“Physical Culture and the Neoliberal City”

Dr. David L. Andrews
Physical Cultural Studies Program
Department of Kinesiology

This topic moves the focus on from subcultures (some of which operate within localized space) to the:

urban/city/metropolitan context

The aim is to examine the place of physical culture within the contemporary, NEOLIBERAL CITY.

The Urban Nation

From 1920 onwards, American has been an URBAN NATION, meaning for the first time the majority of its population lived in cities/metropolitan areas (51.2% urban/48.8% rural).

In the 2010 census, the American population was split between 80.7% living in URBAN areas, and 19.3% living in RURAL areas.

Hence, it is important to consider the place, structure, and influence of sport and physical culture in the contemporary city.

Theme 1:

Baltimore as the Archetypal Neoliberal City
Within the Maryland Context….

Baltimore is “In many ways… emblematic of the processes that have moulded cities under US capitalism, offering a laboratory sample of contemporary urbanism.”


Post-War (1945) Economic and Social Changes in American Cities

DEPOPULATION:
The movement of large portions of the urban population to expanding suburban communities

DEINDUSTRIALIZATION:
The decline of traditional, city-based and large-scale workforce, manufacturing industries.

Since 1950s, Baltimore City’s population declined; surrounding five counties’ population rose.

This is the process of urban DEPOPULATION.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

As with many other Rustbelt cities, Baltimore’s industrial manufacturing base—which had been at the heart of the city’s economy—entered a steep decline in the decades following the end of WWII.

Baltimore’s Employment in Manufacturing and Trade Declined, While Service Jobs Increased: 1970 to 2005

This is the process of urban DEINDUSTRIALIZATION.

Baltimore’s DEPOPULATION and related DEINDUSTRIALIZATION has led to a steep decline in the city’s TAX BASE.

TAX BASE: The tax dollars derived from city RESIDENTS and BUSINESSES which provide much of the BUDGET for the OPERATING of CITY SERVICES and PROGRAMS.

The Core Tenets of Neoliberalism

1. Don’t waste public money on social welfare/“social engineering” programs: government retrenchment
2. Provide more money to individuals through lessening the tax burden
3. Develop corporate/business-friendly (anti-union/deregulated) climate to stimulate economic growth through “trickle down economics”
4. Encourage the commercial privatization of all aspects of society
5. Let the “free market” become the regulator of economic and social development
6. Provide productive individuals with increased freedom and opportunity to cultivate their own lives

Historically, city governments and administrations were focused on providing services and facilities for the city populace.

The Economic/Political Evolution of Baltimore

- Industrial Baltimore
  - Decline in/Relocation of Mass Manufacturing
  - Deindustrializing City
  - Declining Urban Population
  - Shrinking Urban Workforce
  - Diminishing Urban Tax Base
  - REDUCED CITY REVENUES AND BUDGETS
  - Public Service Retrenchment and Commercial Privatization

- Post-Industrial/Neo-Liberal Baltimore

Post-Industrial Baltimore’s Neoliberal Shift

- Welfare Managerial City Governance
  - Baltimore City
  - Entrepreneurial City Governance
  - Private Capital

The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City

- Education Services
- Sanitation Services
- Police Services
- Library Services
- Recreation Services
- Fire Services

- Privatization/Reduction of Public Services and Spaces
Neoliberalism and the Rise of the Entrepreneurial City

There has been a shift away from managerial welfare to entrepreneurially based city governance.

A move away from welfare to commercial oriented objectives.

And, a replacement of the citizen with the consumer as the focal point of urban leadership.

Many urban authorities seem now more interested in providing consumption spaces/opportunities rather than public services.

The Trickle Down Philosophy of Entrepreneurial City Governance

PUBLICLY FUNDED Business Subsidies and Tax Breaks STIMULATES the Growth of the COMMERCIAL SECTOR within cities

Creation of JOBS, Growth in CONSUMPTION LEVELS, Increases in CORPORATE and SALES TAXES

Contribution to CITY FINANCES and OPERATIONAL BUDGET

Contribution to PERSONAL INCOMES

Cities of Consumption

“Once cities prospered as places of industrial production, and in the industrial era they were engines of growth and prosperity. On the eve of the twenty-first century, they are becoming spaces for consumption in a global economy where services provide the impetus for expansion”

(Fainstein & Judd, 1999, p. 2)


Within the post-industrial/entrepreneurial city, CONSUMPTION SPACES/EXPERIENCES are positioned as a key:

MOTOR/ENGINE of ECONOMIC GROWTH

From, in a truly NEOLIBERAL sense, it is anticipated that capital will TRICKLE-DOWN to city RESIDENTS (in the form of employment) and TRICKLE-UP to city GOVERNMENT (in the form of commercial taxes).
Through tax-payer funded corporate subsidies and commercially-focused initiatives, NEOLIBERAL city governments look to create spectacular “TOURIST BUBBLES” (Judd, 1999, p. 53), designed to attract the discretionary leisure income of:

Out of Town Tourists $\$ + Suburban Tourists $\$

The “tourist bubble”, Judd (1999, p. 39) suggests:

“is like a theme park ... [with] standardized venues ... mass produced, almost as if they are made in a tourism infrastructure factory”.


Theme 2:

Baltimore’s Spectacular Reinvention and Corporate Sport

The Reinvented POST-INDUSTRIAL CITY

“deindustrialization and economic restructuring have left many cities in what used to be the affluent West with few options other than competing with each other to be centers of shopping and entertainment”


Industrial Baltimore  Post-Industrial Baltimore

1940s

- Demise of Urban Based Industrial Production
- Movement of Jobs and Population to Suburbs
- Decline of Urban Population, Wealth, and Tax Base
- New Forms of Urban Regeneration and Capital Accumulation
- City Becomes a Consumption/Service Zone

2010s

Centre of Industrial Production  Centre of Cultural Consumption
The “Greater Baltimore City” Vision

Originated in the 1950s, by Mayor William Donald Schaefer and associates.

Focused on publicly subsidized commercial, entertainment, and tourist projects designed to create a vibrant and economically productive post-industrial Baltimore.

Baltimore’s Spectacular Redevelopment: Phase I


Baltimore’s Spectacular Redevelopment: Phase II

“the model for post-industrial waterfront redevelopment around the world.”


The Publicly Subsidized Creation of Post-Industrial Baltimore


Baltimore’s “Tourist Bubble” Service and Entertainment Core

Tangible Benefits (according to the Maryland Stadium Authority):

- National/international recognition
- 670 buildings constructed
- 35,000 jobs
- $3 billion of investment in downtown
Being a “Major League” city:

“SPORT has become an important part of the way in which cities have attempted to create, espouse and transmit images of the city as a reinvigorated centre of spectacle, pleasure and play”


Maryland Stadium Authority (MSA)

Mission:

- To plan, finance, build and manage sports and entertainment facilities in Maryland.
- Provide enjoyment, enrichment, education, and business opportunities for citizens.
- Develop partnerships with local governments, universities, private enterprise, and the community.

“Its mandate includes creating public-private partnerships for financing and operating facilities.”

Source: Maryland Stadium Authority: www.mdstad.com/the-mission-and-vision-statement

Baltimore’s Publicly Subsidized Stadia/Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stadium/Team</th>
<th>Total Public Funding/Subsidy</th>
<th>Sources of Public Funding</th>
<th>Main Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oriole Park at Camden Yards</td>
<td>$208.6 million</td>
<td>State funds</td>
<td>Baltimore Orioles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;T Bank Stadium</td>
<td>$414 million</td>
<td>State revenue bonds, State bond revenues, Stadium Authority Revenues</td>
<td>Baltimore Ravens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deindustrializing Baltimore


Baltimore’s Spectacular Redevelopment: Phase III

Maryland Stadium Authority (MSA): Baltimore Projects

- Baltimore Convention Center
- M&T Bank Stadium
- Orioles Park at Camden Yards
- Hippodrome Performing Arts Center

Baltimore’s Publicly Subsidized Stadia/Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stadium/Team</th>
<th>Total Public Funding/Subsidy</th>
<th>Sources of Public Funding</th>
<th>Main Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orioles Park at Camden Yards</td>
<td>$208.6 million</td>
<td>State funds</td>
<td>Baltimore Orioles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;T Bank Stadium</td>
<td>$414 million</td>
<td>State revenue bonds, State bond revenues, Stadium Authority Revenues</td>
<td>Baltimore Ravens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 3:

Feeding the Downtown “Sporting” Monster

According to cultural geographer David Harvey (2001), in re-developed cities such as Baltimore, continual public investment is needed to perpetually UPGRADE the DOWNTOWN AMENITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE in order to keep it COMPETITIVE WITH RIVAL CITIES.

RIVAL CITIES VYING FOR the same:
- business investment
- tourist dollars
- new residents

“Feeding the downtown monster” (Harvey, 2001, p. 141): a monster which is never satisfied due to the need for continual REDEVELOPMENT and UPGRADING in order to remain competitive.


Sources of NFL Stadium Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stadium/Town</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Current Cost</th>
<th>Private Funding</th>
<th>Public Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco (Proposed)</td>
<td>San Francisco 49ers</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$578 million</td>
<td>$638 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetLife Stadium</td>
<td>New York Giants, New York Jets</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1.65 billion</td>
<td>$665 million</td>
<td>$985 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CenturyLink Field</td>
<td>Seattle Seahawks, Seattle Sounders</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$600 million</td>
<td>$264 million</td>
<td>$336 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedExField</td>
<td>Washington Redskins</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$800 million</td>
<td>$336 million</td>
<td>$464 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Brown Stadium</td>
<td>Cleveland Browns, Cincinnati Bengals</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$350 million</td>
<td>$140 million</td>
<td>$210 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T Stadium</td>
<td>Dallas Cowboys, the Texas Rangers</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1.1 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$622 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Stadium</td>
<td>Charlotte Panthers</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$250 million</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
<td>$150 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Meadowlands Stadium</td>
<td>New York Giants, New York Jets</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1.65 billion</td>
<td>$665 million</td>
<td>$985 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Field</td>
<td>San Diego Chargers, Los Angeles Dodgers</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$550 million</td>
<td>$220 million</td>
<td>$330 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FirstEnergy Stadium</td>
<td>Cleveland Browns</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Financial Field</td>
<td>Philadelphia Eagles, Philadelphia Phantoms</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx Field</td>
<td>Washington Nationals</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$500 million</td>
<td>$200 million</td>
<td>$300 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LincFinancial Field</td>
<td>Arizona Cardinals, Phoenix Coyotes</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$1.1 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$622 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliant Stadium</td>
<td>Houston Texans</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$700 million</td>
<td>$280 million</td>
<td>$420 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citi Field</td>
<td>New York Mets, New York Islanders</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Ballpark</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Rays</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$350 million</td>
<td>$140 million</td>
<td>$210 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FirstEnergy Stadium</td>
<td>Cleveland Browns</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Life Stadium</td>
<td>New England Patriots, Toronto Maple Leafs, NHL</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$700 million</td>
<td>$280 million</td>
<td>$420 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;T Bank Stadium</td>
<td>Baltimore Ravens</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$475 million</td>
<td>$190 million</td>
<td>$285 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx Field</td>
<td>Washington Redskins</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$800 million</td>
<td>$336 million</td>
<td>$464 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Financial Field</td>
<td>Philadelphia Eagles, Philadelphia Phantoms</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Field</td>
<td>San Diego Chargers, Los Angeles Dodgers</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$550 million</td>
<td>$220 million</td>
<td>$330 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Meadowlands Stadium</td>
<td>New York Giants, New York Jets</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1.65 billion</td>
<td>$665 million</td>
<td>$985 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Field</td>
<td>San Diego Chargers, Los Angeles Dodgers</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$550 million</td>
<td>$220 million</td>
<td>$330 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FirstEnergy Stadium</td>
<td>Cleveland Browns</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citi Field</td>
<td>New York Mets, New York Islanders</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Ballpark</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Rays</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$350 million</td>
<td>$140 million</td>
<td>$210 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FirstEnergy Stadium</td>
<td>Cleveland Browns</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Life Stadium</td>
<td>New England Patriots, Toronto Maple Leafs, NHL</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$700 million</td>
<td>$280 million</td>
<td>$420 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;T Bank Stadium</td>
<td>Baltimore Ravens</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$475 million</td>
<td>$190 million</td>
<td>$285 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx Field</td>
<td>Washington Redskins</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$800 million</td>
<td>$336 million</td>
<td>$464 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Financial Field</td>
<td>Philadelphia Eagles, Philadelphia Phantoms</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Field</td>
<td>San Diego Chargers, Los Angeles Dodgers</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$550 million</td>
<td>$220 million</td>
<td>$330 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Meadowlands Stadium</td>
<td>New York Giants, New York Jets</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1.65 billion</td>
<td>$665 million</td>
<td>$985 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Field</td>
<td>San Diego Chargers, Los Angeles Dodgers</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$550 million</td>
<td>$220 million</td>
<td>$330 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FirstEnergy Stadium</td>
<td>Cleveland Browns</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$478 million</td>
<td>$722 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a perceived need to continually feed the Downtown SPORTING Monster.

There is INTENSE COMPETITION between post-industrial cities vying to be a MAJOR LEAGUE city, and hopefully attract business investment, tourist dollars, and new residents.

POST-INDUSTRIAL INTER-URBAN COMPETITION

Atlanta, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Cleveland

In Baltimore’s case, the established nature of the Orioles and Ravens means that FEEDING THE DOWNTOWN SPORTING MONSTER requires developing new sporting events/attractions/facilities designed to further the city’s CULTURAL and COMMERCIAL appeal.

Why do local governments/politicians place so much emphasis on attracting and retaining “major league” sport?

If you “lose” a team to a COMPETING CITY:

“Politicians continue to believe that it would be political disaster to lose a team on their watch.”


The Baltimore Grand Prix (2011-?) as Neoliberal “Game Changer”

Indy Car Series/American Le Man Series Race

“When the race was announced in June 2010, Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake claimed it would be a ‘game changer’, impacting both the city’s declining economic fortunes and the negative perception of the city held by potential visitors.”

**Driving Around the Virtual City**

See Video Clip 2

**Neoliberal City Politics and Sporting Spectacle**

"The naysayers certainly had their day...until the race started...Anytime you do something big you take a risk...I had the opportunity to let Baltimore shine."

Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake

Mayoral Election Day: September 13


**Benefiting Baltimore Citizens?**

**Trickle-Down Grand Prix Racing?**

Costs to City:
$7.7 million (approx)
(roadwork, police, clean-up etc.)

Projected Returns:
$70-$100 million
(tax revenue, extra jobs, related spending)

Actual Returns:
City did not recover capital cost investment


Once supportive, the ECONOMIC failure of the BGP prompted Baltimore City council president, Jack Young, to call for it to be dropped:

“I initially supported the Grand Prix because I thought it would be worthwhile and because from time to time cities need to explore fresh ideas to generate revenue and attract visitors. But to continue to pursue the race, which has incurred a large amount debt, is not the best option at a time when so many other important programs and services lack much-needed support.”


**The Next Big Thing?**

Baltimore Convention Center and Arena Redevelopment
Recognising Inter-Urban Competition and the Need to “Feed the Downtown Monster”

There is considerable evidence to suggest that the financial impact of professional sport events/teams/stadia on CITY ECONOMIES in general is at best NEGLIGIBLE.

While investors/owners may benefit, there is little evidence of an economic TRICKLE DOWN EFFECT when it comes to sport events/teams/stadia.

Numerous researchers have identified little or no added benefit to CITY ECONOMIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE APPROACH TO SPORT FOCUSED URBAN REGENERATION STRATEGIES</th>
<th>NEGATIVE APPROACH TO SPORT FOCUSED URBAN REGENERATION STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job creation within sectors directly and indirectly related to the event/team/stadium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tax boost to local government from the profits of the event/team/stadium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increased consumer spending, business profits, and related tax generation within the local economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Infrastructure improvements to the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY: SPORT EVENT/TEAM/STADIUM: AN IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTOR TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY

SUMMARY: SPORT EVENT/TEAM/STADIUM: A QUESTIONABLE CONTRIBUTOR TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY

As Frank Rashid, co-founder of the Tiger Stadium Fan Club noted:

“Public subsidies for stadiums are a great deal for team owners, league executives, developers, bond attorneys, construction firms, politicians and everyone in the stadium food chain, but a really terrible deal for everyone else.”


SYMBOLIC (POLITICAL) AS OPPOSED TO REAL (ECONOMIC) BENEFITS?


The Helicopter Effect?

According to Allen Sanderson, the University of Chicago economist:

“If you want to inject money into the local economy, it would be better to drop it from a helicopter than invest it in a new ballpark”

An economic success story?
Both Oriole Park at Camden Yards and Raven’s Stadium generate considerably less from jobs and out-of-state resident spending than their costs to taxpayers in inflation adjusted INTEREST (on initial building costs) and DEPRECIATION (of facilities).

Cost to Maryland tax payer:
- Oriole Park at Camden Yards: $14 million
- M&T Bank Stadium: $18 million


Theme 4:
Neoliberal Baltimore’s Privileged Spaces (and Populations)

The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City
- Education Services
- Sanitation Services
- Police Services
- Library Services
- Recreation Services
- Fire Services
- Privatization/Reduction of Public Services and Spaces

NEOLIBERALISM and the IDEOLOGY of INDIVIDUALISM
The neoliberal urban order providing individuals with opportunities in the consumer marketplace.

The Physical Activity Balance in the Neoliberal City

1. Public Provision
Based on idea that access to physical activity, health, and wellness is a civil right, and there should be free and equal access to physical activity resources and opportunities to all citizens.

2. Market Provision
Based on idea that freedom of choice is best served through the free market where individuals can choose, and pay for, their own activity/health related practices.
The dominance of the privatized physical activity marketplace has created:

“a dominant mode of consumption in which the majority will satisfy most of its [physical activity] consumption through private purchase…” (p. 318).


Physical Culture and the Renaissance City

The postindustrial redevelopment/regeneration or RENAISSANCE of cities focuses on policies designed to attract the RIGHT (particularly in terms of economic/consumer power) population into cities. Most highly prized are what Richard Florida (2002) dubbed the “creative class”.


According to Florida (2002), the creative class is another important MOTOR of the ECONOMY within the post-industrial city, both in terms of the new technologically-based industries they work in, and in the experientially oriented and consumption-based lifestyles they create for themselves.

Living in the right urban environment (diverse, eclectic, dynamic, stimulating), is a key feature of the experiential existence desired by the creative class.

The very idea of the CREATIVE CLASS has had a significant influence in shaping housing, commercial, and urban development strategies and initiatives, all designed to reinvent the city as a place that would ATTRACT this desired population.


The [Economic] Rise and Importance of the Creative Class

It is also about encouraging appropriate LEISURE services and experiences for the creative class to attract them and keep them in the urban core.

“The ideal (for the creative class) is to ‘live the life’ – a creative life packed-full of intense, high-quality, multidimensional experiences. And the kinds of experiences they crave for reflect and reinforce their identities as creative people ... They favour active, participatory recreation over passive spectator sports. They like indigenous street-level culture – a teeming blend of cafes, sidewalk musicians, and small galleries and bistros, where it is hard to draw the line between participant and observer, or between creativity and its creators.

(Florida 2002, p. 166)


The Creative Class and Physical Culture

Highly educated and individualistic professionals (with relatively high levels of discretionary income, and a willingness to use it), interested in involvement in a wide range of PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES/EXPERIENCES as PARTICIPANTS as opposed to SPECTATORS.

Creative Class Activities:
- Climbing
- Running
- Working Out
- Snowboarding
- Road Cycling
- Mountain Cycling
- Kayaking
- Yoga

“creative” and “freelance qualities”
(Banks, 2009, p. 674)


Downtown Spaces of [Commercial] Play

Privatized Physical Activity
(Baltimore median household income: $30,078)

Annual Memberships

Merritt Athletic Club: $540-$1020
CrossFit Harbor East: $2200
Bikram Yoga Baltimore: $1200

South Baltimore CrossFit: The Creative Class in Action?

See Video Clip 4
Reality or Hype?

“Perhaps the best that can be said about the creative-class idea is that it follows a real, if overhyped, phenomenon: the movement of young, largely single, childless and sometimes gay people into urban neighborhoods. This Soho-ization—the transformation of older, often industrial urban areas into hip enclaves—is evident in scores of cities.”


Privatized Sport/Physical Culture Delivery

Those living in relatively wealthy (for not all suburbs are) middle/upper class SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES, experience what is known as:

PRIVILEGE AMPLIFICATION

As a result of their levels of capital, and the advantages derived from living in an area with a WELL-FUNDED (through the tax base) local government and public services.

This is evident within SUBURBAN access to and experience of PHYSICAL CULTURE/ACTIVITY.
PRIVATE SCHOOLS are, by their very nature, privatized and commercial institutions.

Oftentimes, an important part of what you purchase through private schools is access to physical activity-related facilities, programs, and opportunities.

Both PARKS and PLAYGROUNDS (and indeed other public recreational spaces) are PRODUCTS and PRODUCERS of the ENVIRONMENTS in which they are LOCATED.

A Park is Never Just a Park

Public parks are potentially important public spaces where the populace can recreate, interact in safe and welcoming surroundings, and thereby strengthen community identity and involvement (social capital). Conversely, where parks are poorly maintained, and/or become magnets for crime, the local community is unlikely to use them as a gathering place and source of social capital. Here, the park becomes a source of NEIGHBORHOOD BLIGHT rather than a NEIGHBORHOOD ATTRIBUTE.

The “Safe” Park

“A dynamic place where the design, maintenance, and policing of the park work together so that the general public perceives the park as a safe place, wants to go to the park regularly, and spends their optional time in the park engaged in valued activities. Crime and disorder is limited, and diverse usage of the park by different groups is tolerated. Legal activities are the dominant activities in the park. Because the local community values the park, it has a sense of “ownership” of it, and there are sufficient numbers of users who act as “natural guardians” to ensure informal social control. They also support formal interventions by park management and police when such interventions are necessary” (p.5).

- Parents take children there
- Females go there as often as males
- Elderly people regularly visit the park
- Workers have lunch or take breaks there


The Archetypal SUBURBAN PARK

- Location: Baltimore County
- Size: 96.2 acres
- Land Cost: $4.8 million
- Site Development Costs: $3.375 million
- Construction Began: Summer 2001
- Construction Completed: Fall 2002

Model Facilities

Meticulous Maintenance

Managed and Welcoming Environment

Mixed-Use (Population and Practices)
Concerted Cultivation as Cultural Norm

Social Capital and Connectivity

Class Habitus and Active Lifestyle Culture

Community Building: Durable and Recognizable Social Networks

Physical Activity/Culture
BASED SUBURBAN (middle/upper middle class):

PRIVILEGE AMPLIFICATION

Theme 5:

Neoliberal Baltimore’s Under-Privileged Spaces (and Populations)

The Fantasy Neoliberal City

There has been the creation of a “fantasy city” (Hannigan, 1998), in which the Inner Harbor both presents an unreal perception of city life and shields both suburbanites and tourists from Baltimore’s continuing urban problems.


REDUCED TAX BASE
(depopulation and decline in industrial output)

REDIRECTION OF PUBLIC MONIES TO ENTREPRENEURIAL GOVERNANCE STRATEGIES (capital investment in “tourist bubble” developments and corporate subsidies)

= SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN CITY’S OPERATING BUDGET, AND A RELATED REDUCTION (RETRENCHMENT) IN PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROGRAMS
The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City

Reduction of Public Services and Spaces

The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City

Disinvestment and Decline in Public Services

The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City

Disinvestment and Decline in Public Spaces

The "Rot Beneath the Glitter" (Harvey, 2001)

The image of the Inner Harbor draws attention away from the very real social problems that continue to plague Baltimore, and that have not been addressed by the URBAN ENTREPRENEURIAL redevelopment of the city's COMMERCIAL CORE.

These lingering problems include:
- UNEMPLOYMENT
- POVERTY
- EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
- DRUG USE
- CRIME
- HEALTH


Faultlines: Baltimore - Anatomy of a City

Social Disparities Within the Neoliberal City

Those with sufficiently AFFLUENT (creative classes/urban and suburban middle/upper classes) can avail themselves of PRIVATIZED services and programming (health/education/recreation)

However, the most economically VULNERABLE populations (the urban lower classes) were left underserved by the NEOLIBERAL RETRENCHMENT IN PUBLIC services and programming.
“A third-world city in the first world”


Physical Culture and the Underclass City

“Deprivation Amplification”

“a pattern of diminished opportunities related to the features of the local environment. In places where people have fewer personal resources, the local facilities that enable people to lead healthy lives are poorer than in areas that are not impoverished and socially deprived (p. S55).”


Effects of Cuts in Recreation and Parks 1993-2010 budget:

• Reduction in staff numbers
• Increase in activity fees
• Decline in organized football and baseball leagues
• Field and facility poorly maintained
• Playgrounds (80%) unsafe
• One maintenance worker for every 101 acres


The “Risky” Park

“A place where crime and disorder has become the norm to the degree that local users consider the park unsafe, try to avoid being in the park, and limit their time in the park to necessary activities. Crime and public disorder such as vandalism, littering, dog fouling, alcohol and drug abuse, and public sex have become the dominant activities in the park.” (p. 6)

• People go through the park as quickly as possible
• Drunken people hang out there
• Young males dominate the setting
• It is littered with syringes and beer bottles
• Younger children don’t play there.

Unwelcoming and Unsafe (Underused) PUBLIC SPACES

Decades of Decline and Disinvestment

From the early 1990s, public provision for recreation in Baltimore city has been in steady decline due to increased budget pressures:

1993: 143 Recreation Centers

2010: 55 Recreation Centers

2013: 31 Recreation Centers

The Neoliberalizing Recreation Center?

1993: 143 Recreation Centers

2010: 55 Recreation Centers

2012: 11 “Community” Centers

44 out for private tender

Baltimore City Recreation Centers 2010

Source: https://www.baltimorecity.org/Departments/Recreation-and-Parks/Recreation-Centers-and-Parks

The Model “Community” Center

(for every 50,000 of population)

The Private Marketplace

City gets few bids to run rec centers
Public Concerns Over Recreation Center Plan

See Video Clip 9

[Illegal] Baltimore Dirt Bike Subculture

See Video Clip 7

The Twelve O’Clock Boys

See Video Clip 7

An Urban Subculture of Recreation and Protest

“The riders, converging from all parts of the inner city, regard their practice both as a recreation and a protest. The dirt bike culture of Baltimore is a primal and energetic response to the tension between social classes. When the riders embark on the city, they suddenly have a platform. It plays on the delicacy of their lives as they know it from their marginalized communities.”


“This is our tradition, our culture, this is what we do. Ain’t no one going to take it from us. This is our release.”

“It’s a fucked up situation within the city. We’re trying to change that the best way we know how.”

“They’re closing all the recs, they’re closing all the rec centers, so what’s a child to do. Tell me something new.”
The Police Response


Physical Activity/Culture BASED URBAN (under/lower class):

DEPRIVATION AMPLIFICATION

Interestingly...

The Baltimore Orioles and Ravens, having received considerable public subsidies for the building of their new stadiums, refused a $1 tax on every ticket that would have gone to funding parks and recreation (and hence physical activity) in the city. As such, they both:

“balked at a direct subsidy to [public] recreation” (p. 233).


A Wavering Belief in Entrepreneurial City Governance?

“Our recreation centers keep kids safe, healthy and off the streets, and it's our responsibility to protect the interests of our children and our communities. What does it say about our priorities as a city when we will move heaven and Earth to continue a street race but will turn our back on our most vulnerable citizens?...

...Ultimately, city government needs to dedicate its attention to things like retaining and expanding recreation centers for our children and seniors, and to operating swimming pools during the summer for our youths on a full-time basis. We should focus more of our attention toward our neighborhoods and work to improve the everyday lives of our citizens. City officials, including myself, supported the Baltimore Grand Prix because we believed the race would have a positive impact on our city. But the time has come for us to instead focus on core issues that impact the quality of life for all Baltimoreans.”


William B. Marker, a Baltimore lawyer and community activist who sued unsuccessfully for a referendum on the stadium bills:

“What if that money [the public funds spent on Orioles Park] had been spent on schools and drug treatment?...Who knows what would have been.”


Baltimore Social Unrest 2015
Three Baltimore Physical Cultures