganizes (3)	Kenneth Stratton, former head of the DC steering committee announces a reorganization, where several members will not continue with the new organization. Roy Williams Jr. is the new spokesman. Stratton said reorganization is "in the best interests of the community. It is our hope the new members will be able to get the job done." The article states, "The board [Champaign Park District board] wants to tear down the current building and erect a new one that will contain mainly only a gym. the steering committee wants the board to build a complete new center with space for senior citizens' programs."	There is a "hush harbor" move by Williams here. The committee meets and announces the change, but he does not offer comment: "' I won't talk in front of those cameras,' pointing at television equipment that was being set up. He then got into a car and left." So there was an internal meeting that was closed, and then he keeps the proceedings hushed. Def a reference to the white power structure in his decline of comment. Bring in the Nunley on all the DC committe meetings. This is really a move toward racial self-determination.	
8/27/1975	NG (Jim Bray)	Douglass May Get Go-Ahead	Final plans to begin construction are held up for want of an electrical contractor. EHC voices his concern that other contractors might raise their fees because of delays in beginning the project. The article also mentions a "reorganization" of DCSC leadership, with "more moderate members leaving the committee." EB reports to EHC that they will not change their original contract price.	To what extent is the DCSC more moderate? What change in the leadership suggests this shift? I like that EHC has a voice here, as he is called on to effectively moderate between the CPD and the contractors.	
8/27/1975	Courier	Douglass costs up \$4,500 if new site used	In a "study" conducted re: the viability of relocating the DC site, additional cost will be incurred, most of which is attributed to the redrawing of the plans (\$4,000) and the plumbing and heating (\$486). Talks between the park board and the DCSC have at this point broken down. "The next move by the citizens' committee... remains unclear due to a weekend reorganization of the committee's leadership."	Here's another mention of DCSC reorganization. They have to have papers somewhere, but where? Also, there is not mention of the park board's role in generating protests.	

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
8/29/1975	Courier (Les Somogyi, p. 3)	It's 'Go' on new Douglass Center/Park board approves bid, changes	This article cites the approval granted by the park board to build new DC without demolishing the old building. No members of the new DCSC were at the meeting. Davis, a park board member and former member of DCSC, refuses comment. Roy Williams, the new chairman, was not available for comment. JLJ, in the role of Champaign Council Member, issues an "'apology' to all the people who had been involved in the Douglass Center controversy." "He said he saw no reason why anyone in the black community would prevent the demolition project. He asked the board to reissue demolition orders." Helms and the park board were unfazed by JLJ apology.	Is JLJ the voice of reason here? The park board has to be bluffing here. It really makes no sense to not demolish the old center. Why don't they take the issue to the community? Might that damage the credibility of the DCSC? I feel JLJs pain here.
9/2/1975	Courier, p.3	Construction of Douglass nears start	"Consturction of the new Frederick Douglass Community Center will begin in two to three weeks... The building will be next to the old center. The old center was not demolished because of citizens' protests."	Again here, there is an inverted agency granted to the black community, whose actions are viewed as the main cause of the conflict. There is no mention of the fact that the center that is being constructed is not what the community wants.
9/15/1975	Courier, p. 3	Douglass Center plans may be changed again	A special session meeting of the park board is called to discuss the possibility of building on the old site. Demolition of th eold DC is now a possibility, and Toalson offers that he "'received word that there would be no problem' with interference of demolition crews." This news comes in the week before work is to begin on the revised new site. EHC, who has at this time drawn up plans for both possibilities, said "that he has not been told of the recent possible change of plans."	Back and forth. I wonder where Toalson got word from. Who claims to have the authority to call off a protest?
9/16/1975	Courier (Les Somogyi, p. 3)	Douglass Center to be built on old site/Toalson says blacks promise 'no interference'	"The unanimous vote [to build on the original DC site] came after Toalson tole the board he had received 'word that there would be no problems' with interference on the construction site by black who have protested construction of the center. Some blacks had protested the demolition and construction project because they said the planned building did not have enough space. Toalson declined to comment where the assurances came from except to say 'from various sources.'" English bros. "will subcontract the project to Pelmore Excavating Co., 406 E. Columbia Ave., a black contractor." "Architect E. Hedric Clay told the park board that the contractor will now prepare the site for the demolition by putting up fences around the building. He also said pupils in nearby Washington Elementary School will be reminded about safety." "The five months of delay has cost taxpayers about \$5,000 extra on the project [which] come from architect's fees, increased cost for demolition, and an increase in the bid for electrical work."	Toalson's anonymously offered reassurance is enough for the board, after their insistence that the DCSC guarantee no protests. Nice move by English Bros. here to subcontract a black firm. Upstanding, shows an understanding of the role race is playing in this struggle. Where possible, hire black. The question here is what changes ot the spatial plan of the new DC, if any, result from the standoff. There is no indication here.

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
9/22/1975	Courier (Les Somogyi, p. 3)	Commentary: 5 bitter months, but it's the same center/'Tragic' the word for Douglass debate	<p>"Five months and about \$30,000 in extra expenses later, the plan is the same." "The park board, new in leadership and inexperienced in dealing with crisis situations, had its hands full." "'Tragic' is the word most often used in connection with the Douglass Center troubles." The commentary conveys some facts of leadership: Bresnan had been park board president for 12 years and resigned in April, when Helms, a member of the board for two years, took over leadership. Davis "charged Helms' leadership was unable to cope with a black situation. Helms said simply, 'It's a lie.'" Com. Leonhard: "I feel sorry for the black community. They've been deprived of the best use of the building. The rank and file of the black community suffers because the leaders were not effective. If everyone worked with the park district instead of against it, the building would have been built by now...This "Burn, baby, burn" type of leadership has gone out of style with the 1960s...Some of the things the black have said were extremely destructive[sic]...There is an element in the black community that doesn't want us to do anything. Because if we do, they won't have a platform." Davis refers to Helms as "a stubborn man." "Davis said that when Helms showed up at a negotiating session with police escort, it was a gesture of no faith and contributed to prolonging the impasse. Helms said he feared for his safety." "Helms said he thinks the biggest mistake was starting the Douglass Center issue out on a 'racial tone.' He said, 'Dick (Davis) was in charge of it and we hired a black architect, and that was a mistake.'" "Bresnan concluded, 'The main thing is that the building is going to go up and the kids will be able to use it. Too bad it will take a year to build.'"</p>	<p>The change in leadership is a major factor. Helms' words and actions do lack evidence of compromise. Why go through the motions of considering community input if in the final result you don't take that input into account. His 'you're making me do this' rhetoric hides the way in which his framing of the conflict is in itself a form of agency. Due to white privilege, he has the power to 'make a world' that has to conform to his perceptions. Any worldview presented as oppositional to his is considered ill-founded. As patronizing as Leonhard is here, her comments should be taken to heart. Perhaps 1975 is a little late for the rhetoric of black power. Perhaps the fact that there are black members of the park board and local city councils nullify a rhetorical strategy that situates the speaker as only on the margin relative to the center and not part of a whole. In the least, Leonhard's comments recognize that there are multiple perspectives in the black community, and as such, community does not always imply consensus. Further, for the North End, the issues arising out of the DC struggle indicate that there is a changing understanding of blackness, and the position of blackness relative to the white center. There is simultaneously (pulling on hooks here) a contrastive relation to the center, and a complementary one with the power structure such that blackness serves to constitute the whole of the socio-political sphere. Helms' use of a police escort is whitely, signifying that law (enforcement) is on his side. His criticism of the hiring of EHC as a racialized move loses impact both by his lack of mis-recognizing the role of whiteness in this whole affair, and by EHCs steadfastness through this whole ordeal. And, as for Wilkins, why can't he be an architect first?</p>

Date	source	Title	summary	notes
9/23/1975	Courier, p. 3	New Douglass Allocation OK'd	<p>"An additional \$36,390 was approved...by the Champaign Park Board for Douglass Center reconstruction...The total cost for the project is estimated at \$877,620." The extra cost of the project is accrued from "the contractor providing heat during the construction. The increased cost is a result of a five-month delay of the project. Had the project been started in early summer as originally planned, about \$70,000 in extra cost might not have been necessary."</p>	<p>Toalson, the general manager, is the only park board member cited in this report. Again here, the delay, and implicitly the black community, is blamed for the increased cost, however the reasons for the protests are not mentioned. The protests are not framed as a viable political response. Instead, resistance is viewed as coming out of nowhere.</p>
9/28/1975	Courier, p. 36 (D.G. Schumacher)	(D,G.S. editorial) Park board unity now is question	<p>"This past week the old center was demolished, literally clearing the way for a new Frederick Douglass Community Center where it was intended." "Commissioner Davis must take considerable responsibility for the delay. Clearly he did some organizing in the black community to protest the plans, to rightly demand a suitable senior citizens center. He started out doing what he thought was right, but after a point it appeared that the protest was out of hand, and not suitably representing the community in which the center will be built.</p>	<p>The right to protest and make demands of power is acknowledged here, however the of representation of the community's wants is at issue. Schumacher's point here speaks to the changing rhetoric and identity (rhetorical representation?) of the black community that manifest in this conflict. If space is constitutive of identity, then the ways in which claims for space are made constitutive a collective voice. Even though the new DC was built on the site of the old one, that space, and the role it plays in the North End, has changed since the 1940s. It is a new space, that, while still an indelible part of the community, however not in the same ways it has done in the past. Thus the claim for space in the conflict raises at least a few questions for the North End: What does the DC mean to the community? Who are we and what do we want? How do we successfully make demands of a power structure (make claims to the center) of which which we are a part? I think the dual positionality of the the North End community, as simultaneously on the margin and part of the whole, represents not so much a crisis of identity, but a recognition of the shifting position of black folk in America. It is not so much progress as it is a re-figuring. There is a black member of the park board, a black city council member, a black architect. While the numerical representation of African Americans on this project is still not reflective of the society as a whole, black folks are</p>

				coming to a place within the center while maintaining a marginalized status. As the relationship between margin and center shifts from relational to compositional, it does so for both entities. The rhetorical representations and spatial claims of Civil Rights and Black Power, while still valid, have to be amended in order to reflect and represent the altered position of the black community as both outside and inside.	e
12/27/1975	Courier, p.3, Les Somogyi	For months, Douglass Center was a question mark/Building permit finally was issued in October	This article recounts the five-month struggle. The reason for the protests, that the revised plans were deemed "inadequate for a recreation facility," is noted here. In addition, the article notes that Williams gets arrested for a solo-protest on the construction.	The change in park board leadership, which figures prominently in Williams assessment of the conflict, is mentioned in the last paragraph of this report and is technically out of temporal order. Helms' presidency might be more of an issue than is acknowledged here. Recall that both the park board and the DCSC undergo a crisis of leadership.	
2/22/1976	Courier, p.3 photo by Phil Greer	Steel Supports Go Up	A photo with caption	Shadow and light, silhouettes and cranes, new beginnings	
12/8/1976	Courier, p. 2, Michael Murphy	New Douglass rec center will be opened Saturday	"The new building replaces a 30-year-old cinder-block structure that was a community as well as a recreation center for black residents of northeast Champaign."	"community" is no longer part of the DCs title. It is a recreation space. This article presents its facts out of time, such that the protests of the DCSC and black community are not situated as responses. For example, the \$900,00 figure is given before mention of the additional funds that were added to the project, such that the dollar figure appears to be the initial offer. Also, the scaling down of the original building plan due to inflation is not situated as a cause of the initial protests. The library issue is also represented as a potential controversy, as there was space allocated in the original plan that did not make the revision. Interestingly, the senior center, the other cut to the community plan, gets the most play. Perhaps the CPDs quick response to find alternate space for the library made it less of an issue, however, I wonder what the community uptake was?	

Date	source	Title	summary	notes	
12/12/1976	CU Courier	Five Pairs of Scissors Cut Douglass Center Ribbon	Photo caption: "The long debate officially ended Saturday as an open house inagaurated the new Frederick Douglass recreations Center. Making sure the ribbon was cut on the \$900,000 center are..."	The debate is acknowleged in this photo caption. The original DC is also recognized here.	