

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: THE EVOLUTION OF THE BALTIMORE CITY
BUREAU OF RECREATION: 1940 - 1988

Cheryl L. Jordan, Doctor of Philosophy, 1993

Dissertation directed by: Dr. John Churchill
Department of Recreation

The purpose of this study was to examine the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation from its inception in 1940, as the Department of Public Recreation to the beginning of 1988. Research focused on major policies that were developed in the areas of administration, budget, staff, facilities, and programs. Social, political and economic factors were examined to determine the effect each had on the formation of these policies.

The historical method of research was used to examine the artifacts and documents gathered for this study. The data were ordered utilizing the following chronological eras: 1) World War II and the Post-War Era of the 1940s; 2) Desegregation and the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s; 3) Urban Renewal of the 1970s and the Changing Social Climate of the 1980s.

Changes in the policies of the Bureau of Recreation were quantified to measure increases and decreases in budget, staff, facilities and programs. Decisions of the Board of

Recreation and Parks, the policy-making body of the Department of Recreation and Parks until 1987, were examined in light of the three factors mentioned above. The research showed that the policies of the Bureau of Recreation changed significantly over the years, most dramatically with the desegregation of the Department after the landmark Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka Supreme Court decision, and the influx of Federal funds for the City of Baltimore after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The Board of Recreation and Parks focused much of its attention on the "showcase" areas of the Department, like the Baltimore Zoo, Memorial Stadium and the five public golf courses. In 1984, when most of these units were privatized, a power struggle ensued eventually leading to a 1987 referendum that stripped the Board of its policy-making powers.

The conclusions of this study indicated that while economic and social factors had obvious influence over policy decisions in the Bureau of Recreation out of necessity, the political factors had the most dramatic effects.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE BALTIMORE CITY
BUREAU OF RECREATION
1940 - 1988

by
Cheryl L. Jordan

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of The University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
1993

cl MD Dept. of Recreation

Advisory Committee:

Associate Professor John Churchill, Chair/Advisor
Lecturer Ellen Drogin
Professor Vincent Marando
Associate Professor Adah Strobell
Associate Professor Peter Verhoven
Professor Fred Humphrey (Emeritus)

Maryland
LD
3231
M 70d
Jordan,
C.L.

© Copyright by
Cheryl L. Jordan
1993

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Ralph Waldo Emerson Jones, Jr. - my mentor, teacher and friend. He provided the encouragement to succeed and instilled in me the faith that there was a Ph.D. in my blood.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. John Churchill, my advisor and chairman of my committee, who in his own way, pushed me to succeed.

To the rest of the members of my original committee: Dr. Adah Strobell, Dr. Fred Humphrey, Dr. Peter Verhoven and Dr. Vincent Marando, for their patience and perseverance through this long journey.

To Dr. Ellen Drogin, who graciously accepted to replace Dr. Humphrey upon his retirement, and provided valuable assistance.

To the staff of the Baltimore City Archives, who helped to provide me with many of the documents researched for the bulk of this study.

To the five interviewees: Virginia Baker, Alice Smith, Stephanie Esworthy, James E. Grant and the late Hope Godwin. Each provided valuable insight into the history of recreation in Baltimore.

To all of the staff of the Department of Recreation and Parks, but particularly to Marlyn J. Perritt and Stephanie Parham, who provided the flexibility and support to allow me to complete this endeavor.

And finally, to my research assistant, my husband Dan, who was the driving force behind the completion of this dissertation, who believed in me all along, and without whom none of this would have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables	ix
Chapter I - Introduction	1
The Early Playground Movement - Nationally . . .	1
The Early Playground Movement in Baltimore City	3
Purpose	5
Objectives	7
Significance	8
Limitations	9
Delimitations	10
Definition of Terms	10
Organization of the Study	12
Chapter II - Review of Related Literature	13
Historical Research	13
Organizational Research	17
Policy Analysis	22
Summary	24
Chapter III - Methodology	26
Data Collection	26
Primary Sources	27
Secondary Sources	29

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Data Analysis	30
Organization and Presentation of Data	31
Summary	33
Chapter IV - World War II and the Post-War Era of the 1940s	34
The 1940s - Historical Overview	34
The Department of Public Recreation - Organization	35
The Board of Park Commissioners	36
Recreational Activities During World War II . .	40
The Post-War Era in Recreation and Parks	45
Recreational Programs and Activities	50
Continued Segregation in Recreation and Parks .	51
Continued Budgetary Constraints	54
Summary	56
Chapter V - Desegregation and the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s	59
The 1950s - Historical Overview	59
Racial, Economic and Political Unrest	60
Professional Development in the Bureau of Recreation	68
The End of Segregation	71
The Expansion of Recreation Services	72
The 1960s - Historical Overview	77
Challenges to the Bureau of Recreation	78
Racial Tensions in Recreation Programs	82

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Federal Intervention Begins	85
Summary	101
Chapter VI - Urban Renewal of the 1970s and the Changing Social Climate of the 1980s . . .	105
The 1970s - Historical Overview	105
Recreation and Parks in the 70s	107
The 1980s - Historical Overview	131
Recreation and Parks in the 80s	134
The Delaporte Years	141
Conflicts, Scandals and New Initiatives	145
Summary	168
Chapter VII - Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations	173
Data Collection and Analysis	173
Findings	174
Conclusions	177
Recommendations for Future Research	181
General Recommendations	182
EPILOGUE	186
APPENDIX A - Baltimore City Board of Park Commissioners Baltimore City Board of Public Recreation Baltimore City Board of Recreation and Parks	192

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX B - Baltimore City Department of Recreation . and Parks Directors Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation Superintendents	195
APPENDIX C - Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation . . . Budgets	197
APPENDIX D - Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation . . . Recreation Centers, Playgrounds, Playfields	201
APPENDIX E - Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation . . . Personnel Statistics	208
APPENDIX F - Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation . . . Program Trends	210
APPENDIX G - Interview Transcript - Hope Godwin . . .	214
APPENDIX H - Interview Transcript - James E. Grant . .	232
REFERENCES	253

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.	Board of Estimates Appropriations for . . . Baltimore City (1940)	57
2.	Population Characteristics of Baltimore . . City (1940)	58
3.	Population Characteristics of Baltimore . . City (1950 and 1960)	102
4.	Board of Estimates Appropriations for . . . Baltimore City (1950 and 1960)	103
5.	Board of Estimates Appropriations for . . . Baltimore City (1970, 1980 and 1987)	169
6.	Population Characteristics of Baltimore . . City (1970, 1980 and 1990)	170

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"THOSE WHO CANNOT REMEMBER THE PAST
ARE CONDEMNED TO REPEAT IT."
-- George Santayana (1905)

The Baltimore City Department of Public Recreation was established in 1940 as the first fully municipally-operated recreation agency in the City's history. In 1947, it was combined with the Departments of Music and Parks, and all three were renamed "bureaus" to form the present Department of Recreation and Parks (Jones, 1988). The origins of the Bureau of Recreation were founded in the playground movement of the turn of the century, and much of its development over the years has been influenced by this movement.

The Early Playground Movement - Nationally

According to Knapp and Hartsoe (1979), the playground movement grew out of the municipal reform movement, which was developed as a result of the entrenched political machines and the crowded slums of industrialized, urban America at the turn of the century. As early as 1885, the Boston Sandgardens were created to provide secure places for children to play. Knapp and Hartsoe further document the development of the playground

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

movement of the turn of the century, with the establishment of the Playground Association of America (PAA) in 1906, which grew out of the social work movement's attempt to provide programs to battle the ills of urbanization. In 1911, the PAA evolved into the Playground and Recreation Association of America (PRAA), extending the involvement of this fledgling professional association into the general recreation domain.

In 1926, the first professional training for recreators occurred with the opening of the National Recreation School in New York. The PRAA developed into the National Recreation Association (NRA) in 1930, having the playground component as just one part of the awakening profession of recreation. The profession evolved one more step in 1937, with the Recreation Executive Training Program held in Minnesota. As is evidenced by this brief chronology, the evolution of the National Recreation Association followed three major themes:

- (1) the development of governmental responsibility for recreation;
- (2) the rise of professionalism; and
- (3) the ever-expanding definition of recreation and leisure (Knapp and Hartsoe, 1979).

These themes focused attention on the challenges of urbanization (e.g., overcrowding, crime, pollution) and how recreation and parks could address those challenges. Many of the urban areas in the U.S. became involved in the playground movement and the expansion of recreation in a very similar

fashion - as can be traced through the history of recreation and parks in Baltimore.

The Early Playground Movement in Baltimore City

The first playground was established in Baltimore City in 1897, similar to the ongoing efforts in many other urban centers of the U.S. (Kessler & Zang, 1989). In conjunction with this first playground, the Children's Playground Association (CPA) of Baltimore City was founded and operated with funds from the Good Government Club. This club was a private, non-partisan political organization developed to "plan and work for fair elections, honest and efficient government, and the exposure and punishment of criminal misconduct" (Harris, 1908). The fund provided by the Good Government Club was the first step in the future municipalization of recreation. By 1902, the CPA was granted the official privilege of operating children's playgrounds in all five of the City's large parks.

The playgrounds were operated in a formalized manner for eight weeks during the summer, six days a week (Monday through Saturday), and were supervised by uniformed female play leaders. All of these operations were funded by private donations until 1920, when the CPA received \$40,000 to operate its playground programs. Of that sum, \$25,000 came from the Parks Board, \$6,000 in private donations, and \$9,000 from the

Baltimore City government, the latter used exclusively for the operation of the Recreation Pier in Fells Point (Kessler & Zang, 1989).

Concurrently, a second organization sprang to life in 1909. The Public Athletic League (PAL) was founded by Robert Garrett, a wealthy citizen, sports enthusiast, and Olympic competitor in the discus and shot put in the first modern Olympics of 1896. The goal of this organization was to provide sports and athletic programs for boys and young men above the age of seven. While the CPA provided programming to all children, both boys and girls, the PAL focused on athletic competition for boys. In 1914, the PAL became a part of the Parks Department's budget. Throughout the years of co-existence between these two organizations, there was considerable competition for the use of park space in the provision of programs.

In 1922, the Children's Playground Association and the Public Athletic League merged to become the Playground Athletic League (PAL), developing a joint mission to promote the active use of Baltimore City's parks for both sports and playgrounds. The PAL was led by Robert Garrett, who took over the helm of the combined organization, much to the dismay of Mary B. Steuart, who had been the leader of the CPA. Refusing to play a subordinate role, she left the organization completely.

The new PAL was funded by the Parks Board budget, the Community Fund, and individual donations (predominantly Robert Garrett's). The budget was standardized at \$55,000 until the PAL was absorbed into Baltimore City Government upon the revision of the City Charter in 1940. The provision of recreation services was now mandated by the creation of the Department of Public Recreation, under the leadership of Harold S. Callowhill, Superintendent of Recreation. Organized municipal recreation had become a reality in the City of Baltimore.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation by focusing on the major policy changes that occurred from its beginning in 1940 through 1988.

It was hypothesized that social, economic and political factors impacted significantly on policy decisions made by the Board of Recreation and Parks, the policy-making body of the Department of Recreation and Parks until it was changed by referendum to an advisory body in 1987. Segregation and the inherent racism that accompanies it were examined for their potential influence on policy decisions during the 1940s and 1950s. The changing demographic makeup of Baltimore City was evaluated to determine whether any significant shifts in Board

of Recreation and Parks policies occurred (i.e., desegregation of recreation facilities and programs).

The economic impact of Federal intervention in cities in the 1960s and 1970s, and the subsequent loss of Federal funding in the 1980s, were examined for their effect on policy decisions, particularly in the area of budget formulation. State and local funding levels were reviewed, and alternative sources of funding were considered, particularly in the area of building construction, for their possible influence on the budget process.

Political factors such as the personalities of the Mayors of Baltimore City, members of the Board of Recreation and Parks, Directors of the Department of Recreation and Parks, and Superintendents of the Bureau of Recreation were compared and contrasted for their effect as leaders on policy decisions. Examination of the power struggles that inevitably occurred emphasized the extent of political influence on these decisions. The competency of both the members of the Board of Recreation and Parks and the employees of the Department of Recreation and Parks were documented and evaluated for their impact on resulting policy determinations. Various legal issues related to desegregation and organizational changes regarding the policy-making role of the Board were analyzed for their effect on policy decisions.

All three factors (social, economic and political) were compared for their influence on the policy decisions of the

Board of Recreation and Parks. The resultant decisions traced the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation from its small, segregated beginnings to the large, multicultural agency that it is today.

Objectives

The objectives of this study were to answer the following research questions:

(1) What were the major policies that were developed in the areas of fiscal, organizational, human and physical resources from 1940 to 1988, specifically:

- a) Administration (e.g., key persons, boards)
- b) Budget
- c) Staff
- d) Facilities
- e) Programs

(2) What were the trends in policy development?

- a) Increases and decreases in these various categories
- b) Programmatic shifts
- c) Administrative changes

(3) What was the basis for changes in these trends?

What factors affected these policies?

- a) Social
- b) Political
- c) Economic

All of these questions were analyzed through:

- a) Interviews
- b) Oral histories
- c) Documentary analysis

Significance

The results of this study could hold significance for those who develop policies in the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks as well as other, older municipal recreation and parks departments similar to Baltimore. The information generated from this study may also be of useful for strategic planning purposes to other municipal departments outside of the realm of recreation and parks that have been impacted by the social, economic and political forces examined in this study. The data may also indicate areas for further study, which may be of use to many jurisdictions.

This study may also provide a model for other municipal recreation and parks departments to examine their own

administrative decisions. Finally, the information obtained through this study will add to the already existing field of knowledge in recreation and parks.

Limitations

This study was limited by the accuracy and completeness of the available data. The Bureau of Recreation has relocated its administrative offices several times since its inception, and there have been several fires that may have contributed to the loss of some data.

The researcher attempted to conduct this study in as unbiased a fashion as possible, but a limited amount of bias may cloud some of the data presented. This study was also limited by the researcher's decisions regarding items to be examined. Some existing data may therefore have been excluded.

The unavailability of several prospective interviewees due to illness or lost contact created some gaps in data. The memory of the individuals interviewed for this study also proved a limiting factor, as several of these individuals had been absent from the Bureau of Recreation for a considerable period of time.

The lack of available interdepartmental and inter-Bureau written communication also limited the data to be analyzed. Included in this loss of information were critical minutes of

the various committee meetings of the Board of Recreation and Parks (Personnel, Executive Sessions) that disappeared when the Board was switched from a policy-making to an advisory capacity.

Delimitations

This study is delimited to the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation from 1940 to 1988.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout the study to explain the methods and procedures used in the analysis of data:

Advisory board - This type of board is only advisory to the governing body of the jurisdiction which appoints it. This board has no final authority or responsibility for policy or administration (Lutzin & Storey, 1973).

External criticism - The process of determining the authenticity of data (Gottschalk, 1950).

Historical method - The process of critically examining and analyzing the records and survivals of the past (Gottschalk, 1950).

History - Any integrated narrative or description of past events or facts written in a spirit of critical inquiry for the whole truth (Nevins, 1938).

Internal criticism - Analysis to determine the credibility of documents and/or witnesses of events (Gottschalk, 1950).

Policy - A chosen course of action significantly affecting large numbers of people (MacRae & Wilde, 1979).

Policy-making board - This type of board, made up of citizen volunteers, has full responsibility for policy formulation and implementation. This board may be separate and independent (i.e., fully autonomous) or semi-independent (i.e., answering to a higher governing authority, city council, or municipal administrator) (Lutzin & Storey, 1973).

Primary source - Original documents or remains; the first witness to a fact (Good & Scates, 1954).

Public policy - A course of action chosen by a government that significantly affects large numbers of people (MacRae & Wilde, 1979).

Secondary source - A source in which more than one mind has come between the historical event and the user of the source (Good & Scates, 1954).

Organization of the Study

The remainder of this study includes a review of the literature related to the historical method, documentary and policy analysis, organizational theory; a discussion of the study methodology; and documentation of the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation's role as a part of the Department of Recreation and Parks. Included as well, are a summary of the study, along with conclusions and recommendations for further research. An epilogue was added to describe events that have occurred since 1988, so that the reader may put the events of the previous half-century into a current perspective.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation by focusing on the major policy changes that occurred from its beginning in 1940 through 1988. In order to achieve that purpose, literature was reviewed that examined historical, organizational, and policy research for the purpose of providing a framework, both theoretical and practical, for the study.

Historical Research

In an effort to provide a theoretical underpinning for the historical research conducted in this study, several "bibles" of historical research were consulted, along with a few general research sources. The closest example of any type of recreation history of Baltimore is the book The Play Life of a City: Baltimore's Recreation and Parks 1900 - 1955 (Kessler & Zang, 1989). This volume was a companion piece to a pictorial display that was developed by the Baltimore City Life Museums and exhibited at the National Recreation and Park Association Congress held in Baltimore in 1991. There does not seem to be any organized historical documentation of the years beyond 1955. A great portion of the Kessler and Zang

book dealt with the development of the park system in Baltimore, with a final chapter briefly dealing with the issue of segregation in recreation and parks.

Of the "bibles" of historical research that were reviewed, Gottschalk (1950) provided most of the historical research method framework necessary for conducting this study. His discussion of primary and secondary sources, and process of internal and external criticism for the analysis of documents and testimonies, proved valuable in the quest for authentication of data.

In addition, Good and Scates (1954) discussed the different schools of thought of historical interpretation, providing specific knowledge of historical development, from the "great man" theory to the eclectic "collective psychological" theory. Each of these seven theories lends a greater understanding to the study of history and the possibilities of differing interpretations of the same event.

The value of history is reinforced by Kerlinger (1973), who stated that "without good history ... a discipline can lose perspective." Kerlinger indicates that historiography has a necessary relevance to all the social sciences, humanities, and formulation of public and private policies, because:

- (1) all data used in the above are drawn from the past;
- (2) all policies involve assumptions about the past; and

(3) all workers in the social sciences are personalities of given times whose thinking is determined by the historical circumstances of their lives and experiences. Kerlinger cautioned against the wide use of secondary sources, as the possibility of tainted sources is greater when an individual who was not an eyewitness has recounted the event.

Kent (1967) remarked on the importance of writing historical studies by indicating that "to break off a significant fragment of the human past and examine it closely is an act of some social importance ... criticizing thus becomes an elemental phase of systematic historical research. The importance of continuing historical research lies in the systematic study that implies skepticism of things being taken for granted." Dates of important events in the history of organizations must be verified, and not assumed to be correct by consulting one source, especially if that source is secondary.

Wallace (1987) remarked that in discussing the "politics" of public history, American capitalism is considered an economic, social and cultural system. Any systematic study of history should consider these areas as factors influencing the course of history. This researcher's study examined the economic, social and political factors that may have affected the history of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation.

This researcher's efforts were strengthened by the comments of Elton (1967), who indicated that the student

"would do well to suppose that he does not grasp the true meaning of his material until he has thoroughly acquainted himself with the organization that produced it, the purpose for which it was produced, and the difference between common form and the exceptional." The researcher has been a member of the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks (the organization under study) for a total of fourteen years since 1973, and has had open access to the majority of the records of the Department.

Several sources were consulted to provide background on the uses of oral history sources as a part of systematic research. Allen and Montell (1981) indicated that oral sources can be used by local historical researchers in three important ways. First, orally communicated history can supplement written records; second, it can complement what has been documented in formal history; and third, it can provide information about the past that exists in no other form.

The historical research conducted in this study had elements of qualitative research in its design, and several sources were consulted to provide background in this area. Bogdan and Biklen (1982, p. 59) discussed historical organizational case studies, which "concentrate on a particular organization over time, tracing the organization's development. The researcher relied on data sources such as interviews with people who have been associated with the organization, observations of the present, and existing

written records." Bogdan and Biklen also discussed the process of coding historical information by time or key events to provide some organization to the data.

Taylor and Bogdan (1984) indicated that the qualitative researcher studies people in the context of their past and the situations in which they find themselves. The qualitative aspect of a historical study was further described in Taylor and Bogdan's chapter with the discussion of the use of oral history sources.

The review of the preceding volumes of literature provided the theoretical background for the historical research being conducted in this study.

Organizational Research

In an effort to evaluate the structure and lifecycle of an organization, several studies were reviewed that examined the establishment, growth and decline of particular organizations. In a longitudinal study of the development of a new, innovative medical school, Kimberly (1979, p. 441) described the early life cycle of this organization, indicating that "the birth of any organization is affected by a complex set of political, economic, social and psychological factors." His discussion of a new organization (the medical school) dealt with these factors, indicating that even though there is considerable controversy among organizational

theorists, organizational outcomes can be attributed to the particular characteristics of a particular individual (Kimberly, 1979, p. 443). In the medical school's case, the dean of the school was the driving force behind the innovation and growth of that particular organization.

Kimberly went on to discuss the different stages in the life of a new organization from its birth and early development to its institutionalization, indicating that the situations that lead to early success as innovation are not the same ones that may lead to longer run successes. He indicated that "existing organizations have an established culture and an institutionalized set of norms, values and procedures", while the new organization has to establish all of these (Kimberly, p. 455). He also noted (p. 456) that "systematic, in-depth, comparative analysis of the birth, life and death of organizations should lead to both a clearer understanding of the complex nature of organizational success and to more dynamic perspectives on organizations."

The examination of the birth, life and decline of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation and the different stages of rebuilding that have occurred over the years followed some of Kimberly's observations, particularly when the characteristics of particular individuals are examined in light of organizational outcomes. The innovation of a director of the Department of Recreation and Parks such as Chris Delaporte or the steadfast denial of equal rights for

all individuals by the Board of Recreation and Parks in the integration fight are key examples of this discussion.

Mack's (1988) thesis, A History of the York Recreation Commission From 1904 to 1975, provided significant background information for development of the practical framework of this study. Mack traced the history of the York (Pennsylvania) Recreation Commission, focusing on the people, programs and issues that shaped its development. The York Recreation Commission, an independent policy-making board, received funding from several sources, including the Woman's Club of York, the York City School Board, and the Common Council of York (Mack, p. 140).

Mack's study documented the struggle for funding of recreation services through the above-mentioned sources, and the political turf battles between education and recreation over the control of recreation programs and facilities. The examination of a truly independent policy-making provided significant contrast to the study of semi-independent Board of Recreation and Parks in Baltimore City.

Glover's (1983) dissertation, A Study of the Changes in the Decision-Making Authority of Selected Recreation Citizen Boards in the United States, examined changes in the citizen recreation and parks boards of fifteen municipalities in the U.S. This study examined these boards to determine (a) what changes had occurred; (b) what factors brought about these

changes; (c) what the impacts of these changes were; and (d) the implications of these changes (p. 3-4).

One of the major findings of this study was that thirteen of the fifteen boards had experienced declines in their authority, either through barely maintaining the status quo, moving from policy-making to advisory, or being totally dissolved. Only two boards had experienced actual increases in authority (Glover, 1983, p. 92).

Glover goes on to indicate that the consolidation of authority within municipal governing bodies was identified as the most important reason for reductions in citizen boards' authority. The influencing factors for this change were (1) the governing body directed it; (2) the governing body thought the board had become too powerful; and (3) the governing body felt the need to increase efficiency in operations (Glover, p. 93). In most cases, the governing bodies were pleased with the changes, which provided the major impact of the study.

This study provided background to the changes that occurred in the Baltimore City Board of Recreation and Parks. The need for increased efficiency in operations and the control of the Board's power were indeed issues that led to its change from policy-making to advisory status.

A discussion of the "dysfunctional consequences" of organizational decline were discussed by Cameron, Whetten, and Kim (1987) in their examination of selected colleges and

universities. By their definition (p. 127), "decline" involves restricted resources and pressures to cut back. In the study of the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation and the Department of Recreation and Parks as a whole, much evidence of decline and subsequent new growth were made evident. Cameron, Whetten, & Kim indicate that there are "Twelve Dysfunctional Consequences of Organizational Decline" (p. 128) ranging from no long-term planning to nonprioritized cuts, as well as conflict and centralization of decision-making authority. While their study examined colleges and universities, many of their observations hold true to governmental organizations, and were observed in the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation, particularly in the dilution of authority of the Board of Recreation and Parks in 1987.

Davies (1962) in Cameron, Whetten, & Kim (p. 135) observed that dissatisfaction, conflict and scapegoating exists when organizations "become accustomed to abundance and unbridled growth, as was typical of the 1960s and 1970s." When this occurs, zero budget increases, limited mobility, hiring freezes, and other characteristics of stability are viewed as relative deprivation. Such was the case in Baltimore City during the late 70s and early 80s and was documented in this dissertation. The struggle for funding of local government operations is an overriding concern of policy analysis, which was examined in the next section.

Policy Analysis

The final segment of literature reviewed for the purposes of this study covered the areas of policy and public policy analysis. MacRae and Wilde (1979) described policy analysis as analysis by citizens who seek policies for the public, and can also be utilized by government officials and employees, acting as representatives rather than as citizens and seeking policies that further the public interest. Both the Baltimore City Board of Recreation and Parks (the citizens) and the Department of Recreation and Parks (the government) participated in urban policy analysis.

In the analysis of urban policy making, Lineberry and Sharkansky (1978, p. 406) indicated that this effort is "beset by ignorance as much as by disagreements on goals and ends." They state that "some of the reasons for this crisis of ignorance are related to our assumptions that governments can solve problems by putting resources to bear on them and expanding the bureaucracies to deal with them."

The examination of the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation showed that the quest for additional funding was uppermost in the thoughts of its policymakers.

Lineberry and Sharkansky (p. 401) also indicated that political conflict and political power produce policy choices. They remarked that "frequently in the city, policies are

advocated and adopted with little insight into their impacts" (p. 215). Both of these observations are evidenced in the history of policy decisions in the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation through the Board of Recreation and Parks, and will be traced through the three chapters of history in this study.

Marchszak (1984) indicated that research findings are only one of the many inputs to a policy decision. Other inputs include the views and wishes of constituencies, testimonials, the "give-and-take" of colleagues and superiors, staff opinions, existing policies, and preconceived attitudes. Research findings, however, are critical and more empirical than many of the other qualitative dimensions described above.

Lineberry and Sharkansky (1978) aided in the discussion of public policy decisions by indicating the urban problems that are corrected or exacerbated by these decisions:

- (1) The Fiscal Crisis
- (2) The Crime Problem
- (3) The Pollution Problem
- (4) The Racial Problem
- (5) The Tax Problem
- (6) The Housing Problem
- (7) The Poverty Problem
- (8) The Fiscal Inequities Problem
- (9) The Police Problem

Many of these problems, particularly the problems of fiscal crisis, race and fiscal inequities, have an impact on the

decisions that are made in the field of recreation and parks, and were described and detailed in this study.

Summary

Several types of literature were reviewed for the purpose of this study. Historical research reviewed provided the procedural framework for the study as well as the method to accurately interpret the data gathered. Two organizational studies were examined that provided both examples of framework and comparisons of the history of another agency's (Mack, 1988) policy-making board as well as an examination of changes in decision-making authority of selected U.S. citizen boards (Glover, 1983).

Other studies in organizational theory (Kimberly, 1979; Cameron, Whetten, & Kim, 1987) provided insight into the structure of organizations and an examination of their lifecycles. The final segment of literature reviewed examined policy decisions, analysis and ways in which policy is related to finances, as well as who has control over policy decisions. These studies provided insight into the reasoning behind focus on budgetary considerations.

The overriding financial concern of policy analysis indicated that budgetary considerations are a critical component of policy decisions. The political considerations of organizational theory as well cannot be discounted. Changes

in decision-making authority from policy-making to advisory boards indicated the preference for the consolidation of power with the local governing body, similar to the events that occurred with the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The intent of this study was to examine the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation from its beginning in 1940 until 1988, focusing on the factors that influenced changes in policy decisions. This chapter contains documentation of the methods of data collection, data analysis, and data organization.

Data Collection

The methods used to compile and analyze data in this study are those presented by both Gottschalk (1950) and Good and Scates (1954). Good and Scates described the three major steps in the historical method as follows:

(1) The collection of data, with consideration of documents, remains or relics, of primary and secondary sources, of bibliographical procedure, and of organization of materials.

(2) the criticism of data collected, using the processes of internal and external criticism.

(3) the presentation of facts in a readable form. Gottschalk preceded this description with the "Four Bare Essentials of the Historical Method", which are:

- a) the collection of surviving materials that may be relevant;
- b) the exclusion of those materials that are unauthentic;
- c) the extraction of credible testimony; and
- d) the organization of that testimony into a meaningful narrative or exposition.

Kerlinger states that historical research "is the critical investigation of events, developments and experiences of the past, the careful weighing of evidence of the validity of sources of information on the past, and the interpretation of the weighed evidence" (Kerlinger, p. 701).

The data were collected using the following primary and secondary sources:

Primary Sources

(1) Minutes of the meetings of the Board of Park Commissioners (1940 - 1947) and the Board of Recreation and Parks (1947 - 1988). Both of these boards were policy-making entities until 1987, when the Board became advisory through an amendment to the City Charter (via referendum).

(2) Interviews and oral histories from surviving key figures in the early history of the Bureau of Recreation, as well as interviews with recent and/or current administrative

personnel in the Department of Recreation and Parks. Interviewees were as follows:

a) Virginia S. Baker - Current employee of the Bureau of Recreation as a Recreation Program Coordinator in the Office of Adventures in Fun. She has been employed with the Bureau for the past fifty years.

b) Stephanie Esworthy - Current employee of the Department of Recreation and Parks as the Superintendent of the Bureau of Music and also as Contract Officer for the Department. She has served in the previous positions of Administrative Assistant to Douglas Tawney (1965 - 1982).

c) Hope Godwin - A previous Recreation District Supervisor for the Bureau of Recreation, who had been employed earlier with the Playground Athletic League (pre-1940). She left the Bureau in 1960 after professional difficulties with then Superintendent Callowhill. Ms. Godwin died in 1992.

e) James E. Grant - Retired Superintendent of Recreation (1981 - 1988).

f) Alice D. Smith - Retired (1993) Recreation District Supervisor for the Bureau of Recreation.

(3) City documents (e.g., budgets, legislation) available from the Maryland Room of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, as well as from the Department of Recreation and Parks Fiscal Services Unit.

(4) "The Harold S. Callowhill Collection" - consisting of documents, artifacts, and photographs of the tenure of Callowhill, who was Superintendent of Recreation in Baltimore City from 1935 - 1966.

Secondary Sources

(1) Clippings of the City's major newspapers (from 1940 to present) - The Sun, the News-American (formerly known as the News-Post), and the Afro-American, located at the City of Baltimore Archives. (Note: The only difficulty with these clippings was that the page numbers of the articles were for the most part non-existent, therefore, many of the citations used in this study will not have a page number included.)

(2) Archives of the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks, including a "facility file" on all community centers in the City system (both past and present).

(3) Records from the Baltimore City Life Museums, where information was amassed for a pictorial history of the Department from 1900 to 1955.

All of the above data were collected by note-taking, xeroxing of documents, audiotaping and written transcription of interviews and oral histories.

Data Analysis

Relevant data gathered were analyzed and verified through the use of the historical methods of external and internal criticism found in Gottschalk (1950) and Good and Scates (1954). External criticism was used to determine the authenticity of data, examining it for forgeries, garbled documents, or texts that have been restored. Internal criticism examined the credibility of documents and interviews. Credibility is described by Gottschalk as being "as close to what actually happened as we can learn from a critical examination of the best available sources." He indicated that the historian establishes verisimilitude (i.e., the appearance of truth), rather than objective truth (i.e., actuality). Credibility, according to Gottschalk, tests whether:

- (1) The witness was able to tell the truth;
- (2) The witness was willing to tell the truth;
- (3) The witness testimony was accurately reported; and
- (4) There was any independent corroboration.

Once the data were verified using these methods, they were ordered chronologically and followed these topical categories:

- a) World War II and the Post-War Era of the 1940s
- b) Desegregation and the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s

- c) Urban Renewal and the 70s
- d) The Changing Social Climate of the 80s

The data gathered were selected and analyzed based on their relevance to the social, political and economic factors and their influence on the administrative policy decisions of the aforementioned chronological breakdowns.

Organization and Presentation of Data

The data, having been organized chronologically, were presented along with the rest of the chapters of the study as follows:

Chapter IV - World War II and the Post-War Era of the 1940s - documented the events of the 40s and the factors that influenced the administrative decisions made during these times, focusing on the budgetary constraints of the early Department of Public Recreation and later Bureau of Recreation. Information was also presented that documented the early initiatives in the integration movement.

Chapter V - Desegregation and the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s - examined the events and the factors that affected the decisions made during those turbulent times. Emphasis was placed on the resistance of the Baltimore City Board of Recreation and Parks to integration in the 50s and

the coping of the city and the Bureau of Recreation after the civil disturbances of the late 60s.

Chapter VI - Urban Renewal of the 1970s and the Changing Social Climate of the 1980s - focused on the more recent events in the evolution of the Bureau of Recreation, tracing the growth of specialized programs to address the needs of urban youth in the 70s to the innovative programs and facilities developed during the 80s.

Chapter VII - Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations - summarized the previous six chapters, including conclusions drawn from this study and recommendations for further research.

Epilogue - added to update the evolution of the Bureau of Recreation since 1988 to provide a more current context in evaluating the growth of the Bureau.

Appendices included listings of the members of the Board of Recreation and Parks from 1940 to 1988 (Appendix A), as well as a listing of the Directors of the Department of Recreation and Parks from 1940 to 1988 (Appendix B). These appendices provide accessible reference to specific individuals and place them in visible context with one another. Charts showing the increases and decreases in budgets (Appendix C), staff (Appendix D), numbers and types of facilities (Appendix E) and kinds of programs (Appendix F) were also included, as well as several transcripts of interviews with key personnel (Appendices G and H).

Summary

The data collected for this study were compiled using the historical method described by Gottschalk (1950) and Good and Scates (1954). Data were collected from a variety of sources, both primary and secondary through note-taking, xeroxing of documents, audiotaping and written transcription of personal interviews.

The data were analyzed for authenticity (external criticism) and credibility (internal criticism). Data were then ordered chronologically by decade, according to the most prevalent trends of that particular decade.

Conclusions were drawn based on the changes (increases, decreases) that occurred in budgets, staff, number and types of facilities and programs. The examination of these changes in relationship to the economic, social and political factors of the time substantiated these conclusions.

CHAPTER IV

WORLD WAR II AND THE POST-WAR ERA OF THE 1940S

The 1940s - Historical Overview

As the decade of the 1940's began, Germany had already invaded Poland, Norway, Denmark and France; Britain and France had declared war, and the United States was bracing for the inevitable. By 1941, the Lend-Lease Bill was passed, and arms were on their way to Europe to help battle the Nazi invasion. At home, the United States continued to reel from the Great Depression, with 7 million Americans still without jobs (Bedford, Colburn, & Madison, 1972).

Set into these global and national events, the Baltimore City Charter had been revised in 1939 and the Department of Public Recreation was created in 1940, to provide public support for organized recreation services for the citizens of Baltimore, similar to what was already provided in the area of parks services. While the Department of Public Recreation had its own policy-making board, it still needed to go before the official Board of Park Commissioners, who were responsible for the management of the Department of Parks and Squares (City Charter, 1939) to discuss the utilization of parks and the playgrounds within them. The Department of Parks and Squares maintained and operated all of the green spaces and playgrounds that had been built in the parks, with Druid Hill

Park being the focus of much of the early leisure activity that occurred in them.

The Department of Public Recreation - Organization

In the years before the governmental absorption of recreation services in Baltimore, the Playground Athletic League (PAL) had operated playground and sports activities with a mixture of funding sources. Prior to 1940, the PAL relied heavily on private contributions, especially Robert Garrett's, the founder of the early Public Athletic League, and an avid recreational sports supporter. As has been previously documented, the PAL had also received minimal funding from the Board of Park Commissioners (Park Board) to supplement its private donations. By 1940, however, with the creation of the Department of Public Recreation, municipal support increased from the "standard" \$55,000 to \$139,144. This enabled support of a full-time, year-round staff of forty recreation workers who operated eight recreation buildings and varied recreation programs in as many as eighty-seven indoor sites (predominantly schools), as well as numerous playgrounds (Recreation, June 1941).

The Board of Park Commissioners

Harold S. Callowhill, the Superintendent of the Department of Public Recreation, (who came to the Department after serving as the Director of the old Playground Athletic League from 1935 to 1940), would often come to the Board of Park Commissioners asking for permission to hold a specific recreational activity in the parks, or to utilize a facility that was under Parks' control. For example, in January of 1940, Callowhill asked permission to utilize the Cahill Building, which was a Department of Parks facility that would later become one of the first comprehensive recreation centers in the system (Parks Board Minutes [hereafter referred to as PBM], March 19, 1940). The building was placed at the disposal of the Department of Public Recreation in July 1940, with the physical care of the facility being left to the Parks Department, as was the case with many of the facilities and playgrounds. Also, in May of 1940, Callowhill sent a letter to the Board asking for permission "to conduct playground activities for colored children in the northeast sector of Harlem Square" (PBM, June 27, 1940). Harlem Square was one of the many small neighborhood squares in the northwest area of the City that were maintained and controlled by the Parks Department. The issue of segregation, which was implicit in the decisions of the Park Board, often led to the upholding of

the "separate but equal" philosophy legalized by the Plessy vs. Ferguson Supreme Court decision of 1896.

The Department of Public Recreation, as well as the Department of Parks and Squares, remained segregated in the 1940's, and Callowhill knew that permission would have to be granted for these playground activities to take place. In the case of Harlem Square, the decision regarding the use of the northeast sector of the square was left up to the "best judgment" of the General Superintendent of Parks, George L. Nichols. The playground activities for colored children were permitted, as long as the children remained in "their" playground. The continued requests for services for the growing "colored" population of Baltimore will remain evident throughout Chapter IV, and particularly in Chapter V, as desegregation becomes a volatile national issue.

In 1941, the Department of Public Recreation, in conjunction with the National Recreation Association, developed a twenty-five year "Long-Range Recreation Plan", that laid out the proposed expansion of recreation programs and facilities through the year 1966. The Park Board came to the realization that the taxpayers and voters seemed to be unwilling to provide funds for the expansion of public supervised recreation programs that they didn't believe feasible to conduct (PBM, December 10, 1941). In a secretarial memo included in the Park Board minutes of December 10, 1941, J.V. Kelly, Secretary to the Park Board,

indicated that "it seems futile to continue studies and reports from decade to decade without working out at the same time such a definite financing program as will show that the plan is feasible in the face of mounting Federal taxes, even with the State and Municipal taxes reduced." This Secretarial memo also indicated that the next study of either recreation or parks should address the following factors:

- (1) The present assessed value of property (if not already City-owned);
- (2) The cost of development, with the cost of the building shown separately;
- (3) The estimated cost of policing, lighting and the keeping of the grounds;
- (4) The estimated cost of heating, lighting and the maintenance of the buildings; and
- (5) The annual cost for play supervision in all of the areas controlled and operated by the Department of Public Recreation and the Department of Parks, especially the playground areas.

While the Parks Department and the Public Recreation Department remained separate entities, the superintendents of both agencies realized that many of their activities were interrelated. The operations of these two Departments became much more formalized; the Parks Department had a budget of \$2,151,510, and the Department of Public Recreation's budget was a mere \$216,477 (The Sun, December 10, 1941). The

Commission on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, a private, non-profit agency formed to seek out fraud and waste in municipal government, recommended that these two agencies concentrate on the activities that they had been mandated by the City to provide - "recreational facilities, forestry, and garden work" (PBM, December 10, 1941, p. 361). The Commission also recommended that the Recreation budget be reduced by \$10,000, while the parks budget be reduced by only \$5,000, since the Parks Department had a larger maintenance concern. The gap between the funding of the parks and the funding of the recreation programs and facilities would continue for many years.

Alfred E. Cross, one of the Park Board Commissioners, recognized the public demand for play areas, indicating that the Park Board should not seek to purchase any more large park areas, but concentrate on smaller parks and squares to be used for recreational activities. Citizen backlash, however, to the City purchasing more land for play areas was evident. Mrs. Paul Stevens, who sent a letter of protest to the Park Board in December of 1941 regarding the purchase of a playground area in Northeast Baltimore, indicating that the money "should be used for safety traffic regulation instead in the interest of our children" (PBM, January 7, 1942, p. 362). Commissioner Cross countered these types of protests, by indicating that "open play spaces in a City afforded an actual antitoxin against juvenile delinquency" and would oppose

cutting down the size or elimination of any play space owned by the City (PBM, March 25, 1942, p. 366).

Recreational Activities During World War II

Japan had bombed Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, and the United States was heavily involved in World War II, both in Japan and in Germany. While the Department of Public Recreation and the Department of Parks were attempting to maintain their services to the citizens of Baltimore, they were becoming increasingly involved in the provision of recreation services to the U.S. soldiers housed at many of the military establishments located both in the City and in nearby localities. James H. Rogers, the Regional Recreational Representative for the Department of the Army, met with Superintendent Callowhill to work out a plan for meeting the recreational needs of soldiers stationed at Fort George G. Meade, Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Edgewood Arsenal, the Fifth Regiment Armory and the Fort Holabird Quartermaster's Depot. The Army was particularly concerned with the morale problems at Fort Meade, and turned to the City's recreation services for assistance. Callowhill organized dances both on-site at Ft. Meade and also at two local centers that were established at the Fifth Regiment Armory and the Rennert Hotel, both in downtown Baltimore. With a budget of \$6,000 in 1941 for personnel, maintenance and operations, the Department offered

socials, dances, parties and other types of entertainment for the troops (Callowhill Collection, 1941)

While the Department offered these types of activities for the nation's troops, the general public did not go unserved, though funding for recreational activities was scarce. In April 1942, however, the Budget Director of the City sent a letter to the Park Board, requesting the Department to close its three swimming pools for the summer, because the \$30,000 needed to operate the pools was not available. The Board expressed concern over public cleanliness (especially among the colored population) if the pools remained closed. The money could not be made available, and the pools were closed for the Summer of 1942. (PBM, April 15, 1942)

The issue of segregation appeared again several times during the war years. The activity most frequently challenged was golf. In April 1942, Baltimore lawyer Dallas Nicholas sent a letter to the Park Board on behalf of two colored golfing clubs requesting that the ban be lifted on their use of other golf courses besides Carroll Park, the nine-hole course reserved for them. The Park Board, however, felt that they had a good record of giving the colored golf clubs "equal and adequate facilities at Carroll Park," not recognizing the fact that it was the only nine-hole course, while the other three courses (Mt. Pleasant, Clifton, and Hillsdale) were eighteen holes (PBM, April 15, 1942). As a result of Mr.

Nicholas' letter and subsequent pressure, in May 1942, the Board notified the General Superintendent of Parks not to refuse colored golfers at any of the courses. In June, Commissioner C. Markland Kelly indicated that "no further action on extending the use of recreational facilities to Negroes should be taken until the courts decide on how far it was necessary to go." The motion to allow Negro golfers on golf courses besides Carroll Park was rescinded. In July 1942, the Baltimore Circuit Court issued a writ of "mandamus," forcing the Park Board to reopen the golf courses to all golfers. For the time being, the Board obeyed the writ, but both the battle against segregation, and World War II raged on.

In December of 1942, Robert Garrett, the chairman of the Board of the Department of Public Recreation, requested that control of certain neighborhood parks and squares be turned over to the Recreation Department for programming. These nine areas were Collington Square, City Springs, Franklin Square, Harlem Park, Johnston Square, Lafayette Square, Madison Square, Perkins Square, and Union Square (PBM - December 9, 1942). Commissioner Cross had hoped that the Department of Public Recreation would be placed as a sub-department under Parks so that the Board could exert complete control over it, but realized that it was created because the cost of supervised recreation had become too heavy to be supported by Garrett's private funds. It was agreed that the Recreation

Department could only, at this time, have the control of playground use in these areas, and requested a meeting with Mr. Garrett and Superintendent Callowhill to work out the details of the arrangement. By February 1943, Superintendent Callowhill came back to the Board and asked for Harlem Park again. At this time, the Department of Recreation was given total control of it, including the total cost of operation (PBM, February, 1943).

In 1943 sufficient funding was made available from the Parks Department's budget to open the pools again for the summer, but the segregation issue flared up again. The Court of Appeals ruled that the writ of "mandamus" was invalid due to several "trial errors," and the Negro golfers were relegated to the Carroll Park course once again with no immediate recourse (PBM, March 17, 1943). The Department of Public Recreation continued to expand, however, growing from four recreation buildings in 1940 to eight buildings in 1943 and over 74 indoor recreation programs located in school buildings and on playgrounds. Not only had the number of centers doubled, but the number of full-time, year-round staff had done almost the same, moving from twenty-four in 1940 to forty-one in 1943 (Recreation, June 1943).

The competition between the Departments of Parks and Public Recreation continued through the 1940s. In December 1943, the Department of Public Recreation asked for the use of Baltimore Stadium, which was managed by the Park Board, for a

fundraising event. This request was summarily rejected since the facility was not designated for fundraising activities, and the Recreation Department had to look elsewhere for a facility (PBM, December 1, 1943). By 1944, the City's Charter Revision Committee was beginning to discuss the possibility of a consolidation of both Departments, but encountered opposition among officials along with Superintendent Callowhill (PBM, March 15, 1944). Movement towards this end was beginning to occur, with the turning over of six of the original neighborhood parks and squares to the Department of Public Recreation for total operation.

While all of these changes were occurring, some other more subtle changes were beginning to appear. Since the spring of 1943, Carroll Park Golf Course had been undergoing a substantial renovation, and the golfers, both Negro and white, had been playing together on the other golf courses. Attorney Dallas Nicholas approached the Park Board again in June 1945, asking that all public golf courses be open to all golfers. Now that the Carroll Park renovations were complete, however, the Park Board once again ruled that Carroll Park Golf Course would be the only golf course opened for Negroes only, still maintaining their "separate but equal" posture (PBM, June 5, 1945). World War II was ending, but the battle for equality was just beginning.

The Post-War Era in Recreation and Parks

As the war ended and the troops returned home from other countries with their new experiences and a taste for different recreational activities, the demand for services from the municipal departments of recreation and parks increased. In Baltimore in 1945, the pools that were located in the major parks - Druid Hill (both black and white), Clifton and Patterson (white only) - received tremendous usage, seeing an increase of over 20,000 participants in the first ten days of the swimming season as compared to the prior year (PBM, August 8, 1945). These increases were in spite of the new requirement for bathers to bring their own suits and towels, which were previously provided for them at a minimal cost to cover laundering and repairs.

The Department of Public Recreation saw an increase in participation and demand for services. By July of 1945, the Department was employing fifty-six full-time workers who worked on a year-round basis in ten recreation buildings and over sixty-six indoor recreation centers in school building gymnasias (Recreation, July, 1945). The total budget for the Department of Public Recreation that year was \$341,224, which included funds from not only municipal sources, but also supplemental funding from private, state and some Federal sources.

As the pressure to consolidate recreation and parks services continued, the Park Board began the process of restructuring the Department of Parks. In September 1945, the Board petitioned the City Service Commission to abolish the position of General Superintendent of Parks, upon the retirement of George Nichols, and to create the position of Director of Parks. R. Brooke Maxwell, who had been the assistant to Mr. Nichols, was recommended for the new position (PBM, September 4, 1945). The first phase of the restructuring had begun, with the Department of Public Recreation already reconfigured for the proposed consolidation. Maxwell was confirmed as the first Director of Parks in February 1946, and the Department of Public Recreation, under Superintendent Callowhill's leadership, received a modest \$25,000 increase in its budget amounting to \$448,745. Additionally, six other neighborhood parks and squares were turned over to recreation for total operation: Johnston Square, Cloverdale Playground, Madison Square Playground, Perkins Square, Lafayette Square, and Federal Hill Park. All of these changes did not occur smoothly, however. In June 1946, the Director of Parks discussed the conflicts between parks and recreation regarding the maintenance of these parks and squares areas, indicating that recreation did not have the staff or the training to do the job. The Park Board directed the Department of Public Recreation to insure

that the areas that were being turned over to them were properly maintained (PBM, June 5, 1946).

The continuing battle with the central Baltimore government over the lack of funding for the provision of recreation and parks services became more apparent in the Summer of 1946, when Park Board President C.K. Straub asked Mayor McKeldin for additional funding. The number of facilities that were being managed by the Parks Department had grown significantly, with the addition of three large park pools at Patterson, Riverside and Gwynns Falls Parks. In addition, the Department of Public Recreation was managing more playgrounds, squares and indoor centers at its still minimal funding levels.

The increasing demand for more services on the part of the Negro population of Baltimore came to the forefront in the midst of all of these budget problems when Addison Pinkney, Executive Secretary of the Baltimore Chapter of the N.A.A.C.P., met with the Board and demanded answers to the following concerns:

(1) Why the squares in the Negro communities were being allowed to deteriorate (NOTE: many of these squares were now under the control of the Recreation Department);

(2) Why the Park Police were driving colored people from playgrounds in both Bentalou Park and Druid Hill Park, even though the color density of the population in those areas was changing;

(3) Why if two-thirds of the patrons of Druid Hill Park were black, the present tennis and swimming facilities for them in the park were woefully inadequate (Druid Hill had the only swimming pool available to Negroes in the City);

(4) Why there was not colored patronage allowed on all of the city's golf courses (PBM, August 14, 1946).

Mr. Pinkney also came to the meeting "to dispel the fallacious deduction that Negroes create slums" and offered to work with the Park Board and appear at City Council meetings and the Board of Estimates hearings on the budget to ask for more funds for recreation and parks services (Morning Sun, August 15, 1946). The Board listened to Mr. Pinkney but did not provide a response to his inquiries.

The Department of Parks would continue to receive cuts in its budget (\$46,000), but these cuts were modest compared to what the City Council had slashed from the Department of Public Recreation, which had requested \$813,301 for 1947, as compared to the \$448,745 it had received in 1946. The City Council refused to allow these increases and cut the Department's budget by \$339,435 to a final total of \$473,866, a mere \$25,121 over what it had received the previous year (Evening Sun, December 13, 1946).

The need for a combined effort on the part of recreation and parks services had become increasingly apparent, and in 1946, the Baltimore City Charter was amended to consolidate the Departments of Parks, Recreation and Music. In July 1947,

the actual consolidation became official, and the Departments became "bureaus" comprising the present Department of Recreation and Parks. The seven member Board of Public Recreation was merged with the five member Board of Park Commissioners. The product was a seven member policy-making Board of Recreation and Parks, consisting of several members of both previous boards. The new Board consisted of Robert Garrett as President, J. Marshall Boone, S. Lawrence Hammerman, Dr. Bernard Harris (the only Negro on the Board), Weston B. Scrimger, R. Wilburt Marsheck and Mrs. Howard W. Ford (PBM, July 28, 1947). In August 1947, the titles of the top administrators for the Department were changed as follows: Director of Recreation and Parks, Superintendent of Recreation, and Superintendent of Parks. R. Brooke Maxwell was selected as Director, who was, as the City Charter mandated, "familiar with the sound, modern practices of community recreation and park operation, and shall be a person of high standing in this field" (City Charter, 1946, p. 121). Harold S. Callowhill remained Superintendent of Recreation, and Charles A. Hook became Superintendent of Parks (PBM, August 18, 1947).

While the merger was necessary, it took quite some time for the power of the Board to become unified and begin to change the City's perception of the value of the field of recreation and parks, which had never been quite understood. In 1947, the Recreation budget was once again cut by \$194,948,

forcing Callowhill to request transfers of funds from full-time salaries to part-time salaries and building expenses to keep the programs and activities in the Bureau functioning (PBM - September 10, 1947). The effect of these adjustments was to diminish the quality and quantity of services provided and postpone needed maintenance of facilities.

The one bright spot in this period of dissension and cuts was the opening of the Chick Webb Memorial Recreation Center, which would be the first recreation center constructed exclusively for the use of Baltimore's Negro population. While many smaller centers were being operated for Negroes in schools and other park areas, this was the first building constructed specifically for their use. It was actually the renovation of an old ice plant, and the East Baltimore neighborhood surrounding it raised \$15,000 to purchase the plant, while the City appropriated \$121,842 for reconditioning (Baltimore News-Post, November 29, 1947).

Recreational Programs and Activities

Through all of the events that were occurring on the administrative level in the Department of Recreation and Parks, the field staff continued to provide programs to meet the needs of the residents of Baltimore City. In an interview with Hope Godwin (1988), recreation program supervisor during the 40's and 50's, she indicated that the types of programs

that were offered were fairly standard around the City - sports activities (athletics) such as basketball, football, soccer, softball and track & field. These activities were predominantly offered for boys and men, with physical conditioning, crafts, cooking and dancing classes offered for the girls. Children's activities such as playground group games, contests, table games and arts and crafts classes were offered in many of the recreation centers and playgrounds throughout the year (Interview, Virginia S. Baker, November 1, 1988).

Continued Segregation in Recreation and Parks

The programs offered by the Bureau of Recreation were still segregated as were all of the recreational and parks facilities through the 1940s. The Bureau had a separate Colored Division, which operated seven community centers (including Chick Webb), six school sites and four public housing sites (B of R Financial Sheets, 1948/1949). This was in contrast to the twelve community centers, thirty-nine school sites, and four public housing sites operated for whites during school year programming.

In March 1948, the Urban League of Baltimore submitted a letter to the Board requesting a conference on the subject of the Board's policy of segregation in recreational and athletic programs in the Bureau of Recreation. Robert Garrett,

President of the Board, ordered a special committee made up of Board members to confer on the matter (PBM, April 6, 1948).

The Urban League came back to the Board in May 1948 and submitted a report outlining their request. Dr. Bernard Harris, the only Negro member on the Board, agreed with the Urban League and wanted to let the desegregation issue evolve on its own, but not hinder its evolution by maintaining previous policies of mandated segregation, especially in the area of athletics (PBM, May 4, 1948). This current discussion of desegregation was precipitated by a violation of Board policy when an interracial basketball team played at Cahill Recreation Center in December 1947, causing the forfeiture of any games played by that particular team and the disruption of the Amateur Sports 14-16 year old basketball league played at Cahill. In January 1948, the Board ruled that "the policy of the Department of Recreation and Parks of not allowing interracial athletics be continued until further study by this Board" (PBM, January 20, 1948, p. 162). The only dissenting vote on this measure came from Dr. Harris. The Progressive Citizens of America, a political group following the presidential candidacy of Henry Wallace, supported Dr. Harris' efforts, and were described by Robert Garrett as subversive and communist. Garrett indicated that through various court cases, "the separation of races is normal treatment in Maryland. (PBM, January 20, 1948, p. 162).

The next challenge, also in the area of athletics, came again from the golfers. Mr. Charles R. Law requested a hearing after having been refused play at the Mount Pleasant Golf Course, whereby the Board reiterated its policy of making only Carroll Park Golf Course open to blacks. Again, Dr. Harris was the only dissenting voice on the Board, indicating that Carroll Park was not equal, therefore the "separate but equal" argument was not valid. By July 1948 the Board had devised an elaborate system of staggered play on each of the city's golf courses, whereby certain days were for white players, and certain days were open to black players. Mr. Law, however, went ahead with a lawsuit trying to force the issue to desegregate the golf courses totally (PBM, July 20, 1948).

At the same time, challenges were surfacing in the sport of tennis. The Young Progressives of Maryland, the youth component of the Progressive Citizens of America, informed the Board that they would be playing an interracial tennis match in Druid Hill Park on July 11, 1948. R. Brooke Maxwell, Director of Recreation and Parks, advised the group not to proceed in this manner, and any efforts to do so would be dealt with by the Department's Police Division. The Young Progressives went ahead with the match, and a total of twenty-four persons were arrested that day (PBM, July 20, 1948). This case would go through various appeals courts and as far

as the Supreme Court, which refused to hear the case (Kessler & Zang, 1989, p.39).

The the average participant appeared quite willing to engage in interracial play, but the policy-makers were holding the line on desegregation until they were absolutely forced to integrate. In a July 17, 1948 letter to the editor, Ernest Hernsten wrote that "Charles A. Hook, Superintendent of Parks, should be strongly urged by the people of Baltimore to recind at once the un-Christian like order which prevents Negroes and white persons from sharing the recreational facilities together in our Baltimore parks. Let us, by example, show that all Americans are brothers...not second-class citizens." (The Sun, July 20, 1948).

The Board of Recreation and Parks had held firm, however, indicating in a statement to the Baltimore Afro-American (July 10, 1948) newspaper that the Board "was more or less autonomous and could make its own rules" and that the segregation policy was "a practice and custom arising out of the rulings of this Board". This battle would continue to rage on for several more years, as will be documented in Chapter V.

Continued Budgetary Constraints

In addition to the segregation issues facing the Department, the continual cutbacks of the Department of

Recreation and Parks' budget requests made the gains in public support minimal, at best. For example, 1949's budgets for both parks and recreation included only \$186,793 in additions, as opposed to \$900,000 that had been requested, due to City-wide fiscal restraints. The Board protested the cuts to Herbert Fallin, the City's budget director, saying "a cut of that size means something will have to be neglected, and if you neglect proper maintenance of your plant - before you know it, you have nothing left to maintain" (PBM, September 21, 1949). These words would become quite prophetic as the Department dealt with mounting maintenance problems in subsequent years.

As the Department of Recreation and Parks moved into the 1950's, it faced these two major issues:

(1) The lack of budgetary support from the City, which hampered significant expansion of services, even though the City residents were constantly clamoring for new programs, new facilities and new playgrounds.

(2) The segregation issue, which eventually came to a head in the early 50's and forced policy changes that brought the Department into line with national trends.

Summary

The 1940s began with World War II and the development of publicly supported recreation in Baltimore City. Recreation had moved from the private realm of donations from wealthy individuals such as Robert Garrett to fiscal support from the general City budget. With a beginning sum of \$139,144, the Department of Public Recreation managed to operate eight recreation buildings and as many as eighty-seven school sites with a full-time, year-round staff of forty recreation workers. Programs offered ranged from team sports activities for boys, to crafts, cooking and dance classes for girls and playground games and contests for young children (see Appendix F).

The appropriations for Baltimore City in 1940 and comparisons of the Department of Parks, the Department of Public Recreation, and the Enoch Pratt Free Library system are presented in Table 1 (Board of Estimates Appropriations, 1940). The other departments in the City were quite large, and would not lend themselves to a valid comparison. As can be seen, the gap between recreation and parks was quite wide, but the number of facilities and acreage of land was much larger for the Department of Parks and Squares. The Enoch Pratt Free Library System served similar leisure time interests, and was funded accordingly.

TABLE 1
Board of Estimates Appropriations for Baltimore City
(1940)

Department	Amount	% of Budget
Public Recreation	\$ 139,144	.2
Parks	\$ 2,000,000	3.2
Libraries	\$ 552,885	.9
TOTAL CITY	\$61,759,097	100.0

While the segregation issue had begun to take shape, the Negro population of Baltimore City remained quite low. Table 2 indicates the percentage of Negro versus white population in the City in 1940.

The Negro population of less than 20% had a difficult time demanding equal services from an overwhelmingly white population. The separate Colored Division of the Bureau of Recreation operated seven community centers, in contrast to the twelve community centers operated for the white population.

TABLE 2
Population Characteristics of Baltimore City
(1940)

Race	Population	%
White	692,705	80.6
Negro	165,843	19.3
Other	552	.1
TOTAL	859,100	100.0

The Board of Recreation and Parks, headed by Robert Garrett, an avowed segregationist, would not move on the integration of the Department of Recreation and Parks until forced to do so, which occurred in the next decade.

CHAPTER V
DESEGREGATION AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT
OF THE 1950S AND 1960S

The 1950s - Historical Overview

By the beginning of the 1950s the United States had recovered from World War II. The focus of attention was on a different threat, however, the "Red Scare" (communism) and with it, the rise of the McCarthy era, which sought out and persecuted real or perceived communists in the U.S. Fraught with suspicion and paranoia, the "blacklisting" of many well-recognized personalities led to an uncertainty in our reactions to one another. Almost immediately, we were thrust into the Korean War the U.N. forces were sent to battle the North Korean Communist threat.

At the same time, the civil rights movement gained momentum in the U.S. with the Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka Supreme Court decision, which strenthened the demands for equality under the law for all people. The years that followed led to great strides in civil rights, but not without great struggle and serious conflict (Bedford, Colburn, & Madison, 1972).

The City of Baltimore was thrust into the civil rights arena, and the Department of Recreation and Parks had to

adjust its policies to meet the new laws that were being mandated with the public outcry for civil rights.

Racial, Economic and Political Unrest

At the opening of the 1950's the Department of Recreation and Parks was still operating on the assumption of "separate but equal", even though the wall of defense of that philosophy was crumbling. Two members of the Board, R. Wilburt Marsheck and J. Marshall Boone, were vehemently opposed by The Urban League of Baltimore and the Baltimore Chapter of the N.A.A.C.P. when their terms were up for renewal. Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr. backed both members, and they were recommended for reappointments to terms that would last until 1955 (Afro-American, September 27, 1949). The Baltimore City Council, who must approve all appointments, delayed approval of the appointments based on the opposition, and the two men quit (Evening Sun, October 6, 1949). The President of the Board, Robert Garrett, a well-known segregationist, was also threatening to quit as a result of a scandal developing over preferential use of contractors (possibly through bribery) in City construction projects. The department's firing of an employee (Myron J. Cohen) over the matter was being challenged, and if he were reinstated, Garrett threatened to quit. Cohen was found not at fault and reinstated, and on January 27, 1950, Garrett quit the Board of Recreation and

Parks and notified the Mayor of his "protest resignation" (Morning Sun, January 27, 1950). With these three resignations, the black community felt that there was new hope for the integration of the Department of Recreation and Parks. In an Afro-American article (May 6, 1950), Garrett, even though he had been identified with the recreation scene in Baltimore for over half a century, was bid a "not too fond farewell." The newspaper remarked that they thought that the Board of Recreation and Parks would be better off without him.

Through all of this, the Department of Recreation and Parks remained segregated, with a separate "Division of Colored Activities" supervised by a recently promoted Senior Supervisor, Theodore Brown. The creation of the Senior Supervisor position was necessary, due to the expansion of services to the black community and the continual demand for increased services (PBM, July 6, 1949).

As the demand for services increased, unfortunately, the amount of governmental support did not increase proportionally. In April 1950, the Board made an emergency request to the Mayor for an additional \$25,000 to staff and operate four additional recreation centers and playgrounds in Canton, Brooklyn, Curtis Bay and Towanda, all due to open in the summer (PBM, April 25, 1950). All of these facilities, however, were in white areas, leaving the Negro population with the same ten facilities they had utilized in the past.

In 1950, the Board continued to develop creative ways of avoiding the issue of desegregation particularly on its public golf courses. A "grand experiment" had been developed which created alternate days of use on the golf courses by white and black golfers. By June, the "end run" around the desegregation orders previously given proved a dismal failure. The Memorial Day holiday fell on a "colored day," and the result was that only one hundred golfers played the eighteen hole course, as opposed to the four to five hundred players that would normally participate on a "white day." An editorial in the Evening Sun (June 2, 1950) termed this policy "costly, cumbersome and discriminatory" and noted that "an alert Board would change it (the policy) before the Memorial Day experience is repeated."

As the composition of the Board changed, the receptivity of the Board to the issue of integration changed as well. James C. Anderson was named to replace Robert Garrett as President in June, 1950, and three other members, Gerald S. Wise, George G. Shriver, and James H. Gorges had been selected to replace J. Marshall Boone, R. Wilburt Marsheck, and Weston B. Scrimger, all who had resigned in the past few months (PBM, July 1, 1950). The first test case was brought before this new Board in September of 1950, when Earl Koger, of the New Area Neighborhood Association (NANA) complained that at Easterwood Park and Playground the only paid staff member was white and worked with a handful of whites on organized

recreation activities, while four-fifths of those who utilized the area (and received no services) were black. He indicated that the only remedy to the situation was integration. The response from the Board was that they "promised to give the matter attention as soon as possible in connection with its plans for consideration of its whole policy of segregation" (PBM, September 15, 1950).

While this was by no means a definitive statement of agreement with integration, it was certainly a giant step away from the past attitude of the Board. In its September 29, 1950 meeting, the Board discussed the policy of segregation in the park and recreation system and authorized the President to discuss various phases of the subject with the City Solicitor (PBM, September 29, 1950). In October 1950, the Board voted to replace the white program at Easterwood with a black one by December 1, 1950. While not integrating, this still served the needs of the majority of the population in that community. (PBM, October 27, 1950).

The push for integration heated up in October of 1950, however, with the filing of a lawsuit by Linwood G. Koger, Jr. for the exclusion of three black adults and four black children from Fort Smallwood Beach, one of the City's public beaches operated by the Department of Recreation and Parks. The Board and the Director of the Department, R. Brooke Maxwell, were named as defendants (Evening Sun, October 6, 1950). Another lawsuit was filed by Philip Boyer, a white

basketball coach who wanted to coach Negro boys at one of the Department's school recreation sites but was denied because it violated the Board's policy against interracial athletics. The Board was issued a petition of "mandamus" in November 1950 which would force the interracial team to be approved. The Board promptly ignored the petition with the only dissenting voice once again from Dr. Bernard Harris (PBM, November 18, 1950). The hope for an "enlightened" Board seemed to be disappearing very quickly. In May 1951, a ruling by Judge W. Calvin Chestnut of the Federal District Court forbade City authorities "to exercise any discrimination against Negroes" at Ft. Smallwood Beach. Following its traditional pattern, the Board instituted an alternating schedule of "black/white days" at Ft. Smallwood, with whites permitted on the first twenty days of each Summer month (June, July and August) and Negroes relegated to the last ten days of each month (News-Post, May 25, 1951). Much like the situation at the golf courses in 1950, the "colored days" at the beach involved the Memorial Day weekend, with the predictable result of limited bathers at the beach. An Afro-American editorial (June 2, 1951) described the Board as "incompetent" and charged that the changes in its make-up had "not worked out well." The Morning Sun (June 13, 1951) editorial, referred to the Board's solution to the court ruling on the desegregation of Ft. Smallwood as "stupid and callous."

As a result of increased pressure, the Board prepared proposals for changes in the segregation policy of the Department as follows:

(1) Tennis - certain courts would be designated for interracial play, while others would remain segregated as well; the same situation would hold true for athletic fields in the parks;

(2) Playgrounds - much like the tennis courts, there would be supervised mixed play on certain playgrounds;

(3) Swimming pools - will remain segregated;

(4) Ft. Smallwood - alternate day schedule as before;

(5) Golf courses - Effective July 10, 1951, segregation on all City golf courses will end. This revised policy was approved unanimously, with Dr. Harris agreeing to this small progress, but indicating that he would not give up the fight for complete integration (PBM, June 25, 1951).

Over the next several months, the decision on Ft. Smallwood was revisited over and over again, with proposals for the building of separate bathing facilities for Negroes and whites, and relegating separate areas of the beach to the different races (Morning Sun, October 27, 1951). The biggest economic problem to be faced by the Department was the loss of money for the concessionaires at Ft. Smallwood due to the uncertain political climate. Pressure from this group would undoubtedly force the issue to a climax at some point in the near future (PBM - October 26, 1951).

While all of these deliberations were going on, the Bureau of Recreation was beginning to see small increases in the overall budget. The budget for 1952 would increase by 13.5% to \$768,975, while the budget for the Bureau of Parks would increase by a similar amount (12%) to \$2,301,446. The disparity between the budgets of the two bureaus would continue for many years to come, but the Bureau of Recreation was beginning to make progress. By this point in time, the Bureau was supporting approximately one hundred fifty full-time positions, with over four hundred part-time/seasonal positions to program in twenty recreation centers and over fifty playgrounds and schoolyards (Activity Directory, 1951-1952).

In March 1952, the only Negro member of the Board, Dr. Bernard Harris, left to take a position on the School Board. By the end of the month, Rev. Wilbur Waters was named to replace him as the Negro representative on the Board of Recreation and Parks. This representation was important, as the Ft. Smallwood issue continues to surface. Plans were being pushed forward to create separate beaches for both races to replace the separate day schedule. President Anderson felt that the Board "was not ready for complete integration of the races in the use of bathing facilities" (Morning Sun, January 27, 1952).

Baltimore's position on the integration of facilities seemed to change only when it was forced to change by court

rulings; the Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems and Relations, however, felt that the pace was adequate. The local counterpart of this commission, the Baltimore City Committee on Human Relations, met with the Board of Recreation and Parks in September 1952 and requested a report on the racial status of all facilities. Mr. William C. Rogers, Sr., Chairman of the City Commission, indicated that "recreation and parks was doing an excellent job along race relations lines" (PBM, September 26, 1952, p. 198).

The demand for a integration of all recreation and parks facilities continued. In the spring of 1953, the Baltimore Tennis Club, the city's premier black tennis group, pressed the Board for a ban on segregated tennis play. The Board listened, and proposed that the situation be "restudied" (PBM, April 18, 1953). As the Summer of 1953 began and the temperature began to climb, the cry for open City pools became much louder. An article in the Afro-American (July 18, 1953) decried the fact that while there were seven large outdoor pools in the City, six of them were for whites only, with the blacks being relegated to the one pool designated for them in Druid Hill Park. Members of the East Baltimore black community felt that the expectation that they should travel to Druid Hill, located in West Baltimore, was completely unreasonable. By August 1953, Attorney Linwood G. Koger, Jr. of the Baltimore N.A.A.C.P. chapter approached the Board once again asking that they reverse their segregation policy at the

pools to avoid any further legal action. The Board defiantly agreed not to change its policy with the lone voice of Rev. Wilbur Waters dissenting (PBM, August 22, 1953). The Board responded to a Federal Court injunction on segregation that the swimming facilities in the City were equal, and that a new pool for Negroes would be opening in Cherry Hill in 1954 (The Sun, September 24, 1953). In the meantime, the Ft. Smallwood Beach was opened up to all visitors, but few took advantage of the situation fearing problems with mixing the races (Evening Sun, July 28, 1953). The Board was waiting anxiously for the outcome of a court case involving the State of Maryland and its segregation policy at Sandy Point State Park, which had been almost identical to the situation at Ft. Smallwood. The battle went on, but the conclusion to the integration issue was not far off.

Professional Development in the Bureau of Recreation

As the country, state and city continued to iron out the differences to settle the segregation issue, the Bureau of Recreation was dealing with another serious problem - respect for the profession of recreation and adequate compensation for the professionals working in the field. In December 1953, the Board heard a report from the Leadership and Salary Committee of the Maryland Recreation Society, composed of Mrs. Pauline Ridenour of Social Security, Dr. Ellen B. Harvey of the

University of Maryland, Department of Recreation and Mr. L.B. Twist, chairman of the committee. This group had examined the Bureau of Recreation's salary and administrative structure and came to the following conclusions:

- (1) Public recreation is recognized as important;
- (2) Good leadership is the basis of worthwhile recreation;
- (3) The leadership situation in Baltimore is desperate;
- (4) Present salaries do not attract or hold qualified personnel;
- (5) Graduates of state colleges are not applying to the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation;
- (6) The salaries of the professional people are much too low. (PBM, December 5, 1953, p. 349)

The "Twist Committee" recommended to the Board that the starting salary for a Senior Recreation Leader be \$3,800, as opposed to the current \$2,925, and that all other salaries be adjusted accordingly. The Board, in its usual mode of operation, assigned a committee to study the committee's report, with President Anderson indicating that the Department can train its own people through its In-Service Training Program, and doesn't necessarily need to seek (or pay for), college trained people. Superintendent Callowhill had been fighting this battle for many years, constantly asking for salary upgrades for his professional staff (PBM, December 5, 1953).

The problem escalated in February 1954, when Callowhill came back to the Board, indicating that he was having difficulty hiring staff for the Bureau; there were ten vacancies that he couldn't fill, because there were no applicants. The Board responded that the qualifications for the jobs were too high; Callowhill countered that the salaries were too low. The Board indicated that it would "study the problem" (PBM, February 6, 1954, p. 360).

The next month, six members of the Bureau of Recreation's supervisory staff (Leidig, Burdick, Onion, Cottrill, Harris and Godwin) came to the Board with a grievance, complaining about the continued operation of the many recreation centers despite short staff. The Board, unimpressed by their plea and feeling that the Bureau of Recreation was fairly staffed, squashed their grievance (PBM, March 27, 1954).

Finally, in April 1954 the Baltimore City Council, through a petition by the Citizen's Committee for Recreation, a local support group for the Bureau, was made aware of the salary difficulties in the Bureau. The Board was criticized for ignoring the recommendations of the Twist Committee, and asked to reevaluate the situation (Evening Sun, April 24, 1954). At the next Board meeting, the Citizen's Committee for Recreation met with the Board, who informed them of their role and responsibility as the policy-making entity of the Department, and indicated that the decision on salaries would be their decision, and no one else's (PBM, May 28, 1954). By

July 1954, the salaries of the staff of the Bureau of Recreation had been adjusted, with the range for Senior Recreation Leader from \$3,675 to \$4,275, with all other salaries being adjusted accordingly (PBM, July 17, 1954).

The End of Segregation

While all of the professional development issues were occupying the time of the Board, the desegregation issue was moving along quite rapidly in the nation's court systems. In April of 1954, the Supreme Court, in its Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka ruling, held that segregation in the public school system was unconstitutional, and all school systems were to be desegregated at once (Bedford, Colburn, & Madison, 1972).

The Department of Recreation and Parks, however, was not prepared to accept this decision as final for all types of facilities just yet. By 1955, however, the inevitable was beginning to appear. In March of 1955, the Sandy Point State Park/Ft. Smallwood segregation court case had gone to the U.S. Court of Appeals which had ruled that the beaches must integrate. The Board, in its April, 1955 meeting made a motion to encourage the City to join with the State in appealing the decision to the U.S. Supreme Court. Rev. Wilbur Waters agreed, saying that the case should go to the Supreme

Court to "settle the issue once and for all" (PBM, April 15, 1955, p. 479).

That issue was settled "once and for all" on November 7, 1955, when the Supreme Court ruled that the segregation of beaches, parks, golf courses and recreational facilities was unconstitutional. This decision was merely a widening of the earlier school desegregation ruling, prompting Governor Theodore R. McKeldin to state that he saw "no reason" why the State should not go along with the ruling (The Sun, November 8, 1955).

With their backs to the wall, the Board of Recreation and Parks met in Executive Session on the morning of November 18, 1955 and, in a public meeting later that afternoon, voted to approve unanimously the following motion from Rev. Wilbur H. Waters: "I move that the policy of this Board be that the operation of all park and recreational facilities under its jurisdiction be henceforward operated on an INTEGRATED BASIS" (PBM, November 18, 1955, p. 531). Now, by law, the Department of Recreation and Parks was fully integrated. In practice, the reality of this law would take many years to be fully realized.

The Expansion of Recreation Services

Now that the battle for integration was won, the Department of Recreation and Parks, and more specifically, the

Bureau of Recreation, could devote more attention to the much needed expansion of services for the residents of Baltimore. As early as 1953, the City Department of Planning was pushing its "Inner-City Report" which urged the construction of at least thirty-three new recreational facilities, playgrounds and/or playfields in the next twenty years. In 1954, the Board approved this plan in principle, but indicated that it could not commit to the expenditure of any funds at that point. The funds for capital development may have been available, but operating funds were still in short supply. (PBM, September 23, 1954).

The financial picture seemed to be brightening, however, as the Bureau of Recreation's budget rose an estimated 24.41% to an all-time high of \$931,135, while the Parks Bureau's budget rose 13.45% to \$2,656,852. The gap between the two, though still quite wide, was beginning to narrow, if ever so slightly (PBM, July 17, 1954).

The Bureau of Recreation was now operating nineteen community recreation centers, and twenty playgrounds during the school year. When summer came the number mushroomed to thirty-five community centers and forty-nine playgrounds and playfields (Schedule of Activities - 1955/1956). The continual need for trained staff was never more apparent than in 1956, when Mr. Callowhill came to the Board to discuss his Bureau's personnel recruitment situation. He indicated that he had twenty-two leadership vacancies, and that he was going

to begin recruiting students from high school who were not going to college. These were young people who had the potential to work in recreation, would be trained as Junior Recreation Leaders, and would hopefully be placed on a career track within the Bureau (PBM, February 10, 1956).

Callowhill was adamant about the fact that the people of Baltimore were "facility-conscious" and needed to be made aware of the need for professionally-trained (and professionally compensated) recreation staff (The Sun, June 10, 1956). For example, in June 1956, the pool staff received special training to deal with the racial issues that would likely develop as the pools were opened on an integrated basis for the first time. Edward J. Kelly, Supervisor of the National Park System in Washington, D.C., came to address the two hundred white and Negro pool staff on the challenges of working in a newly integrated situation (Evening Sun, June 21, 1956).

The message that the Bureau of Recreation needed additional funding had started to get through to the Finance Department, as the 1956 budget saw the Bureau of Recreation funding finally exceed the \$1 million mark with a total of \$1,018,877. This represented a 20.3% increase over the previous year. The Parks Bureau also continued to enjoyed significant increases, with a 24.4% increase to a total of \$3,482,957 (Evening Sun, July 9, 1956).

While the attendance was down in the public pools for the summer of 1956 (some attributed it to desegregation, while some attributed it to the unusually cool weather that year), attendance at the system's sixty-three playgrounds and forty recreation centers grew dramatically. There were 1,298,963 persons participating, which was an increase of 89,000 over 1955 (Evening Sun, September 21, 1956).

In January 1957, the Board was introduced to the concept of joint school-recreation sites by Superintendent Callowhill. The Department of Planning was amenable to the idea, and the concept was placed in the Department's Master Plan (PBM, January 11, 1957). By March of that same year, the construction of five recreation centers was completed, and by the Summer 1957, the Bureau of Recreation was operating one hundred and five recreation facilities (News-Post, June 21, 1957).

Unfortunately, as the number of facilities increased, the budget for additional staff did not. As early as May 1957, Mr. Callowhill was warning that the Bureau may have to stop leadership on as many as twenty-six playgrounds where attendance was the poorest, among other factors, due to the lack of funds for staff (PBM, May 16, 1957). This would continue to be the state of affairs for years to come. The Bureau, however, always managed to transfer funds from one area of the budget to another to continue programming.

While integration had occurred in 1955, its reality, as predicted, was a bit slower in coming. As the Bureau of Recreation continued to expand, the need for more leaders grew and the opportunities for promotion increased as well. In July 1957, the Bureau was cited for having separate "white and black" employment lists for personnel. Mr. Callowhill wanted the lists to be continued, as white neighborhoods were threatening to "boycott" recreation centers and programs if a black leader or director were placed there (The Sun, July 3, 1957). By December 1957, the separate lists were declared illegal, however, and Mr. Callowhill complied with the ruling.

As the number of recreational facilities continued to increase, the Bureau of Recreation budget expanded minimally. The budget for 1958 was \$1,308,224, while the budget for the Bureau of Parks increased to \$3,403,248 (The Sun, October 21, 1957).

While the number of recreation facilities would vary seasonally, the number of year-round community centers and playgrounds would continue to grow. By 1958, the number of full-time community centers was forty-three, and the number of year-round playgrounds was twenty-three. The Bureau had expanded so much that the supervisory staff had grown from just three supervisors of recreation centers and playgrounds at the beginning of the decade, to seven district supervisors by 1959 (Schedule of Activities, 1958/59). In addition, the plans of the City's fledgling "urban renewal" program to

rejuvenate run-down neighborhoods were beginning to take shape, and the first demonstration project of comprehensive recreation programming in the Harlem Park community was set to begin in February or March of 1959. This project would determine if the rehabilitation concept of slum clearance would work (News-Post, January 29, 1959). As a part of this demonstration project, the development of the school-recreation concept was added, whereby the local school and the recreation facility would be built in conjunction with one another.

The Bureau of Recreation's budget in 1959 increased slightly to \$1,310,645, with the Parks budget seeing a slight increase as well to \$3,526,162 (PBM, July 17, 1958). While the budget did not dramatically increase, the demand for recreation and parks services continued to grow. The Bureau of Recreation now employed 173 full-time leaders and directors in its recreation centers, compared to 193 employees in the Bureau of Parks (Evening Sun, May 1, 1959). The challenge of the 60's would be to meet the increasing needs of the urban population with the same or diminishing resources.

The 1960s - Historical Overview

The first hurdle in the process of complete desegregation had been won in the 1950s, when the Supreme Court ruled that segregation was unconstitutional in schools, parks and

recreational facilities. The second hurdle would be much tougher, which would be the actual implementation of those newly-won rights. The beginning steps toward this implementation began with the first sit-in by black students at the Woolworth's lunch counter in Greensboro, NC, and continued with demonstrations in Birmingham, AL and the epic March on Washington in 1963, where Martin Luther King, Jr. delivered his "I Have A Dream" speech.

The United States became involved in the Bay of Pigs invasion, and saw the erection of the Berlin Wall. The Cuban Missile Crisis had everyone in the U.S. and around the world on edge, and Americans were urged to build "fallout shelters" to protect against the possible devastation of a nuclear war. The need for a release of this type of tension was overwhelming.

President Kennedy was assassinated, and the U.S. headed into the Vietnam War. President Lyndon Johnson declared a "war on poverty" and promised a Great Society (Bedford, Colburn, & Madison, 1972). It was into this decade of uncertainty and upheaval that the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation moved.

Challenges to the Bureau of Recreation

As the 1960s began, the Bureau of Recreation was faced with many challenges - economic, programmatic and political.

The biggest challenge looming over the Bureau in 1960 was the budget. The budget approved by the Board of Estimates for the Bureau in 1960 was \$1,338,387, a mere \$28,000 over the previous year's budget. The Parks Bureau actually received an \$8,000 decrease with a 1960 budget of \$3,518,230.

The Bureau of Recreation, however, was being asked to operate 130 recreation areas for the summer, with its budget stretched to the breaking point (Evening Sun, June 16, 1960). As a result of these cuts, the ability to hire additional staff was gone, and the quality and quantity of programming at each site would suffer. There was another problem surfacing that sought to disrupt the operation of the Bureau of Recreation from within. Due to the expansion of services over previous years, the Bureau was looking to create an Assistant Superintendent of Recreation position to take some of the load from Superintendent Callowhill. This internal promotional position called for a degree from a university and six years of practical recreation experience, with three of that being in a supervisory capacity. In May 1960, Alfred Cottrill was appointed to that position, much to the dismay of the others who were on the promotion list. Harold Jennifer, who was black, scored first on the exam, with Cottrill placing second. Hope Godwin and Helen Harris Lassahn both scored a close third. Each eligible member on the list felt that they should have been chosen for the job, but Cottrill was selected at the request of Superintendent Callowhill, noting that Cottrill had

been employed by the agency for a month longer than Jennifer (Afro-American, March 19, 1960). This decision was attacked by many segments of the community, intimating that race played a significant factor in the choice. Still others thought that sexual discrimination was a factor as well (Hope Godwin Interview, November 11, 1988). All investigations conducted by internal committees could find no hard evidence of bias in the selection, and the matter was closed.

The next crisis that faced the Bureau of Recreation was Superintendent Callowhill's ban on social dancing in Bureau facilities in the Summer of 1960, citing serious behavior problems at the events that had occurred in previous seasons and were beginning to occur again. Teens and parents fought to change this decision, and three top-ranking Bureau officials - Joseph Kaylor, Helen Lassahn and Hope Godwin resigned, refusing to deal with Mr. Callowhill's "dictatorial approach" any longer. The protest by the parents and teens forced Superintendent Callowhill to rescind his ban on dancing (News-Post, July 19, 1960).

The Director of Recreation and Parks, R. Brooke Maxwell, had retired at the end of 1959, and a nationwide search was conducted for his replacement. After reviewing over 100 applications from around the country, the Board appointed Charles A. (Gus) Hook, who had been serving in the position as Acting Director since Maxwell's retirement (PBM, October 3, 1960). The Department would again be headed by a director

with a parks background, so the Bureau of Recreation had to battle for its share of the Department's allotment all over again.

In the preparation of the 1961 budget, the City realized the necessity of holding on to as much as possible of the recreation and parks services in tight economic times. The Bureau of Recreation received \$1,417,652, while the Bureau of Parks received \$3,288,012. This funding, though curtailed, allowed the Bureau of Recreation to employ 126 full-time recreation leaders and 259 part-time leaders for the summer (Evening Sun, June 19, 1961). In addition, 94 recreation locations were offered during the school year (Evening Sun, November 17, 1961).

Although the demand for services increased at a steady rate the funding did not keep up with the demand. In the 1962 budget, the Bureau of Recreation would see a slight (9.5%) increase to \$1,571,798, and the Parks to \$3,293,355. The Bureau of Recreation, additionally, was beginning to offer programs to deal with the problems of urban youth. In 1960, a program called the "Detached Worker" was designed to meet with the young people on the street and work to encourage them into the recreation centers. The purpose of drawing young people into the recreation centers was to offer them the opportunity to participate in constructive types of recreation as opposed to the unproductive leisure pursuits they found on the streets. This outreach program was privately funded through

a \$19,500 three-year grant from the Playground Athletic League Endowment Fund. It started with one worker in 1960, and grew to five members - one supervisor and four detached workers. In the Fall of 1963, it was planned that this program would become part of the Bureau's regular budget (Annual Report - 1962).

Racial Tensions in Recreation Programs

The need for additional outreach to youth became apparent in the Summer of 1962, when racial tensions reached the boiling point at the South Baltimore swimming pool in Riverside Park. On August 18, 1962 James W. Smith, the black recreation leader at the Sharp Street Playground in South Baltimore, took twenty-six of his black children to the Riverside Pool, a previously all white facility, to enjoy a swimming excursion. The young people were allowed into the pool, but, when they attempted to leave, they were accosted, jeered and chased. Eleven police officers and the K-9 corps were called to protect the young people and to restore order. Mr. Smith vowed to return again for other days of swimming (Evening Sun, August 18, 1962). On August 22, 23 and 25, Smith returned with his young people. They were escorted by police as they went swimming and were escorted as far as twenty-five blocks away when they left the pool site (The Sun, August 25, 1962).

Acting Mayor Philip H. Goodman (acting while Mayor D'Alesandro was on vacation), indicated that "the pools are public property and open to all, regardless of race, color or creed" (Evening Sun, August 25, 1962). Smith and the young people came back every day, escorted by police. They even swam in the pool on August 28, 1962, when a bomb scare caused the evacuation of the pool and the desertion by the lifeguards. There were numerous arrests, and the pool was finally closed on August 30, 1962, when someone threw a fluorescent green dye into the pool (The Sun, August 30, 1962). The pool was reopened a few days later, but repeated protests continued until the pools were closed for the summer.

The budget situation seemed to brighten just a bit, when Recreation received \$1,620,190 and Parks received \$3,811,157 for 1963 (PBM - July 17, 1962). The demand for services continued to rise, with communities blaming all types of mishaps on the lack of recreation facilities. When three young children were killed in the Lakeland community in Southwest Baltimore (two in traffic accidents, one by drowning), the community blamed the deaths on the absence of a recreation facility in their community (Evening Sun, November 23, 1962). This community was quickly placed on the list to receive a recreation facility in the near future, while travelling play leaders would fill the gap in the meantime.

The newest project facing the Department of Recreation and Parks was the continuation of the School-Recreation Program. This program was developed in conjunction with the Baltimore Urban Renewal Housing Agency and the Department of Education. The creation of new school/recreation centers, where recreation centers and schools (predominantly elementary) would be built as one facility, would blossom over the next several years as the building boom started (PBM, February 19, 1963). Later in the year, the Baltimore Urban Renewal Housing Agency revealed that it would be spending approximately \$80 million over the next six years in redevelopment projects around the City, with school-recreation facilities most certainly a part of that plan (Morning Sun, July 6, 1963).

As the Bureau geared up for another summer of programs, the fear of continued racial tensions haunted their plans. The situation at the Riverside pool seemed to have corrected itself through rotation of staff and careful monitoring of the community during the off-season, only to resurface at the Roosevelt Park Pool in Northwest Baltimore (The Sun, June 25, 1963). The problem did not last very long due to quick response by the Baltimore City Police and the transfer of several lifeguards, and the summer went on relatively incident-free.

In recent (October 1992) interviews with Alice D. Smith, currently a District Supervisor with the Bureau of Recreation

and James E. Grant, retired Superintendent of Recreation, both indicated that while integration was made official in 1954, it took quite some time for it to actually occur in many of the local recreation centers, if it occurred at all. Alice Smith recalled that, in many instances, the white youth would just vacate the recreation centers, rather than participate with the black children. James Grant indicated much the same, that within a few years time, when the community started to change, the recreation center would follow right behind.

Federal Intervention Begins

As Lyndon Johnson declared a "war on poverty", the fortunes of urban recreation started to pick up. The 1964 budget for recreation and parks would creep up a bit, with Recreation receiving \$1,857,518, and Parks receiving just under \$4 million at \$3,967,292 (PBM, July 16, 1963). City Council President Thomas D'Alesandro, III backed a request for fifteen recreation centers and fourteen playgrounds to be open on the weekends to provide recreational services for children and youth during their time off from school, with a boost of \$63,000 in the Recreation budget. He stated that "he was very surprised to learn that the facilities are closed on Saturdays and Sundays, the days when they are needed the most." (The Sun, October 13, 1963). In addition, the Park Board announced

that it would begin construction of six new recreation centers in 1964 (Afro-American, December 17, 1963).

As 1964 began, the Board of Recreation and Parks was receiving criticism for some questionable land purchases. In its first meeting of the New Year, board members stated feeling unappreciated and cited that "many citizens do not realize the types of programs that are offered through our Department: Golden Age, Amateur Sports, Dancing, Fitness, Archery, Horseback Riding, etc." (PBM, January 3, 1964 p. 572). In mentioning all of the programs listed above, the Board of Recreation and Parks had recognized that the recreation programs as well as the parks were an important part of their service provision.

An additional successful program for the young citizens of Baltimore, the pilot Detached Worker Project, had its final report submitted, and all were in agreement that this outreach program was sorely needed. As agreed upon three years prior, the program would be absorbed into the Bureau of Recreation budget when its grant from the PAL endowment ran out. The Board approved this measure, and the Detached Worker Project evolved into the Street Club Worker Program, which expanded to employ over twenty workers to outreach to the youth of Baltimore (PBM, February 11, 1964).

The continuing need for expanded recreation programs was evident when Mayor McKeldin wrote to the Board asking for the establishment of physically handicapped recreation services.

In June 1964, the Board authorized Superintendent Callowhill to proceed with the establishment of programs and the creation of a new position in the 1965 budget - Recreation Supervisor for the Physically Handicapped (PBM, June 16, 1964).

The 1965 budget improved again slightly, with the Recreation Bureau receiving \$2,019,625 and the Parks Bureau receiving \$4,065,804 (PBM, August 4, 1964). In September 1964, the Board began to consult with the Mayor's Human Renewal Committee concerning the possible funding of recreation programs in connection with the allocation of federal funds arising out of President Johnson's Poverty Bill (PBM, September 8, 1964). This was the first attempt by the Department to secure any part of the massive federal funds that were becoming available.

As these monies became available, the need for comprehensive planning on the part of the City became critical. The Board sent a letter to the Mayor in response to recommendations from the Greater Baltimore Committee, the entity responsible for the development of the center city. The Board indicated that while it agreed that there was a need for overall planning, the feeling was that its present autonomy or authority in planning recreation and parks facilities should not be relinquished. The suggestion was made that the Recreation and Parks Board should have representation on the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission should have representation on the Recreation and Parks Board. Most

importantly, the Board did not want to transfer any of its power over its Capital Improvement Program funds to any other City agencies (PBM, November 17, 1964).

In an effort to answer the demands of these newly arriving Federal projects, the Board commissioned a new twenty-year Master Plan, with the somewhat successful previous twenty-five year plan due to expire in a year. The previous plan proved adequate, but did not anticipate the great expansion and need for redevelopment of Baltimore. Besides an overview of the Department, the new plan provided schematic plans of proposed uses for existing and future park/recreation sites, as well as a projected recreation plan to meet the demands of the City until 1985. The Board heartily endorsed this plan and gave the consultant approval to move forward (PBM, March 9, 1965).

Samuel Hopkins was named as the new Board President, and the search was on for a new Director of Recreation and Parks to replace Gus Hook, who was retiring. The Street Club Worker Project had received a \$106,756 contract with the Community Action Agency (Federal funds), and the new position of Recreation Supervisor for the Physically Handicapped was officially created. Harold S. Callowhill, Superintendent of Recreation had submitted his retirement letter with an effective date of October 1, 1965 and a new era in the entire Department of Recreation and Parks was about to begin (PBM, May 11, 1965).

Harold S. Callowhill, reflecting on his career with the Bureau of Recreation, recalled his forty-two years in recreation, working even before the Department of Public Recreation had been created in the old Playground Athletic League (News-American, June 2, 1965). He called the Bureau of Recreation "his baby," one that he had seen grow from a \$100,000 budget in 1940 to a \$3.5 million budget in 1965. He talked of the 13 recreation centers that he started with, growing to the 53 in the City in 1965, and marveled at the current 234 full-time recreation employees and the 500 part-time employees, as well as the 7,000 volunteers throughout the City. The gains that the Bureau of Recreation had made during his tenure seemed most satisfying to him.

Another change was about to occur in the Department. By July 1965, Douglas S. Tawney was named the new Director of Recreation and Parks. Tawney had previously been in charge of Baltimore's Civic Center, but was quite familiar with the Department of Recreation and Parks. He had worked for the Department for 22 years, first as a District Park Superintendent and then as Stadium Manager at Memorial Stadium (The Sun, July 14, 1965).

An additional change that was occurring, not only in the Department of Recreation and Parks, but also in all of City government, was the move from calendar year budgeting to fiscal year budgeting, to bring the City in line with the State of Maryland's fiscal procedures. As a result, the

budget that was approved was only for half of 1966 - until June 30. For Recreation, the budget was \$1,103,235, while the Bureau of Parks received \$2,262,070 (The Sun, November 8, 1965).

The final change that occurred in 1965 was the hiring of a new Superintendent of Recreation, John G. Williams. Mr. Williams came to Baltimore from a position as the Superintendent of Recreation in Dekalb County, Georgia. At age 32, he brought youth, energy and vitality to the Bureau of Recreation (The Sun, December 8, 1965). With a master's degree in recreation, Mr. Williams came to Baltimore with a distinct philosophy of recreation. In his first interview, he remarked that "we can go down in history as people who used our leisure well, but if we don't take advantage of it, it will be to our own degradation" (The Sun, December 13, 1965).

The first full fiscal year budget (1966-1967) was recommended as follows: \$2,411,528 for Recreation, and \$4,766,058 for Parks. However, the City was working under an "austerity" plan, and \$156,552 was cut from the Recreation budget, with additional funds cut from Parks as well. In a May 9, 1966 Sunpapers article, the Citizens' Planning and Housing Authority (CPHA) called on the Board of Estimates to restore the funding that was cut from recreation and parks noting that "in meeting after meeting, city residents have asked for more recreation facilities in troubled areas, and city officials have repeatedly promised the facilities....the

delivery of these promises is past due - not in words, but in buildings, equipment and adequate staff to provide good leadership" (The Sun, May 9, 1966). This call for action may have been an omen of things to come, as tensions surrounding the urban crisis began to mount.

In May 1966, Vice-President Hubert Humphrey announced the creation of a new summer program for urban youth called "Operation Champ." This program, piloted in Baltimore and nine other cities, provided summer jobs to 280 persons in Baltimore, and basketball and other leisure types of activities to urban youth. Vice-President Humphrey indicated that the purpose of this program was not to head off any potential riots, but "he conceded that if the energy of slum youth is channeled into constructive outlets, it would be less likely to express itself in destruction" (The Sun, May 19, 1966).

The Summer of 1966 saw the rise of the National States' Rights Party (NSRP), a white supremacist group that was advocating white control of the country and a return to segregation. This group and others attempted to hold rallies in the City's parks to incite race riots. After several attempts and a few actual gatherings, the groups were handed a 90-day injunction to prevent any more rallies from occurring (Evening Sun, August 11, 1966). After an unproductive summer, the strength of the NSRP was diluted and had little future impact on the Baltimore community.

Despite all of these distractions, the Bureau of Recreation continued to program to meet the needs of its urban residents. In October 1966, the Bureau was slated to begin its Fall/Winter programming, with 66 recreation centers and 27 playgrounds operated (Afro-American, September 27, 1966). Superintendent Williams, in an effort to launch some new programming efforts, asked the Board to approve a \$5,000 contract with the Children's Theatre Association to provide the following:

- (1) Four showmobile performances at recreation centers during the summer;
- (2) One performance of each of the three plays in their winter series;
- (3) Sixteen hours of in-service training for recreation leaders;
- (4) The provision of a ten-hour Stagecraft course; and
- (5) To have the CTA assist in two plays at two of the Bureau's recreation centers.

This program was one of the first attempts to contract with an organization to provide specialized recreation services to staff and clients alike. At this same meeting, Williams provided the Board with a draft of the complete reorganization of the Bureau of Recreation. In this reorganization, Mr. Williams had created separate positions of Personnel Director and supervisor for Recreation/School Facilities that reported directly to him, as well as a more

centralized approach to the supervision of 58 recreation centers, 82 playgrounds and 60 school sites. The need for the separate Personnel Director was quite clear when it was recognized that the Bureau now had 318 full-time leaders/directors, 108 staff assigned through the Community Action Agency, and 652 part-time seasonal employees for a total of 1,078 employees in the Bureau of Recreation alone (PBM, September 20, 1966).

Superintendent Williams was also looking for ways to attract educated, qualified professionals to the Bureau. He implemented a pilot program in conjunction with the National Recreation and Park Association to provide three, one-year internships to interested students, indicating that "right now, we don't have salaries high enough to attract college graduates" (Evening Sun, February 15, 1967).

The 1967-1968 budget seemed to provide some, but not enough, assistance for the changes and increases in programming. Recreation was slated to receive \$3,609,741, while Parks would receive \$5,272,361 (PBM - January 17, 1967).

Superintendent Williams, ever an innovator, was proceeding with plans to offer high quality training of his recreation staff through an In-Service Training Program. In March 1967, he invited the Board to attend a training session led by Dr. Harold Meyer, nationally recognized recreator and educator (PBM, March 14, 1967). In addition, Williams was working with the Baltimore Junior College in the development of a "Work,

Learn and Train" Program, the beginning of the recreation curriculum at the City's community college, under the direction of the Bureau's previous Superintendent, Harold S. Callowhill (PBM, April 18, 1967).

Frustrated by the continual lack of financial support to expand recreation centers and programs, Williams welcomed public criticism of the scope of the Bureau's programs. In a report issued by the Citizens' Planning and Housing Association (CPHA), the Bureau was criticized for not being "more imaginative and more responsive" to the recreation needs of Baltimore's poorer neighborhoods. Williams agreed with many of the report's criticisms and replied, "I was glad to see this report come out - maybe the publicity will help us" (The Sun, May 21, 1967).

With the continued demand for increased services, and the shadow of urban unrest looming over the country, the Federal money began to roll into Baltimore. In June 1967, the City received over \$400,000 in Federal anti-poverty money for the development of summer recreation programs. Of that money, \$112,000 was earmarked for the Bureau of Recreation to offer its "Expanded Summer Program." Through these efforts, 67 financially disadvantaged youth received summer jobs, an additional 15 summer playgrounds were opened, and, according to Superintendent Williams, the funding allowed the programs to be "taken to the people." The additional dollars supported the fire hydrant sprinkler program, which allowed young people

to stay cool during the "long, hot summer," additional swimming instruction at two new "portable pools," and bus trips and cook-outs for the children. All of these programs were in addition to the 94 year-round recreation facilities that the Bureau was operating (67 recreation centers and 27 playgrounds) (PBM, September 16, 1967).

In July 1967, Mayor McKeldin stepped up anti-poverty measures to avert "what was going on in the rest of the country" (e.g., the riots in Detroit and Newark). While there didn't appear to be any signs of serious unrest in Baltimore, the Mayor did not want to take anything for granted. He made the decision to cancel the fees that were charged for all of the City's swimming pools (The Sun, August 4, 1967), indicating that "this is a minimal sum and can be considered simply the cost of enlarging and increasing our recreation services to children and adults". The only problem that was created from this decision was the great influx of participants to the pools, forcing a temporary walk-out of lifeguards, who demanded a pay raise to handle the crowds. The raise, from \$1.40 an hour to \$2.10, was quickly granted to avert further pool closings, and the rest of the summer proceeded without incident. The budget impact was minimal, since the raise occurred at the end of the summer.

As a result of the summer's experiences, it became very clear that additional effort was going to have to be placed into the expansion of recreational programs. Programs such as

the "Operation Champ" and the "Fun Wagon" programs were helping in taking recreation to the people, especially in the areas of the City with limited recreational facilities (The Sun, October 2, 1967). By November of 1967, the Bureau of Recreation was to begin operating twenty-five of its community centers on the weekends by shifting staff schedules, since the funding for overtime payments was unavailable (PBM, November 14, 1967).

The year 1968 proved to be a pivotal year in the support for urban recreation programs. Having recognized the need and demand for increased services, the City and the nation were developing plans to meet the needs of the urban resident. Joseph H. Rash, the new President of the Board of Recreation and Parks, vowed to work for more playgrounds and play sites for the citizens of Baltimore, as requested by the new Mayor, Thomas D'Alesandro III. Rash stated that "our policy will be to do the right thing for the people of Baltimore" (News-American, February 8, 1968). Time, however, was running out.

In April 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., beloved civil rights leader, was assassinated. The anger, distress and frustration that had been building in many of the nation's urban areas exploded. This time, Baltimore could not insulate itself from the situation and experienced four full days of angry rioting.

The Bureau of Recreation acted immediately to get the word out that its programs would increase to meet the needs of

the community at that point and throughout the summer. Through the operation of its 85 recreation centers, 38 playgrounds and numerous mobile recreation programs, the Bureau would reach out to all communities. Superintendent Williams noted that the Bureau would be funding 40 "travelling play leaders" as opposed to 26 the previous year, five "fun wagons" as opposed to one, and at least six portable pools, compared to two in 1967. He indicated that the recreation budget would increase to well over \$3.8 million, with the possibility for additional Federal and State funding coming in at any time. That statement was prophetic, because in May 1968, the Mayor announced that he was seeking \$2.5 million for the purchase of 50 new portable pools and the construction of five in-ground "Walk-To" pools. These funds would be made available from the diversion of funds from the sale of Friendship Airport to the State (Evening Sun, May 10, 1968).

Superintendent Williams reported to the Board of Recreation and Parks in June that all of these projects were now in place, and "no one who is interested will be without recreational opportunities" (PBM, June 11, 1968, p. 363). With the expansion of programs, the Bureau and the City experienced a busy, but relatively incident free summer.

In September 1968, the Board of Recreation and Parks would approve a \$35,700 contract with the "Operation Champ" program, that was funded by the Model Cities' Agency to provide recreational programming to the inner city. Douglas

Tawney, Director of Recreation and Parks, called this activity a "grass roots, inner-city recreation program which touched some areas not reached by the Bureau due to the lack of funds" (PBM, September 10, 1968, p. 375). This program provided basketball and other sports activities for young people by taking the program into their community, not waiting for them to come to one of the City's recreation centers. In addition, the Camp Concern program was scheduled to begin its second season in the Summer of 1969, with outdoor camping opportunities provided for young inner-city residents at some of the State's military installations (PBM, September 10, 1968).

The continual shortage of funds to handle the increasing demands for services led to an eleventh-hour bailout of the weekend recreation programs by Mayor D'Alesandro in March 1969. With the Bureau running out of funds to pay staff overtime to work on the weekends (as now mandated by union regulations), the Mayor came up with \$15,000 to keep the thirty-five centers open until the beginning of the new fiscal year in July (The Sun, March 29, 1969).

The budget for the new fiscal year reflected the increase in support for recreation and parks services, with a 20.4% increase over the previous year. The Bureau of Recreation was slated to receive \$3,832,221, while the Parks Bureau would receive \$6,748,975 (PBM, January 21, 1969).

In an effort to keep the summer of 1969 incident free, Mayor D'Alesandro again requested that the pools remain free of charge. The Board agreed to do this, and once again the six large park pools remained open to all (PBM, April 22, 1969). The Bureau of Recreation's fifty portable pools would also remain in operation throughout the summer. The only problems that surfaced that summer were the large numbers of participants utilizing the pools and the resultant neighborhood complaints of roving gangs going to and from the facilities (The New-American, June 29, 1969). Increased police protection seemed to keep that situation under control.

In August 1969, Superintendent John Williams presented the Board with a report on the summer programming in the Bureau of Recreation. He indicated that the Bureau operated 106 year-round facilities, as well as 32 summer playgrounds. The staff of the Bureau had increased to 360 full-time employees, with 800 part-time supplemental workers. Two highlights of that summer were the Camp Concern Program, where five hundred inner-city children were involved in outdoor camping experiences at the Bainbridge Naval Station, and the Camp Variety Program, where 400 disadvantaged handicapped and retarded children were treated to a day camping experience at Ft. Smallwood Park and Beach (PBM, August 12, 1969).

Funding continued to develop to provide expanded recreational programs. In November 1969, 22 recreation centers in the Model Cities (center city) Area were kept open

on the weekends with a \$58,028 grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (The News-American, November 13, 1969). As a result of these increases in funding, the Bureau of Recreation created two new positions to handle the expansion. James W. Smith (the playground leader who refused to let the racist mobs at Riverside Park Pool intimidate him in 1962) was named as the Supervisor for Special Projects, a unit that would handle the implementation of all grant-funded programs for the Bureau. In addition, James E. Grant was named the eighth Recreation District Supervisor, to assist in the handling of the City's 106 recreation centers. These positions would assist in "coping with the expanding recreation needs of Baltimoreans" as the Bureau of Recreation moved into the next decade (The Sun, December 5, 1969).

Abruptly on December 5, 1969, John G. Williams, Superintendent of Recreation, resigned. Frustrated by being passed over for a substantial pay raise like those given to other top officials in City government, Williams realized that recreation was never likely to be considered as vital and essential as other city services, and he left the city (The Sun, December 15, 1969). By mid-December, Alfred L. Cottrill, previous Assistant Superintendent of Recreation, was named the new Superintendent of the Bureau of Recreation (PBM, December 16, 1969), and began the daunting task of taking recreation into the 1970s.

Summary

The country and the Department of Recreation and Parks had desegregated, but not without a fight. Only through the Supreme Court ruling of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka in 1954 did the legal basis for integration begin. The Board of Recreation and Parks, however, waited until the Supreme Court ruled in November, 1955 that segregation of beaches, parks, golf courses and recreational facilities was unconstitutional before declaring the Department of Recreation and Parks integrated. The population of Baltimore was changing, as is evidenced in Table 3 (U.S. Census, 1950 and 1960).

The "white flight" to the suburbs had picked up pace, leaving the poorer individuals in the city, demanding more services. The "War on Poverty" had begun in 1964, and the Federal money flowing into the cities had started, as is evidenced by the increasing budget figures listed in Table 4 (Board of Estimates Appropriations, 1950 and 1960). The Department of Recreation and Parks combined shared 2 to 3% of the city's total budget during the 50s and 60s, which was comparable to what they would share in later years as well. As Table 4 indicated, the Department of Recreation and Parks and the Enoch Pratt Free Library system shared similar budget allotments. The Bureau of Recreation would see its yearly

budgets rise from \$568,476 in 1950 to \$1.34 million in 1960 and \$3.8 million at the close of the 60s (Appendix C). This continual increase in funds supported the growth of the Bureau of Recreation facilities from 53 in 1950 (18 community centers and 35 playgrounds) to 65 (42 community centers and 23 playgrounds) in 1960 (Appendix D).

TABLE 3
Population Characteristics of Baltimore City
(1950 and 1960)

Race	Population	%
1950		
White	723,655	66.1
Non-White	225,099	23.8
Other	954	.1
TOTAL	949,708	100.0
1960		
White	610,608	64.7
Non-White	325,589	35.0
Other	2,827	.3
TOTAL	939,024	100.0

TABLE 4
Board of Estimates Appropriations for Baltimore City
(1950 and 1960)

Department	Amount	% of Budget
1950		
Recreation	\$ 568,476	.68
Parks	\$ 2,011,494	2.4
Libraries	\$ 1,153,432	1.4
TOTAL CITY	\$ 83,451,250	100.0
1960		
Recreation	\$ 1,338,387	.55
Parks	\$ 3,518,320	1.4
Libraries	\$ 2,565,027	1.0
TOTAL CITY	\$253,635,632	100.0

While the Bureau maintained its traditional types of recreation programs (sports, crafts and playground activities), new initiatives were added in the 60s that addressed the needs of urban youth after the unrest of 1967 and 1968. Efforts such as the Detached Worker Program, an outreach effort to meet the youth where they lived that encouraged them to participate in Bureau of Recreation programs, as well as the mobile "Operation Champ" program brought the recreational activities to the children in their

neighborhoods. Portable pools were constructed to provide relief from summer heat, and specialized programs such as Camp Concern and Camp Variety (day camping activities for urban youth and handicapped youth, respectively) were added to the growing repertoire of specialized recreation programs of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation.

The clamor for additional recreation programs and facilities was unceasing. The growth of both in subsequent decades is detailed in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER VI
URBAN RENEWAL OF THE 1970S AND THE
CHANGING SOCIAL CLIMATE OF THE 1980S

The 1970s - Historical Overview

As the 1970s began, two Americans had already walked on the moon, and Richard Nixon had been President for over a year, espousing his "Southern strategy," of a Republican return to conservatism similar to the majority beliefs held in such states as Texas, California, New Mexico and Arizona, as well as the remainder of the "old South" (Chafe, 1991). Nixon's efforts to change the makeup of the Supreme Court, to halt the steamrolling liberalism of the Kennedy-Johnson era, was purposeful in his "politics of polarization." Chafe indicated that all of the efforts of the 1954 Supreme Court decision of Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka were being slowed as the Nixon administration sought to promote "freedom of choice" for individuals as far as school desegregation was concerned.

In the foreign policy arena, American involvement in the Vietnam War was struggling to come to an end. The proposed "Vietnamization" of that country, in other words, the turning over of control of the conflict to the South Vietnamese,

resulted only in an escalation of the war on the United States' part. It wasn't until after Nixon had been elected for a second term, in January of 1973, that the Vietnam War came to an end for America. This ending came only after much internal turmoil and protests by the younger generation, that had moved rather decisively toward the left (Chafe, 1991).

This new, younger generation also shared different types of social beliefs - freedoms of sexuality, individual self-expression, and the questioning of the Protestant Work Ethic. These new beliefs had an effect on all segments of life in the 70s.

The end of 1972 and the beginning of 1973 saw the start of the unravelling of the Nixon administration through the Watergate scandal. In 1973, Vice-President Spiro Agnew resigned in an unrelated scandal involving tax evasion. Gerald R. Ford was sworn in as the first Vice-President chosen under the 25th Amendment. The Arab Oil Embargo, which had been in place since October of 1973, was lifted, but gasoline prices would take considerable time to drop. By the summer of 1974, Richard Nixon had announced his resignation from the office of the Presidency, placing Gerald Ford into the job (Wright, 1990). The trust in and status of politicians in American life would never be the same.

By 1978, Jimmy Carter had been elected President, and Californians had passed Proposition 13, which capped and even rolled back property taxes in that state starting a nationwide

taxpayer's revolt. This revolt led to decreased funding available to local governments from tax bases. By the end of the decade, Israel and Egypt had agreed to peace in the Camp David Accord, but Iran had seized sixty-six American hostages at the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. Inflation reached its highest level in over three decades, as the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) doubled the price of oil (Wright, 1990). The turbulent 1970's proved to be a challenge for all.

Recreation and Parks in the 70s

As the decade of the 70s began, the Bureau of Recreation was beginning to see the gradual increase in funding as a result of additional Federal and State aid to the cities after the civil disturbances of the late 60's. After the report of the Kerner Commission (Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968) was issued, it became very clear that recreation programs and services were indeed considered important, and the lack of these services was listed as a grievance in the majority of the cities surveyed, ranking it equally with grievances concerning inadequate education for the children of urban America. The most common specific complaints dealt with lack of adequate recreational facilities and lack of organized programming.

In an attempt to address these grievances, additional Federal, State and local dollars were being funneled into

recreation facilities and programs at a record pace. The fiscal year 1970 budget saw the funding for the Bureau of Recreation rise from \$3.8 million the previous year to an all-time high of \$4,568,428 (Fiscal Year 1970 Budget Booklet, 1970).

In an Evening Sun (April 7, 1970) article, Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro, III indicated that he wanted to see the construction of recreation centers and playlots throughout the city, and would be examining the possible imposition of an unspecified new tax to pay off the bonds issued for the new construction. However, Federal money was soon made available making the imposition of the new tax unnecessary to hasten the uncontrolled growth of new recreational facilities throughout the City. In just a few years, Baltimore had recreation centers within two blocks of each other, in many instances.

The building of the facilities did little, however, to diminish the racism that was still occurring in many areas of the City, fifteen years after the decision to integrate recreation and parks facilities and programs. In April 1970, for example, there was a near riot at a recreation center in the 500 block of South Smallwood Street in Southwest Baltimore when black youths took over the center and refused to let in white participants. Douglas Tawney, Director of the Department of Recreation and Parks at the time, ordered the center closed temporarily and the black leader who had allowed

the situation, Lee Coleman, transferred to another site immediately (The News-American, April 15, 1970).

In addition, there was great conflict between the Bureau of Recreation and members of several of the communities surrounding the large park pools regarding the charging of entry fees. Many community groups, but particularly the neighborhoods surrounding Patterson Park in Southeast Baltimore, were pressing for fees to be charged to lessen the large gangs of youth that would travel back and forth to the pools during the summer, vandalizing property and shoplifting at the small neighborhood stores. In many instances, the complaints were coming from the white residents of the Patterson Park area about the black participants at the pool. There was even a community request for separate times of participation for blacks and whites, which was immediately turned down by the Board as being against the Department's integration policy (PBM, May 12, 1970). When the Mayor was alerted to the fact that the Board was even considering the possibility of reinstituting pool use fees, he sent a letter ordering that the pools remain free. The Board complied with this directive by voting six to one to keep the pools free of charge, with only Commissioner Kaufman voting against the motion. The pools remained free throughout the Summer of 1970, and police protection was added to control the incidences that caused the earlier community complaints.

As the Summer 1970 programming moved into full gear, the addition of nine hundred federally-subsidized summer youth workers supplemented both the Bureau of Recreation and the Bureau of Parks workforce. The normal staff of four hundred full-time recreation staff and three hundred year-round part-time staff were assisted by these workers to operate 93 full-service recreation centers, 44 summer playgrounds, 48 temporary (portable) swimming pools, as well as five funwagons that would travel around the City to areas that did not have a recreation center in their community (The Sun, June 16, 1970).

In addition to the governmental funding, private enterprises were beginning to assist in the provision of specialized recreational programs. Three corporate sponsors - the Sunpapers, the Coca-Cola Bottling Company, and WMAR-TV donated a total of \$22,400 for the Neighborhood Basketball League (NBL), which consisted of 176 teams in 45 leagues housed at 20 different recreation center sites. These added programs did little to ease the racial tensions that were quite prevalent in Baltimore at the time. Along with the recent problems in the Southeast area of the city, the Southwest section was experiencing similar conflicts. The areas of Mt. Winans (black) and Morrell Park (white), while located next to one another, experienced constant racial difficulties. The Bureau of Recreation had community centers in both neighborhoods, but even the recreation programs could

not alleviate the longstanding racism that existed between these two areas, often culminating in fights between rival youth gangs (The Evening Sun, June 18, 1970). The Bureau of Recreation, however, continued its efforts, in these communities, and others.

The budget for Fiscal Year 1971 showed continued improvment for the Department of Recreation and Parks. The Bureau of Parks received \$6.8 million, while the Bureau of Recreation received a record \$5.4 million (PBM, July 14, 1970). While the money was made available, there was serious concern voiced by the media over the lack of recreation programming in the parks (The Sun, August 23, 1970). It was reported that with 360 full-time staff in the Bureau of Recreation and over 140 recreation centers and summer playgrounds, the need to provide comprehensive recreation opportunities was critical.

Superintendent Cottrill of the Bureau of Recreation had reported to the Board of Recreation and Parks that increased Federal money had allowed the Bureau to operate additional playgrounds, expand Camp Variety for handicapped participants, and purchase three additional portable pools, as well as provide bus transportation to various cultural and educational events. In addition, through the Federally-subsidized Summer Lunch Program, over 7,000 free lunches were being served every day during the summer to qualified participants (PBM, August 18, 1970). This description by the media of a lack of

programming was indicative of the Bureau of Recreation's struggle to provide correct and positive information to the general populace, a challenge that would face them in years to come.

This apparent lack of information, coupled with a somewhat distorted view of the value of recreation services, persuaded the private, non-profit Commission on Governmental Efficiency and Economy to call on Baltimore voters to reject six of eight bond issues. This would mean, among others, the loss of funds for the building of five recreation centers, as well as 50% matching aid funding for parks and open spaces (The News-American, October, 1970). As a result of this rather vocal response by the Commission, Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, III called for the abolition of this group, but to no avail. The bond issue for recreation and parks passed, however, at the polls in November.

In a November 6, 1970 News-American article, Recreation and Parks Director Douglas S. Tawney indicated that even with the bond issue passage, the Department would be in a bit of a financial bind. He indicated that "in those areas of the City that are less affluent, where people can't afford to buy recreation, we must try a little harder". His hope was that increased funding could be obtained at the Federal level. He remarked, in this article, that he was absolutely convinced that the crime rate could be lessened by the offering of recreation services.

While Federal monies came to the Department at a fairly regular rate, the State of Maryland also became a player in the provision of recreation services. In December 1970, the Board of Recreation and Parks received a request to accept funding from the State for a \$72,668 grant to provide an after-school program through the School-Community Centers Program (SCCP), designed to keep school buildings open for citizens of selected communities beyond the regular school day (PBM, December 22, 1970). This was the first year of what would turn out to be a long-standing grant from the Maryland State Department of Education.

In March 1971, the Board received a request from Superintendent Cottrill to again participate in the Neighborhood Basketball League (now called the Baltimore Neighborhood Basketball League or BNBL, for short) that had proven so successful the previous year. The Board approved this request, and the BNBL Program would become an ingrained part of the Bureau of Recreation's Spring and Summer program (PBM, March 16, 1971).

The Board of Recreation and Parks received a report from Director Tawney in April 1971 on the progress of recreation facility construction since 1966. It was indicated that sixteen recreation centers, three fieldhouses, and twenty-three playgrounds, playfields or playlots had been built, while thirty-eight playgrounds and squares had been redeveloped and improved. Further, six recreation centers

were currently under contract for construction (PBM, April 6, 1971).

In addition to the facilities that were being built, new programs and initiatives were being developed to meet the needs of the children in the stressed urban areas. At the same meeting the Board also heard of the softball program being sponsored by the National Brewing Co., which provided \$11,000 for softball leagues for children and adults alike.

At the Board's May meeting, funding for the Bureau of Recreation's participation in the United States Youth Games was approved, which was a national sports competition where children between the ages of eight through fifteen competed in a variety of sports, ranging from bowling to track and field. The purpose of this program was to allow children from various urban areas around the country to compete and have the opportunity to visit other cities. For 1971, the youth would be competing in Boston, Massachusetts. The request for such an event for over sixty young people to participate was a mere \$4,500. The expense was approved and this program also became an accepted part of the Bureau of Recreation's summer programming (PBM, May 19, 1971).

In a June 20, 1971 Sunpapers report, the development of the "Patterson Park Peace Project" was announced. In a predominantly white area that had been plagued with problems since the mid-1960's, when a significant increase in Negro children starting using Patterson Park, the community had

become quite polarized, citing increased crime and shoplifting in the small community businesses. The City decided to handle the situation through the development of the "Peace Project," which involved the use of Federally subsidized Summer Youth Workers as monitors to patrol the parks and streets in the area to assure safety and order. The project worked out well, and the opposing members of the community seemed to have some of their negative feelings diffused. Even though desegregation was a fact, some areas of the city would take much longer to embrace the concept than others.

In July 1971, leaders of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Recreation Center, a project started by the Department of Recreation and Parks, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the National Recreation and Parks Association came to the Board of Recreation and Parks for additional help. This project was sponsored by the three aforementioned organizations as a pilot project to see if a recreation center could be entirely run by neighborhood individuals. The Office of Economic Opportunity had been funding the program at a \$15,000 level, but was about to drop its funding due to budget difficulties. The Department of Recreation and Parks was providing \$26,000 a year, and the Board decided that it could not provide any more support (PBM, July 14, 1971). The center, however, managed to stay afloat and is still a functioning entity today with private community funds.

The Martin Luther King center wasn't the only recreation program that was having its difficulties. In October 1971, the well-known Commission on Governmental Efficiency and Economy (E & E Commission) was again recommending to voters that they reject the \$1.2 million bond issue for the construction of four new recreation centers. The Commission had great concern about the operating costs of recreation centers and the apparent lack of information concerning their effectiveness. They indicated that the Department of Recreation and Parks had no real plan to ensure sufficient operating funds for these new facilities. The Department of Recreation and Parks countered that they were seeking the funds from a Federal source (The News-American, October 13, 1971).

In conjunction with the pressure from the E & E Commission, an editorial was written soliciting readers to vote against the \$1.2 million Park & Recreation Loan (The News-American, November 1, 1971). It was indicated that approximately \$80,000 a year was spent to operate one center, which would place "an additional \$320,000 drain on general funds".

However, in 1971, this pressure did not sway the voters. Seven of the eight bond issues offered were approved (including the Recreation and Parks Loan), with the only defeat occurring on the loan for a new Central Police Station (The Sun, November 3, 1971).

For Fiscal Year 1972, the budget picture for the Department continued to look good. The Bureau of Parks received over \$7 million dollars, while the Bureau of Recreation received quite a considerable jump to \$6.3 million. The Federal money was continuing to have a large impact on the provision of recreation services (PBM, July 14, 1971). The Federally funded Public Service Employment Program allowed the Bureau of Recreation to hire eighteen full-time recreation leaders and three additional maintenance workers (PBM, September 15, 1971).

As a secondary boost from the Federal government, Congressman Paul Sarbanes requested that Baltimore be included among 14 major public recreation study areas as a part of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's Nationwide Open Recreation Study program. As a result of this effort, Baltimore was positioned to receive supplemental assistance from the Federal government. In addition to the Federal money, the support from the State continued. The School-Community Centers Program (SCCP) was funded at a \$90,000 level, which allowed additional school buildings to be open for recreational purposes after-school (PBM, August 18, 1971).

As the recession of the early 1970's began to affect local government, all municipal departments began to feel the pressure. The proposed budget for the Department of Recreation and Parks for Fiscal Year 1973 stood at just over \$18.5 million. The Bureau of Recreation would see its budget

decrease just slightly to \$6.19 million. The Board of Recreation and Parks however, was beginning to look for other places for some of the Bureau of Recreation's innovative programs. Harry Kaufman, one of the Board's commissioners, felt that the Street Club Worker Program, which was designed to work with the "hard to reach" children by meeting them on the streets and encouraging them to participate in the Bureau's regular programs, belonged under the aegis of some other agency, such as Housing, besides the Department of Recreation and Parks. This would be at least one program that could be removed from the Bureau's budget. The remainder of the Board did not feel quite the same, and the program remained (PBM, January 19, 1972).

The City's Department of Planning, after completing several demographic studies, was sure that the Department needed to expand its Aquatics Program. They proposed fifty-five new Walk-To Pools to be constructed, and encouraged a \$2 million loan as a part of the November, 1972 bond issue (PBM, February 23, 1972).

By March, the Board of Recreation and Parks had done some investigating, and proclaimed that fifty-five pools was a much too ambitious project, settling instead on possibly six new Walk-To Pools (PBM, March 22, 1972). For once, the Department would not accede to the Planning Department's proposal and begin the building process on facilities that it could not possibly afford to staff or maintain.

As the threat of employee layoffs loomed large throughout the City, pay raises for all employees were frozen, and all of the city's unions vowed to resist the possible layoffs that would occur (The Sun, April 8, 1972). This scenario would be played quite a few times over the next several years as the recession continued.

Despite the economic difficulties, many of the Bureau of Recreation's innovative programs managed to survive. The Baltimore Neighborhood Basketball League continued at a funding level of \$22,500, with generous donations from its faithful sponsors - The Sunpapers, WMAR-TV, and the Coca-Cola Bottling Company (PBM - April 19, 1972). The 1972 United States Youth Games continued in Detroit, Michigan, at a cost of \$4,000 for 75 participants (PBM, May 17, 1972).

Thanks to continued Federal assistance, the Department of Recreation and Parks managed to hold its own in the provision of recreation and leisure services to the citizens of Baltimore. The proposed budget for Fiscal Year 1974 would be just over \$19 million for the entire Department, with the Bureau of Recreation receiving just over \$7 million.

As the City was beginning to receive greater Federal revenue-sharing dollars, the Mayor requested an additional \$1 million from the Federal government for summer jobs for youth and for recreation. These funds would come directly from the revenue-sharing pot, with the Bureau of Recreation receiving \$350,000 and the Mayor's Office of Manpower Resources (MOMR)

receiving the balance of \$650,000 (The Evening Sun, March 14, 1973).

State funding also aided in the provision of recreation services. Again, the School Community Centers Program (SCCP) provided over \$180,000 for the City of Baltimore, with the Department of Recreation and Parks receiving over \$100,000, with the remainder going to the Department of Education (PBM, May 16, 1973).

The Bureau of Recreation continued to participate in the United States Youth Games, with 73 participants going to Birmingham, Alabama in 1973 for a cost of \$6,000. In addition, a long-standing Equipment Donation Program, sponsored by WBAL Radio and the Baltimore City Fire Department netted over two truckloads of used sports equipment for use by all of the City's recreation centers and programs.

As programming efforts in the Bureau of Recreation grew, Donald A. Millard was named as a new Assistant Superintendent of Recreation to work a Wednesday through Sunday schedule to keep track of the Bureau's many weekend programs (PBM, June 20, 1973). The reality of the impracticality of some earlier initiatives on the part of the Bureau of Recreation such as the portable pool program were becoming quite evident.

In June 1973, the Bureau of Recreation realized that it was close to impossible to continue to maintain its portable swimming pool program, as the pools were constantly vandalized. The Bureau of Parks had no intention of closing

the permanent park pools, yet the Bureau of Recreation could not keep up with the repair of the portable pools (The News American, June 21, 1973).

The Aquatics Program was shifting its efforts to the permanent pools, not only in the parks, but the "Walk-To" permanent pools that were located in various neighborhoods. Additionally, the Bureau opened the newest indoor pool, the Cherry Hill Aquatics Center, in July 1973 (The News American, July 18, 1973).

By September, the Board of Recreation and Parks had authorized the phase-out of the portable pools, citing exorbitant costs of maintenance due to the high vandalism (PBM, September 19, 1973). As a result of this phase-out, the Bureau of Recreation presented the new "Swim and Splash" Program at the remainder of the permanent pools, under the direction of T. Madison Garrison, the new Aquatics Program Supervisor (PBM, October 17, 1973).

The Bureau of Recreation had participated in the United States Youth Games for several years, and was ready to host the games in Baltimore in 1974. The championships would be held in Baltimore, hosting twelve cities at a cost of approximately \$60,000, pending Board of Recreation and Parks approval. The Board approved this event, and the plans began for August 1974 (PBM, September 19, 1973).

The State of Maryland continued to provide funding for recreation and parks projects, with the utilization of Program

Open Space (POS) funds for the construction of one recreation center, one playground and three swimming pools. Program Open Space funds were made available throughout the State through a designation from the real estate transfer tax, and were made available for land acquisition to prevent wholesale development of open space. Since Baltimore City was quite landlocked, with little available land for purchase, the State allowed the City to use the funds for construction and renovation of existing facilities (The Evening Sun, December 12, 1973).

In addition to this funding for construction, the City still allotted funds for further construction of new recreation centers. In November 1973, the bid was accepted for the construction of the Bureau of Recreation's only round recreation center - Mary E. Rodman in West Baltimore (PBM - November 28, 1973). At present, this center uniquely remains the only round recreation center in the system.

The Fiscal Year 1975 budget was quite comparable to the 1974 budget with an increase of just over \$500,000 for the Bureau of Recreation to \$7.5 million. The method of funding, however, was quite significant, with \$1 million of that total coming from Federal grant funds, and approximately \$6.5 million from Federal Revenue Sharing monies (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1974). The Bureau of Recreation was now almost completely reliant on Federal funds for the provision of its programs. The reliance on Federal

funds would become more significant, as the Department of Recreation and Parks moved closer to the 80s.

An Evening Sun article (January 16, 1974), reported that the use of Baltimore's recreation programs was increasing by a rate of 5% per year. The article went on to note that one of the most frequent requests sent to Mayor Schaefer was for more recreation programs. For the past fifteen years, voters have approved bond issues for capital improvements in the Bureau of Recreation. A current bond issue was proposed for \$7.5 million for the construction of twelve new recreation centers and ten permanent Walk-To pools by the spring of 1975. In January 1974, the Bureau of Recreation was operating 106 year-round recreation facilities, including twenty-two dual purpose facilities (recreation wings), used by both recreation and education. Superintendent Cottrill indicated that these types of facilities are an advantage to both departments, with each agency getting full use of the facility at different times during the day.

As the use of recreation services increased, Baltimore was preparing for the summer's arrival of the United States Youth Games. The Games were being promoted and partially sponsored by The News American. This was the seventh annual event, with the Youth Games having started in 1967 (The News American, April 24, 1974).

Baltimore was not only being placed in the limelight by the United States Youth Games, but it was also receiving

additional funding from the Federal Government. A June 4, 1974 article in The News American reported that the City would be obtaining over \$689,000 from the Federal Model Cities Program through four grants for Model Cities Project Sites consisting of various parks and playfields. The aid from the Federal Government continued through the Summer of 1974 with the Federally funded Baltimore Summer Corps and the Baltimore Urban Corps, as well as the Summer Lunch Program that served over 30,000 children free lunches when they participated in organized programs (The News American, June 22, 1974).

The proposed budget for Fiscal Year 1976 saw an approximately million dollar increase for the Bureau of Recreation. The budget would stand at \$8.5 million, with over \$4.5 million coming from Federal grant funds, and the remaining \$4 million from revenue sharing monies (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1975).

Inflation, however, made this budget increase practically negligible. In an effort to maintain as much service as possible, the Bureau of Recreation was planning to cut some of its programs such as Swim and Splash, Camp Concern and the Summer Playground part-time staff in an effort to save \$143,500 and avoid possible layoffs (The Evening Sun, April 1, 1975). The Federal and state support came through, however, and all of the Bureau of Recreation's programs continued throughout the Summer of 1975, with over \$150,000 to support programs such as Camp Concern, Camp Variety for special

populations, the Summer Lunch Program, and Recreational Support programs such as bus transportation for various cultural events (The Sun, June 21, 1975).

After a successful year as host of the United States Youth Games in 1974, the Bureau of Recreation requested Board approval to travel to Fort Worth, Texas for the 1975 Games. The request for approximately \$11,600 for sixty-six participants and eleven coach/chaperones was approved and Baltimore's participation in the Games continued. In addition to the Youth Games, the Bureau of Recreation announced its participation in the Pepsi Mobile Tennis Program, which provided the opportunity for young people in urban areas to learn to play the game of tennis, long considered an elitist sport (PBM, June 18, 1975).

The Bureau received a \$115,000 Federal grant to expand recreational services in the Park Heights area of Northwest Baltimore as a part of that area's Urban Renewal program (PBM, July 23, 1975). In addition, State funds through the School-Community Centers Program were made available at a level of \$122,000 to the Department of Recreation and Parks, and \$42,000 to the Department of Education (PBM, August 27, 1975).

During the Summer of 1975, there was serious pressure placed on the City by the City Council members to release some funds from its \$52 million budget surplus to help to keep recreation centers open on the weekends. Mary Pat Clarke, a 2nd District City Council candidate, remarked that it was

ironic to close the centers on the weekends in view of the public's concern over the increase in juvenile crime (The Evening Sun, July 29, 1975). This pressure continued well into the fall of the year, when the City Council asked the Mayor to restore \$100,000 to the Recreation and Parks budget to keep the centers open on Saturdays, at the least (The Evening Sun, October 17, 1975).

Funding for the Bureau of Recreation fell in Fiscal Year 1977 due to the loss of some of its Federal funds. The Bureau of Recreation was funded at close to its Fiscal Year 1974 level of \$7.1 million (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1976). The majority of these funds were made up by the Federal revenue sharing dollars, with the loss of several of the specialized grant-funded programs.

Capital programs, however, continued at a fast pace, as six new recreation centers opened during this bicentennial year (The News American, April 11, 1976). The constant building of new facilities without adequate operating dollars would continue to plague the Bureau of Recreation in years to come.

The glitter of Harborplace, the new retail shopping/entertainment complex in downtown Baltimore that was opened in 1976, would overshadow some of the conventional types of recreation activities provided by the Bureau of Recreation, but new center construction continued.

In an effort to provide adequate staffing of these centers, the budget for Fiscal year 1978 increased to \$10.5 million for the Bureau of Recreation (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1977).

However, the Federal funds were starting to dry up. As early as April 1977, the Department of Recreation and Parks was slated to lose over \$2 million from its almost \$30 million budget. These cuts would result in the loss of part-time salaries for recreation centers, the elimination of the Camp Concern program for urban youngsters and Camp Variety for Baltimore's special populations, and the phasing out of the Street Club Program. In addition, pools would close a week early during the summer, and all of the City's three ice rinks would be closed (The News American, April 13, 1977).

At the same time, construction funds from the Federal government were still available. In July 1977, the City was waiting for U.S. dollars to become available to pursue the construction of new tennis courts and playgrounds for recreation and parks (The Sun, July 28, 1977). By November of 1977, however, the Bureau of Recreation was closing its centers on the weekends, since the overtime paid to employees had been cut from the budget (PBM - November 30, 1977).

In January 1978, it was reported to the Board of Recreation and Parks that the Bureau of Recreation would be receiving over six hundred summer youth workers as part of a new \$25 million Federal Youth Program. These seasonal

positions would assist with programming in the Bureau, as programs expanded for the summer's activities (PBM, January 18, 1978). The possibility of layoffs in the entire Department of Recreation and Parks loomed large, as the city's Department of Finance was recommending cuts to the Recreation and Parks budget of \$5 million. The Department had originally proposed \$32 million for its Fiscal Year 1979 budget, but the Department of Finance wanted the cut to be almost \$2 million below the Department's Fiscal Year 1978 request of \$29 million. With these cuts, it would be increasingly difficult to continue to support the Department's over 1,400 full-time employees (The Sun, February 20, 1978). The Bureau of Recreation would see its Fiscal Year 1979 budget fall approximately \$1 million to the level of \$9.5 million (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1978).

As a result of these cuts, the Bureau of Recreation would be forced to significantly curtail many of its standard programs. For example, twenty-four of its summer playgrounds would not open, and activities at the Bureau's swimming pools and ice rinks would close a week earlier than planned to meet the budget targets. In addition, all aquatics programs in schools would be discontinued, as well as basketball leagues housed in eighteen neighborhood centers in schools. Finally, all Bureau of Recreation participation in any weekend or after-hours special events would be halted, since the money was not available for any overtime (The Sun, March 30, 1978).

In addition to the inflation problems plaguing the entire country, the move to hold the property tax rate at \$5.99 had become strong. Buoyed by the success of Proposition 13 in California, the taxpayers' revolt was spreading rapidly across America.

In an editorial in The Sun on April 3, 1978, the newspaper noted that Douglas S. Tawney, Director of Recreation and Parks, was having considerable difficulty in dealing with the cutbacks. The editorial stated that "Mr. Tawney is known as a fat-free administrator who has only flesh and bones in his operational budget, so when he says that staying within Mayor Schaefer's budget ceiling will be painful, it has to be taken seriously".

Not only was the City dealing with the pressure to keep taxes as low as possible, but it was also receiving pressure from the residents of the City to be accountable for the way it spent its funds. As a result of this pressure, new performance evaluation procedures were implemented by the Civil Service Commission at the beginning of the new Fiscal Year (July 1, 1978), in an effort to strengthen the accountability of City employees and have an effective way of measuring performance (The News American, May 19, 1978).

Mayor William Donald Schaefer continued to look for other methods of bringing money into the cash-starved City of Baltimore. The Board of Recreation and Parks was informed in August 1978 that all department heads had been directed by the

Mayor to attend their respective professions' national conventions with the hopes of bringing those conventions to Baltimore, since the new Convention Center would be able to handle those types of events (PBM, August 23, 1978). The Board began looking into the possibility of Baltimore hosting the National Recreation and Park Association Congress, as well as other smaller organizational meetings. The possibility of holding the National Congress was tabled for future discussion.

The Fiscal Year 1980 budget would see a very small increase to the Bureau of Recreation, with approximately \$150,000 more than the 1979 budget, bringing it to the \$9.7 million level (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1979). With escalating inflation, this small amount of money would mean continued curtailment of programs.

As a result of the budget difficulties, but also with a long-standing policy of fostering expansion of recreation and parks facilities with little regard for maintenance, the Bureau of Recreation would come under attack for the deterioration of its playgrounds and other facilities (The Sun, May 23, 1979). Many of the facilities that were built during the 50's and the 60's were in need of serious repair and renovation work, with little money available for that type of preventative work, considering that over 80% of the Department's funds were dedicated to personnel resources (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1979).

In an effort to expand the range of services of the Department, the Board of Recreation and Parks approved the assumption of the duty of operating the USS Torsk, the retired World War II submarine that sunk the last Japanese ship during the Pacific Campaign (PBM, July 18, 1979). The positive aspect of this endeavor was that the Torsk would be the first ship of several to become part of the Department's Maritime Museum, based in Baltimore's Inner Harbor. The Maritime Museum was a revenue-producing facility, that helped to underwrite its cost of operation. This was one of the Department's first efforts at operating a true revenue-producing facility, which showed the capabilities of the Department in a business atmosphere. As the 1980's approached, the Department of Recreation and Parks was moving toward a new method of operation.

The 1980s - Historical Overview

As the 1980s began, America still had hostages in Iran, and the Republicans were seizing control of Congress for only the second time during the last fifty years. In 1981, the American hostages in Iran were freed minutes after President Ronald Reagan took his oath of office. Not long after he assumed the Presidency, Reagan survived an assassination attempt by John Hinckley in Washington, D.C. The first successful space shuttle mission was completed in April of

1981, and Sandra Day O'Connor was confirmed as the first woman on the Supreme Court. "Reaganomics" took shape, as Congress approved President Reagan's plans for tax cuts, decreased domestic spending, and a massive defense budget increase (Wright, 1990).

By 1982, President Reagan called for a "New Federalism," where many programs previously provided by the Federal government were assumed by state and local jurisdictions, or were eliminated. Unemployment exceeded 10% for the first time since the Depression, and the Federal budget deficit grew to over \$100 billion.

The United States became part of the United Nations peacekeeping force in Lebanon in 1983, and also combined with several other Caribbean nations to invade Grenada, to overthrow a Cuban-backed government. President Reagan requested funding of the Strategic Defense Initiative, more commonly known as "Star Wars" (Wright, 1990).

As President Reagan's first term as President neared an end, economic recovery began as unemployment fell, the inflation rate dipped, and economic growth increased. The President faced challenges, however, from a wide range of candidates, such as Geraldine Ferraro, the first woman Vice-Presidential candidate for the Democratic Party, and Jesse Jackson, the first nationally recognized black candidate to seek the Democratic nomination for President. Reagan won his second term by a landslide.

In 1985, as more tax and budget cuts were approved in an effort to sustain economic growth, the Gramm-Rudman Act was signed into law by President Reagan, which ordered automatic spending cuts if Congress could not find ways to reduce the ever-growing Federal deficit. By 1986, the United States had attacked Libya in retaliation for two American deaths in a terrorist bombing. Reagan refused to back down on his "Star Wars" program, as he negotiated with Gorbachev of the Soviet Union. The Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) had killed over 10,000 Americans, with many more yet undiagnosed, and the Space Shuttle Challenger exploded after lift-off in Florida. The nuclear reactor at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union malfunctioned and exploded, sending renewed fears around the world concerning nuclear power.

The stock market closed over 2,000 for the first time in U.S. history in 1987, and the trade war between the U.S. and Japan escalated. Bernard Goetz, the New York City "Subway Vigilante," was cleared of most of the major charges placed against him in the shooting of the individuals who attacked him on the subway. The national debt continued to soar, and Lt. Col. Oliver "Ollie" North became a national folk hero as he was investigated as a part of the "Iran-Contra" scandal.

International terrorism continued in 1988, with the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, and the United States accidentally shot down an Iranian passenger plane in the Persian Gulf, where it was protecting Kuwaiti oil

tankers from terrorist attacks. Vice-President George Bush became President, and the AIDS crisis continued (Wright, 1990). This was the national and world stage that the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks played on as it moved into the 80s.

Recreation and Parks in the 80s

The Fiscal Year 1981 Budget Proposal saw the Department's overall funding request rise to just over \$33 million (PBM, January 23, 1980). The Bureau of Recreation would receive a slight increase to \$10.1 million (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1980). This funding level was almost \$4.8 million dollars over the request from the previous year. Mayor William Donald Schaefer was distressed that the Department of Recreation and Parks, along with several other City departments, requested such a big jump in funding. The impending loss of over \$26 million in revenue-sharing funds as the Federal Government began to divest itself of operational responsibility for many long-standing programs and turn them over to state and local authority caused great concern. The Mayor had hoped that the agencies would hold the line on increased spending in preparation for that possible funding loss (The Evening Sun, January 9, 1980).

As possible funding problems loomed, the Department of Recreation and Parks opened the U.S.S. Torsk in March of 1980

to the general public (The Sun, March 16, 1980). This attraction at the Inner Harbor was the harbinger of things to come for the Department, as it looked for other types of revenue-producing programs and facilities to help ease its budget woes.

By March 1980, Alfred Cottrill, Superintendent of Recreation, had become ill, and the Bureau of Recreation was being administered by its two Assistant Superintendents, Donald Millard and Ralph Chase (PBM, March 19, 1980). This would mark the beginning of the "changing of the guard" that would occur over the next two years.

By the summer of 1980, as Federal funds started to dry up, Mayor William Donald Schaefer and the City turned to innovative ways of financing construction projects and other programs. The City Trustees were developed, which was a two-man, in-house City bank that controlled over \$100 million in public money to fund these projects. The City's Director of Finance, Charles L. Benton, and the Chief of the Bureau of Treasury Management, Lawrence Daley were the Trustees that oversaw the provision of these funds. This quasi-public entity was designed as a "convenient way around the often cumbersome political and bureaucratic restrictions outlined in the City Charter" (The Evening Sun, May 29, 1980).

Fortunately, the City, and the Department of Recreation and Parks, managed to hold on to some of its revenue-sharing funds. In addition to these funds, the Bureau of Recreation

still managed to obtain funding from a Social Service Block Grant, the Title XX Program, that helped to fund summer programs such as Camp Concern and Camp Variety. Camp Concern provided a free summer camp to urban children that included overnight camping activities in Druid Hill Park, while Camp Variety involved the day camping program for handicapped individuals (The Sun, July 28, 1980).

The Bureau of Recreation was facing the reality of not having enough funds to keep its swimming pools open on the weekends during the Summer of 1980 (The Evening Sun, August 18, 1980). The era of budget tightening had begun.

There were times, however, when a small portion of new Federal money would be made available to the Bureau of Recreation. For example, in September 1980, a small grant of \$60,000 from the City's Housing and Community Development Agency became available to the Bureau from a Community Development Block Grant to provide a youth football program for children in the low-income areas of West Baltimore (PBM, September 17, 1980).

The Fiscal Year 1982 Budget was proposed at a level of \$32.26 million, with the Bureau of Recreation receiving just a small increase over its Fiscal Year 1981 Budget to a level of \$10.5 million (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1981). The Bureau saw its grant funding, which had numbered in the millions of dollars in the 1970's, fall to a mere \$677,699 in Fiscal Year 1982.

Changes, however, were beginning to happen very rapidly in the Department of Recreation and Parks. In April 1981, Douglas Tawney, found himself pulling double duty, at the request of Mayor Schaefer, as the interim Director of Baltimore's Civic Center, while keeping his position as the Director of Recreation and Parks. As a result of this situation, the Board of Recreation and Parks approved the request for the creation of a Deputy Director's position, to assist in the operation of the Department (PBM, April 22, 1981).

By August 1981, over forty full-time positions in the Department had been lost to budget cuts, and four hundred part-time staff were laid off to meet the Fiscal Year 1982 allocation adjustments. Due to the loss of Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) funds, 120 positions funded by this program were phased out (PBM, August 19, 1981).

After the death of Alfred Cottrill, Superintendent of Recreation in September 1981, applications were accepted for that position (PBM, September 23, 1981). By December of that year, James E. Grant, former Personnel Supervisor, was named the new Superintendent (PBM, December 16, 1981), and Larry Rose, a relative newcomer to the Department of Recreation and Parks, was named Deputy Director of the Department by February 1982 (PBM, February 17, 1982).

By June 1982, Douglas Tawney had retired as Director of the Department, and Larry Rose had assumed the position of

Acting Director (PBM, June 16, 1982). Little did Mr. Rose realize the difficulty in which the Department would soon find itself.

Continuing budget cuts had led to additional layoffs of full-time staff in the Bureau of Recreation, forcing the complete wipe-out of the Recreation Aide class, which was the entry level position for the Bureau. While the Department as a whole had 1044 budgeted positions, it was having serious problems being able to fill vacant positions. The Bureau of Recreation alone had 524 budgeted positions, with 96 vacancies. Many of the vacancies were not allowed to be filled, and were used as salary savings to assist the Department in reaching its budget targets. As had been common practice since the beginning of the 1980's, when fifteen centers were closed, there was discussion of possible closure of some additional recreation centers due to the shortage of staff (PBM, August 11, 1982). The Bureau was now operating 100 full-time recreation centers, with 98 supervised by District Supervisors, and two facilities, the Variety Club Recreation Center (for the handicapped) and the Cherry Hill Aquatics Facility, supervised by Special Program Supervisors.

The Bureau's Fiscal Year 1983 Budget of barely over \$10 million dollars, and the drop in grant funds to an all-time low of \$444,300 (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1982), forced to search for alternative sources of funding in order to maintain as many of the programs as

possible. In January 1983, the Bureau embarked on a rather controversial project to allow video games in its recreation centers as a way of generating funds. The project started with a five-week trial period with only six centers desiring to have the games. The Baltimore City Council, horrified at the "commercialization" of the community recreation centers, introduced a bill to ban the games from the centers. The Board of Recreation and Parks, who had been reviewing the project, encouraged interested City residents to oppose the bill if they thought that the games were having a positive influence in their respective recreation centers (PBM - January 19, 1983). After the initial furor, the games remained in the centers, if they desired to keep them, with limited programmatic and financial impact. Once the early attraction of the innovation was over, many of the centers removed the games due to the constant supervision that was necessary to keep order.

Even with the impending budget cuts, the City still continued to build recreation centers, replacing some older, dilapidated structures. In April of 1983, construction began on the new Fort View Recreation Center in Southeast Baltimore for \$600,000 (PBM, April 27, 1983).

In an effort to raise funds, Director Larry Rose came before the Board in May 1983 to request approval for the initiation of fees and charges for specialized recreation programs and activities. The Board rejected his requests, not

quite ready to accept the reality of fee-based programs as a survival technique for the Department (PBM, May 18, 1983). However, by September 1983, the Board did allow Recreation Superintendent James Grant to sell Nestle's Chocolate candies to raise funds to support initiatives proposed by the administrative offices, with a goal of approximately \$1,000. This revenue-producing effort was acceptable to the Board, since it didn't involve direct fees for recreation services (PBM, September 21, 1983).

Fiscal Year 1984 saw the Bureau of Recreation receive a slight increase to \$10.7 million, while its grant funding remained steady at the \$444,300 level (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1983). However, Fiscal Years 1983 and 1984 had seen the Department of Recreation and Parks faced with significant hiring freezes, except for critical positions, that depleted its staff even further, as current employees left the Department's service.

The Department of Recreation and Parks, but particularly the Bureau of Recreation, was about to undergo substantive changes with the appointment of a new Director of Recreation and Parks, Chris T. Delaporte, in November of 1983. Larry Rose, who had been serving in the capacity of Acting Director, would remain as Deputy Director for some time (PBM - November 16, 1983). At this same Board Meeting, James Grant reported to the Board that his Candy Fundraiser netted the Bureau of Recreation over \$33,000. A new era of revenue producing was

born, and Mr. Delaporte was just the Director to promote this, with his extensive development experience.

The Delaporte Years

As 1984 began, the Department of Recreation and Parks moved into its most creative, yet tumultuous years. Chris Delaporte had actually been Mayor William Donald Schaefer's choice for Director, as the Board of Recreation and Parks had previously chosen Larry Rose. Rose remained only an "Acting" Director for almost two years - never approved or confirmed as permanent Director of Recreation and Parks, and relegated to the position of Deputy Director when Delaporte arrived (Esworthy Interview, 1992).

Chris Delaporte came to the Department of Recreation and Parks with a mission. He was brought to Baltimore from an illustrious past, having worked for Jimmy Carter in Georgia's parks system and again as a member of his administration in the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, a part of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. His mission was to "overhaul the antiquated recreation" system in Baltimore (The Sun, December 30, 1984, p. 4A).

Less than six months after he became Director, Delaporte was before the Board of Recreation and Parks, asking permission to put out a request for proposal to have a private non-profit corporation manage the City's five golf courses.

These facilities had been losing money for years, as their physical condition continued to deteriorate due to lack of funding and staffing problems (PBM, February 15, 1984). The golf courses would be just one of several of the City's programs that would be privatized over the next few years.

Delaporte's goal was to build Olympic-class sports facilities, beginning with a new indoor ice arena, followed by an indoor soccer arena, rowing facility, velodrome for cycling, and indoor track and field facility. With general City budgets being quite tight, he became involved with a relatively new method of funding these types of facilities.

The creative method of funding was called a conditional purchase agreement, which sought private funding, which the City would pay back over a period of years. This agreement would allow the City to fix the cost of the debt service retirement over a designated period of time. The difference between this method and the normal method of obtaining bond issue funds was that approval for this effort did not have to go before the voters as a loan question. The City's Board of Estimates could approve this debt without affecting the \$35 million debt ceiling that the City had to abide by, since that ceiling pertained only to general obligation bonds (The Sun, December 30, 1984).

In March 1984, the Board of Recreation and Parks was presented with a proposal for the constuction of a new ice-skating facility in Northeast Baltimore (PBM, March 28, 1984).

Two months later, the Board was asked to approve \$25,000 to send Baltimore youth and several staff members to the Hurricane Island Outward Bound Program in Maine, a leadership training program designed to promote team building, communication skills, creative problem solving, and physical training through a wilderness adventure activity. The Board approved, and the Department's relationship with the Outward Bound Program began (PBM, May 9, 1984).

Fiscal Year 1985 saw the Bureau of Recreation receive an ever so slight increase in funds to a level of just over \$11 million. In an effort to relieve the Department of additional fiscal constraints, the Board of Recreation and Parks was asked to approve the transfer of the management of the Baltimore Zoo to the Baltimore Zoological Society, Inc. (BZS), a private non-profit corporation. This would allow the BZS to raise funds that the City could not raise, due to complicated municipal finance procedures (PBM, June 20, 1984).

By September 1984, Mr. Delaporte had engineered the creation of the Parks and People Foundation, a private, non-profit organization whose purpose was to raise funds for recreation and parks programs and activities. Ms. Nan Warren was appointed Executive Director of the foundation. (PBM, September 26, 1984). At the September Board meeting, the proposal for the construction of a new Olympic-class rowing facility was presented to the Board for review.

The Department received a 5% reduction in its Federal Revenue-Sharing funds in November 1984, as the divestment of the Federal Government in local programs reached a new level. This reduction was just a small omen of things to come (PBM, November 14, 1984).

At its next monthly Board meeting, Mr. Delaporte presented a proposal to begin charging fees for the use of the Department's swimming pools in the summer of 1985, use which had been free since the late 1960's. In addition to those charges, he also presented a proposal for fees for the use of designated tennis courts. Both proposals were tabled, but arose in the near future (PBM, December 12, 1984).

As 1985 began, it became quite evident that the Department would have to obtain alternative methods of funding for various programs, if it were going to survive. The budget for the Bureau of Recreation for the new fiscal year (1986) stood at \$9.6 million, almost a \$1.5 million dollar drop from the previous year, with \$5 million of that still coming from what was left of Federal Revenue Sharing dollars (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1985).

One promising sign was that the Baltimore Municipal Golf Corporation, a private, non-profit organization endorsed and monitored by the City, would assume the management of the City's golf courses in March 1985 (PBM, February, 1985). At the same time, however, the Bureau of Recreation, on behalf of the City, was requested to assume the management of a

previously commerical recreation facility, the Shake and Bake Family Fun Center, a bowling and roller-skating facility, when Glenn Doughty, a former Baltimore Colt, defaulted on his City loan for the construction of the facility (The Sun, January 25, 1985). This would, indeed, be the Bureau's first effort in the management of a truly commercial recreation facility.

In March 1985, Mr. Delaporte came to the Board with plans to launch a new initiative that would increase the quality of a recreation experience by offering the following types of activities in an instructional mode: (1) cycling; (2) competitive swimming; (3) track and field; (4) ice skating; (5) rowing; (6) golf; (7) volleyball; (8) wrestling; (9) bowling; and (10) basketball schools. As a result of this proposal, the Skill and Talent Development Programs mentioned above were born. Complementing this new initiative was the start of construction on the new indoor ice skating arena in Northeast Baltimore (PBM, March 27, 1985).

Conflicts, Scandals and New Initiatives

As the initiatives within the Bureau of Recreation rapidly grew, so did Delaporte's frustration with the protracted wait between the monthly meetings of the Board of Recreation and Parks. In April 1985, he attempted to circumvent the Board to get approval of funding for some of

these new programs by the Board of Estimates. The Board discovered this attempt, and summarily squashed it (PBM, April 17, 1985). Thus began the long and bitter battle between the Board and the Director.

However, as these conflicts continued to arise, the new, innovative programming developed by Delaporte moved forward. With over \$160,000 of combined State and Federal funding, the Camp Concern Program, the long-standing urban camping program for City children, took on a new life. The program was divided into three very different components: the traditional day camp; a week-long overnight camp, utilizing four state parks; and an instructional basketball camp. There was a \$25 registration fee for participation in Camp Concern, with sponsorships available for those who could not afford the fee. The fee was assessed, not only to raise revenue, but to engender a sense of commitment on the part of the young people (The Sun, April 27, 1985). This was one of the Department's first serious attempts to place a worth on a recreation experience. While there was initial resistance, the fee structure proved little hindrance to participants.

By May 1985, the Board was approving \$50,000 to send over 100 youth to the Outward Bound Program in Maine, which was 60 more than the previous year. Delaporte discussed the possibility of developing an urban Outward Bound Program in Baltimore - the first of its kind in this country. In addition, the Board approved the construction of the proposed

indoor soccer facility in Baybrook Park in South Baltimore (PBM - May 15, 1985).

The Bureau of Recreation was faced with the possibility of losing twenty of its current one hundred recreation centers, due to the loss of over \$2 million dollars from the Fiscal Year 1986 budget. Mayor Schaefer indicated that while the centers' schedules may have to be adjusted, he would find the dollars needed to keep them open (The Sun, May 1, 1985). He did, in fact, find that money, and the Bureau's budget was finally adopted at the \$11.4 million level.

While the Bureau of Recreation was beginning to adjust to the possibility of budget cuts in the future, evidence was beginning to appear that indicated cases of fraud and abuse within Bureau programs. City auditors had been examining the purchasing and payroll records of the Division of Special Projects, the unit involved in the administration of much of the Bureau's Federal and State funds, for programs such as Camp Concern and summer youth corps projects (The News American, May 15, 1985). James W. Smith, supervisor of the division, and several other employees were being investigated for possible "payroll-padding" efforts, as well as for other types of fraud concerning purchasing of equipment and supplies that were unaccounted for. The situation was brought to light when a Bureau of Recreation employee alerted Director Delaporte that some abuses were occurring in the Special Projects office. The investigation widened into a criminal

one when Kurt L. Schmoke, the City State's Attorney, and his office were brought in.

As this scandal continued, the Department was coming under attack from community groups for other reasons. One recreation center in Northeast Baltimore, Mullan Recreation Center, was slated to be closed due to the unsafe structural condition of the building. Community groups in the area protested the closing, noting that money was being spent by the Department of Recreation and Parks on what they perceived as "costly, elite" types of recreation programs at the expense of neighborhood recreation centers. The center was scheduled for closure in June and the building would be demolished (The Sun, May 15, 1985 p. 8G).

At the June Recreation and Parks Board meeting, Director Delaporte outlined to the members of the Board his efforts to upgrade the quality of recreation programs through the offering of what the community was perceiving as "elitist" types of programs. He further detailed the programs that he had brought to them in March 1985, the Skill and Talent Development Programs, and discussed his ambitious plans to add at least five other activities to his previously described programs including: (1) roller skating; (2) performing arts; (3) weightlifting; (4) gymnastics and (5) a permanent collaboration with the Outward Bound Program.

Mr. Delaporte related to the Board his philosophy that recreation was activity, not necessarily a building, so that

strengthening the quality of the activities would significantly add to the recreation experience. He indicated that his goal was to provide recreation experiences that could be measured - they would have a definite starting and ending point, and a "cost per participant per experience" could be calculated. The Board seemed genuinely interested in the prospect, and would await the results of his first summer of new programs. In addition, they voted at the same meeting to close Mullan Recreation Center (PBM, June 19, 1985).

To complement his new initiatives in recreation, Mr. Delaporte started an ambitious effort to increase the quality of the Bureau's Aquatics programs. Delaporte noted that the pools would be operated with a greater sense of professionalism - with lifeguards being issued uniforms, so they would be easily identifiable, and pay increases, so that the City could compete with the private swimming pools, to whom they often lost the best guards. In July, this new approach to the management of the pools appeared operational, when the pool located at Roosevelt Park in the Hampden area of the City was closed due to rowdy behavior of participants. A group of teenagers disrupted July 4th swimming and accosted the pool manager and other guards. The pool was closed and drained for a week, and the community immediately began discussing with Department officials methods for controlling the "rowdies" at the pool. Implementation of the proposed admission fees for the pools was recommended, as were

turnstiles and other methods for controlling the numbers of participants allowed in the pool at one time (The Sun, July 10, 1985). It appeared that the reality of the Delaporte philosophy was beginning to sink in.

July, however, also brought new information on the abuse of funds in the Division of Special Projects, when the Board of Recreation and Parks was informed of the over \$500,000 worth of hoarded property purchased with governmental grant funds discovered through a complete examination of the Division's storage sites around the City. The investigation continued, and the uncovering of the fraud and abuse escalated (PBM, July 17, 1985).

A bright spot in the summer of 1985 was the announcement that the Outward Bound program would be creating a new urban program in Baltimore. With a generous gift of \$500,000 from Baltimore Oriole Eddie Murray, the soon to be constructed Carrie Murray Outdoor Education Center (named after his late mother) and Leakin Park in Southwest Baltimore would serve as home base for this creative, adventure-based activity (The Morning Sun, August 16, 1985).

Another facility about to be constructed was the proposed rowing facility on the Middle Branch of the Patapsco River, just beyond the Inner Harbor area of the City. This building, and other new facilities being constructed, were being financed through conditional purchase agreements, discussed early in Mr. Delaporte's tenure as Director. The rowing

facility had storage areas for Olympic-style rowing shells, and had sparked keen interest among many of the state's colleges and universities (The Sun, August 29, 1985). Plans for this facility also included the offering of instructional rowing classes, for youth and adults alike.

While these new facilities and the growth of new programs were indeed a highlight for the Bureau of Recreation in 1985, the spectre of scandal still hung over it. In an effort to tighten control on the administration of funds and the collection recreation centers fees, strict new guidelines were developed by Mr. Delaporte and his staff, along with the City's auditors, to try to prevent future episodes of abuse. In addition to the Division of Special Projects case, a recreation center director had stolen over \$1,500 from funds raised at his center (The Sun, August 29, 1985).

By October, the new ice skating rink in Northeast Baltimore was opened to the public for use. The building would be managed by Baltimore Ice Sports, a private non-profit corporation devoted to ice skating, both figure and hockey. This year-round facility was a great addition to the City's ice-skating program at its outdoor rink in Patterson Park in Southeast Baltimore (The News-American, October 22, 1985).

The end of October, however, brought ominous warnings from Mayor Schaefer of budget cuts due to the loss of Federal revenue-sharing funds in Fiscal Year 1987. The Bureau of Recreation receives approximately \$5 million from this source,

and efforts were being made to absorb that loss through general budget funds. The threat of curtailed programs again focused on the Department of Recreation and Parks (The Sun, October 31, 1985)

In an effort to reorganize some of the programs in the Bureau of Recreation, Mr. Delaporte informed the Board that the scandal-ridden Division of Special Projects, which also included the Bureau's Day Care and Tiny Tots programs, would be split into: (1) the Division of Developmental Recreation, which would include the Camp Concern Program, Operation Birdland (which transported children to Orioles' baseball games), and all of the Skill and Talent Development programs, and (2) the Division of School-Age Child Care and Tiny Tots. This reorganization would allow each unit to function independently, as the School-Age program sought licensing for its centers. Mr. Delaporte also indicated that the Aquatics Division had already been created during the summer, and plans were under way to reshape the Division of Amateur Athletics, which administered most of the City's organized, competitive sports leagues (PBM, November 20, 1985).

At this same Board meeting, Mr. Delaporte and the Board clashed over approval to send a new employee, Gail Abrams, hired to manage the soon to be completed Carrie Murray Outdoor Education Center, to an Outward Bound Leadership Program in Florida. The Board disapproved the request due to the newness of the employee, and Delaporte's frustration with them

continued to rise. This was not the only problem that the Board and Mr. Delaporte were facing, however.

December 1985 brought the realization that the loss of the \$5 million in Federal revenue sharing funds would result in significant cutbacks in recreation services to the citizens of Baltimore, unless other methods of funding were found (The Sun, December 19, 1985). While 1985 was the year that Director Delaporte began, as he said, "putting in place the components of a new recreation system" (The Sun Magazine, December 15, 1985), it was only the beginning of a rocky road for him, the Board, and the Department of Recreation and Parks.

Mayor William Donald Schaefer had great faith in Director Chris Delaporte. Even though the Bureau of Recreation was going to lose all of its Federal revenue sharing funds, the City absorbed the \$5 million difference through its general budget funds and avoided the painful layoffs with a total budget of \$12.37 million for Fiscal Year 1987 (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1986). All aspects of the Department's programs that had received the direct attention of Delaporte seemed to be flourishing. A January 13, 1986 Sunpapers article reported that the Shake and Bake Family Fun Center, the commercial enterprise formerly owned by Colt Glenn Doughty, had changed from a loosely run facility into a well-programmed center to which people were now coming back. After \$225,000 of improvements to the building, and a reduction in

staff by almost two-thirds, the center was beginning to show promises of breaking even, which it hadn't done since its opening. Anthony Dease, the new facility manager, a former recreation center director, had worked closely with Director Delaporte to turn the center around. Everyone who entered the building now came in with a sense of purpose, and not to just "hang out" (The News American, January 27, 1986).

The biggest crisis of his tenure with the City of Baltimore was about to occur for Mr. Delaporte. City Councilman Kweisi Mfume brought forth charges of sexual favoritism, racial discrimination and unfair hiring practices against Delaporte. Mfume indicated that he had received complaints from some of his constituents who were employees of the Department of Recreation and Parks, as well as from several Board members, as he was trying to get information from the Department on their past hiring practices. As a result of these charges, a five-member panel, made up of four Board of Recreation and Parks members (Paul Goldberg, Ann Scheper, Doris Johnson and Louis Grasmick) and headed by retired Baltimore Circuit Judge Robert B. Watts, would investigate these charges in an effort to resolve the situation (The Evening Sun, January 24, 1986).

Mayor William Donald Schaefer, not having great confidence in the Board's ability to look at the charges objectively with some of its own members bringing the charges to the councilman, threatened to commission his own three-

member panel (The News American, January 24, 1986). The following day, Mr. Delaporte indicated that he was considering legal action against Councilman Mfume for publicly repeating unsubstantiated allegations. Mfume countered, indicating that he told the press that "he didn't think there was anything to the sexual favors allegations", but that the press blew the comments out of proportion (The News American, January 25, 1986, p. 3A).

In response to Mr. Delaporte's lawyers, Councilman Mfume blamed the television stations for sensationalizing and "distorting" his comments (The Sun, January 29, 1986). An editorial in the Sunpapers (February 4, 1986) scolded Councilman Mfume for issuing the charges to the media, instead of the appropriate commissions (Human Relations or Equal Employment Opportunity).

By early February, Mayor Schaefer had scolded the Board of Recreation and Parks for inciting the controversy due to their dislike of Mr. Delaporte's independent management style. The Mayor demanded that the investigative panel reach a conclusion within a week. However, the damage had already been done to Mr. Delaporte's reputation.

In mid-February, Councilman Mfume produced several of the documents from employees that claimed discrimination in hiring practices on the part of Mr. Delaporte, but provided little substantiation of the charges. Delaporte's lawyers had asked the Councilman to provide the names of the two Board members

that had issued the charges as well, but were refused. Mayor Schaefer reiterated that the whole problem was simply a matter of jealousy on the part of the Board over Mr. Delaporte's successes (The Morning Sun, February 15, 1986).

By the 19th of February, the investigative panel cleared Mr. Delaporte of the charges of sexual harassment, but indicated that the charges of racial discrimination and "cronyism" should not be overlooked, although they could not find any real documentation of the charges (The Evening Sun, February 19, 1986). The panel indicated that an effort should be made to hear the complaints of the employees who presented the charges, although they could really find no evidence of misconduct on Mr. Delaporte's part.

An editorial in The News American the following day (February 20, 1986) indicated that the feud between the Board and the Director should end, and that the Board needed to find ways to speed up its cumbersome bureaucracy. Mayor Schaefer, who had become increasingly intolerant of the Board's inefficiency, was agreeing with that assessment.

In a somewhat similar incident, Jean D. Powell, then a Program Supervisor in the Bureau of Recreation, won a long-standing race and sex discrimination suit (from 1982), and was awarded the position of Assistant Superintendent of Recreation (The Evening Sun, April 11, 1986). This lawsuit had occurred before Mr. Delaporte's administration, but had finally worked its way through the legal process.

The workings of the Bureau of Recreation continued, even through these legal battles. The outdoor ice rink in Patterson Park was to be enclosed with a covering quite different from the air filled cover previously used rather unsuccessfully at the Memorial Stadium ice rink, now closed. This covering, along with the renovation of the existing support building, would modernize the facility and make it useable for longer periods of time. While not a completely indoor facility, it would virtually eliminate bad weather as a reason for closing the rink (The East Baltimore Guide, April 10, 1986).

In addition to the ice rink renovations, the proposed fees and identification cards for swimmers in the Summer of 1986 was about to become a reality. The charges would be fifty cents a visit for the large park pools, or \$3.00 for a season-long pass for the smaller neighborhood pools. The I.D. cards and turnstiles would allow the pool employees to control the crowds during the summer, declare capacities and prevent additional participants from entering until others had left the premises (The Sun, March 1, 1986).

In April, Mayor Schaefer indicated that he would replace Vernon Weisand as President of the Board of Recreation and Parks with Michael Hart, a relatively new member of the Board (The Sun, April 24, 1986). It appeared that changes were brewing for the often stagnant Board in light of the earlier difficulties with Mr. Delaporte.

James W. Smith, former head of the defunct Division of Special Projects, was indicted for fraud in a payroll-padding scheme that cost the City over \$225,000 over nine years, with over \$90,000 of that funneled directly to Smith through elaborate payroll-padding and kickbacks (The News American, May 1, 1986). Eleven other members of the Bureau's staff had been granted immunity from prosecution for their testimony against Smith, but were terminated from the Department of Recreation and Parks' employment.

An editorial (The Sun, May 3, 1986) discussed the scandals that had been occurring in the City, starting with John Callan of the Neighborhood Progress (Housing) Administration and ending with James W. Smith of Recreation and Parks. The editorial indicated that these scandals would make it much more difficult for the City to plead its case before the state legislature when it asked for increased funding. Credit was given to Mr. Delaporte for uncovering the Smith scandal, noting that it was Delaporte, and not the Board of Recreation and Parks, who took action on this situation and had begun to revamp old administrative procedures that made the Department ripe for many types of abuse.

In a second editorial entitled, "A Not-as-Relevant Park Board" (The News American, May 16, 1986), written after Michael Hart was officially confirmed as the new President of the Board of Recreation and Parks, the newspaper cautioned the Board to cease its squabbles with the Director and get to the

business of providing recreation services to the citizens of Baltimore.

When Mr. Hart was appointed, Mayor Schaefer sent a clear signal to the Board to carry out its mandated responsibilities. He had indicated his displeasure several times during the previous few years in their inability to work out large deals on Memorial Stadium, and several other large athletic events such as the Navy-Notre Dame football game at the Stadium, while spending great deals of time on patronage matters in personnel (The Sun, May 18, 1986). It was obvious that the Mayor, soon to be running for governor, was having second thoughts about the role of the Board.

All of this controversy did not significantly affect the Bureau of Recreation's Fiscal Year 1988 budget, as it was recommended at just over \$12.5 million. Even with the loss of Federal revenue sharing the year before, the budget remained quite stable, a tribute to Director Delaporte's persuasion of the value of recreation activities for the citizens of Baltimore (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1986).

By the end of May, James W. Smith had pled guilty to all of the charges lodged against him, but through a plea bargain agreement provided restitution of the over \$90,000 dollars that he received in kickbacks, and served no more than three years in jail (The Sun, May 27, 1986). The judge in the case suspended all but fifteen months of his sentence in July (The

Sun, July 30, 1986). The case between Councilman Mfume and Chris Delaporte was settled quietly out of court, with little detail provided.

The new swimming pool fees for all of the park and neighborhood pools, met with great success in some communities, yet great resistance in others. Many low-income areas indicated that their children could not afford even the three-dollar season pass. "Work-off" programs were therefore established to allow children to perform work at their neighborhood recreation center or even at the swimming pools to get a free season pass. This effort received mixed reactions, with some calling it discriminatory, and others complaining that it wasn't being implemented properly. Another problem occurring with the pools was the shortage of lifeguards. Even with the implementation of fees, rowdyism was still occurring at some of the pools due to the staff shortages. Special efforts were made to hire additional staff to alleviate the problems (The Evening Sun, June 30, 1986).

As programming continued in the Department, the Recreation and Parks Board was coming under attack. A proposed City Charter amendment was introduced in the City Council in September 1986 that would strip the Board of its policy-making powers and make it purely advisory. The Director of the Department would then answer to the Mayor, much like all other City agencies except in the Department of Education. The Mayor endorsed the bill, and the move was on

to strip the Board of its power (The Morning Sun, September 7, 1986).

Controversy continued in the Department, when on September 12, 1986, Anthony Dease, manager of the Shake and Bake Family Fun Center, resigned after auditors found that \$15,000 was missing from the center's account (The Evening Sun, September 12, 1986). This would mark the second time in less than a year that an employee had been charged with theft.

By December of 1986, the amendment to the City Charter stripping the Board of Recreation and Parks of its policy-making power had been approved by the City Council's Judiciary Committee and was headed for the ballot in the 1987 election (The Evening Sun, December 3, 1986). The Board, however, would continue to fight until the end. The day after the previous article was published, the Board was admonishing Mr. Delaporte's fiscal staff for not providing them with as detailed an accounting of the Fiscal Year 1988 budget as they would like. After being told that the budget was virtually the same as the previous year's due to the Mayor's instructions to hold the line, the Board still remained unsatisfied, and desired, possibly for the last time, a full reporting of the budget, [which they did not receive] (The Sun, December 4, 1986). The year 1987 would most certainly be the beginning of a new era in the Department of Recreation and Parks.

As 1987 began, the City was learning to work with the interim Mayor, former City Council President Clarence H. "Du" Burns, who replaced William Donald Schaefer, who became the Governor of the State of Maryland. The Department of Recreation and Parks was holding a steady course, even as the focus of some of its programming in the Bureau of Recreation had started to change. The overall Fiscal Year 1989 budget for the Bureau would be close to its Fiscal Year 1988 level at \$12.48 million, even as funds were starting to tighten up due to the effects of Federal spending cuts to the cities during the Reagan administration. However, specialized programs such as the Division of Developmental Recreation grew from a funding level of \$644,000 in Fiscal Year 1987 to a proposed \$1.1 million in Fiscal Year 1989 (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1987). These developmental skills programs proved popular, even though there was a fee attached to each activity, if only nominal. The fees ranged from as low as \$1.00 to participate in an Operation Birdland baseball game, to as much as \$60.00 to participate on the City-Wide Track and Field Team for a year (Developmental Recreation Fee Schedule, 1987). Evaluation of these programs indicated that the fees encouraged the participants (and their parents) to feel that they had a "stake" in the activity, and participation among paying participants, as opposed to those who may have received a "scholarship" or "campership" of some

sort, was markedly better (Registration statistics, Division of Developmental Recreation, 1987).

Of the over \$12 million allotted to the Bureau of Recreation, over half of that went to the operation of the 96 traditional community recreation centers. The remaining funds were divided between all of the specialized programs, which included: (1) Developmental Recreation; (2) School-Age Child Care; (3) Therapeutic Recreation; (4) Senior Citizens Programs; (5) Aquatics; (6) Amateur Athletics; (7) Outdoor Education; and (8) Office of Adventures in Fun. In addition to these specialized programs, the following special facilities were now operational: (1) The Baltimore Neighborhood Recreation Facility (formerly the Shake and Bake Family Fun Center); (2) The Mount Pleasant Ice Arena (under private, non-profit management); (3) The William J. Myers Indoor Soccer Pavilion; (4) The Baltimore Rowing and Water Resources Center; (5) The Patterson Park Ice Rink (under City management); and (6) The Carrie Murray Outdoor Education Center (Mayoral Transition Briefing Book, 1987).

As Mayor "Du" Burns settled into his new position, it didn't take long for him to become embroiled in the Board of Recreation and Parks/Chris Delaporte turmoil. In June 1987, the battle between the two factions boiled over at a Board of Estimates meeting, where a letter was sent by the Board of Recreation and Parks to demand that the Board reject \$165,000 worth of funding requests for summer recreational programs.

The majority of these programs were a part of the Division of Developmental Recreation and included a request for a recreation center basketball team to travel to the National Junior Olympics. President Michael Hart and Director Delaporte had gone to the Board of Estimates meeting indicating that they had attempted to get official approval earlier, but could not get a quorum of the Board members to act in any official capacity. President Hart, who had been supportive of Mr. Delaporte's efforts (much to the chagrin of the rest of the Board), supported the request for funding. Mr. Delaporte indicated that the summer was the busiest time of year, and it was often difficult to get the Board together on quick notice to make decisions on much-needed funding. The President of the City Council, Frank X. Gallagher, a member of the Board of Estimates, after receiving the letter from the Board, chastised them, indicating that if they were going to act that way, "they shouldn't be in City government". Additionally, Gallagher remarked that the Board had to realize that "there were things more important than their own ego" (The Sun, June 11, 1987, p. 1D). Mayor Burns, who was supportive of the proposed City Charter Amendment to convert the Board to an advisory-only board, was clearly angry that the Board would gamble with summer recreation programs for the youth of the City. The funding for the programs was approved, and the Mayor called a meeting with the members of the Board of Recreation and Parks and Director Delaporte. At that

meeting, the Mayor indicated that **he** was the boss and that there wouldn't be any subsequent attempts to undermine Mr. Delaporte or attempts to have him fired. The city solicitor indicated that technically, Mr. Delaporte serves at the pleasure of the Board and should attempt to cooperate with the Board as much as possible (The Sun, June 13, 1987). The battle was not yet over.

Meanwhile, the scandal trial of Anthony J. Dease, former manager of the Shake and Bake Family Fun Center, had concluded with a sentence of five years in jail, with all but two years suspended, and an order to make restitution for what finally turned out to be over \$78,000 stolen from the facility (The Sun, June 19, 1987). It appeared that all of the scandals that had been haunting the Bureau of Recreation and the Department of Recreation and Parks had finally been put to rest.

On the same date in June, it was announced that Chris Delaporte, the creative but embattled Director of the Department, would be leaving by July 1 to take the post as the new executive director of the Maryland Stadium Authority, created by Governor William Donald Schaefer to build a new baseball stadium in downtown Baltimore (The Evening Sun, June 19, 1987). Delaporte indicated that he would stay on part-time, if possible, to oversee some of the remaining construction projects in the Department, including renovation of the historic Chick Webb Recreation Center.

In his last days as director of the Department of Recreation and Parks, Delaporte reminisced about his tenure in Baltimore, indicating that he attempted to bring quality recreation facilities to the City, but was often accused of "being elitist or catering to a few." He indicated that Baltimore was "an old city with habitual patterns" whose sport facilities were centered around its community recreation centers. In an effort to bid for large scale sports events like cities such as Indianapolis or Houston, Baltimore had always lost out due to its lack of quality facilities. He encouraged the Department of Recreation and Parks to continue his efforts of constructing quality facilities (The Sun, July 13, 1987).

Upon Delaporte's departure in October, James E. Grant, the Superintendent of Recreation, assumed the role of Acting Director as a nationwide search was conducted for a new director, while Jean D. Powell, Assistant Superintendent of Recreation, assumed the role of Acting Superintendent of Recreation for the interim.

The Board of Recreation and Parks very quietly became an advisory board after Question J on the city's November referendum passed quite convincingly. Whoever the new Director of the Department would be, they would be appointed by the Mayor, and not by the Board.

By January 1988, Kurt L. Schmoke had assumed his role as Mayor of the City of Baltimore, and the search for a new

director continued in earnest. By the end of January, Mayor Schmoke had identified his choice for that position, and he didn't have to look very far. He named Dr. Ralph Waldo Emerson Jones, Jr., a professor of recreation and a noted expert in urban recreation from the University of Baltimore as the new Director, the first African-American individual to hold that position on a permanent basis (The Evening Sun, January 29, 1988).

On March 1, 1988, Dr. Jones met with all of the employees of the Department of Recreation and Parks at the Baltimore Polytechnic Institute High School and announced "A New Beginning" (The Morning Sun, March 2, 1988). The Department had indeed travelled far since its inception in 1940, and Dr. Jones was now the new leader at the helm to carry it even further.

Summary

The 1970s and 1980s saw the greatest increases in programs and facilities in the history of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation. The number of facilities had doubled by 1970, and continued to increase through 1980 (Appendix D). New initiatives such as the Baltimore Neighborhood Basketball League and the United States Youth Games were implemented. The construction of specialized facilities such as the soccer arena, ice rink, rowing facility, and outdoor education center were the hallmarks of the 80s, as were the initiations of the Division of Developmental Recreation's fee-based instructional programs, Outward Bound, and the School-Age Child Care Division (Appendix F). The needs of Baltimore's residents had increased, and the Bureau of Recreation was called upon to meet them. The fiscal situation had expanded, and Recreation's budget moved from \$4.5 million in 1970 to \$9.9 million in 1980. As can be seen in Table 5, both Recreation and Parks and the Enoch Pratt Free Library system enjoyed minimal increases in their percentage of the total City budget.

By 1970, Baltimore City continued to see white residents flee to the suburbs, with the percentage of white to black residents approaching the 50-50 mark.

TABLE 5
Board of Estimates Appropriations for Baltimore City
(1970, 1980, and 1987)

Department	Amount	% of Budget
1970		
Recreation	\$ 4,568,428	.7
Parks	\$ 6,010,535	.9
Libraries	\$ 6,276,707	1.0
TOTAL CITY	\$666,134,245	100.0
1980		
Recreation	\$ 9,929,389	.88
Parks	\$ 9,262,964	.82
Libraries	\$ 9,637,935	.87
TOTAL CITY	\$1,124,456,967	100.0
1987		
Recreation	\$ 12,371,287	.97
Parks	\$ 11,536,870	.91
Libraries	\$ 12,239,206	.96
TOTAL CITY	\$1,270,216,006	100.0

The percentage of black residents increased, leading to a 54% majority by 1980 (Table 6). That percentage would

continue to increase through the 80s, approaching the 60% mark by the end of the decade.

TABLE 6
Population Characteristics of Baltimore City
(1970, 1980 and 1990)

Race	Population	%
1970		
White	479,837	52.6
Non-White	420,210	46.8
Other	5,712	.6
TOTAL	905,759	100.0
1980		
White	345,113	44.0
Black	431,151	54.7
Other	10,511	1.3
TOTAL	786,775	100.0
1990		
White	287,753	39.3
Black	435,768	59.0
Other	12,493	1.7
TOTAL	736,014	100.0

By 1987, the Bureaus of Recreation and Parks had finally reached equity in funding, which coincided with greater collaboration between the two units with the construction of many of these "special facilities" mentioned above as hybrids of the two bureaus. The privatization of the public golf courses and the Baltimore Zoo led to greater availability of operating funds, which helped to offset the impending loss of Federal Revenue Sharing Funds.

The United States reeled from the Watergate debacle of the 70s, and the distrust of governmental officials was commonplace. The Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation jumped into the fray in the 80s, with the payroll-padding scandal of James W. Smith of the Division of Special Projects and the misappropriation of funds by Anthony Dease, the manager of the Shake and Bake Recreation Facility. The additional scandal over charges of favoritism in employment by Chris Delaporte, Director of Recreation and Parks reduced the credibility of the Department even further.

The strength of the Board of Recreation and Parks had diminished in the 1980s with the privatization of several of their "showcase" facilities (e.g., golf courses, Zoo). Their control over these facilities was terminated, and their attentions turned to Delaporte's administration of the Department. Friction arose when Delaporte consistently attempted to circumvent the Board's authority over operational matters. The power struggle that eventually ensued between

the two led to the Board being removed from a policy-making role to an advisory one by Question J, a voter referendum in the 1987 election. The Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation, as a part of the Department of Recreation and Parks, would chart a new course under the direction of Dr. Ralph Waldo Emerson Jones, Jr.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the evolution of the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation by focusing on the major policy changes that occurred from its beginning in 1940 through 1988. In order to provide background to this study, a brief overview of the early history of recreation in Baltimore City, both through the playground movement and the beginnings of the organized recreation movement was provided. Comparison was made with the evolution of the development of the City's recreation department and the recreation movement on a national basis. Both the local and national levels followed concurrent paths in their development.

Data Collection and Analysis

The historical method of research was utilized to collect data for this study, considering primary sources of data such as minutes of the meetings of the Baltimore City Board of Recreation and Parks, budget documents and personal interviews of selected employees of the Department of Recreation and Parks (past and present). Secondary sources such as newspaper clippings from the major Baltimore newspapers (The Sun, The News-American, and The Afro-American) provided corroborating

data as well as new information for examination. The data were analyzed and verified for credibility and authenticity through the use of internal and external criticism. Once the data were verified, they were ordered chronologically and followed the topical categories of:

- a) World War II and the Post-War Era of the 1940s
- b) Desegregation and the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s
- c) Urban Renewal of the 1970s and the Changing Social Climate of the 1980s

In each of these categories, the social, political, and economic factors present at the time were examined for their influence on changes in policy decisions.

Findings

The early study traced the Bureau of Recreation from its inception as the Department of Public Recreation in 1940 to its merger with the Departments of Parks and Music in 1947 to become the Department of Recreation and Parks. Much of this early examination focused on the decisions of the Board of Recreation and Parks, the policy-making body of the Department. The fledgling Department of Public Recreation began with four recreation facilities in 1940 and grew to eighteen by the end of the decade.

The issue of segregation was examined in the later stages of the 40s, with more detailed attention provided as the Department moved into the 50s and 60s. The continued efforts of the Board of Recreation and Parks to maintain segregated facilities and programs were apparent, lasting until they were forced by law to integrate the Department in November 1955.

While the Department had been technically integrated by law, the reality of integration was a much slower process. There were numerous incidents of racial backlash against the blacks in Baltimore's recreation programs and facilities throughout the next two decades.

After the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the civil disturbances of the late 60s and the early 70s, programs began to focus on the needs of urban youth, with the development of outreach programs such as the Detached Worker (Street Club Worker) Program. Portable pools and other types of mobile recreation programs took services into the neighborhoods of participants.

As the Bureau of Recreation moved through the decades, the racial makeup of the city changed. From a 20% black population in 1940 to 35% in 1960, the needs of a different, more needy population arose. Demand for additional programs and facilities was constant, and the Bureau of Recreation faced consistent budgetary challenges in its attempts to meet the needs of its citizens, along with the rest of Baltimore City. By 1970, the Bureau of Recreation was operating 98

community recreation centers, with demand still increasing. Federal money was pumped into cities, and Baltimore saw an increase in operating funds from \$1.3 million in 1960 to \$4.5 million in 1970.

By 1970, the racial makeup of Baltimore was 46.8% black with many whites fleeing to the suburbs. Those left behind were in greater need of services, and the call for increased recreation programs and facilities continued. The Bureau now operated over 120 recreation facilities. Through the 70s, programs such as Camp Concern for urban youth, Camp Variety for handicapped youth, and the United States Youth Games provided specialized activities. In order to operate these programs, the Bureau of Recreation budget rose from \$4.5 million to \$9.9 million by 1980.

Innovation was the key component of the 80s in the Bureau of Recreation. Recreation programs started to move from totally free activities to a mixture of free vs. fee-based activities. The Reagan era had brought significant cuts in Federal funding to cities. Additional fee-based, yet instructional sports and arts programs were housed in the Division of Developmental Recreation, with additional special programming in the Division of School-Age Child Care.

Large, special-use facilities such as soccer arenas and ice rinks were constructed to meet the changing recreational needs of Baltimore City residents. Many options were considered, among them the privatization of Recreation and

Parks' five public golf courses and the Baltimore Zoo. With privatization, the Board of Recreation and Parks began to lose control of portions of its domain, and a power struggle ensued between them and the Director of Recreation and Parks, Chris Delaporte. By 1987, a voter referendum had passed, and the Board of Recreation and Parks had been removed from its policy-making role into an advisory one.

Baltimore City moved toward the 90s with a 59% black population and the Department of Recreation and Parks moved with a budget of over \$12 million for the Bureau of Recreation. The direction of the Department was now provided by a Director not selected by the Board of Recreation and Parks, but by the Mayor of Baltimore. It was indeed a "new beginning."

Conclusions

The objectives of this study were met by determining:

- (1) The major policies that were formulated in the areas of fiscal, organizational, human and physical resources by tracing the development of administrations, budgets, facilities, staff, and major programs.
- (2) The increases and decreases in the previously listed policy areas were quantified and described in Appendices A-F, with the different administrative changes as well as the policy shifts documented throughout the data chapters.

(3) An examination of the social, political and economic factors that may have contributed to or caused these policy decision changes were described throughout the data chapters as well. The decisions of those involved in the operation of the Bureau of Recreation and the overall operation of the Department of Recreation and Parks were obviously influenced by these factors in each particular era.

Social factors such as race played a tremendous role in the early decisions made regarding the desegregation of the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks. When the policy-making board had avowed segregationists such as Robert Garrett as President, it was unrealistic to think that they would vote to integrate recreation and parks programs and facilities until they were forced to do so. The personal beliefs of Garrett and many other members of the Board of Recreation and Parks interfered significantly in the progress of the Department in regard to integration. In many instances, the members of the Board voted against policies that had been initiated with success on trial bases and had received no objections from the general public, but were in violation of their own personal principles.

Discrimination, either racial or sexual, seemed to play a serious role in decisions made in the Department of Recreation and Parks. For an agency that had been created from a female-dominated unit such as the Playground Association of America, the proliferation of male

administrators that leapt to the forefront once Robert Garrett took charge of the Public Athletic League was quite remarkable. Additionally, the lack of African-American top administrators was evident until the 1980s, when James E. Grant became the first African-American Superintendent of Recreation, and Dr. Ralph W.E. Jones, Jr. became the first African-American Director. Even though the Department had officially been "desegregated" in 1955, it took almost thirty years for a true desegregation of the top administration to occur.

Economic factors also played an important role in many of the decisions that were made by the Board of Recreation and Parks. They were, in fact, creatures of the times that they found themselves in. As Baltimore City grew and changed, they had to adapt their decisions to meet the current situations. The economic growth of the 50s, the Federal involvement, particularly in the 60s and 70s, and the Federal "abandonment" of the cities in the 80s, all created distinct challenges that had to be addressed by the Board.

In addition, the Board of Recreation and Parks focused much of its attention on the economically stimulating "showcase" components of both the Bureau of Recreation and the Bureau of Parks - areas such as Memorial Stadium, the Baltimore Zoo, and the golf courses. It wasn't until 1984, when Director Chris Delaporte moved to privatize these

entities that a power struggle wreaking havoc throughout the Department developed.

With the discussion of "power," the political factor must be considered as the most influential in decisions of the Board of Recreation and Parks. Until the administration of Chris Delaporte, the Board of Recreation and Parks had basically controlled all of the Directors of Recreation and Parks, and thus controlled the Department. With their focus on the high-profile facilities mentioned above and their concern with the political patronage issues of personnel, the Board had become a very powerful force in Baltimore City, even though they were truly only semi-independent. When Delaporte, with the support of the Mayor, privatized the aforementioned facilities and continued his attempts to circumvent the Board, the battle of wills between the two entities clashed, and the Mayor, buoyed by City Council efforts, finally stepped in to support a resolution for a referendum to strip the Board of its policy-making power.

As a result of the type of behavior that was exhibited by the Board during this power struggle and at different points in time during their history, the Board of Recreation and Parks was finally removed from a policy-making role in 1987 to become purely advisory in nature. From that point on, policy decisions were recommended by the Director of Recreation and Parks, with the Mayor of Baltimore providing general direction and control.

The only major frustrations and disappointments for this researcher came from the lack of interdepartmental or inter-Bureau communication that was available, and the unavailability of several prospective interviewees. In addition, having worked in the Bureau of Recreation and the Department of Recreation and Parks for a total of fourteen years, this researcher was aware that critical minutes of various committees of the Board of Recreation and Parks (Personnel, Executive Sessions), where many substantive decisions were made, were unavailable or had been destroyed when the Board was switched from a policy-making to an advisory role. Therefore, many of the controversial decisions that were rumored to have been made would remain just that - RUMOR - with no substantiation possible.

Recommendations for Future Research

As a result of this study, several recommendations have been developed that lend themselves well to the possibility of future research. These recommendations are as follows:

- (1) A separate, more detailed analysis of the desegregation issue in Baltimore might very well lead to new revelations into the factors influencing these decisions in the Department of Recreation and Parks, especially if that analysis begins prior to the 1940s, as it appears that some efforts to desegregate occurred much earlier.

(2) An examination of the Board of Recreation and Parks, concentrating on an intimate examination of the individual personalities on the Board, which may help to explain some of their decisions more completely.

(3) A companion study to the examination of the Bureau of Recreation should be conducted for the Bureau of Parks, as well as a smaller study on the Bureau of Music which could give a complete picture of the entire Department of Recreation and Parks.

(4) A study examining specifically the Federally funded programs that were created during the late 60s and through the 70s. These programs very singularly shaped the Bureau of Recreation in Baltimore City, as well as in many other urban areas, into what they are today, for better or for worse.

General Recommendations

In addition, recommendations as a result of the data obtained in this study might well lead to decisions on the future direction of the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks, but more specifically, the Bureau of Recreation. In many instances, the challenges that are currently being faced by the Bureau of Recreation in regard to the funding of programs, replacement of staff (i.e., due to an aging workforce), and maintenance of facilities are quite

similar to situations that have been documented in this study. The examination of these decisions and their success or failure may aid in the decisions that must be made in the very near future due to downsizing, programmatic shifts or facility decline.

As has been seen throughout this study, there is indeed a danger of repeating the same type of behavior that Baltimore City, as well as many other cities, exhibited when Federal money became available in the 60s and 70s. If and when money begins to filter back into the cities as a result of the newly elected Democratic administration, the Department of Recreation and Parks cannot renovate and build onto the infrastructure of the municipal recreation system again without consideration of proper maintenance, staffing and programming of these facilities in the future.

New jobs programs should not be jumped into as has been done in the past, hiring "warm bodies" just to have a person in a building. With the demise of so many Recreation curricula in our country's colleges and universities, the resurgence of professional preparation to train the recreators of tomorrow must be advocated. The "warm body" approach filled local recreation departments with unskilled staff members who have stayed on the job for years, clogging up the system and preventing educated young professionals from gaining employment, thereby stifling enrollment in these college curricula, forcing them to shut down. Only through

aggressive recruitment of trained, qualified professionals can this cycle be broken and the quality of the provision of services upgraded.

New facilities cannot be built as "make work" projects, with no plans of how to staff, program and maintain them. In Baltimore, for example, many of the facilities that were built in the 60s and 70s are unnecessarily crumbling due to poor periodic maintenance or no maintenance at all, because that item has rarely been included in budgets. The focus has been on hiring staff rather than repairing roofs, surely knowing that someday that roof would leak and need repair.

Again, it is extremely difficult to program a facility without trained staff members to carry the programs out. While the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation is attempting to shift some of its staffing patterns to part-time as opposed to full-time staff, it needs to make sure that regardless of pay status, these individuals are trained in their particular disciplines. Anyone can throw out a basketball, but not everyone can organize a league or properly teach the skills. Our children cannot be shortchanged to save a few dollars in the short run.

The Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks must make sure that Santayana's prophecy does not come true, and be condemned to repeat the same errors made in the past. It is hoped that through examinations like this study and others recommended in this chapter, future recreators can

learn from the mistakes described and take advantage of the successes to make recreation and parks services the best that they can be.

When Mr. Ralph W. T. Jones, Jr. took control of the Department of Recreation and Parks in March 1933, he found the department in a state of confusion. The department had been organized in 1925, but it had no real identity. It was a collection of various agencies, each with its own history and its own methods. Mr. Jones found that the department was not only inefficient but also uncoordinated. He found that the various agencies were working at cross-purposes, and that the department as a whole was not achieving its purpose. He found that the department was not only inefficient but also uncoordinated. He found that the various agencies were working at cross-purposes, and that the department as a whole was not achieving its purpose.

One of Jones' first proposals, after meeting with his staff, was to organize the department into a single, unified agency. He proposed that the department should be organized into a single, unified agency, with a clear line of authority and responsibility. He proposed that the department should be organized into a single, unified agency, with a clear line of authority and responsibility.

EPILOGUE

BUREAU OF RECREATION SINCE 1988

When Dr. Ralph W.E. Jones, Jr. took control of the Department of Recreation and Parks in March 1988, members of the Bureau of Recreation felt that they finally had a friend in the Director's office. Not that Mr. Delaporte and the other directors weren't allies of the recreation center staff at times, but Dr. Jones came in with an urban recreation background, and had taught many of the Bureau's employees in his classes at the University of Baltimore - they finally felt that the new Director was one of "them." Five months into his term, Jones engineered the hiring of a Deputy Director, something that had been long opposed by the now-defunct Board of Recreation and Parks during Chris Delaporte's administration (The Sunday Sun, August 14, 1988). The person hired for this job was Ralph V. Chase, former Assistant Superintendent of Recreation and current Stadium Manager. The "one-two" punch on behalf of recreation seemed complete. The staff of the whole Department, but particularly of the Bureau of Recreation, looked forward to the humanistic tenure of Dr. Jones.

One of Jones' first proposals, nine months into his tenure, was to promote the idea of building six "supercenters" in the city, to replace many of the older, crumbling centers that the Bureau now operated, but could not possibly afford to

maintain (The Sun, December 19, 1988). His idea was to build comprehensive, state-of-the-art facilities, that would serve all populations through a variety of leisure time activities.

The supercenter concept was not quite as well received as one would expect. Members of the City Council and budget officials questioned where the money would come from for the construction of these facilities, and community members were anxious about the possible loss of their neighborhood centers. In the same Sunpapers article, Dr. Jones indicated that the fiscal crisis was exactly the reason for creating the supercenters, since the city's General Budget Fund appropriations could not afford to maintain or properly staff the ninety-three centers that the Bureau now had.

In an effort to examine recreation and parks in an urban setting, Dr. Jones brought Yale University's School of Forestry and Environmental Studies' Urban Resources Initiative Program to Baltimore. This group of graduate students developed comprehensive plans for the management of the City's large parks and their watershed areas, and provided urban forestry education programs for the recreation centers and their urban neighborhoods as well.

Many of the ideas put forth by Dr. Jones did not get a chance to move forward. Suddenly, on March 14, 1989, just over a year since assuming the Director's position, Dr. Jones died of a massive heart attack (The Sun, March 15, 1989). The "New Beginning" of the Department of Recreation and Parks and,

more specifically, the Bureau of Recreation, had come to a grinding halt.

Ralph Chase assumed the operation of the Department of Recreation and Parks upon Dr. Jones' death. Less than three months later, the City Council expressed its displeasure over the lack of movement in the consolidation of recreation programs and facilities as a money-saving measure (The Evening Sun, June 12, 1989). Discussion over the possibility of closing down some of the Bureau's under-utilized or decaying facilities ensued. Some efforts, including the decentralization of the Division of Developmental Recreation, were accomplished, and the program was, in part, absorbed by other units within the Bureau of Recreation.

While the Department's total Fiscal Year 1990 budget remained fairly stable at over \$38 million, and the Bureau of Recreation's budget at just over \$12.8 million, costs were increasing due to negotiated pay raises, as well as the costs of operating all of the special facilities such as the ice rinks, the rowing facility, the Baltimore Neighborhood Recreational Facility (formerly Shake and Bake), the Carrie Murray Outdoor Education Center and the indoor soccer arena (Department of Recreation and Parks Budget Books, 1990). No additional staff were hired to operate most of these new facilities. Instead, personnel were pulled from existing center operations to fill these positions. There had been a

hiring freeze in place for at least two years, and only critical positions were being filled.

The one critical position that was filled was that of the Director of the Department. On February 20, 1990, Marlyn J. Perritt, formerly a top administrator in the Washington, D.C. Recreation Department, became the first African-American female Director of the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks. Most importantly, she was the first female Director in the history of the Department. Just prior to her appointment as Director, Robert P. Wade, former athletic director in the Baltimore City Public Schools and basketball coach at The University of Maryland, was named as the new Superintendent of Recreation, following the retirement of James E. Grant.

Once assuming her position, Perritt had to quickly grasp the responsibility of downsizing the Department, as well as consolidating the recreation services to meet the challenge of dwindling resources. After a year of examining the functions of the Department, her first moves were made in March 1991. At that time, six upper level administrative positions were abolished, including the position of Deputy Director, and the responsibilities of those positions absorbed into other job functions.

In an effort to develop a comprehensive planning approach to its operation, the Department of Recreation and Parks, along with Yale University's Urban Resources Initiative

(one of the programs started by Ralph Jones) worked on the Department's Strategic Plan for Action, which was unveiled at the National Recreation and Park Association Congress in Baltimore in October 1991. This plan is being used as a framework by which the Department is being consolidated and made more responsive and efficient (Strategic Plan For Action, October, 1991).

By the Summer of 1992, the Department had successfully pulled out of all of its public housing recreation centers with the exception of one in the O'Donnell Heights community. The Boys' and Girls' Clubs of America moved into most of these facilities to continue to operate recreation programs (The Morning Sun, February 19, 1992). By the Fall 1992, ten additional recreation centers were closed, either to be turned over for alternate use by community groups or other private providers.

From a programmatic standpoint, several new initiatives were implemented during the early part of Marlyn J. Perritt's continuing tenure. One of these initiatives was the Youth Cotillion, an opportunity for young ladies to formally "enter" adult society (The Morning Sun, November 1, 1991). This program, and others, allowed the Bureau of Recreation to provide activities to bolster young people's self-esteem, as well as provide positive alternatives to the typical anti-social behaviors exhibited by many urban youth. Additionally, city-wide basketball tournaments, as well as overnight camping

activities in city parks provided different experiences for the youth of Baltimore (1990 - 1992 Accomplishments Report to Mayor, 1992).

In an effort to supplement the decreasing municipal support for recreation and parks services, Perritt also developed a new grant-writing team whose purpose was to secure alternative sources of funding for recreation and parks programs. Over \$350,000 in Federal, State and private funds had been secured by the beginning of 1993 (Department of Recreation and Parks Fiscal Year 1994 Budget Request, 1993).

As the Department of Recreation and Parks and the Bureau of Recreation move toward the next century, the realities of decreased governmental support (\$11.4 million projected by Fiscal Year 1994 for the Bureau of Recreation), less staff (281 full-time recreation employees by the end of 1993), and fewer recreation centers (68 at the beginning of 1993), force both the Bureau and the Department to look for new ways of providing services to the citizens of Baltimore (Fiscal Year 1994 Budget Request, 1993). The challenge exists for the Department to grasp by providing quality recreation and parks services through the training of existing staff, maintenance of existing facilities, and enhancement of existing programs, with the hopes of moving on to new projects as the future takes hold.

BALTIMORE CITY PARK BOARD (1937 - 1947)

William M. Thomas	(1937 - 1940)
W. Hamilton Kelly	(1940 - 1941)
Robert M. Brown	(1941 - 1942)
Richard M. Brown	(1942 - 1943)
Robert M. Brown	(1943 - 1944)
Robert M. Brown	(1944 - 1945)
Robert M. Brown	(1945 - 1946)
Robert M. Brown	(1946 - 1947)

BALTIMORE CITY BOARD OF PUBLIC RECREATION (1947)

APPENDIX A

BALTIMORE CITY BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS (1940 - 1947)

BALTIMORE CITY BOARD OF PUBLIC RECREATION (1947)

BALTIMORE CITY BOARD OF RECREATION AND PARKS (1947 - 1988)

BALTIMORE CITY BOARD OF RECREATION AND PARKS (1947 - 1988)

Robert M. Brown	(1947 - 1950)
Robert M. Brown	(1950 - 1951)
Robert M. Brown	(1951 - 1952)
Robert M. Brown	(1952 - 1953)
Robert M. Brown	(1953 - 1954)
Robert M. Brown	(1954 - 1955)
Robert M. Brown	(1955 - 1956)
Robert M. Brown	(1956 - 1957)
Robert M. Brown	(1957 - 1958)
Robert M. Brown	(1958 - 1959)
Robert M. Brown	(1959 - 1960)
Robert M. Brown	(1960 - 1961)
Robert M. Brown	(1961 - 1962)
Robert M. Brown	(1962 - 1963)
Robert M. Brown	(1963 - 1964)
Robert M. Brown	(1964 - 1965)
Robert M. Brown	(1965 - 1966)
Robert M. Brown	(1966 - 1967)
Robert M. Brown	(1967 - 1968)
Robert M. Brown	(1968 - 1969)
Robert M. Brown	(1969 - 1970)
Robert M. Brown	(1970 - 1971)
Robert M. Brown	(1971 - 1972)
Robert M. Brown	(1972 - 1973)
Robert M. Brown	(1973 - 1974)
Robert M. Brown	(1974 - 1975)

BALTIMORE CITY PARK BOARD (1940 - 1947)

Frank H. Durkee	(1940 - 1945)
C. Markland Kelly	(1940 - 1943)
George M. Armor	(1940 - 1947)
Richard M. Baker	(1940 - 1942)
Alfred E. Cross	(1940 - 1943)
S. Lawrence Hammerman	(1942 - 1947)
Edward Kowzan	(1943 - 1947)
C. William Hicks	(1944 - 1944)
C.K. Straub	(1945 - 1947)
Anne W. Bunker	(1946 - 1947)

BALTIMORE CITY BOARD OF PUBLIC RECREATION (1947)

Robert Garrett
Donald Hooker
Mrs. Henry E. Corner
J. Marshall Boone
William H. McAbee
Abel Rosenburg
Robert Stinson

BALTIMORE CITY BOARD OF RECREATION AND PARKS (1947 - 1988)

Robert Garrett	(1947 - 1950)
J. Marshall Boone	(1947 - 1950)
S. Lawrence Hammerman	(1947 - 1959)
Dr. Bernard Harris	(1947 - 1952)
Weston B. Scrimger	(1947 - 1950)
R. Wilburt Marsheck	(1947 - 1950)
Mrs. Howard W. Ford	(1947 - 1948)
Dr. J. Ben Robinson	(1948 - 1952)
George G. Shriver	(1950 - 1961)
Gerald S. Wise	(1950 - 1962)
James C. Anderson	(1950 - 1959)
James H. Gorges	(1950 - 1963)
Rev. Wilbur H. Waters	(1952 - 1956)
Mrs. William Rysanek, Sr.	(1952 - 1960)
J. Alvin Jones	(1956 - 1964)
Dr. Frank C. Marino	(1959 - 1964)
Irvin Kovens	(1959 - 1965)
Mrs. M. Richmond Farring	(1960 - 1975)
Paul K. Hampshire	(1961 - 1969)
Samuel Epstein	(1962 - 1968)
Charles H. Rosenbaum	(1963 - 1968)
Marshall W. Jones, Jr.	(1964 - 1965)
Samuel Hopkins	(1965 - 1984)
Joseph H. Rash	(1965 - 1975)

Mrs. Robert L. Gill	(1965 - 1972)
Harry D. Kaufman	(1968 - 1978)
Dr. Uthman Ray, Jr.	(1968 - 1982 and 1984 - 1988)
Nazzareno Velleggia	(1969 - 1975)
Ann F. Scheper	(1972 - 1988)
Grover L. McCrea, Jr.	(1975 - 1981)
Carolyn O'Hara	(1976 - 1980)
Paul J. Goldberg	(1976 - 1988)
Vernon H. Weisand	(1978 - 1988)
Louis J. Grasmick	(1979 - 1988)
Louise A. Adler	(1980 - 1984)
Howard Marshall	(1981 - 1985)
George L. Russell	(1982 - 1984)
Michael Hart	(1984 - 1988)
Doris M. Johnson	(1985 - 1988)

APPENDIX B
BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS
DIRECTORS (1947 - 1989)
AND
BALTIMORE CITY BOARD OF RECREATION
SUPERINTENDENTS (1947 - 1986)

APPENDIX B
BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS
DIRECTORS (1947 - 1988)
AND
BALTIMORE CITY BUREAU OF RECREATION
SUPERINTENDENTS (1947 - 1988)

NOTE: Prior to the merger in 1947, there was no Director of Recreation and Parks. Instead, there was a Superintendent of Public Recreation (Harold S. Callowhill) and a General Superintendent of Parks (George L. Nichols). Nichols served until 1946, when he retired, and the position of General Superintendent of Parks was changed to Director of Parks and R. Brooke Maxwell was named to that position.

DIRECTORS OF RECREATION AND PARKS (1947 - 1988)

R. Brooke Maxwell	(1947 - 1959)
Charles A. Hook	(1960 - 1965)
Douglas S. Tawney	(1965 - 1982)
Larry Rose (Acting)	(1982 - 1983)
Chris T. Delaporte	(1983 - 1987)
James E. Grant (Acting)	(1987 - 1988)
Dr. Ralph W.E. Jones, Jr.	(1988 - 1989)

SUPERINTENDENTS OF RECREATION (1947 - 1988)

Harold S. Callowhill	(1947 - 1965)
John G. Williams	(1965 - 1969)
Alfred L. Cottrill	(1969 - 1981)
James E. Grant	(1981 - 1988)

1938. Until the merger in 1937, there was little information
 available on the Bureau of Public Recreation in Baltimore. The
 information was available on the Bureau of Public
 Recreation of which the Bureau of Public Recreation might be
 a part. You will see the evidence of the change in 1937.

SUMMARY

1938	\$ 2,000,000 (RECREATION)
1939	\$ 2,131,810 (RECREATION)
1940	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1941	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)

APPENDIX C
BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS
BUREAU OF RECREATION ANNUAL BUDGETS
(1940 - 1988)

1940	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1941	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1942	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1943	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1944	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1945	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1946	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1947	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1948	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1949	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1950	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1951	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1952	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1953	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1954	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1955	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1956	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1957	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1958	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1959	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1960	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1961	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1962	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1963	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1964	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1965	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1966	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1967	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1968	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1969	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1970	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1971	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1972	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1973	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1974	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1975	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1976	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1977	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1978	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1979	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1980	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1981	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1982	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1983	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1984	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1985	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1986	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1987	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)
1988	\$ 2,144,437 (RECREATION)

NOTE: Until the merger in 1947, there was little information available on the Bureau of Public Recreation's budgets. At best, information was available on the Bureau of Parks' budget, of which the Bureau of Public Recreation might receive a portion. You will see the evidence of the change as 1947 grew closer.

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>BUDGETED AMOUNT</u>
	\$ 2,000,000 (PARKS)
1940	\$ 2,151,510 (PARKS)
1941	\$ 216,477 (RECREATION)
	\$ 2,464,262 (PARKS)
1942	\$ 341,224 (RECREATION)
1945	\$ 448,745 (RECREATION)
1946	\$ 473,866 (RECREATION)
1947	\$ 715,383 (RECREATION)
1948	\$ 795,968 (RECREATION)
1949	\$ 568,476 (RECREATION)
1950	\$ 768,975 (RECREATION)
1952	\$ 877,890 (RECREATION)
1953	\$ 924,128 (RECREATION)
1954	\$ 931,135 (RECREATION)
1955	\$ 1,018,877 (RECREATION)
1956	\$ 1,059,633 (RECREATION)
1957	\$ 1,308,224 (RECREATION)
1958	\$ 1,310,645 (RECREATION)
1959	\$ 1,338,387 (RECREATION)
1960	\$ 1,417,652 (RECREATION)
1961	

1962	\$ 1,571,798 (RECREATION)
1963	\$ 1,620,190 (RECREATION)
1964	\$ 1,857,518 (RECREATION)
1965	\$ 2,019,625 (RECREATION)
1966 (FISCAL 1966- 2ND HALF)	\$ 1,103,235 (RECREATION)
1967 (FISCAL)	\$ 2,411,528 (RECREATION)
1968 (FISCAL)	\$ 3,609,741 (RECREATION)
1969 (FISCAL)	\$ 3,832,221 (RECREATION)
1970 (FISCAL)	\$ 4,568,428 (RECREATION)
1971 (FISCAL)	\$ 5,400,000 (RECREATION)
1972 (FISCAL)	\$ 6,390,505 (RECREATION)
1973 (FISCAL)	\$ 6,192,345 (RECREATION)
1974 (FISCAL)	\$ 7,092,288 (RECREATION)
1975 (FISCAL)	\$ 7,582,929 (RECREATION)
1976 (FISCAL)	\$ 8,564,878 (RECREATION)
1977 (FISCAL)	\$ 7,134,917 (RECREATION)
1978 (FISCAL)	\$ 10,520,422 (RECREATION)
1979 (FISCAL)	\$ 9,593,700 (RECREATION)
1980 (FISCAL)	\$ 9,719,104 (RECREATION)
1981 (FISCAL)	\$ 10,102,760 (RECREATION)
1982 (FISCAL)	\$ 10,506,068 (RECREATION)
1983 (FISCAL)	\$ 10,076,357 (RECREATION)
1984 (FISCAL)	\$ 10,742,033 (RECREATION)
1985 (FISCAL)	\$ 11,016,805 (RECREATION)
1986 (FISCAL)	\$ 9,600,772 (RECREATION)

1987 (FISCAL)	\$ 12,371,287 (RECREATION)
1988 (FISCAL)	\$ 12,560,000 (RECREATION)
1989 (FISCAL)	\$ 12,480,000 (RECREATION)

APPENDIX D
BALTIMORE CITY BUREAU OF RECREATION
RECREATION CENTERS, PLAYGROUNDS AND PLAYFIELDS
(1940 - 1988)

1940 - 4 facilities

1. Carroll Mansion Recreation Center
2. Carroll Park Pavilion
3. Patterson Park Casino
4. South Baltimore Recreation Center

1950 - 18 facilities + 35 Playgrounds

1. Armistead Gardens Recreation Center
2. Brooklyn Recreation Center
3. Canton Recreation Center
4. Carroll Mansion Recreation Center
5. Carroll Park Pavilion
6. Hamilton Recreation Center
7. Hollins Recreation Center
8. Latrobe Homes Recreation Center
9. Lions Club Recreation Center
10. Mt. Royal Recreation Center
11. Patterson Park Casino
12. Public School #230
13. North Baltimore Kiwanis Park Playfield
14. Recreation Pier
15. Roosevelt Park Recreation Center
16. Schenley Playfield
17. South Baltimore Recreation Center
18. W.S. Cahill Recreation Center

1960 - 42 Community Centers + 23 Playgrounds

1. Brooklyn Recreation Center
2. Canton Recreation Center
3. Carver-Easterwood Recreation Center
4. Cherry Hill Homes Recreation Center
5. Cherry Hill Recreation Center
6. Chick Webb Memorial Recreation Center
7. Claremont Homes Recreation Center
8. Curtis Bay Recreation Center
9. Elmer Henderson Recreation Center
10. Fairfield Homes Recreation Center
11. Fannie C. Barbour - Poe Homes Recreation Center
12. Flag House Recreation Center
13. Fort View Recreation Center
14. Gilmor Homes Recreation Center
15. Greenmount Recreation Center
16. Gwynns Falls Recreation Center
17. Hamilton Recreation Center

18. Hazelwood Recreation Center
19. Hollins Recreation Center
20. Josiah Diggs Recreation Center
21. Lafayette Courts Recreation Center
22. Latrobe Homes Recreation Center
23. Latrobe Park Recreation Center
24. Leith Walk Recreation Center
25. Lexington Street Recreation Center
26. Lions Club Recreation Center
27. Mary E. Rodman Recreation Center
28. McCulloh Homes Recreation Center
29. Mount Royal Recreation Center
30. Northwood Recreation Center
31. O'Donnell Heights Recreation Center
32. Patterson Park Casino
33. Perkins Homes Recreation Center
34. P.S. #101 Recreation Center
35. Recreation Pier
36. Roosevelt Park Recreation Center
37. Rutland Recreation Center
38. Somerset Recreation Center
39. South Baltimore Recreation Center
40. Westport Homes Recreation Center
41. W.S. Cahill Recreation Center
42. Yorkwood Recreation Center

1970 - 98 Community Centers + 44 Playgrounds

1. Alexander Hamilton Recreation Center
2. Ambrose Kennedy Playground
3. Armistead Recreation Center
4. Arundel Recreation Center
5. Baybrook Recreation Center
6. Bentalou Recreation Center
7. Bocek Playfield
8. Brooklyn Recreation Center
9. Cahill Recreation Center
10. Canton Recreation Center
11. Carroll Park Recreation Center
12. Carter Woodson Recreation Center
13. Cecil Recreation Center
14. Cherry Hill Homes Recreation Center
15. Chick Webb Memorial Recreation Center
16. Claremont Recreation Center
17. Cloverdale Playground
18. Coldstream Recreation Center
19. Crispus Attucks Recreation Center
20. Curtis Bay Recreation Center
21. Dewees Playfield
22. Easterwood Park Recreation Center
23. Edgcombe Circle Recreation Center

24. Elmley Playground
25. Elmer Henderson Recreation Center
26. Fairfield Homes Recreation Center
27. Fannie L. Barbour Recreation Center
28. Flag House Recreation Center
29. Fort View Recreation Center
30. Fort Worthington Recreation Center
31. Franklin Square Recreation Center
32. Fred B. Leidig Recreation Center
33. Furley Recreation Center
34. Gardenville Recreation Center
35. Gilmor Homes Recreation Center
36. Greenmount Recreation Center
37. Grove Park Recreation Center
38. Guilford Recreation Center
39. Gwynns Falls Recreation Center
40. Hamilton Recreation Center
41. Hanlon Recreation Center
42. Harlem Park Recreation Center
43. Herring Run Recreation Center
44. Hilton Recreation Center
45. Howard Park Recreation Center
46. Irvington Recreation Center
47. Irvin M. Luckman Memorial Playground
48. James McHenry Recreation Center
49. John Booth Recreation Center
50. John Eager Howard Recreation Center
51. Johnston Square Recreation Center
52. Joseph Lee Playfield
53. Lafayette Courts Recreation Center
54. Lakeland Recreation Center
55. Latrobe Homes Recreation Center
56. Leith Walk Recreation Center
57. Lexington Terrace Recreation Center
58. Liberty Recreation Center
59. Lions Club Recreation Center
60. Locust Point Recreation Center
61. Lyndhurst Playground
62. McCulloh Homes Recreation Center
63. Madison Square Recreation Center
64. Martin Luther King Recreation Center
65. Mary E. Rodman Playground
66. Medfield Heights Recreation Center
67. Morrell Park Playground
68. Mount Royal Recreation Center
69. Mount Winans Recreation Center
70. Murphy Homes Recreation Center
71. North Harford Playfield
72. Northwood Recreation Center
73. O'Donnell Heights Recreation Center
74. Patapsco Recreation Center
75. Patterson Park Playground

76. Perkins Homes Recreation Center
77. Queensberry Playground
78. Radecke Playfield
79. Ralph J. Young Recreation Center
80. Recreation Pier Recreation Center
81. Riverside Park Playground
82. Rognel Heights Recreation Center
83. Roosevelt Park Recreation Center
84. Rutland Recreation Center
85. Sharp Street Playground
86. Somerset Courts Recreation Center
87. South Baltimore Recreation Center
88. Steuart Hill Recreation Center
89. Towanda Playfield
90. Violetville Recreation Center
91. Waverly Recreation Center
92. Webster M. Kendrick Recreation Center
93. Westport Homes Recreation Center
94. Wilbur Waters Playground
95. Wilkins Playground
96. William H. McAbee Playground
97. Winston Recreation Center
98. Woodhome Recreation Center

1980 - 120 Community Centers/Playgrounds
+ 22 Summer-Only Playgrounds

1. Alexander Hamilton Recreation Center
2. Ambrose Kennedy Playground
3. Ann Street Recreation Center
4. Bentalou Recreation Center
5. Bocek Playfield
6. Brehms Lane Recreation Center
7. Brooklyn Recreation Center
8. C.C. Jackson Recreation Center
9. Cahill Recreation Center
10. Canton Playfield
11. Canton Recreation Center
12. Carroll F. Cook Recreation Center
13. Carroll Park Recreation Center
14. Carter Woodson Recreation Center
15. Cecil-Kirk Recreation Center
16. Central Rosemont Recreation Center
17. Cherry Hill Homes Aquatics Center
18. Cherry Hill Homes Recreation Center
19. Cherry Hill Multi-Purpose Center
20. Chick Webb Memorial Recreation Center
21. Claremont Recreation Center

74. Locust Point Recreation Center
75. Lyndhurst Playground
76. Madison Square Recreation Center
77. Martin Luther King Recreation Center
78. Mary E. Rodman Recreation Center
79. McCulloh Homes Recreation Center
80. Medfield Heights Recreation Center
81. Mora Crossman Recreation Center
82. Morrell Park Recreation Center
83. Mount Royal Recreation Center
84. Mount Winans Recreation Center
85. Mullan Recreation Center
86. Murphy Homes Recreation Center
87. North Harford Playfield
88. Northwood Recreation Center
89. O'Donnell Heights Recreation Center
90. Parkview Recreation Center
91. Patapsco Recreation Center
92. Patterson Park Recreation Center
93. Perkins Homes Recreation Center
94. Radecke Playfield
95. Ralph J. Young Recreation Center
96. Recreation Pier Recreation Center
97. Robert C. Marshall Recreation Center
98. Rognel Heights Recreation Center
99. Roosevelt Park Recreation Center
100. Rosemont Recreation Center
101. Rutland Recreation Center
102. Samuel F.B. Morse Recreation Center
103. Schenley Road Recreation Center
104. Sharp Street Playground
105. Somerset Courts Recreation Center
106. South Baltimore Recreation Center
107. Steuart Hill Recreation Center
108. Tench Tilghman Recreation Center
109. Towanda Recreation Center
110. Variety Club Recreation Center
111. Violetville Recreation Center
112. Walter P. Carter Recreation Center
113. Waverly Recreation Center
114. Webster M. Kendrick Recreation Center
115. Westport Homes Recreation Center
116. Wilbur Waters Playground
117. Wilkens Playground
118. William H. McAbee Playground
119. Woodhome Recreation Center
120. Wyman Park Multi-Purpose Center

APPENDIX E
BALTIMORE CITY BUREAU OF RECREATION
PERSONNEL STATISTICS
(1940 - 1988)

NOTE: Positions described below are full-time positions hired for work in recreation centers and programs. The part-time positions in the Bureau of Recreation were funded by a variety of sources (Federal, State, Local Government Funds and privately raised funds from volunteer groups. These part-time positions were difficult, if not impossible, to track on a City-wide basis.

1940

24 Recreation Workers Employed Year-Round

1950

140 Recreation Workers Employed Full-Time

1960

212 Recreation Workers Employed Full-Time

1970

591 Recreation Workers Employed Full-Time

1980

524 Recreation Workers Employed Full-Time

NOTE: The programs listed below are indicative of the programs
 programming that occurred in each recreation center
 or playground in the Baltimore City Bureau of
 Recreation, unless otherwise indicated.

1949-1950

Boys and Men's Activities

- Baseball
- Football
- Soccer
- Basketball
- Track & Field

Girls and Women's Activities

- Physical Conditioning
- Dance
- Cooking
- Home Arts

APPENDIX F

BALTIMORE CITY BUREAU OF RECREATION PROGRAM TRENDS

Children's Activities

- Playground Games
- Contests
- Field Games
- Arts and Crafts
- Gardening/Nature

Recreational Activities

- Tennis
- Golf
- Swimming

NOTE: The programs listed below are indicative of the basic programming that occurred in each recreation center or playground in the Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation, unless otherwise indicated.

1940s and 1950s

Boys and Men's Activities

Basketball
Football
Soccer
Softball
Track & Field

Girls' and Women's Activities

Physical Conditioning
Crafts
Cooking Classes
Dance Classes

Children's Activities

Playground Games
Contests
Table Games
Arts and Crafts
Gardens/Nature

Co-Educational Activities

Tennis
Golf
Swimming

1960s and 1970s

ALL PROGRAMS FROM THE 50S AND 60S PLUS:

Specialized Programs

1960

Detached Worker Program (later Street Club Workers Program)
Seniors (Golden Age Clubs)

Archery

Horseback Riding

Services for the Physically Handicapped

"Operation Champ" - Mobile Sports Programs for Urban Youth

Cultural Arts Performance Programs

Camp Concern - Day Camping for Inner City Children

Camp Variety - Day Camping for the Handicapped

Operation Birdland - Trips to Major League Baseball Games

Portable Pools

Ice Skating

1970

Baltimore Neighborhood Basketball League (BMBL)

United States Youth Games

19808

ALL PROGRAMS FROM PREVIOUS YEARS, PLUS:

Fee-based Programs

Video Games

Outward Bound

Bowling

Roller Skating

-- Developmental Recreation Programs
(Instructional, and Fee-based)

Cycling

Competitive Swimming

Track & Field (City-Wide Team)

Ice Skating

Rowing

Jr. Golf

Volleyball

Wrestling

Bowling

Basketball Instructional Camps

Roller Skating

Performing Arts

Weightlifting

Gymnastics

Residential Camping (Revision of Old Camp Concern)

School-Age Child Care (School Age and Tiny Tots)

Outdoor Education (Carrie Murray Campus)

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT - HOPE GODWIN

NOTE: This interview was conducted by this researcher (C.P.), Barry Kessler (B.K.), a curator with the Baltimore City Life Museums, and Vicki Houck (V.H.), an undergraduate student at the University of Maryland on November 11, 1988. Miss Godwin passed away in 1992.

B.K. - Why don't you tell us how you came to Baltimore and how you got started in recreation?

H.G. - Well Robert Garrett had formed the Children's Playground Association and there was a woman named Margaret Haydock who was the head of it. Then he got interested - I think he was a javelin thrower, but I'm not sure, in the Olympics. And he was interested in athletics and he decided to form the Playground Athletic League. They added athletic to it and they merged, I don't know the exact date of the merger, maybe I have it here somewhere...

B.K. - 1922... don't worry about it - don't worry about dates...they merged in 1922... I really don't care what the date is, I want to know what you remember about it.

H.G. - Well, the PAL at that time had two departments - a white and a black - this was ahead of 1940 when the legislature established the Bureau of Recreation, and I of course, was in the white department, but the lady who was in charge of athletics for the PAL was named Mora Crossman, and she had been a Sargeant graduate , so, for some reason or other, she evidently felt that I could help her, so she made me her assistant, and as that, I had charge of the night centers for the Negroes. I had to run them in all the school

buildings, you know, the open nights centers - are you familiar with that? And they had colored teachers, so I had this bevy of black ones working for me, and I had a wonderful time. We had a demonstration, where they learned the things that they had in their night centers in the Richmond Market Armory upstairs, and you have never seen anything like it. We had about six hundred people in it, and they were doing the Irish Lilt, and everybody was on a different foot, with a different time, but everybody was in rhythm...it was fantastic! I hadn't seen anything like that in dance classes before, but anyway, that was the colored. And then they established a Colored Division, so then they got their own supervisors, and I was relieved of the responsibility - I had about thirty colored centers in different school buildings...and they ran athletic programs and dance, exercises, similar to the aerobics of today. And then, from that time on, I got interested in the activities of the PAL. Well, that went on until the Bureau of Recreation was created in 1940 by the legislature and then, of course, the PAL was wiped out... it all became the City Bureau of Recreation. And all of us who were with the Department got fairly good jobs at the time. We were made supervisors, you see, and Miss Crossman, who was my boss in previous years, she was the Director of Girls' Activities.... then they had a leader of Children's Activities, who was Miss Pearl Williams, she's still living, she works with Virginia Baker down at Fell's

Point, maybe you know about Fells' Point - we were down there yesterday.... we used to have a wonderful time at the Recreation Pier, you know, it's is the water, and the boys, you know, they'd be playing volleyball, kickball, or something like that - handball - and the ball would go over - we had a long pole, that was this great big long thing, doubled up, and they'd fight for who got to fish the ball out of the water so they could continue the game. We had more fun down at that place.

B.K./C.P. - Let's get back to talking about how the PAL kind of went out and they created the Bureau of Recreation... what really happened in that?

H.G. - It grew - under the PAL, and the staff we had, we had about five district supervisors, and when we became City, there were a lot of buildings that were given over to us. There was 1010 Light Street, which was called South Baltimore Recreation Center, and then we had one down at Carroll Mansion - that was one of my pets.... they gave us that building, and it was very interesting, Carroll Mansion, right across the street from a casket factory, and we got all kinds of things to put things in, these empty caskets and such... and, of course, the D'Alesandros, of course, were down there, and that was their interest, and that was what gave the impetus for getting something through the Legislature... D'Alesandro, really, 'cause he was mayor, and that was his neighborhood, his Little Italy, and all the kids were little Italians

runnin' around down there, and then, in addition to that, they gave us Patterson Park Pavilion, Carroll Park Pavilion, you see, belonged to the City. We had South Baltimore, we had Roosevelt Recreation Center, and Patterson, and there was one built called Joseph Lee, I think that is still in operation... there on East Monument somewhere... we had one at Fairfield. We had, I guess, about ten or twelve of what we called community centers, and while we were building in the City, others were building in the counties, but their interests were different. You see, they were working with all of these volunteers - you had a couple of children, so you wanted to get them in a league somewhere, and all of those county units built up, while Baltimore was building up its City program. And then in 1940, they decided they would incorporate it under the government - whether Garrett gave up pushing money into it or not, but there was a reason... so when we became City, they divided up these community centers, and I got Lions' Club down on Washington Boulevard - that building was given to us, South Baltimore Recreation Center, Carroll Mansion, and Cahill part of the time - have you ever heard of Cahill?... and you see in those days, jitterbug was very popular, they were very popular - indoor recreation in full swing. But then, you see, that's when we had a white department and the colored department. We had them at Montebello - I ran a dance at Clifton and Montebello - Clifton's Union High and Montebello and Cahill.

B.K. - Were those the white dances?

H.G. - These were the white dances, and we had mobs of jitterbugs - and we had a group that would go to each one. On a different night, you'd see the same kids - they went all over the city for these jitterbug dances. Well, that worked all right, until the colored department merged with the white, and then we had to cut the dances, we couldn't have them. You see, you can't take a crowd that's all Negro and bring them into a crowd that's all white and expect them to dance together - not immediately. You had to work into the neighborhood. So, our dance program fell apart.

B.K. - Why did you start those dances?

H.G. - Why did we start them? Well, the reason was, when they would come to the community center, the community center building would be divided into certain areas, and they'd have a large area, which would either serve as a gym or a dance floor - we could put tables up and have games parties - which we did, or club meetings, you'd have different clubs - we developed personality clubs and different groups - well they all wanted to get together, so you had a weekly dance. South Baltimore had a dance on a certain night, and we tried to space them around, and that's why some of the same kids would sometimes appear at the same dances. Did you ever learn to jitterbug?

B.K. - Sure... we did that in high school.

H.G. - It was very popular - we had records - we had a record machine, so we employed a girl to play the records, and then

I was the hostess, and Henry was at the door, keeping the roughnecks out. You had a dance card, and your dance card would admit you to any dance anywhere in the city. And so, when the war came along, I was loaned to the government, and I ran a swing-shift dance over on Monument Street at the YMHA - and from two in the morning until four, I got everybody who had just gotten off of swing shift - all the women, all these...

C.P. - Rosie the Riveters?...

H.G. - That's right, and all these hardnecks. Oh, boy, we had a time over there. And we had that a couple of nights a week - then I'd go home and sleep and go back to work the next day. But, dancing was popular until they merged the two departments. And then the Negroes put up their own dances - I never went to any of them, so I can't tell you what they were - I'm sure they were the same as what the whites did.

C.P. - Around when did they merge - was it around the 50's?

H.G. - 1940... they created the Department of Recreation in 1940.

C.P. - And they merged both the black group and the white group together in 1940?

H.G. - They did.

C.P. - I was under the impression that it happened later.

H.G. - No, no. But, I worked for the Negroes when I was on the PAL rolls - we had a separate department then and, I opened

the night centers and the demonstration up at the Woodsman Market Hall - did you ever hear of the Sun Meet... the Evening Sun Meet at the Armory?

C.P. - Track and Field?

H.G. - Yeah. That was an indoor meet with outdoor events. And we always had about eight thousand kids in that...white and black. My job at that meet was not to run a volleyball tournament - it was to worry about eight thousand coats and shoes and hats... So the bottom floor of the Armory was relegated to Hope, and I had to get all of these kids to work for me... if you came with a certain age group, a certain section of the floor was divided for your use since it was your age group and you took off your outside coat and put it in a bag and overshoes - it was always in the winter, and they wore too much - and put on your gym clothes. And then, you went upstairs to participate in the athletic events. So, I don't know much about the athletic events, 'cause I never saw anything but coats and boots...lost clothes and everything else. But, that was quite an experience, to organize all those bags - they'd line 'em up in bags, and they had numbers - you got a check, and when you came back, you gave a check and you hoped that the coat was back there that would match the kid. But that was the Evening Sun Meet, and the newspaper paid for all of the medals and the awards for that. And, incidently, they paid for all of my checkers that I had, too. That was before the time that the City department was founded.

B.K. - I want to show you this picture and see what you can tell me about it. You recognize that gentleman, don't you? The man on the swing?... it's not too clear - it's supposed to be Harold Callowhill.

H.G. - Harold and I never got along...(TAPE TURNED OFF)... Well, now, we've gotten to the point where the Department had been created and it was during the war years, we loaned people to help out with the war effort...for the swing shift, and as I said, I worked those dances at the YMHA, which was on Monument Street - I don't know if it is still there or not... the Young Men's Hebrew Association. I think it was in the block right off of Howard and Eutaw - I don't know if it's still there or not... Baltimore has changed so.

B.K. - I want to know when you went into the Pimlico school, were you supervising the activities, or did you have other supervisors underneath you or...

H.G. - No, we had what we called night centers in all of the school buildings - wherever there was an interest, or we thought we could get interest, we publicized it, and then we would send a professional there, like for a couple of years, I worked in all of these different nights centers, and we had one over at Roosevelt - the school building there at Falls Road - #55, I think it was called.

C.P. - Robert Poole Elementary....

H.G. - Robert Poole, yeah. And then those night centers, we got leagues going - basketball leagues in the spring and then

they began the same kids again through baseball and then we had, well, we got a deal with the Lion's Club and the Kiwanis... they gave the money and we ran these Little Leagues, and that's when we had the troubles, 'cause the parents were not reasonable at first...

B.K. - What about girls' athletics? What did you do?

H.G. - In these State Meets, you see, they had set programs for the...everybody did the same thing - white or Negro - and then you got winners, and the Negroes had a meet at the Stadium and the whites had a meet - that was when it was still PAL. They had volleyball teams for the girls, and they had leagues where they had teams from down Aberdeen, Elkton... in field ball - girls played field ball and boys played soccer. They had the team games, too. And in individual events, they had the different races, different distances; jumps - different distances, like the hop, step, jump; and throws, like throwing the ball so far - we would divide it into bronze, silver and gold.

B.K. - I actually have a picture of the girls playing basketball...

H.G. - Well, they had that in the winter. I was up one winter in Lanconing... it's a town that God forgot - and we had our headquarters in Cumberland and I used to referee girls' basketball. I was a nationally rated basketball official. Also a hockey umpire - I did that for the PAL. The private schools in Baltimore would call up the PAL and ask if you

could send a hockey referee out for the girls' leagues. And then, every fall, we went up to Philadelphia, and they would have a tournament for the players up there.

B.K. - What did you think about the difference of working for the PAL and working for the Bureau of Recreation? I just wonder, what was the difference?

H.G. - It was very different, because politics entered into it, you see. With the PAL, we had Robert Garrett - he was an old man, and he was a sympathetic man, and that was his baby - he put his money into it and he would follow through. And he had influential friends - he ran the Robert John Garrett Company - and he had money - Evergreen was John's and the other, Robert, was across the street. It was a different environment - we had Board meetings, but they were up at the Parks, you see, because we were the Recreation, Parks and Music - and it was all under one Board, and it was a political thing - it was a lot different in operation. And, then, when Callowhill died, and they got a new Superintendent, and he was a drunk, he was terrible...

B.K. - I wonder if you could give us an example of the Bureau of Recreation in the 40's - how its was working - what the political structure was...

H.G. - Well, it was working very good. Now, they had a Park Board, who were primarily men and who were interested in parks. But, we had a representative on there, so we made out all right and they established fair salaries. We were all

given the opportunity to pay into the pension system for the years we had worked for the PAL by paying an increased amount, which was good and they called it prior service...and it was run by the Board and Callowhill was a hard worker, for all of his faults, he really was, and he got around and people liked him. We had about twenty community center directors - all of them were in charge of a building. Then over the community center directors were the supervisors...now I had Cahill, because they had trouble there - anything that was messed up, they would seem to throw at me, whether it was in a different territory or not. Now, at the Lions' Club, and, part of the time I had Roosevelt, now they've had a lot of trouble with the pool over there, and South Baltimore Recreation Center. So, we took over these recreation centers, and put a director in there, and she was a step higher, of course, than the leaders, and then she, if she didn't have the proper facilities there, like South Baltimore was an old church, so it wasn't a gym program, but it was under the director of the center. So the community centers made good time - we even had one out at Leith Walk, out in Northwood, and we had one at Woodbourne. Everywhere I had a director, and they all ran programs and we had an interaction tournament - baseball, softball, basketball - but no dances, because the colored had come in - we couldn't do that. They had dance programs, where they taught dancing, but not social dancing - aerobics, and that kind of stuff. Then they put out a bulletin, I'm sorry

that I don't have a copy of their schedule of activities, you should be able to get one...

B.K. - My question is, you were supervising the centers, were you also involved with the playgrounds and with the community pools and the golf...

H.G. - For the summer, you had a swimming program, and the different centers were taken by bus to the swimming pool, and they competed in... of course, in the old days we had the Sun Meets, the swimming meets... we ran those in different pools. But then we used Hamilton Rec. when it was built, that was one of my baliwigs, 'cause there was no gym in Hamilton - we opened in an old bowling alley, and the Lions' Club in Hamilton paid the bill for the rent, and then they built - that was the first recreation center that was built on school grounds - the building out there. That did well - they had a beautiful craft shop, two kilns, and then we had dances there 'til they merged with the colored, you see. And the dance floor is built for roller skating, so they own a roller skating rink. They had crafts rooms, they had bowling alleys - everything. And the director would gauge her program by what facilities she had available - and school buildings were used, for gyms and things. And what else did we have - every center had a full program, because if it wasn't there, it was in a school building somewhere near, and by paying the janitor's time, we could utilize it.

B.K. - Tell me more about the activities in the parks... did you run activities in the parks?

H.G. - Every field house had a director. Clifton Park had Earl Regal - he ran it... you know where the swimming pool is in Clifton... across the street was a little field... the sports leagues were different from the programs that the centers ran, because it was a contract thing, and the boys who participated in the leagues had to come in under contract with a physical and everything and they were organized and they had special trophies from Municipal Sports, it was called. And they were mostly the older people - you got the fathers who came in on it then, they used to play, so they got in on Municipal Sports.

B.K. - Where did they play?

H.G. - They played in the parks. We had diamonds that we operated - Clifton Park, we had a dance in the mansion house, and we utilized the tennis courts, and we had an archery range there... well, they had everything, they used everything through their central recreation and the Bureau of Parks. And then we had music - we had concerts in the bandshells, through the cooperation of the Music Department - so, it was a good working business, until the Negroes got in on it - and that spoiled it. Because, if they had left them alone, they would have merged, you know, we had some Negroes in things, we have Negroes here, and they merge, but when they try to force it, then it just doesn't go. And you couldn't just socialize, you

dropped your social activities. We had teenage clubs - I don't know how many marriages may have resulted from those kids coming to those club meetings, but I'm sure a lot of them did. We didn't have any trouble with pregnancies in those days - I don't know whether they were more sophisticated or what - things didn't usually go that far...

C.P. - Did you have any problems with alcohol or...?

H.G. - Once in a while there'd be a problem, usually with our director.

B.K. - I wanted to ask you a little more about the integration, because you said there was a little bit happening, but then...

H.G. - You see, under the PAL, when they got Garrett in on it and we got the Playground Athletic League, while we had primarily a white staff, and the whites were in charge of all of the colored, like I had all of the night centers and gyms, and they ran leagues. Now, they had a man named C.C. Jackson, who was a Negro - he was a nice guy, he was a good friend of mine. He came from Springfield College with a Physical ed. degree, so they respected him. He was a supervisor, so you see, there was an edging in of the blacks into the structure of control - way back, before they got the law in 1940 - that's when the City created the Bureau of Recreation, Parks and Music... but it was hard when you merged, because Baltimore changed...everybody moved to the counties - there was an exodus - except for the ones that wanted to live in

apartments. But the suburbs took over, all around, but Baltimore, we have Mt. Pleasant, where they built the skating rink...but all the counties...

B.K. - Is there any way to summarize what you think the benefits of the recreation program were to the City, back in the 30's or 40's?

H.G. - I think that if I were to say anything, I would say that the emergence of the Negro organization came too late. It should have been earlier - it should have been done by the PAL, then, when they got the two departments, they would have had more power, and more money. And they had a man, a man in the Negro Division named Theodore Brown - he was good, he was a nice man, I don't know whatever became of him. And then Jennifer - he left us to take over the Civic Center when they developed that - we had him as a supervisor in the ZNegro department. They were good, but you see, they were only aping the whites - whatever the whites had - that's what they wanted.

B.K. - Why do you think that they didn't develop something on their own?

H.G. - I don't think the PAL Board was up to that... they were a group of politicians of Garrett's friends who were contributing money, you see, to run it, and they had to have finances, you see, they didn't get it from the City - they didn't get anything from the City until it became a Department.

B.K. - I don't know whether you told us why you left recreation?

H.G. - Callowhill died, and there was a job open, as an assistant superintendent, I don't know what they were doing about that, three of us walked out and went to the schools... then they filled the jobs, not with whites, but with coloreds. And now in the Bureau of Recreation, you have mostly coloreds.

B.K. - Somebody told me that you had the original idea for having the dances in recreation - is that true?

H.G. - True, I started the dances all over, yea. I never had a colored dance, though... I had the colored night centers, but I don't think they ever had a dance persay that was Negro - I guess they weren't up to that, yet. Do they have them now - Negro dances?...

B.K. - Let me ask you this - did the dances cost money... or were they free?

H.G. - They were free. All you had to have was a membership card and you had to behave - or else they took your card away. The card was good anywhere - you could go to any dance...

B.K. - Would you say that the City sponsored the dances - that they cost money to the program?

H.G. - I don't think they cost much, because they had me on salary, and Henry - he was the host - he was the equipment man from the basement, and then we had to pay a girl for the records, which was probably a dollar or something an hour. So you see, they didn't cost anything, and the Coca-Cola Company

was always willing to put in a machine. We had a very good woman in the financial office - her name was Marie Graffee - she got married later on, her name became MacNamara - she was a genius - she could account for every penny. Hamilton made a lot of money - they charged for things, and we had a safe that was built into the building. They had a report they brought in every week - a financial report, and she checked those reports, and nobody got away with anything. She was good... and when she left, they got other people, including Negroes, in the Financial Office - the money went... and Hamilton lost a lot of money - they usually charged for their craft supplies... and there was a lot of scandal....

B.K. - There was one last person I wanted to ask you about and that was William Burdick.

H.G. - He's the one who started the playgrounds. He came here from Newport, Rhode Island, and he was a doctor, and he believed in children's play, so he started the Playground Association. I don't know how he got to Garrett, but he did - got his money working and then it was Garrettt who got the Athletics in on it - but Burdick was the one who started the playgrounds.

APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT - JAMES E. GRANT

NOTE: This interview was conducted by this researcher on October 8, 1992. James E. Grant retired from his position as Superintendent of Recreation in 1989.

C.J. - When did you start working for the Bureau of Recreation?

J.G. - December 12, 1955.

C.J. - Wow, when you came in, the Department had only been desegregated for about how long?

J.G. - Well, the law had passed, but I don't think that there had been any integration at that time. It did begin to happen shortly thereafter.

C.J. - I think, in the Board Minutes - I've been down at the Archives for what seems like half of my life, it was like November of 1955, when the Board said that there would be no more segregation in Recreation and Parks. Now, saying that and it actually being so, I'm sure were two different things.

J.G. - That's true. I really don't remember the incidents surrounding that decision - that had occurred about a month before I got there. When I came in, everything was still in place - those folks who were black were still servicing the youngsters and adults that they had previously served.

C.J. - Were there still two separate divisions? Was there a Colored Division and a White Division?

J.G. - Yes, yes. Well, maybe not, in theory. In actuality, yes they were. At that time, the person who was working under the Superintendent was the Senior Supervisor - there were two such

persons - Mora Crossman was in charge of all of the programs, I think.

C.J. - Centers and playgrounds?

J.G. - Yes, and Theodore Brown, I guess more or less assisted her and was in charge of the black centers and staff.

C.J. - Where did you start at?

J.G. - My first assignment was Lafayette Courts, and the position that became available that I was assigned to came about because they had opened another center, School #101, and the person who was working there at Lafayette Courts had been promoted to the director there, and I went into Lafayette Courts as the leader. I worked at Lafayette Courts from the time that I was hired until February (1956), when I was transferred to Alexander Hamilton, School #145 -they had opened up a new center in that school. You want me to walk right through my career?

C.J. - Oh, sure!

J.G. - Down in South Baltimore, at the Lions' Club Center, where there was a heavy concentration of black families living, the youngsters there were beginning to go into that building, and the administrators felt that they needed to have a black person in there, and I was assigned to go into Lions' Club. Prior to my going to Lions' Club, I was sent to Mount Royal Center to work with Charlie Halm, and Mr. Halm was supposed to train me and prepare me to go to Lions' Club. I have great admiration for Charlie and what he did for his

community, and for his interest and concern for the young people.

C.J. - He was there forever.

J.G. - Forever and a day. I must have worked with Mr. Halm for about three months, but I learned an awful lot from working with Charlie. He was a fine person - and a good teacher! Then, when the time was right, they sent me on down to the Lions' Club, and that is where I spent most of my time in the field. I went into Lions' Club actually, as a leader, working with a new director, and we had a good program in there. Charlie Parks, who was an excellent, excellent recreator was in charge, and he took a job in Florida, but he left a good program, and another director had been working there with him, so they would have that continuity, and the other two staff people who were working with him were there. About that time, we were getting a sizeable number of black kids from the community. First of all, we were getting the boys, for athletics - not getting that many girls - just a sprinkling of girls. The person who had been working with the kids before I came had a basketball league - a nice little house league set up.

Three leagues, three teams of all white youth. This first thing the white youth wanted to know when I came there was if they could all play together. I stayed at Lions' Club as a leader, then I became a director at that site, after the director there became ill and was not coming back to that

site. In all my years in recreation and parks, working at Lions' Club, that's what I really enjoyed. However, there was a complete change in that community. When I went down there as a leader, we had no more than fifteen to seventeen young black men, and as the white families moved on up Washington Boulevard toward Morrell Park and Landsdowne and wherever, these youngsters and more of their families began to move around, I think the thing that put us in good stead was that the youngsters wanted to be a part of the program - they were willing to abide by my stern rules (and I had stern rules), of course everytime I see one of "my boys," they tell me they are happy that I had those rules. In time, we had just a predominantly black community. I guess I stayed there for about twelve years - in those days, you didn't stay in a site very long - you'd stay for a while and then they would move you on to somewhere else. I'm not so sure that that isn't a good thing to do.

C.J. - I think I would agree.

J.G. - You can stay in a place so long that it is no longer a challenge for you. I had some good staff people that came and worked with me, and some of those people later became directors. Some of those young people are still with us working in the Bureau, and I think we provided them with a good experience. One of the things that I remember very, very vividly during the riots - you're too young to remember that...

C.J. - What, the riots? No, I'm not.

J.G. - You're a year older than I thought you were. During those four or five days when there was a curfew and no one could move, I told the Superintendent, Mr. Callowhill, that I really felt that if he would let me go over to Washington Boulevard and Fremont Avenue, I could do more to control those youngsters than all of the police you had down there. I'm going to open the doors, and my young people are going to come in, and they're going to stay in there until I tell them to leave. And I still believe that's true. I think that if they had sent any of us to do our work that we could have done it, and done more to keep things quiet than perhaps the police did. I don't know, I think we started some programs there, I feel, that perhaps had not been tried - I don't remember a lot of sports banquets and Mother and Daughter banquets - we did an awful lot of that, and always tried to involve our youngsters and their parents. It's good now when I see some of the parents working and supporting us, and they still talk about what a good job we did for their children. The young people that I see now, I'm just so proud of many of our young people - I talk about the young fellow who is an accountant and others - they were hellraisers in South Baltimore. I talked to one of those young people the other day and he said "We lost a few, but you saved most of the rest of us."

C.J. - That's important.

J.G. - Yeah. It wasn't unusual for me to bring a boy home with me, if he was in trouble, and it wasn't unusual for me to go to the schools. One of the things that I had difficulty with initially was developing a relationship between that center and the schools, where I could get the principal and the teachers to come by in the evening and see what their young people were doing, and finally, we got that going to the point where it was a very, very good relationship between the elementary school and the junior high school in that community.

C.J. - Where did you go after Lions' Club?

J.G. - After Lions' Club, there was need, because of the growth in recreation centers, for another supervisor, and the Superintendent decided to have one person to handle special programs, and they increased the districts from seven to eight, and I became the District Supervisor of District Eight - that was an experience! We did a superb job, of course, I had good people. And when you have good, dedicated people, you're just guiding them along, making sure that they have good equipment, being there when they wanted to cry on your shoulder, but they would do the work and they knew what they were doing - that's the kind of people that we had.

C.J. - What year was that?

J.G. - That was about '68, or something like that.

C.J. - Well, then, that was the riots.

J.G. - Then it must have been the early 70's. We tried to pull all of our people together, we tried to make sure that they were working together to the degree that, if one of them had a resource, we would work out the details and try to have group activities. We had a heavy concentration of girls in many of our centers, but the thing that bothered me was, that whenever you had a fundraiser, the women were doing the work, selling the tickets and all that, sponsoring the activities like sports programs, and it involved the fellas, it didn't involve was many girls, and I just thought that we had to do something about that. One of the things that we did and had great success was we had Girls' Day, District Girls' Day, which was their day for athletics. It wasn't a matter of whether you can or you can't, you did participate. We tried to hold these kinds of activities on days when school was out, for a full day. The girls' activities went over extremely well. Of course, I tried to get some things going in many of the centers that I had done in Lions' Club. We had one evening a week that we devoted the entire buildings to the youngsters - I don't know how we're doing things now, but in those days youngsters 12 yrs. old and younger came in the afternoons, but we set aside one evening to get those little people together, and they just had a fantastic time. I think that why I'm troubled when I go into some of these recreation centers and don't see people really doing things for these youngsters there's a tremendous amount of organization used to

get kids to do things, but it will develop. Of course, the thing about it is, once you teach these kids these kinds of activities, that's what they draw from. I went to District 8 and I stayed there a guess about eight years, and that was a good experience, whereas when I was working in the recreation center I had the opportunity to work closely with young people, and I could in some way shape their growth and development, working as a District Supervisor I had to shape the development of the staff, and we would always get the young people who were music majors, math majors...

C.J. - Anything but recreation majors...

J.G. - Right, and it took a great deal of work to bring some of them around. Those young men, who figured that because he played basketball, he said "I'm a recreator," but we've come through that, and we tried to involve volunteers. I talked about the Girls' Day, and some of the male leaders thought we were giving too much attention to the girls and wanted something for the boys, so I hired three guys who were teachers, and that was one of the best moves I ever made. These guys, they were good, dedicated men, and they knew what they were doing, and they just went in and did a fantastic job. I just believe that there needs to be an ongoing schedule. I know that there will be times, for one reason or another, where you just don't follow that schedule, but I contend that if I go into your recreation center, just give me fifteen minutes and I'll tell you something about the people

who run that facility. I think the facility reflects the people that work there. Then after fiddling around the District for about eight years, the position of Personnel Officer came up...

C.J. - Mr. Lampkin had died....

J.G. - Well, he had retired; he was ill, and he retired, and I followed him, and that caused a lot of concern. There were some older folk, who had been around longer, and felt that they should have been promoted.

C.J. - When will we ever get through to folks that longevity doesn't necessarily mean competence?

J.G. - That's right.

C.J. - You became Superintendent of Recreation in...

J.G. - In '80 (I think)... it must have been just prior to...

C.J. - I've got it - it's in the Board Minutes...

J.G. - I applied for the position because it was the thing to do, not because I was interested in becoming Superintendent, but then I wind up being #1 on the list, and the people who were, I guess, in line, for whatever reason didn't qualify on the examination. They asked me, "are you interested?" and I said "yes, I'm interested" and after a lot of discussion - Board Discussion, Mayor's Discussion, let's see, I guess we're African-Americans now, there had never been one of us filling that position. I wasn't aware that it had created some discussion at the City Hall level.

C.J. - Well, from what I've been reading, the first person who tried had been Harold Jennifer...and he didn't get it, and Cottrill got it, and all hell broke loose.

J.G. - That's why I've always thought that they gave Jennifer the job at the Civic Center.

C.J. - The paper said that if they didn't give it to him, there was going to be a war...

J.G. - One of the hearing officers for Civil Service said that the Board went against his recommendation only once, and that was Jennifer's case. He said it was clear that he (Jennifer) was shoulders and above Cottrill.

C.J. - O.K., you were Superintendent of Recreation...

J.G. - Shortly after that, they got the bright idea to have the Superintendent of Recreation in one building and the Superintendent of Parks in another building, which was near the Director - UNFAIR TREATMENT! I told one Board member that I was comfortable where I was - I didn't want to go anywhere else...

C.J. - But we were always second-class citizens....

J.G. - Always, always. The one person that I can remember from years back who did any work with recreation, and I got to respect him a great deal, was Bill Bunn (engineering Division). Bill, within the work that he was assigned, seemed to be more concerned with what he was doing. However, there was always a tremendous difference between recreation and parks. Of course, our budget, I believe, when I came in was

about \$9.5 million, and the total budget was like \$27 or \$28 million. I can remember in later days, when the budget was \$38 million, our budget was \$10.5 million. Granted, there were a lot of things that Parks was responsible for, like construction and all that, but we never really had anything to work with to any degree, because it was all tied up in personnel. It seems like in the middle, late 60's, early 70's, any community that said to City government "we want a recreation center" - BINGO! -they would build a recreation center. We looked up one day and we were operating 136 facilities. Some of them were poorly staffed, in need of repair, but the community asked for recreation. I used to keep a map of facilities located in Councilmanic Districts, and Councilmanic District #6 had more than any others, and someone told me that the thinking was, "if we give them another recreation center, we'll keep them quiet." My thinking is, that we still had too many sites for the population of this City, and I can remember very vividly that Doug Tawney, who was the Director for a long period of time, used to say to us - "You need to begin thinking about what the future holds. The City is not going to be able to provide what it now provides. I see the day when the City will open a recreation center with a Director and a custodian." We didn't hear him, and we looked up, and just what Doug was saying to us was right there before our eyes. From a high of

140 centers, when I left, there must have been ninety, or eighty-eight or so...

C.J. - We have seventy now... where did they all go? I don't remember hearing what I've been hearing over the past couple of years. I mean, we shut down at least fifty, and I didn't hear a squeak...

J.G. - People, in many instances, were not as vocal, and in some instances, like some of the housing projects, when they began to rehab the places, we just walked out, and never went back. I remember one of the first real crises that I had as Superintendent was at budget time, and Doug (Tawney) said to me, "You're going to have to close some centers and lay off some staff" and we tried to look at some sites, and I think the same type of thinking that goes on now, like, if you walked out of a building, the City would still be providing some type of service in that community. You looked at statistics, whether the building was about to fall down around your head, etc. - all these kinds of things went into play - was there a center here and one across the street? We went down this list and decided that we would come out of some of these small centers and school buildings where we only had a corridor or maybe the gym - MY GOD! - you would have thought that we were trying to turn the world around! But we did what we thought was in the best interest of the community based on what the City needed to do. When we started talking about the staff people that we would be laying off, it was at a time

when we were planning to move some of our supervisors around, and one of our supervisors gathered their forces together and they said, "We don't have any concern about that center you want to close, we're just concerned about you moving Mr. X," but we went ahead and did it anyway. It's better, because we went through with it. That wasn't always the case, however. There have been situations where staff have made recommendations based on all of the information that we had, and we firmly believed that we were making the best choices that we could make, but we didn't get the support that we needed, and people would often cave in to the political leadership. Through it all, the City survives. And of course, after staying there for several years as Superintendent, after Chris (Delaporte) left, they put me in as Acting Director, and then I came back to my position, and then I came home (retired).

C.J. - And that was in '89... or '90?

J.G. - I had surgery in '88, and I guess this was before that...

C.J. - You weren't Superintendent when Dr. Jones came in? He came in during '88?

J.G. - That's right, I had surgery late in '88. That Acting Director position was a very taxing assignment... very taxing.

C.J. - So, tell me about some of your supervisors... tell me about Callowhill...

J.G. - A man who was very dedicated - extremely dedicated. A man with a memory as big as an elephant. When I look at the way that the Department and the Bureau was structured, there was a recreator out of the University of North Carolina that did a lot of writing.... when I read his work, and I look at the way this department was structured, Callowhill either had extremely good ideas, or he patterned his structure after that which this person had emphasized. I did not have enough personal contact to have had any real feeling about him. He had a good reputation, I think, as an administrator, course, he didn't mess around, he would say "this is what we're going to do" and we did it.

C.J. - Tell me about John Williams...

J.G. - A maverick, as much as Chris Delaporte... a guy who, I thought, had a lot on the ball, and he brought a different kind of an attitude to the Bureau and certainly, he was not Callowhill. Callowhill was Ivy League, button-down; John was shirt-collar open, "let's go play some softball." He mixed with the people. I found him easy to talk with, he made himself available, he would come around, wanted to come to your programs. John brought in that idea of the interns, he brought a lot of them in... they benefitted by being here and we benefitted by having them.

C.J. - He didn't stay very long....

J.G. - No, he didn't... I was not close enough to know whether it was friction between him and the Director, or the Board, or

the Mayor, or whether he had just decided that it was time for him to go... but I'm trying to think, what did he leave as his mark? I guess maybe it was the interns program.

C.J. - Al Cottrill....

J.G. - You may not hear a lot of folks say this, he and I got along well together. I didn't have any trouble out of Al. I always invited him down to my center for programs, and he always came, though not always dressed appropriately for the occasion. Everyone else would be in their gym shoes and ready to participate, but Al was always in his suit - but he always came. Al didn't do very much of getting about in the Districts as Superintendent. We I said he came out to my center, that was when he was supervisor of Boys' and Men's Activities. He spent most of his time in the office. He was famous for not going out to the centers. I don't know how well-prepared he was for the job that he held. He was a loner, and I think he would just assign people and hope that things would move on. I get the impression that he was not very well thought of by some of the powers-to-be, that he would send his subordinates to attend meetings and functions that he should have attended, but that was his way of operation. He was there during part of that growth period, when we received a good bit of assistance from the "War on Poverty" programs.

C.J. - O.K. let's go the next step up - Tawney.

J.G. - One of my real favorites. He didn't spend a great deal of time with us...

C.J. - He was a parks man...

J.G. - Yes... if you did what had been decided for you to do, you didn't see very much of him...

C.J. - He left you alone...

J.G. - Yes, he said, "You won't find me looking over your shoulder. Once you decide what you're going to do, I expect you to do it. When it's time for that project to be finished, I want it finished." He had great problems with Cottrill. Doug probably did more to cover up for Cottrill than any other person - he was the only person that would have been able to do that. I really didn't know him as a person that much... I do know that he was very, very dedicated to the Mayor. And it paid off for him, and the Department benefitted from that. We hadn't gotten to Larry Rose, yet (laughing)...

C.J. - Let's talk about him... the dark however many years he was with us.

J.G. - What was he here - a year and a half, maybe two years...

C.J. - Maybe two...never permanent, always acting...

J.G. - He came in as Deputy Director, and then they made him Acting Director, but he just couldn't cut it...

C.J. - He was out of his league....

J.G. - This job was just over his head, and he told me, when Chris was hired, that it was the best thing that ever happened

to him - it was like a load had been lifted off of his shoulders. He did not get off on the right track when he came here.

C.J. - In talking with some other people, I've heard that he was put in to keep someone else out...

J.G. - I know that there was this guy from Boston...

C.J. - Steve Crosby?...

J.G. - Yeah, that's right - Crosby! And then, for whatever reason, he and one of the prominent Board members, who was a good supporter of the Mayor, had some problems.

C.J. - Chris Delaporte...

J.G. - I have great respect for Chris Delaporte. There's so many things that I could tell you that I liked about Delaporte - he would sit and, right at the spur of the moment, would make a decision, and you would think it was something that he had been working on for ages... when he took those two hundred youngsters down to New Orleans, he said, "I hadn't planned that... I just thought about that on the spur of the moment!" I thought he had an extremely keen mind, when he did what he called "elevating the trees" in the parks, and you could see clear across the park, and I would say, my goodness, why hadn't we done that kind of thing before? I never had difficulty talking with him... there were a couple of things that I wasn't happy about... I wasn't happy about the way he would move some of my people around and not tell me about it, and I just thought that I should have been told. If you had

an idea and wanted to try it, he'd sure find a way for you to try it, and if you'd fall flat, well, get up and try something else! I think that that's the mark of a good administrator.

C.J. - Do you think that he neglected the rec. centers?

J.G. - Well, there no doubt that his interest was in the "showplace" kinds of facilities, and that was his interest, and that was really where he directed his energies. I don't know that he neglected them, but he didn't put as much time in them as he did the "showpieces" that he was developing... His tenure was five years or less... his work with Outward Bound... I just thought that Outward Bound could have done more to work with the kids in the recreation centers instead of the private schools.

C.J. - So you were with the Department from the mid-50's to the late 80's, when did recreation assume the operation of all of the pools, or did we ever assume operation of all of them?

J.G. - When we got into the pool business, Parks was operating the big park pools, and we were operating the small neighborhood pools. I tend to think it was in the early 80's...

C.J. - When Jean (Powell) took them over...

J.G. - Yes, during that time... I think it was under Larry Rose's tenure.

C.J. - This is probably a silly question... did we move forward all of the time you wre associated with the Department, or was there any time that we moved backward?

J.G. - I think as a whole, we generally moved forward... I think there were some high points....when we had good programs, volunteers, and the dollars were there... but you know, sometimes, you make the greatest progress when the chips are down, and you don't have as many people to do the work. At one point, when I was in the Personnel Office, we had 525 approved positions - that's not including the part-time people...and then, along came the CETA programs, all these federal programs... we got some good people out of these programs, some are still with us today. Then, as they poured more money into these programs, we started taking in "bodies," and I was not totally pleased with that - we were getting lots of bodies, and many of them brought nothing with them, and we weren't adequately training them. Then as we allowed them to stay there, and these folk began to some of the older folks who had retired or died, we began to lose some of that program edge. There was a time, when we could go to a Cheryl Pitz, who worked at a community college, and we could get some young people who had some exposure to recreation, who knew a little something of what they were doing, but when we lost the recreation programs, we now got the man who says "I can do recreation, because I used to play football."

C.J. - Street Club Workers.....

J.G. - I think the idea was a heck of an idea - there was an ideal there... I think that when Harry Smith was there, the program had the potential, but I think that when we came to

the height of that program, we had a lot of people there, and I don't think they were necessarily the people who could do what the program was designed to do. Many of them had their own problems, and couldn't go out on those street corners and do what they were supposed to do. I admired Doug Tawney for what he was trying to do...the fact of it is that it just did not work.

C.J. - When did it stop?

J.G. - Well, when we began to lose funds, in the early 80's.

C.J. - I have one last question...what would you consider as your major accomplishment as Superintendent of Recreation - what would you like to be remembered for?

J.G. - I hope that I brought staff together... I hope that I built up some credibility in the Department, I came in when nothing had gone on for eleven years, when the only thing that you did was get your reports in on time. I would hope that people, in other Departments, would begin to see us in a different light. The thing that I'm not happy about, is that I came at a time when we were phasing down... someone else was there when we built all those buildings... I was there when we closed them out. I think that we continue to provide services for the community - I think that's a plus for our staff people. The Day Care Program came about during that time, and I really think that you have a good program over there.

C.J. - O.K. - I think that's it - it's been helpful.

J.G. - I certainly hope so!

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

NOTE: For ease of tracing references to these organizational minutes and reports, they are ordered chronologically, not alphabetically.

ORGANIZATIONAL MINUTES

Baltimore City Parks Board (1940 - 1947)

- _____. March 19, 1940.
- _____. June 27, 1940.
- _____. December 10, 1941.
- _____. January 7, 1942.
- _____. March 25, 1942.
- _____. April 15, 1942.
- _____. December 9, 1942.
- _____. February 10, 1943.
- _____. March 17, 1943.
- _____. December 1, 1943.
- _____. March 15, 1944.
- _____. June 5, 1945.
- _____. August 8, 1945.
- _____. September 4, 1945.
- _____. June 5, 1946.
- _____. August 14, 1946.

Baltimore City Board of Recreation and Parks (1947 - 1987)

_____. July 28, 1947.
_____. August 18, 1947.
_____. September 10, 1947.
_____. January 20, 1948.
_____. April 6, 1948.
_____. May 4, 1948.
_____. July 20, 1948.
_____. July 6, 1949.
_____. September 21, 1949.
_____. April 25, 1950.
_____. July 1, 1950.
_____. September 15, 1950.
_____. September 29, 1950.
_____. October 27, 1950.
_____. November 18, 1950.
_____. June 25, 1951.
_____. October 26, 1951.
_____. September 26, 1952.
_____. August 22, 1953.
_____. December 5, 1953.
_____. February 6, 1954.
_____. March 27, 1954.
_____. May 28, 1954.
_____. July 17, 1954.
_____. September 23, 1954.

_____. April 15, 1955.
_____. November 18, 1955.
_____. February 10, 1956.
_____. January 11, 1957.
_____. May 16, 1957.
_____. July 17, 1958.
_____. October 3, 1960.
_____. July 17, 1962.
_____. February 19, 1963.
_____. July 16, 1963.
_____. January 3, 1964.
_____. February 11, 1964.
_____. June 16, 1964.
_____. August 4, 1964.
_____. September 8, 1964.
_____. November 17, 1964.
_____. March 9, 1965.
_____. May 11, 1965.
_____. September 20, 1966.
_____. January 17, 1967.
_____. March 14, 1967.
_____. April 18, 1967.
_____. September 16, 1967.
_____. November 14, 1967.
_____. June 11, 1968.
_____. September 10, 1968.

_____. January 21, 1969.
_____. April 22, 1969.
_____. August 12, 1969.
_____. December 16, 1969.
_____. May 12, 1970.
_____. July 14, 1970.
_____. August 18, 1970.
_____. December 22, 1970.
_____. March 16, 1971.
_____. April 6, 1971.
_____. May 19, 1971.
_____. July 14, 1971.
_____. August 18, 1971.
_____. September 15, 1971.
_____. January 19, 1972.
_____. February 23, 1972.
_____. March 22, 1972.
_____. April 19, 1972.
_____. May 17, 1972.
_____. May 16, 1973.
_____. June 20, 1973.
_____. September 19, 1973.
_____. October 17, 1973.
_____. November 28, 1973.
_____. June 18, 1975.
_____. July 23, 1975.

_____. August 27, 1975.
_____. November 30, 1977.
_____. January 18, 1978.
_____. August 23, 1978.
_____. July 18, 1979.
_____. January 23, 1980.
_____. March 19, 1980.
_____. September 17, 1980.
_____. April 21, 1981.
_____. August 19, 1981.
_____. September 23, 1981.
_____. December 16, 1981.
_____. February 17, 1982.
_____. June 16, 1982.
_____. August 11, 1982.
_____. January 19, 1983.
_____. April 27, 1983.
_____. May 18, 1983.
_____. September 21, 1983.
_____. November 16, 1983.
_____. February 15, 1984.
_____. March 28, 1984.
_____. May 9, 1984.
_____. June 20, 1984.
_____. September 26, 1984.
_____. November 14, 1984.

- _____. December 12, 1984.
- _____. February 27, 1985.
- _____. March 27, 1985.
- _____. April 17, 1985.
- _____. May 15, 1985.
- _____. June 19, 1985.
- _____. July 17, 1985.
- _____. November 20, 1985.

BALTIMORE CITY RECREATION AND PARKS BUDGET BOOKS

- _____. Fiscal Year 1970.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1974.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1975.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1976.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1978.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1979.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1980.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1981.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1982.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1983.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1985.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1986.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1987.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1988.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1989.

- _____. Fiscal Year 1990.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1991.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1992.
- _____. Fiscal Year 1993.

MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS, BOOKLETS, DOCUMENTS

Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation - The Harold S.
Callowhill Collection (1897 - 1974).

Baltimore City Board of Estimates - Appropriations (1940).

Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation - Financial Sheets
(1948-1949).

Baltimore City Board of Estimates - Ordinance of Estimates
(1950)

Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation - Activity Directory
(1951-1952).

Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation - Schedule of Activities
(1955-1956).

Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation - Schedule of Activities
(1958-1959).

Baltimore City Board of Estimates - Ordinance of Estimates
(1960).

Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks - Annual
Report (1962).

Baltimore City Board of Estimates - Ordinance of Estimates
(1970)

Baltimore City Board of Estimates - Ordinance of Estimates
(1980)

Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation - Division of
Developmental Recreation Fee Schedule - 1987.

Baltimore City Bureau of Recreation - Division of
Developmental Recreation - Registration Statistics -
1987.

Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks - Mayoral
Transition Briefing Book - 1987.

Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks - Fiscal
Year 1994 Budget Request Information Booklet - 1993.

Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks -
Strategic Plan For Action - October, 1991.

Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks - 1990 -
1992 Accomplishments Report to the Mayor - 1992.

Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks - Fiscal
Year 1994 Budget Request (1993).

INTERVIEWS

Baker, Virginia S. Personal interview, conducted along with
Barry Kessler, November 1, 1988.

Esworthy, Stephanie. Personal interview, October 14, 1992.

Godwin, Hope. Personal interview, conducted along with
Barry Kessler and Vicki Houck, November 11, 1988.

Grant, James E. Personal interview, October 8, 1992.

Smith, Alice D. Personal interview, October 9, 1992.

LETTERS

Letter from Charles A. Harris, October 23, 1908.

Secondary Sources

BOOKS

Allen, B., & Montell, L. (1981). From memory to history:
Using oral sources in local historical research.
Nashville, TN: The American Association for State
and Local History.

- Bedford, H., Colburn, T. & Madison, J. (1972). The Americans: a brief history (4th ed.). San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Black, H.E., ed. (1949). Charter and public local laws of Baltimore City. Baltimore, MD: King Bros.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Chafe, W.H. (1991). The unfinished journey: America since World War II. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University.
- Elton, G.R. (1967) The practice of history. New York, NY: Thomas V. Cromwell.
- Good, C.V., & Scates, D.E. (1954). Methods of research: Educational, psychological, and sociological. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Gottschalk, L. (1950). Understanding history: A primer of historical method. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Kent, S. (1967). Writing history. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kessler, B., & Zang, D. (1989). The play life of a city: Baltimore's recreation and parks, 1900 - 1955. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore City Life Museums and the Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks.
- Knapp, R.F., & Hartsoe, C.E. (1979). Play for America: The National Recreation Association, 1906 - 1965. Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.

Lineberry, R.L., & Sharkansky, I. (1974). Urban politics and public policy. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Lutzin, S.G., & Storey, E.H. (1973). Managing municipal leisure services. Washington, DC: International City Management Association.

MacRae, D., Jr., & Wilde, J.A. (1979). Policy analysis for public decisions. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.

Majchrzak, A. (1984). Methods of policy research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Nevins, A. (1938). The gateway to history. Boston, MA: D.C. Heath.

Taylor, S.J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Wallace, M. (1987). The politics of public history. In J. Blatti (ed.), Past meets present, (pp. 37-53). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.

Wright, J.W. (ed.). (1990). The universal almanac 1991. New York, NY: Universal Press Syndicate.

PERIODICALS

Cameron, K., Whetton, D. & Kim, M. (v. 30, #1, 1987). Organizational dysfunctions of decline. Academy of Management Journal, p. 126 - 138.

Kimberly, J.R. (v. 22, #3, 1979). Issues in the creation of organizations: initiation, innovation, and institutionalization. Academy of Management Journal, p. 437-457.

_____. (June, 1941). Recreation. New York, NY:
National Recreation Association.

_____. (June, 1943). Recreation. New York, NY:
National Recreation Association.

DISSERTATIONS, THESES

Glover, R. B. (1983). A study of the changes in the decision-making authority of selected recreation citizen boards in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Mack, S.W. (1988). A history of the York recreation commission from 1904 - 1975. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS

Jones, Jr., Dr, R.W.E. and others. (1988). "Hand in hand into the 90's: An analysis of Baltimore City recreational and related educational programs and facilities - Volume I". Baltimore, MD: EMAR Associates.

_____. (1968). Report of the national advisory commission on civil disorders. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1940, 1950, 1960, 1970, 1980 and 1990). Census of the population (Vol. 1, part 22). Washington, DC: U.S. Gov't Printing Office.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

NOTE: For ease of tracing references to these newspaper articles, they are listed chronologically, not alphabetically.

Parks budget over \$2 million. (1941, December 10). The Sun.

Negros ask use of park. (1946, August 15). The Morning Sun.

Park program hit by fund curb. (1946, December 13). The Evening Sun.

Chick Webb center to be opened. (1947, November 29). The News-Post.

Mixed tennis tourney opposed. (1948, July 10). Baltimore Afro-American.

Segregation in park facilities. (1948, July 20). The Sun.

Mayor backs Boone again. (1949, September 27). Baltimore Afro-American.

Council action on Boone retold. (1949, October 6). The Evening Sun.

Garrett quits as head of Parks board after reinstatement. (1950, January 27). The Morning Sun.

Hope for Park board now. (1950, May 6). Baltimore Afro-American.

A colored holiday only on a public golf course. (1950, June 2). The Evening Sun.

Segregation suit filed. (1950, October 6). The Evening Sun.

Full lifting of park ban asked. (1951, May 25). The News-Post.

The Rec. board is incompetent! (1951, June 2). Baltimore Afro-American.

The Parks board's latest stupidity. (1951, June 13). The Morning Sun.

Beach race policy will be restudied. (1951, October 27). The Morning Sun.

Divided beach bathing policy at Smallwood. (1952, January 27). The Morning Sun.

Closed gates of city pools drawing mounting protests. (1953, July 18). Baltimore Afro-American.

Fort Smallwood resort opens but few take advantage. (1953, July 28). The Evening Sun.

City defends pools policy. (1953, September 24). The Sun.

Recreation unit is criticized. (1954, April 21). The Evening Sun.

High court bans segregation at beaches and parks. (1955, November 8). The Sun.

Recreation facilities - are they adequate? (1956, June 10). The Sun.

Pool aides get racial advice. (1956, June 21). The Evening Sun.

Bureau of Rec. staff run 136 play centers in the city.
(1956, July 9). The Evening Sun.

Summer "Rek" area use rises 89,000 over '55. (1956,
September 21). The Evening Sun.

105 Recreation Centers in city to be operated. (1957, June
21). The News-Post.

Recreation racial lists held illegal. (1957, July 3). The
Sun.

\$25,362,169 increase asked in city budget for next year.
(1957, October 21). The Sun.

Nation will be watching renewal plan. (1959, January 29).
The News-Post.

The city payroll - 27,000 working for \$116.4 million.
(1959, May 1). The Evening Sun.

Rec. dept. bypasses employees. (1960, March 19). Baltimore
Afro-American.

Recreational bureau to operate 130 units. (1960, June 16).
The Evening Sun.

3 top-rank rec. bureau employees resign. (1960, July 19).
The News-Post.

Record playground season expected. (1960, June 19). The
Evening Sun.

94 rec. locations listed. (1961, November 17). The
Evening Sun.

Police disperse 1,000 in racial outburst. (1962, August
18). The Evening Sun.

Boy hit by rock in row at park. (1962, August 25). The Sun.

Acting Mayor gives appeal in race issue. (1962, August 25). The Evening Sun.

Riverside pool dyed green. (1962, August 30). The Evening Sun.

3 deaths blamed on lack of rec. facilities. (1962, November 23). The Evening Sun.

Two negroes are jeered- leave pool. (1963, June 25). The Sun.

Renewal unit will spend \$80,460,000. (1963, July 6). The Morning Sun.

D'Alesandro would boost rec. (1963, October 13). The Sun.

Park board plans 6 new centers. (1963, December 17). Baltimore Afro-American.

Callowhill ready to retire, notes city rec. gains. (1965, June 2). The News-American.

Tawney elected rec. head. (1965, July 14). The Sun.

1966 budget proposals for city compared with 1965. (1965, November 8). The Sun.

Another new rec. head named. (1965, December 8). The Sun.

Man in the news - rec. chief hopes to "capture" youth. (1965, December 13). The Evening Sun.

Group asks city to restore cash for rec. (1966, May 9). The Sun.

New recreation program to help city's slum youth. (1966, May 19). The Sun.

90-day injunction bans rallies here by state's rights party. (1966, August 11). The Evening Sun.

Rec. dept. sets fall-winter program. (1966, September 27). Baltimore Afro-American.

Recreation unit recruits trio. (1967, February 15). The Evening Sun.

Recreation program scored. (1967, May 21). The Sun.

6 public pools drop fees. (1967, August 4). The News-American.

Baltimore's poor - lack of facilities for rec. creates crisis in inner city. (1967, October 2). The Sun.

Park board head lists aims: more play sites promised. (1968, February 8). The News-American.

Mayor to seek \$2.5 million for pools. (1968, May 10). The Evening Sun.

Relief is given to play centers. (1969, March 29). The Sun.

Free pools lure gangs to patterson park area. (1969, June 29). The News-American.

22 rec. centers now open on weekends. (1969, November 13). The News-American.

Recreation unit creates 2 posts. (1969, December 5). The Sun.

Chief tells why he left. (1969, December 15). The Sun.

Mayor planning for recreation construction. (1970, April 7). The Evening Sun.

City closes rec. center after racial strife hits. (1970, April 15). The News-American.

Fun wagons to roam city. (1970, June 16). The Sun.

Youth fights worry south baltimore areas. (1970, June 18). The Evening Sun.

Summertime blues - is there a cure? (1970, August 23). The Sun.

D'Alesandro asks end to E & E group. (1970, October 3). The News-American.

Parks caught in money bind. (1970, November 6). The News-American.

Patterson park "peace project" being expanded. (1970, June 20). The Sun.

Rec. funding opposed. (1971, October 13). The News-American.

Our suggestions on loan questions. (1971, November 1). The News-American.

City votes approve 7 bond issues; new Central police station defeated. (1971, November 3). The Sun.

City worker unions vow to resist threatened layoffs, payless holidays. (1972, April 8). The Sun.

Mayor requests extra \$1 million for youth jobs and recreation. (1973, March 14). The Evening Sun.

New pool hit by vandals. (1973, June 21). The News-American.

Cherry hill homes aquatics center open. (1973, July 18). The News-American.

City allotted funds for recreation. (1973, December 12). The Evening Sun.

Use of city recreation programs increasing 5 per cent a year. (1974, January 16). The Evening Sun.

News-American boosts United States youth games. (1974, April 24). The News-American.

City gets \$689,574 for parks, playfields. (1974, June 4). The News-American.

12,000 jobs for area youth. (1974, June 22). The News-American.

2,000 positions would be eliminated. (1975, April 1). The Evening Sun.

Mayor raises the curtain on summer youth program. (1975, June 21). The Sun.

Clarke would use surplus funds to open reks on weekends. (1975, July 29). The Evening Sun.

Saturday rek days backed. (1975, October 17). The Evening Sun.

Parks dept. thinking bigger as centers, programs expand. (1976, April 11). The News-American.

City budget cuts may mean 4,000 layoffs. (1977, April 13). The News-American.

City approves \$8 million in projects, will be ready when
U.S. money grows. (1977, July 28). The Sun.

Lower budget forces recreation cutbacks. (1978, February
20). The Sun.

City parks department details proposed cuts. (1978, March
30). The Sun.

The cutting edge of \$5.99. (1978, April 3). The Sun.

New city plan rates workers. (1978, May 19). The News-
American.

City playgrounds are sharp with glass. (1979, May 23).
The Sun.

Most city agencies seeking bigger budgets. (1980, January
9). The Evening Sun.

Mayor to open Torsk next week. (1980, March 16). The Sun.

City turns to trustees for help. (1980, May 29). The
Evening Sun.

Overnight urban camping, or, catered in Druid Hill. (1980,
July 28). The Sun.

Parents piqued at no-weekend pools. (1980, August 18). The
Evening Sun.

City recreation chief off & running. (1984, December 30).
The Sunday Sun, p. 1A.

City close to leasing golf courses. (1985, January 23).
The News-American, p. B1.

City ready to take control of indebted shake and bake.
(1985, January 25). The Sun, p.1D.

City takes over control of shake & bake center. (1985, January 26). The News-American, p.A1.

City team takes over debt-ridden shake and bake. (1985, January 26). The Morning Sun p.A1.

City moves kids' camping program to state park. (1985, April 27). The Sun, p.1A.

Recreation budget rise requested. (1985, May 1). The Sun, p. 1B.

It's that time of year: budget cuts debated. (1985, May 1). The News-American, p. B1.

Group critical of "costly elite" parks projects. (1985, May 15). The Sun, p. 8G.

City investigates 2 workers, parks accounts. (1985, May 15). The News-American, p. 1A.

Indoor soccer field OK'd. (1985, May 16). The News-American, p. 1B.

Behavior problems pull plug on pool. (1985, July 10). The Sun, p. E1.

Outward Bound comes to Baltimore. (1985, August 16). The Morning Sun, p. C1.

Baltimore tightens rein on parks funds. (1985, August 29). The Sun, p. 4F.

7 firms interested in rowing facility; make 2nd round bids. (1985, August 29). The Sun, p. 8F.

Youth hockey club practices at city's new ice skating rink. (1985, October 22). The Sun, p. 1D.

Skaters test ice at new rink. (1985, October 22). The News-American, p. 4A.

Mayor warning of budget cuts. (1985, October 31). The Evening Sun, p. B1.

Chris T. Delaporte. (1985, December 15). Sun Magazine, p. 4.

Budget squeeze may close some city rec. centers. (1985, December 19). The Sun, p. C1.

Shake and Bake relishes success after takeover. (1986, January 13). The Sun, p. 4A.

City parks director under investigation. (1986, January 24). The News-American, p. 6A.

Parks board to probe charges against Delaporte. (1986, January 24). The Evening Sun, p. D3.

Delaporte considers action against Mfume. (1986, January 25). The News-American, p. 3A.

Shake and Bake a safe place to recreate. (1986, January 27). The News-American, p. 4A.

Mfume calls newscasts distorted; TV stations deny it. (1986, January 29). The Sun, p. 2F.

Grandstanding councilman. (1986, February 4). The Sun, p. 8A.

Mayor "disturbed" with parks boards in Delaporte conflict. (1986, February 9). The Sun, p. 1B.

Mfume documents reveal no charges against Delaporte. (1986, February 15). The Morning Sun, p. 6A.

Delaporte cleared of misconduct by mayoral committee.
(1986, February 19). The Morning Sun, p. 1C.

Charges against Delaporte held largely unfounded. (1986,
February 19). The Evening Sun, p. D1.

The nasty feud should end. (1986, February 20). The News-
American, p. 6A.

Everyone into the pool. (1986, March 1). The Sun, p. 6A.

Patterson park ice rink to get new enclosure with \$400,000
grant. (1986, April 10). The East Baltimore Guide,
p. 1.

City settles bias suit, agrees to promote parks worker.
(1986, April 11). The Evening Sun, p. D5.

Schaefer plans to replace chief of parks board. (1986,
April 24). The Sun, p. 1B.

Probe said to accuse ex-parks official of fraud. (1986,
April 30). The Morning Sun, p. 1B.

City employee of probed in \$250,000 theft. (1986, April
30). The Evening Sun, p. A1.

Ex-city parks official indicted in \$225,000 theft. (1986,
May 1). The News-American, p. 1B.

City's latest scandal is third in about a year. (1986, May
1). The News-American, p. 2B.

Ex-parks aide indicted in theft of \$225,353. (1986, May 1).
The Sun, p. 1E.

City scandal. (1986, May 3). The Sun, p. 10A.

A not-as-relevant park board. (1986, May 16). The News-American, p. 4A.

Parks board gets mayor's signal to shape up. (1986, May 18). The Sun, p. 1B.

Parks administrator confesses to decade of payroll kickbacks. (1986, May 27). The Sun, p. 1D.

City pool fees all wet, critics fume. (1986, June 30). The Evening Sun, p. D1.

NPA official ex-official is sentenced for kickbacks. (1986, July 30). The Sun, p. 1D.

City considers tighter control of parks agency. (1986, September 7). The Morning Sun, p. 1D.

\$15,000 missing; Shake and Bake manager quits. (1986, September 12). The Evening Sun, p. D3.

Bill would strip parks board of power. (1986, October 7). The Evening Sun, p. D1.

City parks board could lose clout. (1986, December 3). The Evening Sun, p. B1.

City parks panel angry, demands data from staff. (1986, December 4). The Sun, p. 1D.

Parks board feud draws firm warning from mayor. (1987, June 11). The Sun, p. 1D.

Mayor tries to halt parks board fight with Delaporte. (1987, June 11). The Evening Sun, p. A10.

Burns proclaims peace in parks board battle. (1987, June 13). The Sun, p. 8A.

Delaporte to head stadium panel. (1987, June 19). The Evening Sun, p. A1.

Recreation director given 2 years for diverting funds. (1987, June 19). The Sun, p. 4B.

Dease gets Shake and Bake theft term. (1987, June 19). The Evening Sun, p. D2.

Hosting large amateur events now big business. (1987, July 13). The Sun, p. 1C.

Jones expected to get parks post. (1988, January 1). The Evening Sun, p. 1B.

New city parks chief gives pep talk to staff. (1988, March 2). The Sun, p. 1B.

Park director plans to hire an assistant. (1988, August 14). The Sun, p. 2B.

Parks head proposes recreation "supercenters", closing of neighborhood sites. (1988, December 19). The Sun, p. 1D

Ralph Jones, Jr. dies; city parks chief was 50. (1989, March 15). The Sun, p. 1D.

City council expresses displeasure over parks, recreation. (1989, June 12). The Evening Sun, p. B4.

Debs at city cotillion combine practicality with stardust reveries. (1991, November 1). The Sun, p. 1A.

City funds gone; rec centers scramble. (1992, February 19). The Morning Sun, p. 3D.