

Laurance S. Rockefeller and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission: Race, Recreation, and the National Parks

by David Glassberg

University of Massachusetts, Amherst



© 2022 by David Glassberg



Abstract

This project focuses on the links between the conservation movement and civil rights through an examination of the reach and impact of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) and its chairman, Laurance S. Rockefeller (LSR). The Commission's landmark report in 1962 identified large racial disparities in access to public lands and recreation across the USA, which prompted the National Park Service (NPS) to establish new National Recreation Areas and Historical Parks in urban areas in the 1960s and 1970s. The project examines the history of the ORRRC, contextualizes the Commission's work within the longer history of the civil rights movement's efforts to desegregate state and national parks, and NPS efforts to increase recreational opportunities in urban areas. Based on research in the records of the ORRRC at the Rockefeller Archive Center and in the National Archives, the project also discusses the central role of LSR in the Commission's history, as well as his views on civil rights and public lands.

The entire study, commissioned by Marsh Billings Rockefeller National Historical Park, includes five chapters. This report is drawn from chapter 3, which examines the ORRRC's uneven efforts between 1958-62 to identify and recommend remedies for racial disparities in outdoor recreational opportunities in urban areas. The complete chapter examines ORRRC studies of New York City, Chicago, St. Louis, and Los Angeles, as well as Atlanta, the focus of this report.

The Matter Deliberately Not Touched On: The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission and Race

Introduction: Race and the ORRRC

On June 1, 1959, Marion Clawson of Resources for the Future sent Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) advisor Luther Gulick a letter outlining his recommendations for special studies that the ORRRC might undertake. In an aside, Clausen remarked,

One matter which I deliberately did not touch on in the outline of projects but which I think the Commission must seriously consider is the relationship of outdoor recreation to the racial issue in the United States. It seems quite clear that the NAACP and other Negro organizations are going to make a major effort to lift the segregation now applicable to parks in the Southern states. As I understand it, there have already been some moves in this direction. I was recently at a meeting in Virginia Beach and found that the major park in the area has been closed for the last three years because the park authorities would rather see it closed than to have it open to Negroes. There is surely a major problem in the making here—in some ways more difficult than the school problem in relation to racial segregation. Several of the studies I have mentioned might give special consideration to racial issues or it might be separated out as a separate study or studies in itself.¹

Gulick apparently forwarded this letter on to Laurance S. Rockefeller (LSR), but the ORRRC never organized a separate study of “racial issues” on the future of outdoor recreation. However, the issues were all but impossible to ignore amid the period’s escalating campaigns for the desegregation of public schools and recreational facilities. Several ORRRC volumes mentioned racial conflicts, though deliberately downplayed them, as the draft chapters from the study directors made their way into print. Given the administrative structure of the ORRRC, it is unlikely that LSR directly ordered these changes, but they were in line with his belief that the ORRRC needed to steer clear of public controversy to accomplish its goals.² LSR had no personal ties to the civil rights movement, and

civil rights organizations were not among the organizations represented on the ORRRC Advisory Board nor among the long list of local and national organizations that the ORRRC staff consulted with during the period of the study. While LSR did not oppose the goals of the civil rights movement, he showed little interest in using ORRRC studies as a tool to advance them.³

Race and the Demand for Recreation

Although the ORRRC senior staff did not give “racial issues” a high priority, it did not ignore race as a factor influencing the demand for outdoor recreation. On December 7, 1959, Norman Wengert, the deputy director of studies for ORRRC, requested that the Library of Congress Reference Department include the literature on “Negroes” in its bibliography of the various topics that the ORRRC staff should examine.⁴ And it included 266 African Americans among the 2750 adults it interviewed for its national survey, *Participation in Outdoor Recreation: Factors Affecting Demand Among American Adults*.⁵ A chapter on “Outdoor Recreation on Weekend and Vacation Trips” reported that “the multivariate analysis indicates that Negroes are less likely to take a vacation trip than white people with the same income and vacation privileges. The racial differences appear quite substantial ... and are statistically significant.”⁶

However, the survey researchers remained deliberately incurious about the reasons for these racial disparities. The paragraph that introduced multivariate analysis explained:

It is important to find out (regardless of reasons) that Negroes on the average engage in outdoor recreation less than white people. And it is equally important to learn to what extent these racial differences are attributable to other factors such as low income, low education, or lack of paid vacations on the part of Negroes.⁷

The study’s elaborate table of factors left out segregation and discriminatory practices, the factors that would have been most obvious to any Black person at the time.⁸

ORRRC and Metropolitan Area Studies

One ORRRC study, however, was less hesitant to name the largest reason for the racial disparities in access to outdoor recreation evident in the statistical snapshots. Volume 21, *The Future of Outdoor Recreation in Metropolitan Regions of the United States*, identified discrimination and the battle for civil rights as significant factors shaping the future of outdoor recreation in America.

The metropolitan areas study grew from LSR's keen interest in cities and improving outdoor recreational opportunities in urban areas. LSR told Gulick on April 24, 1959 that "I feel we certainly have a responsibility, before our report is turned in, to consider the effect that the availability of urban recreation has on the overall outdoor recreation problem."⁹

By December 1959, this feeling had coalesced into Project 10, "Study of the Recreation Needs, Habits, and Preferences of the People in Selected American Cities and Regions."¹⁰ Deputy Director Wengert assigned what became known as the metropolitan areas study to the "Forecasts and Economic Studies Group," headed by ORRRC Chief Economist Laurence I. Hewes. Immediately before joining the ORRRC in July 1959, Hewes, age 57, worked in Denver for the Bureau of Reclamation as the principal assistant to the Chief of the Economic Resources branch. ORRRC Executive Director Francis Sargent informed LSR that Hewes had a PhD in Economics from George Washington University, was engaged in "economic analyses of recreation problems," and had "wide government experience, including that of Regional Director of the Farm Security Administration."¹¹ But Sargent's memo to LSR did not mention Hewes' work with movements for racial justice in the years that followed his employment with the FSA.

When the FSA ended in 1944, Will Alexander, the former executive director of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, recruited Hewes to work for the Rosenwald Fund in Chicago, which sent him to Fisk University for a month to

study race relations. There he met the prominent African American sociologist Charles Johnson and economist Robert Weaver. As Hewes recalled in the “Color Line” chapter of his memoir, published in 1957:

Our objective at the Fund in those months was to find a way to deal with requests from public administrators and industrial leaders for technical aid in reducing racial tensions. These requests poured in from all over the Northern and Western sections of the country. The immediate cause of those demands was a great influx of Southern whites and Negroes to the great war plants of these regions ... Evidence of the need for such work was tragically manifest in such disastrous events as the Detroit riot, the LA zoot suit riot, and the so-called hate strike at the Detroit Packard Plant.¹²

The Rosenwald Fund established a new organization, the American Council on Race Relations, and Hewes remembered attending its founding conference in Chicago in June 1944, along with Johnson, Weaver, Walter White, Charles Houston, Mary McLeod Bethune, and Ralph Bunche. After the Chicago conference, Rosenwald Fund Director Edward Embree sent Hewes to San Francisco as the Council’s West Coast director.¹³

Hewes listed among his accomplishments with the Council organizing a training school in race relations for the Richmond, CA Police Dept.¹⁴ He also joined in a controversy over the building of suburban housing with restricted covenants south of San Francisco, complaining that the FHA would not guarantee loans to open-occupancy builders in predominantly white neighborhoods.¹⁵ The “Color Line” chapter relates several other incidents when his civil rights activities were thwarted by the actions of higher political officials, and concludes, “so ended my experience in the troubled area of race relations.”¹⁶ In 1947, Hewes departed San Francisco to become land reform advisor at General McArthur’s headquarters in Tokyo, and remained there until taking the Bureau of Reclamation job in Denver in 1949.

Hewes worked to bring focus to the ORRRC’s general idea of studying recreation in metropolitan areas and select cities. By May 1960, Hewes and Wengert had persuaded LSR and the ORRRC to increase the \$20,000 originally approved for

the metropolitan areas study at its December 14, 1959 meeting to \$100,000.¹⁷

They explained that:

By 1976 nearly half of the American people will be living in urban communities of more than 500,000 population, and that conditions of urban living will significantly affect needs, wants, and preferences for outdoor recreation. Since metropolitan regions differ in physiographic setting, in the availability and accessibility of recreation resources and opportunities, in economic and social structure, in political mechanisms for planning and providing recreation, in rates of growth and stages of maturity and in degree or urgency of recreation needs, it is proposed to undertake studies in five metropolitan regions in different parts of the country.¹⁸

The five metropolitan areas proposed for study (with a total population of over 30 million) were Chicago in the Midwest, Los Angeles in Southern California, New York City on the East Coast, Saint Louis in the Central Plains, and Atlanta in the South.

Hewes was keenly aware that racial discrimination existed in these cities, having grappled with it directly earlier in his career in Chicago and California. Raised in Virginia, he also understood that racial segregation existed by law throughout the South, including Atlanta. Several months after LSR and the ORRRC tabled Marion Clawson's suggestion that the Commission study racial discrimination in outdoor recreation, Hewes made sure that it was included in the metropolitan area studies.

At the time of Atlanta's selection, the NAACP had made state and local park systems in every Southern state, including Georgia, the target of major desegregation efforts. State parks had been established relatively late in the South, and grew with the support of federal New Deal programs in the 1930s. Nearly all of the state parks were white only, with only a few set aside for Blacks. Georgia established George Washington Carver State Park in 1950, and added four more "colored" parks by 1956, in addition to opening up "colored" sections at two older parks. But as Georgia and other states hustled to establish "separate but equal" facilities, Blacks sought to desegregate them all, both through the courts and through sit-ins, "wade-ins," and other non-violent direct actions.¹⁹

Georgia's government actively resisted these efforts. Immediately after the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board* in May 1954, the director of the Georgia State Park system declared that the only trouble between the races in his state was the result of "outside influences."²⁰ The following year, in November 1955, the Supreme Court issued a separate ruling outlawing segregation in public parks, and in *Holmes v. Atlanta*, ordered Atlanta to integrate its public golf courses.²¹ The Supreme Court ruling prompted Georgia's governor, Marvin Griffin, to warn that "Georgia would abandon all state parks before race mixing would be allowed. ...While I cannot speak for city officials, I can make the clear declaration that the state will get out of the park business before allowing a breakdown in segregation in the intimacy of the playground." In 1956, the Georgia state park agency leased twelve of its parks to private operators to avoid desegregation.²²

Frank Gibson and the Atlanta Metropolitan Area Study

To direct the Atlanta Metropolitan Area Study, Hewes hired University of Georgia Political Science professor Frank K. Gibson (1924-88), a native of West Virginia who received his PhD at UNC Chapel Hill in 1953.²³ Gibson's principal area of research was public administration; before taking on the Atlanta recreation study, he had published articles on topics such as "Financing Municipal Sewerage Systems in West Virginia" "and "Forms of Municipal Government in Georgia."²⁴

On January 5, 1961, Gibson met with Hewes and the directors of the other metropolitan area studies in Washington DC to discuss "the major outdoor recreation problems peculiar to each area." He returned to a University of Georgia campus in upheaval over the enrollment of its first Black students, Hamilton Holmes and Charlayne Hunter, on January 9. Two days later, the campus erupted in violence as white students marched to Hunter's dorm, smashing windows with bottles and bricks, until the Athens police dispersed the crowd with tear gas. Immediately after the disturbance on campus on January 11, Gibson helped organize several faculty meetings to rally support for embattled University President O.C. Aderhold, whom several state politicians had threatened with

dismissal. When asked about it in 1975, Gibson recalled that at the time, Gibson was untenured, and feared losing his job. He also recalled receiving a sufficient number of obscene telephone calls at his home number that he advised his wife to stop answering the phone. There is no evidence that Gibson was especially active in the civil rights movement before or after January 1961, but his experience that month likely had an impact on the views that he would express in successive drafts of the Atlanta Metropolitan Area Outdoor Recreation Study.²⁵

Gibson's first draft was replete with references to the civil rights struggle underway. He declared that "All other factors influencing outdoor recreation demand fade into insignificance when compared to the Negro problem." He added,

As Negroes concentrate more and more in urban areas, as their income and education rise, they will demand more and more in the way of outdoor facilities. If they are satisfied with segregated facilities the state will doubtless meet their demands. If, as appears a certainty, they bring pressure to force integration, the effects on all public outdoor recreation will be chaotic for an undetermined number of years.²⁶

It was Hewes's job, however, to edit Gibson's study so that it would be acceptable to the ORRRC leadership.²⁷ Upon receiving Gibson's first draft, Hewes marked it up extensively in red pencil, identifying places in the draft where Gibson's comments were "not particularly relevant to the topic of outdoor recreation."²⁸ Wrapping up his critique of one chapter, Hewes complained "It appears that this chapter is chiefly concerned with the problem of race. Even though race is specifically treated as a topic, there is constant re-reference to it to such an extent that it is difficult to get a sense of balance in reading the chapter." He noted,

At this point, I should like to introduce the thought that in dealing with these problems of race, politics, and administrative structure, wisdom should dictate a relatively delicate handling of these various attributes of the outdoor recreation problem...The effect on readers of continual reference to these points raises first a question of their relevance to the central issue, and second, the question of the writer's sense of proportion. I do not suggest that these various points should be suppressed, to the extent that they are significant,

they should be stated, but, once stated and put in relatively moderate language, there seems to be little point in continually agitating the issue.²⁹

Hewes concluded,

The report in general is a good one. However, by virtue of pounding too hard on certain topics, I believe some critics would charge the author with a lack of objectivity. It would be a shame if this otherwise splendid report were to lose its significance as a public document because of a possible judgement that some of the material does not relate directly to outdoor recreation, or that outdoor recreation has been used as a vehicle to air the author's views on other topics.³⁰

Hewes visited Athens, Georgia to meet with Gibson in person, bearing his marked-up copy of Gibson's draft.³¹ Hewes reported that during the meeting he "explained to Professor Gibson when published our metropolitan regional studies would constitute official government documents and therefore we would have to be extremely careful in our comments relative to the administrative, political, and economic structure of the several states." He cautioned that "the document must give the impression of balance and that criticisms must be carefully worded and tempered." Hewes reported that Gibson was "very cooperative" in response to his criticisms.³²

Gibson completed his revisions in a week and returned the document with a note: "Under separate cover I am sending a "defanged" copy of the Atlanta Study. You will note that in a few instances I was unable to carry out your recommendations--a matter of principle."³³

The Atlanta Metropolitan Area Study as Published

Despite Gibson's characterization of the report as "defanged," much of his initial draft made it through to final publication. Chapter 4, "What Does the Future Hold?" concludes with the following passage, not very much changed from

Gibson's first draft:

It can be predicted that the Negro problem will not be solved in the South by the year 2000. While great strides have been made in raising the economic and social status of the Negro in Georgia, he still remains in a definitely inferior position. The decreasing number of Negroes engaged in agricultural production and domestic services will result in a higher income level for this race, but the concentration of Negroes in urban areas, and in particular in the Atlanta area, will serve to intensify rather than mollify the conflict between the races.

A pattern of recreational use has already developed in Atlanta that is similar in many ways to the "block busting" that occurs in most northern and some southern cities. As the colored section in the downtown area spreads, an exodus of whites occurs from those neighborhoods into which the Negroes move. The inevitable result of this spread is that white playground areas tend to become surrounded by mixed or colored neighborhoods. When this occurs, the end product is a transfer of the playground from white to colored status. Within the past 12 months, two previously all-white playgrounds in the city of Atlanta have changed status in this manner. [...]

What the future will bring can be only a matter of conjecture. At present, Negroes in Atlanta have instituted legal proceedings to integrate city parks. Opinion among veteran observers is unanimous in believing that if successful, this action will result in closing all swimming and picnic facilities. Opinion is just as unanimous that an attack on segregated State parks will have the same result. ... Certainly new park acquisitions and capital expenditures in present parks are both kept at a minimum as a result of the ever-present specter of integration.

While the Negro's status will doubtless improve in the South, it would be optimistic in the extreme to expect his assimilation into the traditional southern culture any time in the near future. Should the courts force an end to segregation in State parks, attempts will first be made to circumvent integration by lease or sale of the parks, then closure will be ordered. Since those persons with the greatest political influence in this State have private recreation resources, or are rural residents whose demand for outdoor recreation is low, the pressure to reopen will be resisted for many years.³⁴

Gibson identified what would come to be called “white flight” as the most important trend that would affect Atlanta and other major cities trying to provide additional public recreation facilities for its citizens.³⁵

In April 1962, Hewes circulated to the directors of the five metropolitan area studies the edited manuscript that would be released later that year. Gregory Stone, the director of the St. Louis Metropolitan Area Study, commented, “The only general criticism I have is the playing down of race relations. This problem is not only found in St. Louis and Atlanta, but particularly in Chicago, and probably in Los Angeles. I know it must be present in New York.”³⁶

Conclusion

In many ways, the ORRRC began its work in one era and finished it in another. In 1953, Colonial Williamsburg Director Kenneth Chorley, who would serve as a member of the ORRRC five years later, declared that when it came to integration, “We are, to the best of our judgement, doing all we can in this situation. We have felt that by pushing too fast too far we might only aggravate a prejudice we want to see disappear.”³⁷ By the time ORRRC ended its operations in 1963, steady pushing from the civil rights movement had integrated Colonial Williamsburg along with many other public accommodations in the South and elsewhere.

Laurence Hewes quietly pushing the authors of the five metropolitan area studies to say something, but not too much, about the impact of racial discrimination on outdoor recreation opportunities in urban areas exemplifies the position of LSR and the ORRRC on race. The ORRRC sought to produce credible social science while steering clear of public controversies that could sidetrack its primary goal of convincing local, state, and federal government agencies to set aside more space for outdoor recreation in rapidly suburbanizing metropolitan areas. Hewes’s prior experience with the American Council on Race Relations made him aware of sociological studies of urban race relations, and he recommended that his study directors read this literature. But significantly, in over two years of planning and implementing the five metropolitan area studies, there is no evidence that Hewes

or the study directors consulted with leading African American scholars, such as St. Clair Drake at Roosevelt University in Chicago, E. Franklin Frazier at Howard University in Washington, DC, where the ORRRC staff worked, or prominent social work faculty at Atlanta University.³⁸ Nor did they reach out to either national leadership or local branches of civil rights organizations such as the Urban League or the NAACP. As a result, the ORRRC received little or no mention in African American newspapers such as the *Atlanta World*, New York's *Amsterdam News*, or the *Chicago Defender*. Taking an essentially paternalistic approach to the "Negro problem" in US cities, the ORRRC analyzed the projected recreational needs of African Americans with little or no participation by African American scholars or organizations. However, by the mid-1960s, as African Americans gained more political power and positions in local government, the Supreme Court, and the cabinet, that would begin to change.

¹ Marion Clawson to Luther Gulick on plans for Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (hereafter ORRRC), June 1, 1959, Laurance S. Rockefeller papers (hereafter LSR papers), ORRRC, RG 6, Series 2, Subseries 2, Box 6, Folder 67, Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC). Clawson, among the first resource economists to study outdoor recreation, had met with the ORRRC on May 12, 1959, where he presented his outline of proposed studies in person. At the time, LSR had considered recruiting Clawson as a potential ORRRC staff member, even deputy director, but Clawson's previous tenure as director of the Bureau of Land Management under Truman led Bernard Orell, an Eisenhower appointment to the Commission and vice president at Weyerhaeuser, to warn LSR that he would be "a liability to the Commission." (Bernard L. Orell to LSR, May 15, 1959, LSR papers, ORRRC, RG 6, Series 2, Subseries 1, Box 3, Folder 30, RAC). Clawson also did not endear himself to the commissioners at that meeting when he argued that the academic experts with whom they would contract to do the recreation studies should retain the right to publish their findings independently, stating "with any reputable university you are not going to get a contract to do this kind of work if the results are going to be subject to editorial revision." Orell told LSR Clawson's "rather irritated reiteration...of an idea that obviously was untenable to the Commission" demonstrated his lack of judgement. (Orell to LSR, May 15, 1959.). When Gulick forwarded Clawson's June 1 letter on to LSR, Rockefeller replied "When Mr. Clawson presented his material at our last Commission meeting, it was accepted with something less than your outspoken enthusiasm...this was not a reflection on the memorandum, but more or less a personal evaluation of Mr. Clawson and the fears of a few that his past political implications might not be in the best interests of the Commission." (LSR to Gulick, June 9, 1959, LSR papers, ORRRC, RG 6, Series 2, Subseries 2, Box 6, Folder 67, RAC). For more on Clawson's career with BLM and other activities, see Marion Clawson, *From Sagebrush to Sage: The Making of a Natural Resource Economist* (Washington, DC: Ana Publications, 1987).

² As the study was getting underway, LSR advisor and Prudential Insurance Company Vice President Fred Smith told him that "because of the considerable pressures and vested interests involved, getting anything done is going to be primarily a matter of political strategy with intelligent public relations riding tandem. If we handle ourselves brilliantly, not many compromises will be necessary; if we don't, no compromises will be possible." (Fred Smith to LSR, September 19, 1958, LSR papers, ORRRC, RG 6, Series 2, Subseries 2, Box 4, Folder 36, RAC). Administratively, LSR remained in NYC while the staff labored in Washington DC. LSR's assistant, Carl Gustafson, occasionally travelled to Washington to meet with staff, and nearly all correspondence from the staff to LSR went through Gustafson, who summarized its main points for his boss and briefed LSR after his visits, but seldom went into great detail. "For approximately four months I have been receiving copies of all letters, inter-office memoranda, and proposals issued by the ORRRC staff. While I have been in touch with all members of the staff on occasion by letter, but mostly by phone, and while I have attempted

to keep you alerted as to the important developments and crises that have occurred there, obviously a great deal has gone on that is of importance and that I am sure you would like to know about, if not in detail then certainly in substance.” (Carl O. Gustafson to LSR, March 11, 1960, LSR papers, ORRRC, RG 6, Series 7, Box 17, Folder 195, RAC).

³ Laura Miller and I have discovered no contemporary evidence of Laurance S. Rockefeller’s views on the state of American race relations in 1958. While the Rockefeller Foundation supported Black colleges (Spelman College was named after LSR’s grandmother Laura Spelman Rockefeller), it had an ambiguous relationship with the study of race relations. See Maribel Morey, “Rockefeller, Carnegie, and the SSRC’s Focus on Race in the 1920s and 1930s,” in *Insights from the Social Sciences* (SSRC’s digital forum), January 8, 2019. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund listed donations to the Urban League, United Negro College Fund, and the American Council on Race Relations among the dozens of charities it supported in its *Annual Review, 1941-50*.

⁴ See LSR to Gulick, June 9, 1959. Wengert began work as deputy director for studies June 15, 1959, but left in May 1960 to take academic post at Wayne State. So, Wengert oversaw initial work, then was replaced by Lawrence Stevens.

⁵ The statistics in study #20 were frequently cited in other ORRRC publications. A column publicizing the survey of recreational activities of African Americans appeared in the *Chicago Defender* in 1960. “Recreational Survey Begins,” *Chicago Daily Defender*, Nov 30, 1960, p. 8.

⁶ *ORRRC Study Report 20: Participation in Outdoor Recreation: Factors Affecting Demand Among American Adults. Report to the ORRRC by Eva Mueller and Gerald Gurin, assisted by Margaret Wood, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan* (Washington, DC: 1962), p. 42.]

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁸ See Gretchen Sorin, *Driving While Black: African American Travel and the Road to Civil Rights* (New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2020).

⁹ LSR to Gulick, April 24, 1959, LSR papers, ORRRC, RG 6, Series 2, Subseries 2, Box 5, Folder 55, RAC.

¹⁰ ORRRC Project Authorization No. 10, December 14, 1959, LSR papers, ORRRC, RG 6, Box 15, folder 177, RAC.

¹¹ Francis Sargent to LSR, “Progress Report on Staffing,” July 27, 1959, LSR papers, ORRRC, RG 6, Series 2, Subseries 2, Box 5, Folder 59, RAC.

¹² Laurence Hewes, *Boxcar in the Sand*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957), p. 209.

¹³ *Boxcar in the Sand*, 210. Embree's account of the founding conference in May 1944 does not list Hewes, Bethune, or Bunche. Edwin Embree, "The American Council on Race Relations." *The Journal of Negro Education* 13 (Autumn, 1944): 562-564. However, Rosenwald Fund records show that Hewes was on the payroll alongside Robert Weaver and Joseph Weckler. See *Rosenwald Fund Review of Activities in Race Relations 1941-46* (Chicago, 1946), p. 28. In Julius Rosenwald Fund Folder, FDR Presidential Library/Marist College. For more on founding conference, see Alfred Perkins, *Edwin Rogers Embree: The Julius Rosenwald Fund, Foundation Philanthropy, and American Race Relations* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011). Perkins does not mention Hewes by name in his biography of Embree, but does mention the American Council on Race Relation's activities on the West Coast. Embree was well-known to the Rockefeller family, and was an important figure at the Rockefeller Foundation before becoming head of the Rosenwald Fund.

¹⁴ See "Local Groups Plan Action Against Racial Prejudice," *The Californian* (Salinas, California), January 31, 1946, Page 1; "Laurence Hewes Urges Proposition 11," *The Sacramento Bee* (Sacramento, California), October 14, 1946, Page 4; *Boxcar in the Sand*, 213. In September 1946, Hewes's report for the American Council on Race Relations, titled "Race Relations on the West Coast," lamented that during the war "many fellow citizens sincerely identified 'Americanism' and 'democracy' with white supremacy and keeping weaker people 'in their place' ...Whites who held different views were promptly discounted as 'nigger lovers,' 'Jap-lovers,' and Communists, even by some responsible union, business, and community leaders." Quoted in Shana Bernstein, *Bridges of Reform: Interracial Civil Rights Activism in Twentieth Century Los Angeles* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 100. Bernstein cites this report as being in the John Anson Ford Papers at the Huntington Library, carton 6, as well as in the Civil Rights Congress Collection, Los Angeles, in the Southern California Library for Social Studies and Research, box 18, folder 6. See also Bernstein, "Interracial Activism in the Los Angeles Community Service Organization: Linking the World War II and Civil Rights Eras," *Pacific Historical Review* 80 (May 2011): 231-267. Mark Brilliant, *The Color of America Has Changed: How Racial Diversity Shaped Civil Rights Reform in California 1941-78* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010) also discusses Hewes's activities and his "Race Relations on the West Coast" report of September 1946, but mistakenly cites it as an article that appeared in *The Nation* magazine on September 21, 1946.

¹⁵ "Bias Issue Halts Building New San Francisco Homes," *The Pittsburgh Courier* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania), June 16, 1945, page 15. For more on this controversy, see Richard Rothstein, *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America* (New York: Liveright, 2017), pp. 10-12 ,

¹⁶ Hewes, *Boxcar in the Sand*, 217.

¹⁷ "Project Authorization Number 10, Revised May 25, 1960, Records of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Records of the ORRRC, 1958-62,

RG 368, Box 3, Folder Project 10, Correspondence, National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD (hereafter NACP). In a memo from Carl Gustafson to LSR on April 4, 1960, Gustafson reported:

[O]ur Washington staff is suggesting that we add approximately \$80,000 to the \$20,000 we had approved and carry this program of studies into 5 other metropolitan areas – Atlanta, St. Louis, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia-New York. I reviewed this program with Hewes and Wengert last week. Basically, I am convinced that this is a very much needed study. We have the money in our present budget to do this, because we have not been spending as rapidly as anticipated. The program requires your approval to pursue the availability of possible contractors, and it would require Commission approval which could be obtained by mail, once the program is in a proposal form. There is a matter of some urgency here, as most of the contractors are, or will be, universities, who must be approached quite soon so that they can initiate plans prior to June. I have a draft of this proposal.

Gustafson to LSR, “Items for discussion, in order of suggested urgency,” April 4, 1960, Rockefeller Family, General Files, 1962-1976, RG 3, Box 310, Folder “LSR/COG Memoranda,” RAC.

¹⁸ “Metropolitan Region Study-Efforts to identify Metropolitan Areas to Study,” March 8, 1960, Records of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Records of the ORRRC, 1958-62, RG 368, ORRRC Project Files, Box 3, Folder Project 10, Correspondence, NACP.

¹⁹ William E. O’Brien, *Landscapes of Exclusion: State Parks and Jim Crow in the American South* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016), pp. 99-100. On wade-ins along the Mississippi Gulf Coast in 1960, see Andrew W. Kahl, *This Land Was Ours: African American Beaches from Jim Crow to the Sunbelt South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012). On the sit in at Glen Echo Park in Maryland in 1960, see USNPS, “A Summer of Change: The Civil Rights Story of Glen Echo Park.”

²⁰ He said this at the Annual Meeting of Association of Southern State Park Directors. O’Brien, *Landscapes of Exclusion*, 130.

²¹ Tomiko Brown-Nagin, *Courage to Dissent: Atlanta and the Long History of the Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 116-22

²² O’Brien, *Landscapes of Exclusion*, 134. See “Segregation Ban in Parks Decried,” *New York Times* November 9, 1955, and “Georgia Leasing Its State Parks,” *New York Times* April 22, 1956.

²³ On meeting of ORRRC in Atlanta, see *Atlanta Constitution*, April 19, 1960, p. 17. The Atlanta contract with the University of Georgia was signed on July 19, 1960.

²⁴ Gibson bio summary, in RG 368 ORRRC Project File, Box 1 “Atlanta” folder, NACP; also Delmer Dunn, “Frank K. Gibson,” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 23 (March 1990), 71.

²⁵ Dr. John C. Belcher interview with Frank Gibson, May 28, 1975, UGA integration oral history project, in Charlayne Hunter-Gault Papers, Series I, Box 1, Folder 15, Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.

²⁶ Gibson, “Tentative Findings and Conclusions,” July 14, 1961, p. 26.

²⁷ On January 31, 1961, the ORRRC General Counsel informed Executive Director Sargent, referring to the conflict with Clawson in May 1959 about the possibility of contractors publishing their work independently, that with few exceptions, “Our remaining study contracts . . . contain language declaring the products of the contracts shall be the property of the Commission, with complete discretion to publish the study results in whole or in part.” ORRRC General Counsel to Executive Director, re: “Publication rights of study contractors,” January 31, 1961, LSR papers, ORRRC, RG 6, Series 8, Box 25, Folder 277, RAC. On May 12, 1961, Director of Studies Lawrence Stevens instructed Hewes and the other group chiefs overseeing contractors reports that while they were not expected to “undertake major rewriting or reorganization of a contractor’s report,” they were responsible for “initial editing for the purpose of eliminating superfluous wording and irrelevant material and for improving clarity of thought. Major editorial changes in substance, emphasis, or organization should be brought to the attention of the contractor and his agreement sought.” Lawrence N. Stevens to Messrs. Tharp, Hewes, Davis, and Diamond, “Processing of Reports by Contractors – Part II,” May 12, 1961, LSR papers, ORRRC, RG 6, Series 8, Box 24, Folder 266, RAC.

²⁸ L. I. Hewes, Jr. to Jerry Anderson, October 16, 1961, p. 1, Records of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Records of the ORRRC, 1958-62, RG 368, ORRRC Project Files, Box 17, Folder Southeast River Basin Commission, NACP.

²⁹ Hewes to Anderson, October 16, 1961, pp. 3-4.

³⁰ Hewes to Anderson, October 16, 1961, p. 6.

³¹ Scrawled across the cover in red pencil, “This is the copy with my suggestions for revision. It was the basis of my conference with [Jerome] Anderson of SERB [Southeast River Basin Study Commission] and Gibson at Athens on October 30, 1961.” Records of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Records of the ORRRC, 1958-62, RG 368, ORRRC Project Files, Box 1, Folder 1, Atlanta, NACP.

³² L. I. Hewes, Jr., Memorandum, “Travel to Athens, Georgia in connection with the Atlanta Metropolitan Study,” Records of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Records of the ORRRC, 1958-62, RG 368, ORRRC Project

Files, Box 1, Folder 1 Atlanta, NACP.

³³ Cover letter with "defanged" copy of Atlanta Study sent from Gibson to Hewes, November 7, 1961, Records of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Records of the ORRRC, 1958-62, RG 368, ORRRC Project Files, Box 1, Folder 1 Atlanta, NACP.

³⁴ *ORRRC Study Report #21: The Future of Outdoor Recreation in Metropolitan Regions of the United States. Reports to the ORRRC by Commission Staff and Selected Universities and Planning Agencies. Volume 1: The National View-Present Conditions and Future Prospects of Outdoor Recreation for the Residents of the Metropolitan Centers of Atlanta, St. Louis, and Chicago* (Washington, DC, 1962), p. 128.

³⁵ See Kevin Kruse, *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), especially chapter 4, "The Abandonment of Public Space."

³⁶ Letter to Laurence I. Hewes, Chief, Forecasts and Economic Studies Group, ORRRC, from Gregory P. Stone, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, April 26, 1962, p. 2. Records of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Records of the ORRRC, 1958-62, RG 368, ORRRC Reference Files, Box 10, Folder Study Report #21, NACP.

³⁷ Chorley letter to Broadus Mitchell, April 22, 1953, quoted in Anders Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Press, 2002), p. 115.

³⁸ June G. Hopps, Tony B. Lowe & Obie Clayton "I'll Find a Way or Make One': Atlanta University and the Emergence of Professional Social Work Education in the Deep South," *Journal of Social Work Education*, (2019), DOI: [10.1080/10437797.2019.1671255](https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2019.1671255).