A History of University Circle in Cleveland

A History of University Circle in Cleveland

Community, Philanthropy, and Planning

Darwin Stapleton

MSL Academic Endeavors
CLEVELAND

Preface

This book is written for both scholars and a general readership interested in University Circle, Cleveland, educational and cultural institutions, and American history and urbanism generally. The idea of writing a history of University Circle, and specifically of University Circle, Inc. (UCI) — and its predecessor, the University Circle Development Foundation — was proposed by Leonard Mayo, then a trustee of University Circle, Inc. His proposal was supported by Mrs. William Treuhaft, another UCI trustee who was active in many civic and educational institutions. With funding from the Cleveland Foundation, the project was undertaken by Clarence H. ("Red") Cramer, then a former professor and dean of Case Western Reserve University. Dr. Cramer was the author of several authoritative histories of the university and its schools. After several months of research focusing on the history of UCI, Dr. Cramer's increasingly severe, and eventually fatal, illness led to suspension of the project.

Murray Davidson, a Vice-President of UCI, was a champion of

the history project since its inception, and after it was dormant for some months, sought the advice of several historians who recommended that I be selected to continue it. I agreed to continue the project on the condition that it would be a history of University Circle as a whole, rather than focusing on the history of University Circle, Inc. In the latter stages of my work on the project Elizabeth deBruin succeeded Murray Davidson as a Vice-President of UCI, and graciously supported the projects while bringing her own questions and concerns to it. The Cleveland Foundation generously funded the research and initial preparation of manuscript under grant no. 83-589-14R.

In carrying out the project I have been privileged to have the assistance and advice of numerous knowledgeable and enthusiastic people. Researchers Holly (Rarick) Witchey, Bari Stith, and Elizabeth (Liz) Palay were indefatiguable and contributed to the intellectual as well as the factual content of the book. Professors Park D. Goist and Stephen Brobeck, with whom I co-taught the American Studies course, "Cleveland: Growth and Modernization," at Case Western Reserve University from 1978 to 1986, introduced me to the many absorbing aspects of Cleveland's history. Students in that course contributed numerous observations, wrote helpful term papers on various aspects of University Circle, and tested many of the concepts which frame this book. Dr. Mary Stavish and others connected with the gestation and development of the *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* answered questions about Cleveland history even before the *Encyclopedia* was published. Invitations to write three essays for

the Encyclopedia gave me further opportunities to research Cleveland history.

Any book based on original research relies on librarians and archivists for direction and support. My research in particular has been greatly enriched by the advice and assistance of staff at the Western Reserve Historical Society and the Case Western Reserve University Archives, both in Cleveland, and the Rockefeller Archive Center in Sleepy Hollow, New York. When I moved from Case Western Reserve University to the Rockefeller Archive Center in 1986 I found that the archives of the Rockefeller family and of the Rockefeller Foundation were treasure troves of material on the history of University Circle. I recommend that anyone conducting research on the history of University Circle and Cleveland contact the Rockefeller Archive Center regarding the possibility that valuable supportive materials may be there.

The manuscript of this book had several reviewers over the years. Donna L.H. Stapleton, my wife and support of now nearly a half-century, read the manuscript in varying stages with an eye to accuracy, consistency and felicity of phrase, and has been encouraging in innumerable and loving ways. She invested in documenting the history of University Circle photographically, and it is regrettable that in this version her photographs are not included. At an early point Henry D. Shapiro and Zane Miller provided wide-ranging criticisms of two drafts that helped me to rethink some of the big questions. I had helpful advice on several chapters from Professor Morell Heald, professor of American Studies at Case Western Reserve University; Dr. Kenneth W.

Rose, Managing Editor of the Encyclopedia of Cleveland History, and for twenty years Assistant Director at the Rockefeller Archive Center; and Dr. Judith Sealander, while a Visiting Scholar at the Rockefeller Archive Center. At the Rockefeller Archive Center I had the support and forbearance of two wonderful Executive Assistants, Madeleine Tierney and Camilla Harris. At an important point Assistant Norine Hochman of the Center generously took the time to convert the book manuscript into an up-to-date word-processing format.

While the stimulation and insights of other have been invaluable to the development of this book, I have persisted in the historian's professional obligation to apply his best judgment to the interpretation of the evidence. The story is therefore presented in my words and from my perspective. I recognize that readers may disagree with my views, and it is my hope and expectation that this work will encourage others to study, interpret, teach, and write about the history of University Circle with new understandings.

In the end the work of any historian is a culmination of a lifetime of research, experience, and education. While growing up in small Pennsylvania towns, my experience with cities was limited to tourist visits to Philadelphia, New York, Washington, D.C. American cities began to interest me as an undergraduate at Swarthmore College (1965-69) when so many crucial currents in contemporary American society seemed to be expressed in urban areas. Courses in my history major seldom dealt with the problems of cities, but courses in urban education, American

political systems, and economic development helped me to grapple with many of the issues.

In my first year of graduate school at the University of Delaware (1969-70) I took a course in urban history taught by visiting professor Charles N. Glaab, a pioneer in that field. When faced with the active military draft of the Vietnam War era, I found conscientious objection to the only ethical and Christian alternative. I was drafted in the spring of 1970: facing the requirement of finding appropriate alternative service, I sought and obtained an inner-city social work position. Two years at the Lutheran Settlement House of the Lutheran Social Mission Society in Philadelphia (1970-72) provided valuable and enduring lessons in the frustrations and exhilarations of urban life. While I cannot be sure that I changed lives or circumstances at the Settlement, the experience changed me. As a God-given bonus, my tenure at the Settlement overlapped with Donna's, and we met and married in my first year there.

I returned to the University of Delaware to pursue a Ph.D. in history. I chose urban history as one of my doctoral examination fields, and studied that field under the enthusiastic direction of Dr. Carol E. Hoffecker. In 1974, before completing my doctorate the next year, I took a position with The Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe under the direction and mentorship of Edward C. Carter II, the Editor-in-Chief of the project. Working on Latrobe's urban engineering and industrial projects over the next decade I did substantial research on the late 18th and early 19th century histories of Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Pittsburgh and New Orleans.

In 1976 I took a position at Case Western Reserve University in the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, then composed of the Program in the History of Technology and Science, and the American Studies Program. Dr. Robert E. Schofield, an eminent historian of science, had a deep interest in the industrial history of Cleveland, and encouraged my interest in that area. Two doctoral students, Edward J. Pershey and Rudolph Snowadsky, asked me to direct their dissertations on aspects of the history of the Cleveland machine-tool company, Warner & Swasey, a process that taught me much about Cleveland history. While in Cleveland, Donna and I attended Epworth-Euclid United Methodist Church (now University Circle United Methodist Church), located in University Circle, an institution that often grappled with the issues of its urban location.

Subsequent to our years in the Cleveland area, where we lived in inner-ring suburbs of the city, we settled in the New York City and Boston metropolitan areas. In both cases my institutional employers (Rockefeller University and the University of Massachusetts Boston) were in the core city, and Donna and I enjoyed the cultural offerings both at those institutions and in those cities at large. Our experiences in those settings undoubtedly influenced my perspectives on the history of University Circle.

I completed the major part of the University Circle manuscript in 1990, and made minor revisions and additions to the manuscript over the next three decades. In 1990 it was expected that the book would be published by University Circle, Inc., but when that did not come to fruition I sent the manuscript to Ohio

State University Press. Although it was well-received there, and I was given a publishing contract, a subsequent severe budget reduction at the press resulted in revocation of the contract. I did not then pursue other options, but throughout the 1980s and 1990s, and occasionally into the 2000s, I published articles or presented material drawing on my research and the manuscript. Those publications are listed in an appendix to this book: in several cases the publications considerably extended subjects undertaken in this book; in other cases they are only obliquely related to the history of University Circle.

Finally, I am grateful to William C. (Bill) Barrow, Head of Special Collections at Cleveland State University's Michael Schwartz Library, for contacting me in 2018 regarding the possible publication of this manuscript. I knew that some students of Cleveland history were aware of the manuscript's existence, and I had hoped at some point to publish it, but it is unlikely that would have happened without Bill's contact. I am grateful as well to Barbara I. Loomis, Digital Scholarly and Programs Administrator at the Library, and her staff, for their skill in converting my manuscript into publishable form.

A good deal of what is the best and worst of United States history can be better understood by studying cities, which both involved citizens and scholars should do. I hope that this book is a contribution to that process.

Darwin H. Stapleton
Wernersville, PA
February 2020

Author's Note

A History of University Circle was substantially completed in 1990. A few additions and modifications have been made to the text since then, but in conception and execution the book remains largely as it stood in 1990. Because it did not become a publication at that point, I drew on substantial portions of it for several articles in journals and for chapters in edited volumes. In some cases those publications included research done for, but not included in, the original manuscript, as well as additional new research. Most of those articles and chapters, and publications related more broadly to Cleveland and Midwest history, are referenced in this book's footnotes and all are included in a bibliography at the end of this book.

What appears here is largely the story of University Circle to about 1985. My view of its history as expressed then, based on my substantial research in original sources as well as from reading many published works, remains my view. Yet, some thirty-five years of rich and important history of University Circle (1985-2020) are not described here. It is my hope that

others will take up the writing of that history, as well as adding to, emending, or revising what I have written about University Circle. Those scholars and writers, while often consulting the same sources but able to draw on new sources, will have the opportunity to reflect on trends and developments only faintly visible in the 1980s, and undoubtedly will provide fresh views of the history of University Circle.

Introduction

1. The Context of the Circle: Community, Philanthropy, and Planning

This book traces the history of University Circle in Cleveland with reference to three fundamental themes in the development of urban America: community, philanthropy, and planning.[1] They bear on University Circle in particular because it is a collection of nonprofit institutions, created and sustained by philanthropy, and brought together in the 20th century by a series of plans that reflect certain visions of community. Leading institutions in the Circle such as Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland Museum of Art, Musical Arts Association

1. The great urban historian Oscar Handlin stated that "the central problems of urban history are those of the organization of space within the city, of the creation of order among its people, and of the adjustment to its new conditions by the human personality." His themes are similar to, but more general than, those here. Oscar Handlin, "The Modern City as a Field of Historical Study," in Oscar Handlin and John Burchard, eds., *The Historian and the City* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press and Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 2.

(Cleveland Orchestra), Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland Institute of Art, Cleveland Institute of Music, Cleveland Music School Settlement, and University Circle, Inc. have evolved in the context of over a hundred years of philanthropy focused on one urban space.

Philanthropy and planning in University Circle have been largely under the control of the wealthy elite of Cleveland, a class which emerged in the second half of the 1800s as Cleveland experienced vast and profitable growth in commerce (especially railroads and lake shipping) and industry (especially iron and steel, machinery and electrical products, chemicals, and textiles). This elite created and developed the Circle because, on the one hand, they believed that with wealth came civic responsibility and, on the other, because they wanted to create institutions that would sustain their values in the midst of what they saw as the chaotic, disintegrating forces of urban America. Initially, at least, Cleveland's elite reached toward creating a set of institutions that would be a bulwark of what they thought of as community. Like most Americans, for Cleveland's elite the concept of community has been defined as a group of people who share a way of life and have common social and cultural concerns.[2]

2. Paul Meadows, "The Idea of Community in the City," in Melvin I. Urofsky, ed., (*Perspectives on Urban America*, Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1973), pp. 23; Park Dixon Goist, *From Main Street to State Street: Town, City and Community in America* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1977), pp. 35; Alex Marshall, *How Cities Work: Suburbs, Sprawl, and the Roads not Taken* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2000), pp. 197-207.

Community

In American history the idea of community has been both elusive and compelling. Early European settlers were sometimes able to recreate entire villages or religious communities, but more often the chances of migration and settlement threw together a variety of people who had to create a new community for government, religious observances, commercial transactions, and occasionally mutual defense. Over time Americans learned how to create community by various forms of association that could be extended or dissolved as populations mushroomed or declined.[3]

These learned processes of community development attracted much of Alexis de Tocqueville's attention as he described American culture in the 1830s. He believed that American community was based on the rough equality experienced by white, male citizens, derived from those face-to-face contacts in the home and market that were possible in a largely agricultural society, and that were based on a commitment to creating and supporting local institutions, especially manifested in local government, schools, and churches. These institutions were supported largely by the freely given efforts of citizens,

3. A classic description of antebellum community creation is in Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Americans: The Democratic Experience* (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), esp. pp. 49112. The conscious creation of community in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century has been examined by several scholars. For intellectual and social history approaches to the topic, respectively, see: Henry D. Shapiro, *Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870-1920* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), and Anthony F.C. Wallace, *St. Clair: A Nineteenth-Century Coal Town's Experience with a DisasterProne Industry* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987), esp. ch. 7.

including those, such as women and African-Americans, who did not have all the benefits of citizenship. As one historian has noted, "volunteerism was the social currency which bound antebellum communities together."[4] This kind of community was found (to the extent that such a community could be found anywhere) in the mid-nineteenth century village of Doan's Corners, which was centered adjacent to (and broadly overlapped with) the future site of University Circle.

Doan's Corners was dominated by residents of Anglo-Saxon heritage, and most adults were self employed as craftsmen, merchants, or farmers. In many ways self-reliant, the village functioned as a large extended family. This form of American community was challenged after mid-century by massive influxes of foreign-born immigrants, and by rapid industrialization, particularly in villages on the periphery of urban centers like Cleveland. These new factors forced a reevaluation of the ethnic homogeneity and intimacy that seemed to many Clevelanders to be fundamental to American community, a reevaluation that called forth a variety of responses.

The response of the wealthier citizens throughout the United States, whose residences in the latter nineteenth century grew increasingly separate from the homes of working-class

4. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Phillips Bradley, ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1945), 1:57-60, 180, 298330, 2: 109128, 17880; Robert N. Bellah, et al., *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment In American Life* (New York: Harper & Row, 1985), pp. 3839; Kathleen D. McCarthy, *Noblesse Oblige: Charity & Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago, 1849-1929* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1982), p. 4 (quote).

immigrants, was to form new institutions and initiate reforms that would sustain or recreate their idea of community, in part as a means of exercising hegemony over an increasingly fragmented city. Historian Thomas Bender has described this response as "[defining] for themselves and *for others* a public culture that looks very much like their group values writ large."[5]

The wealthy elite of Cleveland, for example, favored parks in their city that would encourage the allegedly healthful and morally improving effects of walking or riding through a faux-rural landscape; and they promoted the temperate use of alcohol (or better yet, total abstinence from it) because they believed that liquor broke up families and permanently scarred children; they planned heavily-regulated residential areas (often suburbs) for themselves in order to preserve Anglo-Saxon dominance (again, in faux rural settings); and they wanted to establish institutions that either ameliorated the evils of the industrial city or that diffused the assumed benefits of higher culture (art, music, literature and science). In Cleveland these responses to late nineteenth century urbanization found a focus in University Circle.[6]

5. Thomas Bender, "Metropolitan Life and the Making of Public Culture," in John Hull Hollenkopf, ed., *Power, Culture, and Place: Essays on New York City* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988), p. 265. Italics in original.
6. On elite institution-building and reform in nineteenth-century Cleveland see David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *Cleveland: A Tradition of Reform* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1986) and Thomas F. Campbell and Edward Higgins, eds., *The Birth of Modern Cleveland, 1865-1930* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1988). On the broader questions of elites and institutions see Peter Dobkin Hall, *The Organization of American Culture, 1700-1900: Private Institutions, Elites, and the Origins of American Culture* (New York: New York University Press, 1982).

In the latter 19th and early 20th century different feelings of community developed in the areas adjacent to University Circle. Neighborhoods known as Murray Hill and Hough emerged, with self-conscious identities and a willingness to create local institutions (such as churches) that focused community relationships. Like many American urban neighborhoods, they were characterized by high degrees of ethnic or racial homogeneity.[7] The wealthy elite often viewed these districts, filled with people from regions of southern and eastern Europe (or, beginning in the 1910s, African-Americans from the American South), as reservoirs of un-American attitudes and values. These new urban neighborhoods certainly were different than the remembered experience of Cleveland before 1860 or villages such as Doan's Corners, but they had in common developing senses of community that were seldom recognized or appreciated by Cleveland's elite.

Philanthropy

Philanthropy as we understand it today has its roots in the Christian evangelical revival, political reform and social uplift movements of antebellum America. Evangelical movements of the 1820s and 1830s were closely connected to the birth of the antislavery, temperance, and Sunday school organizations. These were strong in Cleveland and accustomed its church-goers to participating in the creation of voluntary institutions focusing on social causes, like the American Anti-Slavery Society or

7. John C. Teaford, *The Twentieth-Century American City: Problems, Promise, and Reality* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), pp. 5661.

the Cuyahoga Total Abstinence Society, as well as to donating money to support such traditional direct-aid charities as hospitals, poorhouses, and orphanages. In the early 1860s the creation and operation of the United States Sanitary Commission, a civilian agency which unified several competing efforts to provide medical care and other aid to Union soldiers during the Civil War, drew on the antebellum reform experience, but also demonstrated clearly the possibilities of nationwide organization and professional leadership. In the decades after the war wealthy citizens in several American cities, including Cleveland, created Charity Organization Societies to centralize the fundraising efforts of traditional charities. The process of philanthropic centralization paralleled the growth of centralized business organizations and monopolistic business practices in the latter 1800s.[8]

New reform organizations also sprang up at the same time, particularly as urbanization proceeded rapidly, and cities experienced both levels of poverty and needs for cultural organization that never had been approached previously in America. Settlement houses, parks, orchestras, and missions to the most needy immigrants were responses to the possibilities and problems of gathering hundreds of thousands of Americans into urban foci. Such organizations were communal efforts with widespread support which, in the view of urban elites, helped to counter the apparently splintering tendencies of urban life.

8. McCarthy, *Noblesse Oblige*, p. 89. For a view of philanthropy in the Midwest generally, see: Darwin H. Stapleton, “Urban Philanthropy,” in *The American Midwest: An Interpretive Encyclopedia* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2007), pp. 1225-1228.

Some, though certainly not all, of the wealthiest Americans responded strongly to the new opportunities for philanthropy. One outstanding example was John F. Slater, a New England industrialist, who in 1882 put $1 million into a relatively new form of philanthropy, a charitable foundation, and directed its efforts toward education for black Americans in the South. Clevelanders were well aware of this new approach: the Slater Fund's first president was Ohioan Rutherford B. Hayes, former president of the United States, and a trustee of the Western Reserve University, which had just moved to Cleveland.[9]

The most advanced position on the nature of philanthropy was articulated by Andrew Carnegie, the Pittsburgh iron and steel entrepreneur. In 1889 he published an article entitled "Wealth," which argued that wealth carried with it the unavoidable responsibility for using it to promote social welfare. Not only is "Wealth" usually regarded as stating the credo of late Victorian philanthropy in America, but Carnegie modeled his ethic by giving away virtually all of his fortune.[10]

Yet most major philanthropists, including Carnegie and the leading Cleveland industrialist, John D. Rockefeller, found that the possibilities for the distribution of their wealth were not only endless, but difficult to assess, and began to seek means of ensuring the effectiveness of their gifts, and the long term

9. John H. Stanfield, "Philanthropic Regional Consciousness and Institution-Building in the American South: The Formative Years, 1867-1920," in Jack Salzman, ed., *Philanthropy and American Society: Selected Papers* (New York: Center for American Culture Studies, Columbia University, 1987), pp. 12729.
10. Joseph Frazier Wall, *Andrew Carnegie* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 8068, 82884.

stability of the nonprofit institutions they favored. For a very few super-rich Americans it was possible to hire a personal staff of philanthropic advisers. Others began to expect (or demand) that charities and other nonprofits hire professional staffs, create endowment funds to provide perpetual income support, and establish boards of trustees (on which the wealthy would be liberally and, if legally possible, permanently represented) to provide overall supervision. Certainly, the institutions that gathered at the Circle from the 1880s onward usually were established or controlled by boards composed of wealthy Clevelanders, employed professional operating staffs, and established endowments at an early point to reduce heavy annual calls on trustees.

As these institutions grew in programs, collections and staff, additional support had to be raised, but in new ways. In general, by the mid-twentieth century the age of a few wealthy donors had passed in Cleveland, and fundraising had begun to be a professional activity, reaching out to all who could afford to donate a few dollars. There is a revealing contrast between the 28 pledges that raised a $2,000,000 endowment for Severance Hall (home of the Cleveland Orchestra) in 1928, and the thousands of donors who by the beginning of the 21st century supported the Orchestra's sustaining and endowment fund campaigns. The newsletters, receptions, appeal letters and special exhibitions engendered by this broadened fund-raising have been one means of engaging a larger number of Clevelanders in the support of the Circle, even while trusteeship

tends to be vested in the actual or social-stratum heirs of the original philanthropists.[11]

Government funding has been a relatively minor theme most views of the Circle, although without the cooperation and collusion of the city, state, and federal government the Circle would have been a vine without a trellis. The Circle's emergence as an entity may be traced back to 1882, the year the city of Cleveland purchased Wade Park, and government has provided the Circle with the infrastructure of streets, sewers, water, and police and fire services fundamental to urban life. But even the most active city administrations have failed to affect the character of the Circle's institutions, and municipal funding for them has been inconsequential. Even the city's planning function has been consistently usurped by the elite and their agencies.[12]

Planning

The planning of the Circle, generally the forethought about the future siting of buildings and about their architectural design, and the altering of the landscape and the layout of streets, began with Jeptha Wade's Victorian-era vision for the park which is named for him. But throughout much of the first century of the area that became the Circle (1796-1896), there was no overall scheme to direct Cleveland's growth, which derived far more

11. For a general commentary on trusteeship, see: Darwin H. Stapleton, "Trusteeship," in Helmut K. Anheier and Stefan Toepler, eds., *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* (New York: Springer, 2010), part 20, pp. 1571-75.
12. A recent critic of American cities argues that loss of government control over urban planning has been the cause of significant failures in design: Marshall, *How Cities Work*, pp. xii-xiii, 133-55, 213-14.

from the real estate speculations of entrepreneurial citizens rather than government foresight. Street and landownership patterns of residential and commercial areas surrounding the Circle were crazy-quilts of parcels based on hundreds of individual real estate investments and speculations, with only those few straight avenues and township boundaries that had been laid out by the early surveyors of the Western Reserve to provide some visual coherence.

In the Progressive Era some headway was made on planning for the future, first with the creation of the city's Park Commission in 1893. It had powers which made it nearly inaccessible to normal democratic processes, and quickly obtained the confidence of the elite. Business leaders John D. Rockefeller and William J. Gordon, donated land, or funds to purchase land, to make a park corridor along the entire Doan Brook valley that ran through the heart of the Circle. That was the first major park system in Cleveland.

In the first two decades of the 20th century the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce took leadership in planning. The Chamber initiated the studies which led to the Group Plan (1905), a coherent ordering of new public buildings on a site northeast of Public Square, the traditional focus of Cleveland's public life. (Histories of the Group Plan do not note that it was based in part on the real estate legacy of Leonard Case, who was also the founder of Case School of Applied Science.)[13]) In the

13. The Case real estate legacy was dealt with in: Darwin H. Stapleton, "Saving a City from Itself: Euclid Avenue, Temperance, and the Charitable Impulse in Cleveland, 1870-1930," Euclid Avenue Past-Present-Future Lecture Series, Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland, OH, November 12, 2005.

next decade the Chamber attempted to initiate a similar process of coherent planning in University Circle based on the focus created by the new Art Museum (1913), and they had some effect on later decisions. But equally significant was the creation of a real estate holding company, the University Improvement Corporation, by leading Circle philanthropists. The company bought land to create a buffer zone to the west of the Circle which it sold off to institutions such as Epworth-Euclid Church, Wade Park Manor, and Fenway Hall. This pattern of leadership by private forces, especially the business elite, has continued in Cleveland. As a 1990s critique described it, “In Cleveland’s tightly coupled framework, the concentration of business and government forces occurs informally, with the public sector in a sustaining but subordinate role to the corporate board.”[14]

Underlying the planning of the Circle and indeed the entire rationale for it, was the Progressive Era fascination with order and efficiency. Other cities, notably Chicago, attempted in the same era to bring cultural institutions together, usually in or adjacent to parks, with the idea that they could be mutually supporting and would be conveniently accessible to city dwellers. Few cities, however, had a site as well located and spatially adequate as Cleveland’s University Circle, and few cities carried out the Progressive reform dictates of order and efficiency as thoroughly as did Cleveland.[15]

14. Susan E. Clarke and Gary L. Gaile, *The Work of Cities* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), p. 122.
15. Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Culture and the City: Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago from the 1880s to 1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), pp. 140, 222-225; David D. Van Tassel, "Introduction: Cleveland and Reform," in Van Tassel and Grabowski, eds., *Cleveland: A Tradition of Reform*, pp. 810; Margaret Lynch, "The Growth of

Other planning was carried out with more limited objectives. Wade Allotment (1905), a residential subdivision next to the Circle, was carefully designed to appeal to Cleveland's elite. The Garden Center (1930) took control of the horticulture bordering the Wade Park lagoon. Western Reserve University added a medical complex to its campus in the 1920s, and tried to recognize the interrelationships of its various units by appropriate design of its buildings.

After World War II there were renewed attempts at government planning. But neither of the two largest scale attempts, the municipal Comprehensive Plan of 1946 or the federal University-Euclid urban redevelopment plan of the 1960s, had a significant effect on the Circle. Instead, elite planning for the Circle emerged in a newly coherent form with the creation of the University Circle Development Foundation (1957) and its successor, University Circle, Inc. (1970). Focusing on limited but critical issues such as parking and coordinating expansion plans, they proved effective in helping to stabilize the Circle during an era of rapid social and economic change.

Conclusion

By the beginning of the 21st century University Circle was widely recognized as a remarkable oasis of culture, education and potential innovation that was all the more remarkable because it was within a Midwest city that since mid-century had been characterized by declining population and significant

Cleveland as a Cultural Center," in Campbell and Miggins, eds., *The Birth of Modern Cleveland, 1865-1930*, pp. 20911; Galen Cranz, The Politics of Park Design (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1982), pp. 6162.

losses of jobs in its traditional industrial base. The Circle seemed firmly established, with an enviable philanthropic heritage, and many of its institutions in recent years had added to their traditional wealthy donors a broad base of support among Cleveland's citizens and corporations.

With all of its alterations over the years, visitors to University Circle at the beginning of the 21st century could barely see evidence of the varying forces that had shaped it. Wade Park, at the heart of the Circle, barely retained its nineteenth-century aspect as a source of beauty and relaxation for strollers, and the secluded glens and winding paths were hinted at only in the nooks preserved by the Garden Center (now the Cleveland Botanical Garden). Instead, Wade Park and Rockefeller Park were primarily landscapes for institutional buildings and were thoroughly interpenetrated with city streets. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, connecting the Circle with the shore of Lake Erie to the north, not only was a major traffic artery, but could be recognized by an astute observer as marking the boundary between the Circle and the Hough neighborhood to the west.

Visitors found more businesses had appeared in the Circle in the early 21st century than had been there for several decades. It is a paradox that the philanthropists who were largely were responsible for creating the Circle had made their money in large-scale commercial occupations, yet did not at first favor the intermingling of commerce with culture. Cleveland's leaders never lost their adherence to the ideals of social reform, and their fear that urban vices came along with unbridled business. From the 1870s when temperance advocates cleared Doan's

Corners of its taverns until the 1960s when the University Circle Development Foundation purchased and closed down numerous shops and eateries in the name of development, the forces that have controlled the Circle often have been skeptical of free enterprise at the local level.[16]

The Circle has been far more accommodating to the automobile. While the Circle was conceived prior to the automobile's development, its streets have been bent to serve the automobile's needs. While the Circle has not sacrificed substantial parts of its parkland for accommodation to the car, finding places for the automobile was the motivating force in 1957 that initiated sustained cooperation among the Circle institutions. Even an infrequent visitor to the Circle recognizes the ubiquitous signs for University Circle, Inc. that indicate the location of parking lots.

But the signage is one of the few evidences that one is located in the Circle. While the perspective from Euclid Avenue to the Cleveland Museum of Art is striking (and reproduced frequently in promotional publications), the Circle is not a clearly delineated district: no central monument provides focus, no single avenue provides frontage for the institutions, nor is there significant geographic change. In part this lack of identity is a problem that Cleveland has in common with other sprawling

16. In 1986 a critic of the Circle argued that "to an outside observer, it certainly appears that over the past 25 years the major decisions in University Circle were in effect against off-campus students and student life. The needs of Severance Hall, the museums and hospitals seem to have dominated, with the agreement of [Case Western Reserve University] officials." Thomas Bier, "CWRU helped demolish its off-campus," [Cleveland] *Plain Dealer*, 27 January 1986.

mid-western cities, but it is also a matter of the self-definition of the Circle. The founders of the Circle, and after them the institutions, have been concerned to keep control of the land on the boundaries of the Circle, both to make sure that its uses are consonant with theirs, and to allow for future expansion. That control has created a buffer zone around the Circle which not only has created a gray area for visitors, but also has made the adjacent neighborhoods unsure of the institutions' intentions.[17]

A final measure of University Circle that may be apparent to the visitor is the population using it. During the daytime there is an exuberant mix of students (undergraduate, graduate, and professional), some of whom may also live in the Circle; music and art students, some of whom may be children, and some of whom may be senior citizens; visitors to the several museums; busloads of public school students arriving for special concerts by the Cleveland Orchestra; families taking loved ones home from the University Hospitals; and employees of the Circle institutions scurrying to and from work. At night this scene will be radically different, as it is in so many American cities where urban life has been transformed by the automobile: only a few students will be seen on the streets; clusters of cars will be arriving for events at Severance Hall or the Museum of Art, or

17. Two master plans for Case Western Reserve University have confirmed the matter of indistinct boundaries. In the 1988 plan for campus development, which of necessity was a plan for about 50% of University Circle three of the plan's reported nine goals were to develop a campus that would "feel like a community," to "relate to the surrounding community," and to "be legible (identifiable and easy to traverse)." *CWRU: The Magazine of Case Western Reserve University* 1 (Fall 1988): 4. In 2001 planners reported that "first-time visitors cannot easily discern where CWRU begins and ends": G.M. Donley, "The Place to Be," *CWRU Magazine* 14 (Fall 2001): 24.

a film at Institute of Art; and the buses of University Circle, Inc. will be making their rounds, picking up and delivering those who do not want to transect the Circle at night.

A visitor who experiences and recognizes some or all of the dimensions of University Circle will have some insight into not only the remarkable and flawed visions of its founders, but also aspects of the dreams, efforts and mistakes of all those who have followed. In effect, the visitor will grasp a thread of that great web of people, achievements, and potential that is American history.

Part I: Community

"In the summer there were picnics, rides, wild berry picking, with hunting and fishing close at hand. We ranged Doan Brook from the Shakers to Lake Erie, and took long horseback rides… In Autumn, chestnut, walnut and hickory nuts were waiting to be gathered, and in the winter skating, sleigh-rides and coasting helped out…at times with plenty of snow, [we] could go clear across the valley and the frozen brook."

Charles Post, *Doan's Corners and the City Four Miles West* (1930)

2. Doan's Corners: A Changing Community

The history of University Circle begins with the creation of a community of New England immigrants at Doan’s Corners. The community was centered just to the west of the modern Circle, although Doan’s Corners overlapped what are now the University Circle boundaries. In Doan’s Corners can be traced the beginnings of the ideals of community and philanthropy that so profoundly shaped the future of the Circle. Moreover, the forces of urbanization and industrialization that transformed Doan’s Corners from a rural village to an integral part of an industrial metropolis led to both the reform movements and the patterns of cultural institutionalization that shaped the future of the area.

In 1796 the state of Connecticut Land sent a surveying party under the direction of Moses Cleaveland to the Western Reserve, a district of northeast Ohio purchased from the United States Congress by the company. Cleaveland made a treaty with the

resident Indians to eliminate their claims, and directed the survey of a town site where the Cuyahoga River flows into Lake Erie.[1] The plan of the town was that of an 18th-century New England village, characterized long rectangular lots and a central open commons. In honor of their leader, the surveying company decided to call the town Cleaveland, a name shortened to Cleveland by the 1830s.[2]

One of the earliest settlers in Cleveland was Nathaniel Doan, a Connecticut native who had accompanied the original surveying party as a blacksmith. In 1797 he returned with a second surveying party, and in January 1798, in compensation for his services, the company granted Doan one of the surveyed lots in Cleveland, with the stipulation that he was "obliged to reside thereon as a blacksmith."[3] It was not unusual in this era for a land company to offer homesteads to craftsmen in order to assure potential settlers of their services.[4]

1. The Battle of Fallen Timbers (1794) and the Treaty of Greenville (1795), the first successful steps in the new federal government's strategy of extinguishing the Native Americans, and their claims, in the Northwest Territory, provided the impetus for the Connecticut Land Company to venture into what had been Native American land for thousands of years.
2. David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. (Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press and Case Western Reserve University, 1987), pp. 194-95, 197, 294. *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* can be viewed on-line at http://ech.cwru.edu (site accessed June 12, 2013).
3. Harlan Hatcher, *The Western Reserve: The Story of New Connecticut in Ohio*, revised edition. (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 38-39, quoting Connecticut Land Company minutes, 23 January 1798.
4. Louis C. Hunter, *Waterpower in the Century of the Steam Engine, A History of Industrial Power in the United States, 1780-1930*. Vol. 1. (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press and Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation, 1979), p. 3.

Sometime in the late winter or spring of 1798 Nathaniel Doan left Connecticut with his wife, several children, and a servant (perhaps a blacksmith apprentice), and journeyed 92 days to Cleveland. Doan dutifully set up shop close to the Cuyahoga River. Legend has it that in the ensuing summer Doan and his family were driven out of this location by the mosquitoes and fevers of the river bottom.[5] Doan and his family relocated about four miles east of the village site, near a stream which tumbled down from a rocky bluff. This site was strategic because it was on an Indian trail which followed the southern edge of the Lake Erie plain, and seemed likely to be a main route between Cleveland and points east.[6] There Doan purchased a 100-acre lot (designated lot 402 of Cleveland Township by the surveyors) from the Connecticut Land Company.

Doan exploited the opportunities which were available to an initial settler on the expanding frontier. Within a few years he established a tavern, an institution which served the functions of restaurant, hotel, meeting place, and post office. The tavern was located at the point where a road laid out from the south met the new Euclid Road, at what is now the northwest corner of 107th Street and Euclid Avenue. Doan also established nearby a blacksmith's shop, a small general store, and a works for making

5. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. xviii, 346; Charles Asa Post, *Doan's Corners and the City Four Miles West* (Cleveland: Caxton Company, 1930), pp. 38, 41; Samuel P. Orth, *A History of Cleveland*. 2 vols. (Chicago and Cleveland: S.J. Clark Publishing, 1910), 1: 100. Orth lists four children in the Doan family; later sources state that there were six.
6. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 783.

baking soda. Each of these was an important asset to a newly-established agricultural community.[7]

In 1802 when Cleveland Township (including the village of Cleveland to the east) was organized by the Ohio Territory, Nathaniel Doan was elected town clerk and one of the township's three supervisors of highways. He later was a captain of the local militia company, postmaster, and, after Cuyahoga County was established in 1807, a county commissioner.[8] Doan's family also played important roles in the emerging community. His daughter Sarah was the teacher of the first school in the region — at Newburgh a few miles south of Cleveland. His brother, Timothy, bought land several miles further east in 1801 (in what was later Euclid Township), and settled there with his wife and six children. After Nathaniel Doan died in 1815 Job Doan, his son, continued to operate the tavern, and served as justice of the peace.[9] The Doan family's activities and abilities gave them such prominence that the location of the tavern became known as Doan's Corners.[10]

During its first fifty years of settlement Doan's Corners' major source of livelihood was agriculture. The census of 1840, for example, showed that farming was the main occupation of 80% of the 178 households in Cleveland Township (which by then excluded the city of Cleveland).[11] As the lake commerce

7. Post, *Doan's Corners*, pp. 42-43.
8. Post, *Doan's Corners*, pp. 42, 63; Rose, *Cleveland*, p. 39; Orth, *History of Cleveland*, 1: 232, 242, 683.
9. Rose, *Cleveland*, pp. 43, 45; *Annals of Cleveland, 1818-1935* (Cleveland: Works Progress Administration, 1938), 5: 186; Orth, *History of Cleveland*, 1: 99, 232, 234, 241.
10. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. xviii-xix.
11. U.S. Census, Ohio, Cuyahoga County, Cleveland township, 1840,

developed, and after the Ohio and Erie Canal was completed in 1832, Cuyahoga County farmers were able to participate in a regional and national economy. They took advantage of their situation along the shores of Lake Erie where, compared to many other areas of the Midwest, the growing season began early and ended late. They cut abundant crops of hay to feed their cows and planted extensive orchards. By the 1840s and 1850s Cuyahoga County, one of the smallest counties in the state, was one of the leaders in cheese, butter, and fruit production, most of which was marketed. Grapes became cash crops later, with large harvests reported by 1870.[12]

The 1850 census and a 1852 business directory for the Cleveland area show that Doan's Corners had coopers (barrel-makers), blacksmiths, a saddle and harness maker, a wagon maker, a shoemaker, a carpenter, and a butcher.[13] At about the same time Samuel Cozad had a grist mill north of Euclid Road along the creek known as Doan Brook. The Doan Brook valley had several other water-powered mills. Upstream, beyond the bluffs, were three mills operated by the North Union Shakers (a religious community), and downstream (where Superior Avenue now

manuscript schedule on microfilm, Western Reserve Historical Society (hereafter WRHS), Cleveland, OH.

12. Robert Leslie Jones, *History of Agriculture in Ohio* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1983), pp. 123-24, 183-85, 195, 215, 220, 222, 228-30; Horatio Ford, *The Ford Home* (Cleveland, OH: Horace Carr, 1925), pp. 11-13. Note that the importance of haying in Cuyahoga County led it to be an innovator in the adoption of hay mowers in the l860s: Jones, *History of Agriculture in Ohio*, p. 274.
13. David S. Brose and Alfred M. Lee, *A Model of Historical Sites Archaeology in the Inner City*. Archaeological Report no. 55. (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Natural History, 1985), p. 53; U.S. Census, 1850, Ohio, Cuyahoga County, East Cleveland Township, manuscript census on microfilm, WRHS.

crosses the brook) was Crawford's mill, built about 1825 as a sawmill and later converted to a cider press. Other industries were the brickyard of Andrew Duty and sons, located about a mile east of Doan's Corners (across from the present Alta House in Murray Hill); the Embury Clock Factory; a plant for distilling oil from coal; a small metal works; and a mill for pressing molasses out of sorghum stalks. South of the Corners were stone quarries opened in the 1830s to extract a hard shale, known as "bluestone," used for construction and paving. One of the quarry owners was Martin Gale, who by 1860 lived on Euclid Road with his wife Susan and a household of eight children and three servants.[14]

The expanding economic life of Doan's Corners to mid-century was paralleled by a growing community and social life. Taverns long remained central to political activities and were usually the location of public meetings. Travelers stopped at them to share news, and mail was often picked up and delivered there. When the Doan family gave up the tavern business, they were succeeded at the Corners by tavern keepers Jim Brown and Jim Wright. Wright was one of the community's notable characters in the 1850s and 1860s, known for his stylish clothing and willingness to tell a story.[15] Durham Tavern was opened initially in 1824 on Euclid Road about a mile west of Doan's Corners, and survives today as the Durham Tavern Museum. East of the Corners, at about where Superior Avenue now crosses Euclid

14. Post, *Doan's Corners*, pp. 70, 95-97, 116, 124-25; Brose and Lee, *Archaeology in the Inner City*, p. 52; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 443, 724-25; 24 U.S. Census, 1860, Cuyahoga County, East Cleveland Township, manuscript census on microfilm, WRHS.
15. Post, *Doan's Corners*, pp. 76-77.

Avenue, was Abner McIlrath's tavern. It was the polling place for East Cleveland Township during elections. According to an account in the *Cleveland Leader*, at the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861 East Cleveland residents met at McIlrath's to take measures "for the defense of the stars and stripes."[16]

Religious life was slow to become organized in the Doan's Corners area, possibly because settlement occurred at the same time that Protestant denominations in the United States were splintering over such issues as slavery and biblical inerrancy. Thus organized religion was first evident at the Corners in the care of the dead rather than of the living: in 1823 Job Doan and others purchased a lot north of Euclid Road (the northwest corner of Euclid and 105th) as a cemetery and village commons. Shortly a stone schoolhouse was built on the commons, and it housed most of the community's religious services.[17]

A Presbyterian church had its roots in a Sunday school begun in 1826 in the home of Sally Cozad Mather, located on Euclid Road about a half mile east of the Corners. It flourished under the "plan of union" which committed Presbyterians and Congregationalists to jointly support churches and religious education in the Western Reserve. After about 1830 when Sally Mather moved to Bath, Ohio, the classes were held in the stone schoolhouse, and the Ford family (whose home was also to the east of the Corners) and others supported it.

On November 30, 1843 the Presbyterian Church of East

16. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 350, 652; I.T. Frary, *Early Homes of Ohio* (Richmond, Va.: Garrett and Massie, 1936), pp. 199-200; *Annals of Cleveland*, *44*: 204.
17. Rose, *Cleveland*, pp. 99-100; Post, *Doan's Corners*, pp. 129-30, 136.

Cleveland (as the Doan's Corners area was then sometimes known) was founded with the Sunday school at its core, and in 1845 a church building for it was erected at the corner of Euclid Road and Doan Street (later East 105th Street). It became a Congregational church in 1862 and was known after 1872 as the Euclid Congregational Church. Other churches established at Doan's Corners were a Methodist Episcopal church (1837) on the lot next to the schoolhouse, and a Disciples of Christ church (1843) next to the Presbyterian church. Although worship and Christian education were the central activities of these congregations, they also served as social centers for the community, providing a distinct alternative to the taverns. A typical event was a maple sugar festival held at the Presbyterian/ Congregational church in March 1861. The women of the church conducted the event and charged admission of fifty cents a couple: it seems likely that the proceeds supported foreign missions.[18]

With a thriving agricultural economy, numerous small businesses, and a growing variety of institutions serving social and religious purposes, Doan's Corners by 1860 was attractive to newcomers. The assets of Doan's Corners, combined with the rapid commercial-industrial growth of nearby Cleveland, contributed to the steady population growth throughout the township of East Cleveland.

The population of East Cleveland was not homogeneous. It is

18. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 380-81; Post, *Doan's Corners*, pp. 128-32, 135-37; Justus L. Cozad, "Early History of the Euclid Avenue Congregational Church," *The Beacon Light* (November 1906), copy in folder 3, container 3, I.T. Frary Papers, WRHS; *Annals of Cleveland, 44* (1861): 520.

true that as late as 1860 most of the residents of the Corners were born in New England or Ohio, but there were also immigrants from the British Isles and northern Europe. Households sometimes contained people from a variety of backgrounds. Hiram Garretson, for example, lived on Euclid Road on the western edge of the Corners area. Born in Pennsylvania, he moved with his family to southeastern Ohio in 1827 when he was an infant. He came to Cleveland in 1852 at the age of 25, rising to become a prominent wholesale merchant (and later an investor in the iron ore business) in partnership with Leonard and Robert Hanna. Garretson's first wife died, and in 1856 he married 21-year-old Ellen N. Abbott, a native of Massachusetts. By 1860 their household had four children from Garretson's first marriage, all born in Ohio, and three servants, one each from Ohio, Ireland, and Germany.[19]

A household of a different character was Milo and Harriet Hickock's, on the north side of Euclid Road opposite E. 100th Street. Milo, a building contractor, and his wife were both from Connecticut, and being in their fifties they had three grown children. All were born in Ohio and lived at home: one, Henry A. Hickock, 21 years old, was an accountant. There were two male boarders, one from England, and the other from Ohio, suggesting that the family income was not always adequate and needed to be supplemented.[20]

In the heart of Doan's Corners was a household headed by

19. "Hiram Garretson," typescript, folder 4, box 3, Wade Papers, WRHS; U.S. Census, 1860, East Cleveland, entry 51, WRHS; *Loomis & Talbott's Cleveland City Directory for 1861* (Cleveland: Herald Office, 1861), p. 99.
20. U.S. Census, 1860, East Cleveland, entry 99, WRHS.

Nathan Post, a saddle and harness maker. He and his wife had emigrated from New York in the late 1840s with a family of five children, and added two more after their arrival in Ohio. The youngest members of the Post family were Charles (11) and James (8). By 1860 the eldest son, Nathan Post, Jr., had a trade as a mechanic, had married an Ohio native and settled next door to his parents.[21] Charles Post is a particularly significant resident for historical study because seventy years later he wrote *Doan's Corners and the City Four Miles West*, in part a description of the neighborhood as he and others remembered it. For a boy it was an idyllic place:

> In the summer there were picnics, rides, wild berry picking, with hunting and fishing close at hand. We ranged Doan Brook from the Shakers to Lake Erie, and took long horseback rides. My brother James and I had a pair of ponies which we rode . . . In the autumn, chestnut, walnut and hickory nuts were waiting to be gathered, and in the winter skating, sleigh-rides and coasting helped out . . . at times with plenty of snow, [we] could go clear across the valley and the frozen brook.[22]

But the 1850s village of Post's memory was beginning to change. Doan's Corners, which had been comfortably outside of Cleveland for sixty years, was soon to be absorbed by it. Doan's Corners gradually became part of Cleveland's web of streetcar lines, water systems, and closely-spaced houses, just as

21. U.S. Census, 1850, East Cleveland, entry 2582, WRHS; U.S. Census, 1860, East Cleveland, entries 102 and 103, WRHS; Post, *Doan's Corners*, p. 52-53.
22. Post, *Doan's Corners*, p. 53.

many other peripheral towns and villages became enmeshed in burgeoning late-nineteenth century American cities.[23]

These changes challenged the definition of community as the residents of Doan's Corners had known it. The village's annexation by Cleveland in 1872 sharpened the sense of loss in a community formerly characterized by personal acquaintance and extended family relationships. After annexation leading residents championed temperance, or complete abstinence from the use of alcoholic beverages, as a means of controlling what they saw as urban chaos, and some of them later promoted the development of University Circle as a haven of sobriety and moral uplift.

The expansion of Cleveland that forever changed Doan's Corners was fueled by a rapid growth of business and industry. The pivotal moment in the city's history was probably in 1832 when the Ohio and Erie Canal was completed, connecting Portsmouth on the Ohio River with Cleveland on Lake Erie. Grain, pork, butter, and other agricultural products from northern Ohio came to Cleveland by canal and were transferred to lake shipping bound for Buffalo, the Erie Canal, and points east. Textiles, metal goods, and manufactured goods of all sorts came to Cleveland by the reverse route, or even through Canada via the St. Lawrence River, Lake Ontario, and the Welland Canal (opened in 1829) around Niagara Falls. In the 1850s Cleveland's role as a transport nexus was cemented by the building of several railroads that connected Cleveland to its regional neighbors,

23. Charles N. Glaab and A. Theodore Brown, *A History of Urban America* (London: The Macmillan Company, 1967), pp. 142-43, 150-52, 154-58, 166.

Toledo, Cincinnati, Columbus, Pittsburgh, and Buffalo. By the 1860s Cleveland was firmly tied into a rail network covering the Northeast and Midwest.

Cleveland entrepreneurs stimulated their city's growth by developing new markets and products. In the 1850s and 1860s Cleveland capitalists such as Samuel L. Mather, Leonard Hanna, Robert Hanna, and Doan's Corners resident Hiram Garretson, invested heavily in the iron ore fields of the Lake Superior region and began to ship the ore to Cleveland for smelting. Cleveland entrepreneurs also built railroads into regions of Ohio producing limestone and coal, the other ingredients for blast furnaces. Cleveland thereby became one of the leading centers of iron and steel manufacture in the United States.[24]

Growing along with the iron and steel industry was the manufacture of machinery and the building of ship machinery

24. Samuel P. Orth, *A History of Cleveland, Ohio* (Chicago and Cleveland: S.J. Clarke, 1910), 1: 718; Peter Temin, *Iron and Steel in Nineteenth-Century America: An Economic Inquiry* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1964), pp. 170, 199; J. Wiggins & Co., comps., *Cleveland As It Is: A History of Cleveland and Statistical Exhibit of the Trade, Commerce and Manufactures…* (Cleveland: Newcomb, 1872), pp. 21, 103, 106. An excellent recent study of Cleveland industrialists' involvement in iron mining in the upper Great Lakes is: Terry S. Reynolds and Virginia P. Dawson, *Iron Will: Cleveland-Cliffs and the Mining of Iron Ore, 1847-2006* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2011). For one Clevelander's deep involvement in developing the Cleveland-area rail network, see: Darwin H. Stapleton, "Amasa Stone," in Robert J. Frey, ed., *Railroads in the Nineteenth Century, Encyclopedia of American Business History and Biography.* (New York: Facts on File, 1988), pp. 379-381. For a general overview of the industrial growth of Cleveland see: Darwin H. Stapleton, "The City Industrious: How Technology Transformed Cleveland," in Thomas F. Campbell and Edward M. Miggins, eds., *The Birth of Modern Cleveland, 1865-1930* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1988), pp. 71-95.

and iron bridges. By the 1880s Cleveland became a major maker of machine tools, such as lathes and drill presses, and of electrical equipment. Large numbers of lake ships, including ore carriers, were built at the mouth of the Cuyahoga River. Many ships, even those built of wood, needed iron steam engines, propellers, and propeller shafts, which were supplied by Cleveland firms. One fabricating company, King Iron Bridge, made bridges that were erected throughout the United States.[25]

Petroleum and chemical industries also were critical to Cleveland's industrial growth. Petroleum refining had the most dramatic impact, as the city's production grew from a negligible amount in the early l860s to millions of barrels per year in the 1880s. Since the oil fields were in northwestern Pennsylvania, and many of the markets were along the Atlantic coast, the diverting of petroleum westward to Cleveland was clearly a feat of commercial wizardry. The chief wizard was John D. Rockefeller: in the 1870s and 1880s through his company, Standard Oil, he developed monopoly control of the petroleum industry by shrewd (often ruthless) business deals, by creating innovative business forms, including the trust, and by obtaining secret shipping rates from the railroads. Several of Rockefeller's business partners in Standard Oil, including W.H. Doan, Samuel Andrews, and Stephen V. Harkness, lived in the Doan's Corners area and played significant roles in the development of University Circle.

Petroleum refining required various chemicals to prepare the

25. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 324, 369, 548, 592; Wiggins & Co., comps., *Cleveland As It Is*, p. 111; *The Industries of Cleveland* (Cleveland: Elstner, 1888), p. 40.

raw petroleum. In the 1860s the Cleveland Chemical Company was founded to supply the need, and Eugene Grasselli moved his operations from Cincinnati to a site along the Cuyahoga River in 1866. Another chemical industry was paints and varnishes. In the 1870s two major coatings companies, Sherwin-Williams and Glidden, were established, and quickly developed national markets.[26] Eventually the wealth of the Grasselli, Sherwin, Williams, and Glidden families contributed significantly to the development of the Circle.

The result of all this business activity was enormous economic opportunity which not only encouraged residents to stay and raise families in Cleveland, but also drew immigrants from inside and outside the borders of the United States. There were about 7000 Clevelanders in 1840, 43,500 by 1860, and 160,146 in 1880. By then it was clear that Cleveland would be one of America's great cities: at the high point of its population, from 1930 to 1950, Cleveland averaged 900,000 residents.[27]

The physical growth of Cleveland is easily traced by studying the extension of the city's streets. Generally, eastward expansion occurred along a series of broad avenues radiating eastward from the original center on the east bank of the Cuyahoga. The north-south streets (the modern numbered streets) connected these avenues much like the crossing threads in a spider's web. Individual landowners wishing to sell lots typically were

26. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 548; Wiggins & Co., comps., *Cleveland As It Is*, p. 119; *Industries of Cleveland*, p. 47; Allan Nevins, *Study in Power: John D. Rockefeller, Industrialist and Philanthropist* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), vol. 1.
27. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. xxvi, xxxiii, xliv, xlvii, xlix; Orth, *Cleveland*, p. 117.

responsible for laying out the new streets, which were therefore set to create saleable lot sizes rather than to conform to an overall city plan.[28]

The expansion of Cleveland's passenger transportation network into Doan's Corners is a clear example of how the new urban infrastructure created and sustained new residential areas on the periphery of the city. In the 1860s a horse-drawn omnibus ran through the Corners, picking up city-or suburb-bound passengers two or three times a day. In 1872 the East Cleveland Railway Company laid down a street railway for horse-drawn cars to travel along Euclid Road from downtown to beyond Doan's Corners. Horse cars served the Circle area several times daily until electric streetcars were introduced in 1888 and service became even more frequent. The macadamizing of Euclid Road in the 1870s also permitted easier travel, an amenity no doubt appreciated by regular commuters, among them John D. Rockefeller, who, after buying a residence at Forest Hill in 1878, often passed through the Circle on his way to his downtown office or to the Erie Street Baptist Church.[29] The transportation innovations shrank the trip from the Corners to the center of Cleveland from a half-day in the 1830s to a half-hour by the 1880s, so that many people could live there and work downtown.

28. *Ibid*, pp. 529-30; Edmund H. Chapman, *Cleveland: Village to Metropolis, A Case Study of Problems of Urban Development in Nineteenth-century America*. 2nd ed. (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1981), pp. 39-43, 99-102.
29. Orth, *Cleveland*, p. 745; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 356, 1003; 26 *Annals of Cleveland 55* (1872): 769, 56 (1873): 142; Grace Goulder, *John D. Rockefeller: The Cleveland Years* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1972), pp. 148-150.

The urbanization of the Doan's Corners area brought governmental change. In 1866 the village of East Cleveland, including most of the Corners, was formed out of Cleveland Township. (East Cleveland village was bounded by Superior Avenue on the north, by Quincy Avenue on the south, by E. 55th Street on the west, and on the east by a line just east of E. 105th Street, near Doan Brook.) In 1872 an annexation campaign was successful, and the village became wards 16 and 17 of Cleveland. The frontier of the city had reached Doan's Corners and had swept to its far edge in only four years. The area east of East 105th Street, including most of what today is regarded as University Circle, was not annexed by Cleveland until 1892.[30]

Annexation by a city in the nineteenth century was regarded as a mixed blessing by those whose communities were gobbled up. Advantages included the extension of urban amenities such as gas, water, sewerage, parks, police and fire departments. In the latter nineteenth century the technology of the utilities was strongly centralized, requiring heavy capital investments in the gasworks, pumping stations, and sewer mains which formed the cores of the systems. Communities on the city's periphery lacked the funds to erect competing systems, and cities often held out the opportunity to connect to their utilities as one of the rewards of annexation.

On the other hand, annexed towns and villages gave up much of the intimacy of their political lives, submerging their

30. Orth, *Cleveland*, p. 49; *Annals of Cleveland 55* (1872): 784; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp.354-55; Post, *Doan's Corners*, p. 179.

communities into the vastly larger, often heavily foreign-born, electorate of the cities. For the gentrified periphery of the city, the din of foreign languages and the encounters with different cultures were disconcerting, and the fear of political domination by the working-class immigrants in the urban core was visceral. There was also the likelihood that annexed areas would have higher taxes than before annexation, precisely because the former suburbanites would have to pay for higher levels of services.

The debate over the annexation of East Cleveland in 1872 was therefore bitter and divisive. The pro-annexationists argued that by joining Cleveland the residents would have "better fire and police protection, added water facilities, a better school system, [and] better mail service," and within a few months of annexation the city police and fire departments did establish stations in the area. Mention was also made of the possibility that the city would locate a new park "where it will be accessible to East Cleveland."[31]

The anti-annexationists were concerned that their community with its semi-rural lifestyle would be immediately altered. Their worst visions seemed confirmed by the *Cleveland Leader's* exhortation in the eve of balloting: "Voters of East Cleveland, you have the opportunity to make your growing and attractive corporation a part of the thriving and beautiful city of Cleveland. The city needs your broad territory for manufactories and suburban homes."[32] When they lost the election the anti-annexationists turned to political maneuvering and a court

31. *Annals of Cleveland 55* (1872): 142, 780-83.
32. *Annals of Cleveland 55* (1872): 779.

injunction to stop the inexorable urbanization, but they failed to nullify the annexation process.

There ways other than legal maneuvers by which the apparent forces of urbanization might be slowed, however. Most important in the Doan's Corners area was a strong temperance movement. Prominent leaders were Horace C. Ford, Cordelia Cozad Ford, and William Halsey Doan, members of the Euclid Avenue Congregational Church at Doan's Corners. The Fords had lived on Euclid Avenue (at the site of the present Allen Memorial Library across from Severance Hall) since 1853. Prior to the Civil War the Fords' temperance concerns seem to have been less significant than their commitment to the anti-slavery movement, but both areas were elements of the broader reform program of evangelical Christianity in the Northern states. (These evangelicals had resources: Doan, grandson of Nathaniel Doan, had gone to California for the gold rush but returned to the Corners in the 1860s and made his fortune in the oil business with his neighbor and partner S.V. Harkness.)[33]

After the Civil War Cleveland's temperance activists took national leadership of the movement, symbolized by holding the convention of the National Temperance Society in Cleveland in 1868. Subsequently the first slate of Prohibition Party candidates was nominated (1869), and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was founded (1874), in Cleveland. Cordelia Ford was one of the five founders of the WCTU's Cleveland branch, and

33. Orth, *History of Cleveland*, 2: 342-43; Horatio Ford, *The Ford Home (Cleveland: Horace Carr, 1925)*, pp. 10, 15; *Cleave's Biographical Cyclopaedia of the State of Ohio* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., [c. 1875]), p. 96; Post, *Doan's Corners*, p. 97; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 4; Rose, Cleveland, pp. 325.

its first vice-president.[34] Nationally, the temperance movement was closely related to Protestant churches. At Doan's Corners temperance meetings often were held at the Methodist church, among other sites, and included among their sponsors the Sons of Temperance. At one meeting of the Sons in 1873 Horatio Ford and Liberty Holden, residents of Doan's Corners, were the speakers — in spite of publicly taking opposite sides of the annexation issue a year before. Perhaps temperance's most conspicuous achievement locally was William Halsey Doan's purchase and closing of the only tavern in wards 16 and 17 (the Wright House at Euclid and 107th) in 1873. Its libations were replaced by an ice-water fountain on Euclid Avenue erected by the WCTU, and new traveler's accommodations were provided by a family hotel erected by Liberty Holden on the former tavern site.[35]

But the industrial-commercial economy of the region, growing from the time the first stone quarries were opened on the adjacent heights and small craft shops were established at the Corners, continually encroached on attempts to control the

34. Marian J. Morton, "'Temperance Reform in the 'Providential Environment,' Cleveland, 1830-1934," in David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *Cleveland: A Tradition of Reform* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1986), pp. 55-56; Ford, *The Ford Home*, p. 19; W.A. Ingham, *Women of Cleveland and Their Work* (Cleveland: W.A. Ingham, 1893), pp. 171-72.
35. *Annals of Cleveland 55* (1872): 781, 56 (1873): 95, 582, 57 (1874): 765, 59 (1876): 1057; *Historic Sites of Cleveland: Hotels and Taverns* (Columbus, OH: Ohio Historical Records Survey Project, 1942), pp. 247-67; William G. Rose, *Cleveland: The Making of A City* (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1950), pp. 392, 554; Ingham, *Women of Cleveland*, pp. 171-72; Ruth Bordin, *Women and Temperance: The Quest for Power and Liberty, 1873-1900* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981), pp.9, 22-28.

effects of urbanization. Symbolically, a major supplier of alcoholic beverages, the Cleveland Brewing Company, was established in the mid-1880s at the intersection of Hough and Ansel avenues north of Doan's Corners. It soon became the dominant beer producer in Cleveland, and remained so until the onset of prohibition in 1920.[36]

The railroad also came to Doan's Corners permanently in the 1880s. While from 1836 into the 1840s there had been a simple horse-drawn line from the quarries down Euclid Avenue, neither its stone cargoes nor its small passenger business were sufficient to keep it in business. Nearly fifty years later, in 1881, the New York, Chicago and St. Louis Railway was organized to connect Buffalo and Chicago, with a branch to St. Louis. Its route through the Circle was parallel to, but south of Euclid Road and just along the foot of the heights. This railroad was named the "Nickel Plate" because the towns along its potential route in western Ohio engaged in heated bidding for the route, and the *Norwalk Chronicle* commented that for what the towns were offering the railroad could be nickel-plated.[37]

The construction of the double-tracked line of the Nickel Plate was a threat to William Vanderbilt's Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railroad, which also connected Buffalo and Chicago. Vanderbilt chose to fight the competition by buying the Nickel Plate through two agents, Judge Stephenson Burke and John Devereux of Cleveland. The Nickel Plate then became a poor sister to the Lake Shore until it was sold in 1916 to the Van

36. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 122; Jones, *Agriculture in Ohio*, pp. 236, 314; Brose and Lee, *A Model*, pp. 43, 68.
37. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 719-20.

Sweringen brothers of Cleveland, who invested heavily in it and made it a modern, well-operated line. It was not, however, a passenger-oriented railroad, and the Circle did not have a station.[38]

A major commercial addition to the Circle in the 1870s was right next to the railroad, at the foot of Cedar Glen: the Blue Rock Spring House. It took advantage of the rising American interest of hydropathy (a belief that internal and external administration of water, particularly mineral water, could cure ailments) to exploit a sulfur-laden spring. The spring was first used as a source for commercially-bottled water by Dr. Nathan H. Ambler, but in 1880 he opened the Blue Rock Spring House as a spa. Inside, at the floor level it had bathing chambers cut into the underlying rock. Most people probably came to the House to drink the water and to picnic rather than to bathe, at least in the early years before the roads next to the house were improved.[39]

The industrial-commercial development of the Circle area as it became part of Cleveland was mirrored by population growth and change. The census of 1870 counted 5050 people in the village of East Cleveland. There is no comparable total for 1880 because the area was not counted separately from the city, but the census enumerator's records show an increase in residences on Euclid Road from 1870 to 1880, a steep decline in the occupations of "farmer" and "gardener," and a dramatic increase in the number of white-collar professionals. Still, in the old

38. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 720; Ian S. Haberman, *The Van Sweringens of Cleveland: The Biography of an Empire* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1979), pp. 24-30.
39. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 106-7; Frary, *Doan's Corners*, ch. 6, pp. 7-8.

Doan's Corners and along Euclid Road most of the families remained of New England, New York, and Ohio origin and most of the European immigrants were household servants.[40]

The Corners now held several wealthy families. In the early 1870s Worthy Streator, a retired physician in his 50s, had a large residence on the north side of Euclid Avenue between 97th and 100th streets. Streator was president of the Lake Shore and Tuscarawas Valley Railroad, an important coal-carrier for Cleveland's industries. His household in 1870 included his wife Sarah, an adult son working as a farmer, two school-age sons, a 30-year old male schoolteacher who was a boarder, and Fred Douglass, a 20-year old African-American stable hand. Oscar Streator, perhaps a brother of Worthy, lived next-door with his wife and child. He was a cattle dealer.[41]

The Streators represented the wealthy class of Cleveland. While Cleveland's businessmen and industrialists had long occupied large residences on the section of Euclid Avenue between 9th and 55th streets, closer to the heart of the city, by the 1870s some, like Streator, now were located in the old Doan's Corners area.[42] Probably the most prominent was William Halsey Doan, a temperance advocate and grandson of the original settler. He was only 41 years old and living on Euclid near Streator in 1870 when he listed his fortune as $125,000 in real estate, and

40. U.S. Census, 1870, Ohio, Cuyahoga County, East Cleveland, manuscript census on microfilm, WRHS; U.S. Census, 1880, Ohio, Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, ward 16, enumeration district 49, manuscript census on microfilm, WRHS.
41. U.S. Census, 1870, East Cleveland, entries 22 and 23; *Cleveland* [city] *Directory, 1873-74* (Cleveland: n.p., 1873), entries for "O.A. Streator," and "Dr. Worthy S. Streator"; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 148.
42. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 379-80.

$30,000 in personal possessions. The office for his oil-refining partnership with George Chase was on Superior Avenue in the center of the city. Also in the household were Doan's wife, Elizabeth, a homemaker; his 62-year old mother; Miller Halsey, a clerk in an oil works and probably a nephew; an 18-year old Czech servant girl; and John Shiffler, a 22-year old stable hand from Bohemia. Ten years later Doan was at the same residence with his wife, but now another relative, 14-year old Lillie Perry, lived with them.[43]

Other businessmen only slightly less wealthy than Doan who lived at the Corners included William J. Ranney, a coal dealer; Colonel Charles Doubleday (a native of England), who owned a fleet of railroad sleeping cars; J.A. Gardner, an oil dealer; and Captain Thomas Walson (from Scotland) and B.L. Pennington, ship brokers. Stephen V. Harkness, Doan's business partner and one of the original incorporators of Standard Oil with John D. Rockefeller, lived on the western edge of the Doan's Corners area.[44]

The future University Circle also had a substantial professional class. Perhaps the most remarkable resident was Dr. Martha Canfield. Sometime in the 1870s she moved onto Streator Avenue, just a few doors away from Worthy Streator. She was one of the earliest women in the Cleveland to earn a medical

43. U.S. Census, 1870, East Cleveland, no. 54, WRHS; *Cleveland Directory, 1873-74*, "William H. Doan"; U.S. Census, 1880, Cleveland, w. 16, e.d. 49, WRHS.
44. U.S. Census, 1870, East Cleveland, nos. 74, 76, WRHS; *Cleveland Directory, 1873-74*, "Col. C.W. Doubleday"; U.S. Census, 1880, Cleveland, w. 16, e.d. 49, WRHS; James W. Wooster, Jr., *Edward Stephen Harkness, 1874-1940* (New York: n.p., 1949), pp. 2-15; Goulder, *John D. Rockefeller*, p. 101.

degree, graduating from the Cleveland Homeopathic Hospital College in 1875. Near the end of her career, in 1912-13, she was instrumental in the establishment of the Woman's Hospital of Cleveland, which was located within a few blocks of her home. But at this time she had a medical office in her residence, and her husband commuted to his law practice on Superior Avenue in downtown Cleveland. In 1880 the Canfields had living with them daughters who were 6 and 8 years old, and Regina Moore, a 33-year old housekeeper from Germany.[45] There were also several other physicians, engineers, lawyers, bookkeepers, journalists, salesmen, railroad agents and conductors, schoolteachers and at least one clergyman and three musicians.[46] This group, usually commuters to downtown offices, or otherwise serving clients outside of the Corners, was perhaps only slightly higher in economic status than the class of storekeepers and craftsmen who made up the largest occupational group at the Corners.

By the 1870s and 1880s the old Doan's Corners area already had a distinct commercial district along Euclid in the vicinity of 105th Street. Grocers, druggists, tobacconists, morticians, and craftsmen had their stores there, frequently living above or

45. U.S. Census, 1880, Cleveland, w. 16, e.d. 49, WRHS; *The Cleveland Directory for the Year ending June, 1881* (Cleveland: Cleveland Directory, 1880), p. 94; Glen Jenkins, "Women Physicians and Woman's General Hospital," in Kent L. Brown, ed., *Medicine in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County: 1810-1976* (Cleveland: Academy of Medicine of Cleveland, 1977), pp. 57-59.
46. The clergyman was Jabez Hall, pastor of the Euclid Avenue Church of Christ (Disciples of Christ). The musicians were Miss Ada Holmes (living with her mother of the same name), Charlotte Allman, and Dwight P. Stebbins. *The Cleveland Directory, 1881*, pp. 222, 254, 518; U.S. Census, 1870, East Cleveland; U.S. Census, 1880, Ohio, Cleveland, w. 16, e.d. 49, WRHS; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 345.

adjacent to them. An important cluster of occupations related to the horse-drawn carriage industry. For example, Ely Gill, a harness maker born in Pennsylvania, lived on 105th street with his Ohio-born wife and three children. William Cozens, a blacksmith who shoed horses, had emigrated from England to the United States about 1873, and had lived in the area for several years with his wife (also English) and three children under 10 years of age. Alphonso Robinson, another blacksmith, had his 27-year-old son Orvis, also a blacksmith, living at home with him. The Robinson household also included Alphonso's wife, three daughters, a son-in-law who was a machinist, and one granddaughter.[47] Other craftsmen probably had their work close by, such as the numerous stone cutters, most of whom surely worked in the quarries on the heights, and the carpenters, brick masons, roofers and the painters, who probably were participants in the rapid residential development of the area.

There was, finally, a group of unskilled workers. William Sweetman, for example, was from Ireland and worked as a road grader. His wife was from England, and they had two daughters, 6 and 8 years old, who were born in Ohio and attended school. Sweetman's brother-in-law, a coachman born in Canada, lived with them. Although primarily composed of men who were referred to only as laborers in the census and city directory, this group also included a substantial number of women who took in boarders or who were caring for the elderly and disabled. Mary Hammond took care of her 74-year old rheumatic stepfather;

47. U.S. Census, 1870, Ohio, East Cleveland, no. 18, WRHS; U.S. Census, 1880, Ohio, Cleveland, w. 16, e.d. 49, WRHS; *The Cleveland Directory, 1881*, p. 456.

Emily Ballard boarded a family of three as well as caring for her steelworker husband, and her infant and 3-year-old sons.[48]

There were several African-Americans living in the Circle in the 1870s and 1880s, all born outside of Ohio. They were in occupations and living situations not apparently different than other immigrants. Margaret Fisher (born in Virginia) worked as a domestic servant for Dr. Nelson Chipman in 1870, and lived in Chipman's house with her 6-year old daughter. On the other hand, Arthur Collins, a gardener born in South Carolina, and Tharp Holmes, a railroad porter, had their own homes. The occupational and residential patterns of African-Americans at the Corners were similar to those throughout Cleveland in the 1870s and 1880s, when the African-American population was less than 2% of the city and was nearly evenly distributed throughout Cleveland.[49]

Although Doan's Corners' population had by the 1880s grown to exhibit the wide ranges of social classes and ethnic groups typical of Cleve1and as a whole, for some it retained a flavor of community life that became a powerful memory in later years. For example, in the 1930s Ihna T. Frary, who lived in Doan's Corners as a child in the 1870s and l880s and later became an officer of the Cleveland Museum of Art, wrote his reminiscences. He recalled that community life centered on the churches. He knew them as a place of "social and intellectual as well as our religious life. We met socially [he recalled] before

48. U.S. Census, 1880, Ohio, Cleveland, w. 16, e.d. 49, WRHS.
49. Kenneth L. Kusmer, *A Ghetto Takes Shape: Black Cleveland, 1870-1930* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1976), pp. 10-12, 19, 42-44; U.S. Census, 1870, East Cleveland, no. 8, WRHS; U.S. Census, 1880, Cleveland, w. 16, e.d. 49, WRHS.

and after services and at occasional church dinners and 'sociables'."[50] Newspaper announcements at the time support Frary's recollection, recording such events as a performance of the Doan Vocal Society at the Congregational church. Other community activities also took place at Fairmount School, and others at the Doan Armory built at Doan and Euclid by William Halsey Doan.[51] For Frary the Doan Brook valley of the 1870s and 1880s was a place for child's play much as Charles Post had recalled it in the 1850s. Frary described pools and ponds for summer swimming and fishing, "rocks that would have delighted Druids, and caves . . . which to the imaginative minds of small boys were well nigh terrifying."[52] Frary's vision of Doan's Corners was markedly different from the demographic and economic changes that were daily transforming the Corners. To the extent that those who resisted annexation, which included temperance advocates, and those other reformers who wished to preserve some echo of the sort of community that Frary remembered, quick and decisive action was necessary. Their instrument was philanthropy, a newly-emerging force in the development of Cleveland.

50. I.T. Frary, *Doan's Corners* (typescript), ch. 11, p. 1, folder 2, container 2, Frary Papers, WRHS; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 421.
51. *Annals of Cleveland 58* (1875): 338; Frary, *Doan's Corners*, ch. 2, p. 1, ch. 11, p. 1, ch. 12, p. 3.
52. Frary, *Doan's Corners*, ch. 6, pp. 4-5, 11.

3. Neighborhoods, Outreach, and Discrimination

Urban neighborhoods are regions of cities with distinct ethnic or class characteristics, and usually are bounded by major streets, railroads, parks, or important geographic features.[1] University Circle is surrounded largely by neighborhoods that have helped to shape it since the late 19th century. In turn, personal and institutional attitudes of discrimination often have characterized the Circle's relationships with bordering neighborhoods. As a group the neighborhoods bordering on the Circle have reflected the demographic patterns of the city and nation over the last two centuries, but each has evolved a sense of community that has sometimes been at odds with the institutions of University Circle.[2]

1. Michael J. White, *American Neighborhoods and Residential Differentiation* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967), pp. 2-9; Scott Greer, "Neighborhood," in David L. Sills, ed.. *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (New York: Macmillan & The Free Press, 1968), 5: 26.
2. Parts of this chapter are utilized and its subject is further developed in: Darwin H. Stapleton, "Religion, Reform, Race (and Rockefeller):

Murray Hill was the earliest neighborhood to take shape. Consisting of a few scattered houses with a brickyard and some vineyards in the mid-1800s, and growing rapidly in the following years, Murray Hill is a wedge of steeply rising land between the railroad which runs along the south edge of the Case and Reserve campuses, and the edge of the heights that overlook the Lake Erie plain on which Cleveland is built.

The founding of the Lake View Cemetery in 1869 on the eastern side of Murray Hill had unforeseen consequences for the neighborhood. Because Cleveland's growing industrial-commercial elite demanded elaborate monuments and even mausoleums for their family burial plots, the cemetery provided jobs for stone carvers, stone masons, and gardeners.[3]

In 1880 Joseph Carabelli came to Cleveland and established the Lake View Granite and Monumental Works along Euclid Avenue not far from the entrance to the cemetery. Carabelli was a stone carver from the province of Como in north Italy who had emigrated to the United States in 1870 and spent ten years in New York practicing his trade. Carabelli's quick success in Cleveland attracted other Italian stone-cutters, some from Lombardy in the north, and many from the province of Campobasso in the south of Italy. Late in the 1880s Pasquale d'Enrico came to Murray Hill from the town of Ripalimosani,

Cleveland History Viewed Through the Lens of Philanthropy," in Gladys Haddad, ed., *From All Sides: Philanthropy in the Western Reserve*. Tenth Annual Western Reserve Studies Symposium. (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University), pp. 20-29.

3. J.H. Wade to Randall Wade, 6 February 1871, folder 1, box 1, Wade Papers, Western Reserve Historical Society (hereafter WRHS), Cleveland, Ohio.

adjacent to Campobasso, the first of a large colony of “Rips” to arrive. By 1920 the population of Murray Hill was 98% Italian, completely eclipsing the earlier German settlement there. As the population grew, many of the residents found employment in various Cleveland industries, particularly in textile manufacture.[4]

The first outside intervention in the lives of the emigrant Italians of Murray Hill appears to have been the initiative of some members of the Euclid Avenue Congregational Church (of Doan’s Corners), who in 1887 gathered some Murray Hill Germans and Italians for biblical instruction and hymnsinging. A daughter of President Cutler of Western Reserve University helped lead the group, carrying out the bible studies in Italian. (Such outreach to emigrants by Cleveland Protestants was common in this era.) Since some in the neighborhood were Protestants, including Joseph Carabelli, this missionary intrusion was accepted, and laid the groundwork for the establishment of St. John Beckwith (Presbyterian) Church in Murray Hill in 1907.

4. David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1966), pp. 152-53; *Holy Rosary Church Golden Jubilee, 1909-1959* ([Cleveland]: n.p., c. 1959), unpaginated; Edward M. Miggins and Mary Morgenthaler, "The Ethnic Mosaic: The Settlement of Cleveland by the New Immigrants and Migrants," in Thomas F. Campbell and Edward M. Miggins, eds., *The Birth of Modern Cleveland, 1865-1930* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1966), pp. 127-26; B.F. Whitman et al. to John D. Rockefeller, 16 October 1888, box 49, Office Correspondence, RG 1, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC), Sleepy Hollow, NY; interview with Ruth Fiscus, 4 December 1985, in author’s files.

The majority Catholic population of Murray Hill had no parish church within three miles at first, and the nearest Italian mass was held at the St. Anthony of Padua church (itself founded only in 1887) in "Big Italy," the largest Italian settlement in Cleveland, near the center of the city. In 1891 the Diocese of Cleveland asked the Scalabrini Fathers to provide missions to the scattered Italians in the diocese, and one of them, Father Joseph Strumia, began regular work in Murray Hill. Living in the home of Joseph Carabelli, he said masses in a hall provided by Pasquale D'Enrico.

In 1892 a neighborhood meeting produced a resolution in favor of raising funds to erect a church. The committee appointed to carry out the effort had a composition which suggests that erecting a church was seen by the residents as a community need as much as founding a Catholic parish. The committee had four Italians and one German (Jacob Krass), and it included Father Strunia, the protestant Carabelli, and John Silveroli, who had provided his home as a meeting place for the earlier Congregationalist bible study group.

The committee raised funds to buy a lot on Mayfield Road, and by the end of 1892 a stone chapel had been erected. Ten years later the needs of the community had so grown that an adjacent lot was purchased and plans were drawn for a larger building, and in 1908 the cornerstone was laid for a new sanctuary, the Holy Rosary Church, which came to symbolize the Murray Hill community.

The church became the heart of many community activities, including those that preserved the regional Italian heritage of

the residents, such as celebrating the Feast of the Assumption in August, and those that provided entry into American life. As early as 1895 the priest at Holy Rosary provided a school for adults desiring to qualify for American citizenship, and the next year invited a group of Ursuline Sisters to instruct children in English by teaching the catechism.[5]

The other major community institution in Murray Hill was Alta Settlement House. It grew out of a nursery school established in the neighborhood by the Cleveland Day Nursery Association, a philanthropic group which sought to provide childcare for low income working parents. In 1898 the director of the nursery and Joseph Carabelli approached John D. Rockefeller for funding for a more adequate building, and discussions evolved into financing the construction and operation of a social settlement. Opened in 1900 on Mayfield Road in Murray Hill, it was named Alta House in honor of one of Rockefeller's daughters, Alta Rockefeller Prentice.[6]

The settlement house movement in the United States was fifteen years old by this time. Alta House was one of the 100 or so

5. *Holy Rosary Church Golden Jubilee*; B.W. Whitman et al. to John D. Rockefeller, 18 October 1888, loc. cit; Michael J. McTighe, "Babel and Babylon on the Cuyahoga: Religious Diversity in Cleveland," in Campbell and Miggins, eds., *The Birth of Modern Cleveland*, pp. 232-34; Miggins and Morganthaler, "The Ethnic Mosaic," pp. 127-28; Gene P. Veranesi, *Italian Americans and Their Communities of Cleveland* (Cleveland: Cleveland State University, 1977), p. 211; I.T. Frary, "The Italian Mission," *Beacon Light* (January 1905), copy in folder 1, container 3, I.T. Frary Papers, WRHS.
6. Marian J. Morton, "From Saving Souls to Saving Cities: Women and Reform in Cleveland," in Campbell and Miggins, eds. *The Birth of Modern Cleveland*, pp. 331-32; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 19-20.

settlements in the larger cities of the East and Midwest, including ten others in Cleveland by 1922 (such as the Cleveland Music School Settlement discussed in chapter 8) that were established largely at the instance of middle and upperclass women aiming to promote social reform in urban working-class and immigrant neighborhoods. The staff of each house was committed to living in the neighborhood (hence the term "settlement"), and to learning firsthand about the culture and environment of the residents. Most institutions of this type provided a range of services to families, with a concentration on recreational, educational, cultural and health activities for children.[7]

A woman who grew up in Murray Hill described Alta House as "a marvelous service" to the neighborhood. She recalled:

> My mother washed for a living and had to work in order to get along. My father's wages weren't enough. So in the meantime she would put me up to the nursery known as the Alta House. I think I was about two years old when she started leaving me there because I can remember them changing me out of my clothes and into rompers. . . They had a playground back of it which also was a boon to those little youngsters down in that area because the houses were built close to the street and there was no playground for the children really.[8]

Other services to the neighborhood included clubs, classes, and

7. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 61-62; Charles N. Glaab and A Theodore Brown, *A History of Urban America* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), pp. 239-40.
8. Rose Miller, "Alta House," Geauganspeak (September 1964): 5.

(with the construction of an addition in 1913) a library, swimming pool and gymnasium. Rockefeller continued to fund Alta House until 1921, donating a total of more than $300,000; afterwards it became affiliated with the Cleveland Community Fund (now the United Way).[9]

Murray Hill was in most ways typical of ethnic neighborhoods in Cleveland and many American cities of the Midwest and East. It was more densely settled than most of Cleveland, having a population of 6,510 in about a half square mile by 1930, but had few community services other than those provided by the church and private charity (although Murray Hill did have a public elementary school). While it provided mostly unskilled labor to the city's industrial districts and family incomes were low, Murray Hill was known for strong family and neighborly relationships. For many immigrants, and their children, no other community ever replaced it.[10]

Across the Circle from Murray Hill was another neighborhood, radically different in origin, appearance and population: the Wade Park Allotment. It was part of the land originally purchased by Jeptha Wade in the 1870s, but he reserved it for later development when he donated Wade Park to the city in

9. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 19-20, 996; Grace Goulder, *John D. Rockefeller: The Cleveland Years* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1972), pp. 155-56.
10. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 54-8, 559-60; Fiscus interview; Kenneth Seminatore, "Memories of Murray Hill," *Cleveland Magazine*, August 1976, pp. 48-52; John Bodnar, *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1965), pp. 177-79, 206-16; U.S. Department of Commerce, *Sixteenth Census of the U.S.: 1940. Population*, vol. 1. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1942), p. 542.

1882. What became known as Wade Park Allotment was a curving strip of land to the north and east of the park, bounded by East 105th Street on the west, Ashbury Avenue on the north; East Boulevard on the south, and Bellflower Road on the east.

About 1905 Jeptha Wade's grandson, Jeptha H. Wade II, decided to lay out the tract into large lots which would appeal to wealthy buyers. At the time Cleveland was in the midst of a vast reorganization of its residential districts, largely due to the effects of the streetcar and the automobile. The electric streetcar was introduced in the 1890s, and the automobile began to be manufactured on a large scale after 1900. Both devices extended average commuting distances (particularly after cheap fares and free transfers were introduced on Cleveland's trolleys), so that both workers and bosses could live further from the crowded city core but still get to a factory or office in an hour or less.[11]

Part of this process was a relocation of the primary residential areas or Cleveland's elite, from the mid-19th century when many had lived along Euclid Avenue between East 22nd and East 55th streets ("Millionaire's Row"), although the city's west side also had a silk stocking district in the Franklin Circle area. By 1900 the growth of industry and population had rendered these areas less attractive as they were hemmed in by dense immigrant and working class districts, and were adjacent to the noise and dirt of Cleveland's major industrial areas.

Many wealthy Clevelanders were looking for a site which would

11. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. xxxiv-xxxvi, 230-31, 268, 978-79; Eric Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture, 1876-1976* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1979), p. 97.

combine attractive surroundings, ample space to construct large houses and outbuildings, a likelihood of neighborhood stability, and yet be within reasonable commuting distance of downtown businesses and offices. Some found the lakefront communities of Lakewood and Bratenahl attractive, others moved to the Cleveland Heights subdivisions laid out by Patrick Calhoun and the Van Sweringen brothers. In the 1920s Shaker Heights and Rocky River became focal points of upper-class settlement.[12] But the most prestigious new location for Cleveland's elite was the Wade Park Allotment.

The advertising brochure for the Wade Allotment claimed that

> Every known improvement of the highest grade has been installed and the building restrictions for every lot have been worked out with one object in view, the ultimate beauty and protection of the entire allotment. These restrictions, together with the natural advantages of the property, can produce only one result and that is a model residence section, for many years to come.[13]

Most lots were generous. The largest had 100 feet of frontage on Wade Park, with depths of about 250 feet. But some interior lots along Magnolia Drive were equally large, and others on Magnolia had the same frontage but less depth. Only clusters of

12. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp.120, 239, 611, 638, 664; Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture*, pp. 101-9; Ian S. Haberman, *The Van Sweringens of Cleveland: The Biography of an Empire* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1979), pp. 7, 9.
13. *Wade Park Allotment* (Cleveland: Corday & Gross, c. 1905), unpaginated.

lots north of Wade Park Avenue were more modest, averaging about 75 x 130 feet.[14]

It was not just size and location which made the allotment noticeably different than other Cleveland subdivisions, however. Wade also included in his deeds certain provisions (restrictive covenants) requiring that the owners had to construct a dwelling of a certain value, that only one family could be resident, that no liquor could be sold on the premises, and that the land could only be resold to Caucasians and Protestants. The residents of Wade Allotment subsequently made or seriously discussed agreements with each other restricting the placement of buildings and fences, and forbidding ownership of the houses by fraternities or African-American organizations.[15]

These requirements were common in upper-class developments throughout the United States at the time, and upheld elite notions of private property as well as responding to their concerns about the lifestyles of the working classes and new urban immigrants. While Wade Park Allotment established standards of beauty which could be admired by almost everyone, restrictive covenants regarding ethnicity such as the Allotment employed were ultimately ruled unconstitutional and did not portend well

14. *Wade Park Allotment of parts of Original Lots 386-387-394-395-403 of East Cleveland Township* (Cleveland: Wade Bros., c. 1915, single sheet; Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture*. pp. 96-99.
15. Wade Allotment Association papers, WRHS; memorandum of agreement, property owners on Bellflower Road, 23 June 1915, and abstract of deed covenant, J.C. Cromwell to Lillian M. Baldwin, 14 October 1920, box 1, Secretary-Treasurer's Office Files, Case Western Reserve University Archives, Cleveland, OH (hereafter CWRU Archives).

for the future of liberty and equality in Cleveland or the United States.[16]

At the time, however, it seemed that Wade Allotment was an outstanding example of residential planning, and the results fulfilled the dreams of its founder and its residents. Many elite Clevelanders moved into the allotment and, with the assistance of the city's leading architects, built some of the most beautiful homes the city has ever seen. Mr. and Mrs. Edmund S. Burke, Jr's. house (1910), for example, was designed by J. Milton Dyer, a graduate of the Case School of Applied Science trained at the École des Beaux Arts in Paris. The Burkes had purchased two lots at the intersection of Magnolia and Mistletoe Drives, yielding a diamond-shaped parcel without a clear front and back. Dyer adapted an English manor house style to the site, presenting attractive views of the 42-room house from all angles. Dyer had earlier received the commission to design Cleveland's new city hall, so he had no difficulty with the scale of the Burke house.[17]

The Wade Allotment community had a particular sense of self-identity. Residents knew that they represented a significant portion of the city's elite: by 1918 enough had moved there such that the *Social Register of Cleveland*, an annual guide to

16. Anona Teska, "The Federal Impact on Cities," in Melvin I. Urofsky, ed, *Perspectives on Urban America* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1973), pp. 267-66; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 366-67, 941; Haberman, *Van Sweringens*, pp. 13-14.
17. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 352; Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture*. pp. 75, 99. Burke was a governor of the Federal Reserve Bank and "the father of Cleveland polo": *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 779.

the city's upper class, listed 46 prominent families living in the Wade Allotment.[18]

The husband and wife in such families often were both born to considerable wealth. Leading members of the Everett, Grasselli, Mather, Williams, Brown, Harshaw. Glidden, Burke, Squire, Wellman, McBride, White and Gordon families were among the first to claim places in the Allotment. It was common for these families to be interrelated by blood or marriage.[19]

The larger houses in the Allotment had servants' quarters in the house or over the carriage house, or both, and staffs which might include housekeepers, a gardener, and chauffeur. The Burke house, the largest in the allotment, had the help of six live-in servants. The lawns were large and well-kept; there were ample carriage houses or garages available; often with a gasoline-engine car for the husband, and an electric automobile for the wife; and some houses had backyard greenhouses, tennis courts or outdoor gymnastic sets for the children. The Greenes, Everetts and Wades had tennis courts on the lots adjacent to their houses.[20]

One aspect of Wade Allotment life which should not be overlooked was that many families had second, or even third, residences elsewhere. Randall Wade, Jeptha H. Wade II's father, developed Little Mountain in nearby Geauga County, Ohio as

18. *Social Register of Cleveland.* 1916 (New York: Social Register of Cleveland,1917).
19. *Wade Park Allotment as parts of Original Lots*; author's interviews (1984) of former residents of Wade Allotment, 1984, identities withheld by request, in author's files.
20. Author's interviews of former residents of Wade Allotment.

a summertime "camp" in the l870s: it evolved into a private vacation community with cottages, a lodge, and its own church. Several of the wealthiest Wade Park residents wintered at estates or luxury hotels in Thomasville, Georgia, where quail hunting was a favorite pastime.[21] Thus, community life in the Allotment was tempered by the seasonal absences of several families or family members.

The Wade Allotment actually had a relatively short lifespan as a prime residential district. Measured by the Social Register, its height was probably in the latter 1920s, when 56 Wade Allotment families were listed; by the latter 1930s there were 41 on the register; and by the latter 1940s only 23, about half of whom were headed by widows.[22] By that time several of the houses had been purchased for use by Circle institutions. On the other hand, while the heart of the Allotment – which held

21. Warren Corning Wick, *My Recollections of Old Cleveland: Manners, Mansions, Mischief*, Joanne M. Lewis, ed. (Cleveland: Carpenter Reserve Printing, 1979), pp. 62-64; Adella Prentiss Hughes, *Music is My Life* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1947), pp. 69-70; Walter R. Brueckheimer, "The Quail Plantations of the Thomasville - Tallahassee - Albany Regions," *The Journal of Southwest Georgia History* 3 (Fall 1965): 44-45, 52-58, 62-63; Elisabeth G. Hitchcock, "The Travels of St. Hubert's Chapel," *Lake County. Ohio. Historical Society Quarterly* 15 (November 1973): 1-3; Bari Oyler Stith, "A Treasured Place: The Changing Community of Little Mountain, 1800-1986," AMST 536 seminar paper, American Studies Program, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, in author's files.
22. *Social Register of Cleveland. 1928, 1938, 1941, 1949* (New York: Social Register Association, 1927, 1937, 1940, 1948. The author's review of the 1941 *Social Register* (which has 1940 information), showed that in 1940 there were 60 households listed in the Wade Allotment. Of those, 26 were headed by widows (or possibly, in some cases, by divorcées), and 6 were headed by unmarried women. That is, the majority of households in the Wade Allotment were headed by women: *Social Register of Cleveland. 1941.*

the largest, and most elegant houses – declined in population and importance, its northern and eastern portions did not, and areas just outside the boundaries of the Allotment actually experienced an increase in population during the housing shortages of the 1940s. The census tract which included the Allotment had 4,137 residents in 1930, 4,080 in 1940, and 5,021 in 1950.[23]

The heart of the Allotment also thinned out because the next generation of Cleveland's elite did not want or need houses built for substantial entertaining or time consuming maintenance: tastes had changed to a more private lifestyle, and household expenses were more likely to be allocated for appliances than maids and butlers.[24] New residential districts on the periphery of Cleveland, such as Shaker Heights, had emerged to establish the bucolic suburban milieu aspired to by all social classes by the mid-20th century: many of the Wade Allotment's families, or their children, moved to Shaker Heights, or further east to Gates Mills and Hunting Valley.[25]

The future role of the Allotment's magnificent housing and expansive lots was obvious as early as 1936, when the Cleveland Music School Settlement moved into the Burke house, and the

23. This tract is bounded by 105th Street on the west, Euclid Avenue on the south and southeast, and Wade Park and Asbury avenues on the north: *U.S. Department of Commerce. Sixteenth Census of the United States: Population. vol. 1.* p. 642; *Ibid, U.S. Census of Population: 1950. Census Tract Statistics*. *Cleveland. Ohio. and Adjacent Area – 1950 Population. Census Report, vol. 3*. ch. 12. (Washington: Government. Printing Office, 1952), p. 16.
24. Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), pp. 173-81, 192-93.
25. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 933. 941-42.

Western Reserve Historical Society moved into the Hay-McKinney House on East Boulevard. Through the following decades as houses came on the market they were almost always purchased for institutional use: Western Reserve University acquired many of them for office buildings, but also demolished some to provide space for dormitories. Most houses on the west end of the Allotment were replaced by the new Veterans Administration hospital in 1964, and the next year the Western Reserve Historical Society tore down the Grasselli house in order to build its Auto-Aviation Museum.[26]

In one sense, the pace of these physical changes was paralleled by the transformation of the areas adjacent to the Wade Allotment. In particular, the district bordering on the immediate north and west very early became a prime residential area for Cleveland's African-American elite. That area and indeed the Doan's Corners area in general had held a significant Black population for several decades, but only in the 1920s did the pattern of African-American migration within the city make it a particular focus of attention.[27]

Cleveland's African-American population had increased dramatically in the first two decades of the 20th century, rising from 5,988 to 34,450. Increasingly discriminatory real estate policies as well as *de facto* racism in city and school policies had largely confined Cleveland's Black citizens to the Central district of downtown Cleveland, overloading its public facilities and facilitating opportunities for vice and crime.

26. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp.253, 1010, 1041.
27. Kenneth L. Kusmer, *A Ghetto Takes Shape: Black Cleveland, 1870-1930* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1976), pp. 168-69, 214.

The city leadership's understanding of the impact of Black migration can be represented by the attitudes of Newton D. Baker, a former mayor of Cleveland, secretary of war under President Wilson, and a chairman of the city's Democratic party. According to the observations of one historian, Baker's "thinking about blacks was hedged with contradictions…he publicly espoused the rhetoric of inter-group tolerance and supported an educational campaign against prejudice and discrimination. Yet he retained much of the paternalistic racism of his West Virginia upbringing and looked upon blacks as an infant race that needed guidance."[28] Writing in 1935 Baker cast the history and results of black migration to Cleveland in a negative light:

> [The] colored people who came here a dozen years ago … brought with them their habits, which were better adapted to cabin life in the palmetto swamps than they were to the sanitary and hygienic needs of congested life in an industrial city. The houses they took over had recently been vacated by a fairly sturdy lot of people who respected their houses and kept them in repair. After ten years of the new occupancy, they had to be torn down to keep them from falling down or crawling away.[29]

Baker's attitude suggests that there was a limited basis for racial integration in Cleveland in his era. The city certainly had enough

28. Walter A. Jackson, *Gunnar Mvrdal and America's Conscience: Social Engineering and Racial Liberalism, 1936-1967* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), p. 22.
29. Quoted in Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1989), p. 128.

vestiges of the more racially-tolerant atmosphere of the latter 19th century to allow some residential mobility for those who could afford to move out of the Central district. These middle class and blue-collar Blacks generally moved eastward, where space was created by the out-migration of other ethnic groups (as Newton Baker had observed). One significant vacancy was in the East 55th Street area, since Eastern European Jews and their progeny were leaving that original settlement area and were creating new neighborhoods in Hough, Collinwood and other areas to the east.

Still, as has been true in Cleveland throughout the 20th century, the neighborhoods into which African-Americans could move generally were limited to those in which some of their brethren already lived, and those who actually exercised their Constitutional right to live where they pleased usually faced strong resistance. One outstanding case of resistance occurred when Dr. Charles Garvin, a leading Cleveland physician, decided in 1925 to build a house within the original Wade Allotment on Wade Park Avenue near Mistletoe Road.

As related by Kenneth Kusmer in *A Ghetto Takes Shape* (a history of Cleveland's Black population from 1870 to 1930), when Garvin's intentions were known a campaign of intimidation immediately began.

> Whites … used every conceivable tactic in their attempt to keep Garvin out of the neighborhood. While the house was being built they harassed and threatened the workmen. Once construction was completed and the Garvins had occupied their new

> home, whites dynamited the house twice in an effort to force the Black doctor to leave. The first bomb, luckily, only shattered a window, but the second did considerable damage to one section of the house.[30]

Garvin and his family had the courage to complete the house and move in, although for some months in the summer of 1926 the house was guarded by police or sympathetic whites and Blacks. By the next year the incident was over, and Garvin was an established resident. He was a pioneer in the Black elite neighborhood on the northern edge of the Allotment which was later described by residents as "our Shaker Heights."[31]

At the time of Garvin's purchase a group of ten Allotment residents (including Garretson Wade, Jeptha H. Wade's son) attempted to form a syndicate to repurchase his lot and any future lots obtained by "persons who are considered undesirable neighbors, particularly persons not of the Caucasian race." The regarded such action as "absolutely essential to prevent the rapid and serious deterioration of the entire neighborhood." They failed to obtain Garvin's lot, but their statements are an unmistakable reflection of their concept of neighborhood and community.[32]

There was no significant resistance to the slow African-American migration to the district to the west of the Circle

30. Kusmer, *A Ghetto Takes Shape*, p. 169.
31. *The Observer* (CWRU student newspaper), supplement, 7 April 1970, pp.7-9.
32. W.H. Boyd, G.G. Wade, C.W. Collister, et al. to residents of Wade Allotment, 14 October 1925, historical collection of the Cleveland Institute of Art, Cleveland, OH. Copy courtesy of Christine Rom.

known as Hough. A neighborhood of single-family wood frame houses on modest lots, it accommodated only a few Blacks prior to World War II, and by 1950 was 5% Black. Its transformation to a majority Black neighborhood occurred in the next decade.[33]

Hough had been developed as a residential area in the late 19th century. It was largely estates and farmland from the north side of Doan's Corners all the way north to Superior Avenue until the l880s, when it was subdivided into lots by major landholders, such as Doan's Corners resident Stephen V. Harkness, whose fortune had been made in Standard Oil. There was little coherent planning for the area, either by developers or the city, with the result that the street layout (created before the automobile) was rather haphazard and there were few parks or other public areas.[34]

Residents of what was termed in 1910 "the healthiest [neighborhood] in Cleveland and with the best behaved citizens,"[35] found employment in the industrial-commercial clusters springing up to the south along the Nickel Plate railroad, to the west along East 55th Street (such as the Brush Electrical

33. David A. Snow and Peter J. Leahy, "A Neighborhood in Transition: Hough, Ohio," in Edward M. Miggins, ed., *A Guide to Studying Neighborhoods and Resources on Cleveland* (Cleveland; Cleveland Public Library, 1984), pp. 103-4.
34. *Ibid*, pp. 103-4; Marvin B. Sussman, et al., *Hough, Cleveland. Ohio: A Study of Social Life and Change* (Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1959), p. 56. In order to relieve traffic congestion the city planned as early as the 1920s to construct an extension of Chester Avenue from East 40th Street to University Circle through the southern part of Hough, but it was not completed until the 1940s: *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 930; Commissioner of Engineering to W.R. Hopkins, 7 June 1928, folder 1, container 2, W. R. Hopkins Collection, WRHS.
35. Sussman, *Hough*, p. 103.

Company), and to the north along Lake Erie. There was only one major industry within Hough itself, the Cleveland Brewing Company at Ansel and Hough avenues.[36]

Hough had a variety of ethnic groups who settled densely. Initially, for example, Germans settled around Cleveland Brewing, and Slavic groups were on the northern areas nearer the metalworking businesses on the lakefront. In the 1920s Jews moved into northeast Hough adjacent to the Glenville district, an area that soon became the focus of Cleveland's Jewish culture. The densest concentration of African-Americans was in the Crawford Road area.[37]

The Hough area showed symptoms of overcrowding by the 1930s, when depression-era incomes reduced home repair rates just when much of the housing stock was becoming 40-50 years old, and when families often resorted to doubling-up or taking in boarders to make ends meet. The resulting housing deterioration already was serious by the 1950s when the African-American in-city migration was heaviest.[38] The subsequent Black outmigration from these conditions by those who could afford it rendered the Hough district vulnerable to rapid demographic

36. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 122, 487-88, 525; David S. Brose and Alfred M. Lee, *A Model of Historical Sites Archaeology in the Inner City*. Archaeological Report no. 55. (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Natural History, 1985), pp. 43, 68; Harkness Estate Ledger, 1899-1920, Commonwealth Fund Archives, RAC.
37. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 574, 637, 773, 897; Lloyd P. Gartner, *History of the Jews of Cleveland* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1978), p. 270; Brose and Lee, "A Model," p. 68; Kusmer, *A Ghetto Takes Shape*, pp. 151, 284.
38. Snow and Leahy, "A Neighborhood in Transition," pp. 104-5; Glaab and Brown, *A History of Urban America*, p. 299; Susmann, Hough, pp. 18-22.

change. By 1960 Hough began to be a byword for all the troubles that American cities were experiencing; but those who regarded the problems of Hough as inherent in its new racial identity forgot that underlying the situation was a history of shortsighted development and citywide racism.

Hough, the Wade Allotment, and Murray Hill were the major neighborhoods adjacent to, or within, University Circle and were therefore the most likely targets for the outreach efforts of the Circle institutions. Their residents should have provided a large proportion of those taking art classes or musical instruction, using day care for preschoolers, or making visits to the parks and hospitals. Yet there were attitudinal obstacles to outreach to those neighborhoods and the ethnic groups resident in them, as well as ethnic groups generally, and these limited the full development of University Circle's potential.

Cleveland had a liberal social tradition in the 19th century, when African-Americans found Cleveland a relatively racially-tolerant city and the early immigrant groups generally settled neighborhoods and founded churches without incident. But by the turn of the century intolerance bloomed in Cleveland as it did throughout the United States.[39] In some instances discrimination was a blatant and clear attempt to deny privileges or to intimidate. The racial covenants on Wade Allotment deeds, and the bombing of Dr. Garvin's house were of that type, and were part of an effective pattern of discrimination against Cleveland's African-Americans by virtually all segments of the white community.

39. Kusmer, *A Ghetto Takes Shape*, chs. 3 and 8; Glaab and Brown, *A History of Urban America*, pp. 224-25, 287.

Less consistent but still obvious discrimination was exercised against Cleveland's Jews. While covenanted real estate also aimed to limit their mobility, developments like the Wade Allotment or Shaker Heights were a small portion of the market, and Jews found many neighborhoods open to them. Perhaps the ambiguity of Cleveland's discrimination against Jews is best summarized by an incident which occurred in University Circle in 1906, when the leading Jewish social organization, the Excelsior Club, decided to move to a site on Euclid Avenue.

As reported in the Jewish press, the club decided to move from downtown to the cultural center of the city, and selected a site in the heart of the Circle, between the Women's College and Adelbert College. President Charles Thwing of Western Reserve tried to block the sale by asking the trustees of the future art museum, who were then negotiating with the city to build on a site in Wade Park, to declare that the Excelsior tract lay on a crucial access-way to the future site. The leaders of the club took the matter to Mayor Tom Johnson, who told them that he would back them fully if there was any difficulty.

The Excelsior Club went ahead with their plans, and in 1908 erected a fine brick building with large meeting rooms and an auditorium. When the Excelsior Club merged with the Oakwood Club in 1931, the building was sold to Western Reserve University: in an irony apparently unappreciated at the time, the university trustees named the building Thwing Hall.[40]

40. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 383; Gartner, *History of the Jews of Cleveland*, pp. 94-5. Thwing's anti-semitism surfaced again in 1921 when he described a fundraising campaign as "Jewish," thereby offending Samuel Mather, the chairman of the board of trustees: Samuel Mather to C.F. Thwing, 7 June 1921, Samuel Mather folder, box 20,

Later developments suggest that Thwing's attempt to stop the Excelsior Club may have been unrepresentative of the Circle's attitudes toward Jews and Jewish institutions. When the Temple was constructed at Ansel Road and 105m Street in 1924, its leader, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, was recognized as a great intellect and a world leader of Zionism. His numerous invitations to speak at neighboring Epworth-Euclid Methodist Church indicate the widespread respect he had in the Cleveland community. His congregation was large enough that in the 1940s some worship services were held at Severance Hall on high holy days. In those same years President Leutner of Western Reserve University enthusiastically welcomed the establishment of a branch of Hillel, the Jewish student league, on its campus.[41]

The leaders of Circle institutions had a similarly ambiguous attitude toward the Italian population in Murray Hill. Many probably shared the hostility expressed in a Cleveland religious magazine which claimed that many residents of the Hill were "in manners, language and sympathies as unAmerican as though they still resided in their native lands," and that it was "a social and political necessity that means should be found for educating them and elevating them."[42]

In 1914 trustees of Western Reserve University and President Thwing also worried about the continuing growth of the Italian

Charles F. Thwing Office Files (hereafter Thwing Office Files), CWRU Archives.

41. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 107, 892, 961; Gartner, *The Jews of Cleveland*, pp. 274-75; W.G. Leutner, memorandum, 15 April 1946, box 15, Winfred G. Leutner Office Files (hereafter Leutner Office Files), CWRU Archives .
42. "An Italian Mission," *Beacon Light* (May 1900), copy in folder 1, container 3, I.T. Frary Papers, WRHS.

population in Murray Hill. In part they were concerned about its effect on the houses adjacent to the campus owned by various professors and administrators. One trustee argued:

> … I really feel that the [Italian] invasion having reached the railroad is in fair way at most any time to leak across, and when it does, a snow man on a summer day will represent real estate values on some of these streets.[43]

In 1915 an agent of the University went so far as to ask Vincennso Campanella, the owner of property between Murray Hill and the university, to be "very careful as to whom he sold the property." Campanella promised to sell only to the university "or someone endorsed by the University."[44] In fact, there never was competition for land with the Murray Hill community until the 1960s, when the university was the aggressor.

Nonetheless, there remained a misunderstanding of the Italian community which sometimes led to absurd situations. I.T. Frary, an officer of the Cleveland Museum of Art, thought that the execution in Boston of Sacco and Vansetti in 1927 required police protection for the museum, even though the museum had "received no threats or rumors of trouble."[45]

In hindsight, potentially the most insidious form of racism in the

43. Homer H. Johnson to C.F. Thwing, 7 April 1914, Land Acquisition Folder, box 3, Thwing Office Files.
44. Michele A. Vaccanello to C.F. Thwing, 2 April 1915, Land Acquisition Folder, box 3, Thwing Office Files.
45. I.T. Frary to W.R. Hopkins, 19 August 1927, folder 5, container 2, William R. Hopkins Collection, WRHS; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 421.

Circle was the research carried out for the Brush Foundation. Cleveland electrical pioneer Charles F. Brush created the foundation in 1928 in order to conduct research "contributing to the betterment of human stock, and toward the regulation of the increase of population, to the end that children shall be begotten only under conditions which make possible a heritage of mental and physical health."[46] Brush's ideas must have been known to many of Cleveland's elite: he was a patron of music; a trustee of Western Reserve University, Case School of Applied Science, and University School; and president of the Chamber of Commerce.

Moreover, Brush's view of the possibilities of science was held by many prominent Americans of the era, and by the 1920s a field of study generally known as eugenics had developed to carry out just such studies as Brush proposed. This field gathered strength from a grab-bag of observations and beliefs, ranging from the recognition that better public health and disease control of recent years was contributing to population growth, to the unsupported assertion made by some physicians and alarmists that upper-class women in Western nations were becoming physically less capable of bearing as many children as the women of the lower classes.[47]

46. Quoted in James M. Wood, "Cleveland Medicine's Incredible Ghosts"; *Cleveland Magazine* 12 (July 1983), p. 60.
47. W. F. Bynum, E.J. Browne and Roy Porter, eds. *Dictionary of the History of Science* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 131; Hamilton Cravens, "American Scientists and the Heredity-Environment Controversy, 1883-1940," Ph.D. dissertation. University of Iowa, 1969, esp. chs. 5, 6; Garland E. Allen, "The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910-1940: An Essay in Institutional History." *Osiris*, second series, 2 (1986): 225-264; Margarete Sandelowski, *Pain,*

The Brush Foundation chose as its director a professor of medicine at Western Reserve, T. Wingate Todd, who was already well-known for his research into the growth and development of children. With Brush Foundation support Todd continued his work, which involved the painstaking measurement of supposed hereditary differences in bone growth, and by launching a campaign to systematically x-ray children from the public schools, focusing on healthy children of English, German, Italian, and African-American descent.

Todd's researches proved informative about child development, but were not in the end a contribution to eugenics. Todd himself was inclined to believe that environmental influences were the primary determinant of human development. On his death in 1938 a new director was appointed, William W. Greulich, an anatomist and anthropologist who continued some of Todd's work before moving to Stanford University in 1944. The focus of the Brush Foundation changed after Todd's death, moving in the direction of contraception research and other aspects of population control, rather than studies of heredity and racial characteristics.[48]

Pleasure and American Childbirth (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1964).

48. Wood, "Cleveland Medicine's Incredible Ghosts," pp. 60, 127-26, 130; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 133, 969; "Yale Scientist to Guide Brush Work," 15 November 1939, and M.R. Weir to W.G. Leutner, 17 May 1944, box 4, Leutner Office Files; T. Wingate Todd to L.E. Frank, 27 April 1933, 16 November 1933, folder 3952, box 369, series 1.3, General Education Board Archives, RAC; Charles C. Gillispie, ed. *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1970-1980), 2:171. Some of Todd's work on allergies and nutrition in children was supported by the Cleveland Foundation in the 1930s: "Brush Foundation," folder 20, container 2, Cleveland Foundation Records, WRHS.

The racism and ethnocentrism which the Circle institutions exhibited on occasion, and which were implicit in the research sponsored by the Brush Foundation, were sometimes diminished by the blunt refusals of Circle leaders to be party to any action with racial overtones.[49] and other times by a strong countervailing belief that it was preferable to serve or even celebrate the diverse population of the city. Yet Cleveland's elite had an ambiguous response to ethnic and racial groups which resulted in equally ambiguous outreach programs.

For example, the Circle institutions were tardy in directing their programs to the immediately adjacent neighborhoods. They preferred to develop citywide programs, or even to focus on areas distant from the Circle, rather than encourage participation by local residents.[50] Of course, one group of residents, those in the Wade Allotment, had a strong hand in creating and sustaining the Circle itself.

Direct services to the Circle were provided in cases. Schools adjacent to the Circle were included in those that were invited to the Circle's institutions: the Historical Society had a scholastic

49. In 1914, for example, a member of a prominent Cleveland family who was a resident of the Circle was "inclined to treat with rather short patience" any discussion of "the Roman or Sicilian invasion" of the university area: Homer H. Johnson to C.F. Thwing, 7 April 1914, Land Acquisition folder, box 3. Thwing Office Files. Strong ethnocentrism, on the other hand, led a professor of the School of Medicine (prior to its removal to the Circle) to urge that only "native Americans" be appointed to the faculty: Frederick C. Waite to C.F. Thwing, 6 May 1919, "Annual Reports of Professors" folder, box 16, Charles F. Thwing Office Files.
50. Leaders of Chicago institutions also tended to attempt city-wide programs before recognizing neighborhood needs: Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Culture and the City: Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago from the 1880s to 1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), pp. 156-62.

program by 1912, and the Cleveland Museum of Art and the Orchestra followed within the decade. Western Reserve University had a daycare center in its School of Education which relied upon neighborhood children for much of its population. University hospitals served the local area substantially after they moved to the Circle in the 1920s.[51]

Other programs of Circle institutions focused on areas well removed from the Circle. For example, the University Neighborhood Centers, founded by Reserve's School of Applied Social Sciences in 1926, were located in the Broadway and Harvard Avenue areas.[52] In 1939 the Museum of Art obtained funds from the General Education Board, a Rockefeller philanthropy, to make reproductions of art works available to high school classes, but aimed the program at Shaker Heights High School, an elite suburb.[53]

Most of the Circle institutions appealed to a broad spectrum or the city's residents. Western Reserve University and Case Institute of Technology had perhaps the widest range of possibilities. Western Reserve was one of the earliest racially

51. Newton D. Baker to L.K. Franck, 1 April 1932, with enclosure of 23 January 1932, folder 1183, box 631, RG 1.4, General Education Board Archives, RAC; *Plans and Policies for Future Development, of Western Reserve University School of Medicine and University Hospitals of Cleveland* (Cleveland: n.p., 1954), pp. 13, 71-72; *The Cleveland School-Museum Program* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, and Cleveland Museum of Natural History, 1927); Hughes, Music is My Life, p. 292.
52. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 1002, Thomas F. Campbell, *SASS: Fifty Years of Social Work Education* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1967), pp. 55, 60-61.
53. W.W. Brierly to Thomas Munro, 13 April 1939, and "Memorandum Regarding Exhibition Project with Secondary Schools," 1 June 1939, folder 3325, box 319, RG 1.2, General Education Board Archives, RAC.

integrated undergraduate colleges in the United States, graduating its first Black student in 1892, and admitting one or more African-Americans to nearly every class thereafter. Cleveland College, the evening division of both Reserve and Case, drew a cross-section of the city's population from its opening in 1925.[54] The campuses sponsored numerous public events, from lectures and theatrical performances, to sports. For the first half of the 20th century the Case-Reserve football game at Thanksgiving was probably the city's most anticipated annual entertainment.[55]

The culturally-minded of any socioeconomic level or ethnic group in the city generally found in the Circle some program in which they could participate. In 1919 Frederick Whiting began the annual May Show at the Art Museum for local artists, and thereafter the possibility of entering a juried exhibition of the best of the art created by Cleveland's (and later northeast Ohio's) artists was a powerful motivating force in the city's artistic community.[56] The Cleveland Institute of Art, the Cleveland Music School Settlement, and other Circle institutions provided public exhibitions of the artistic achievements of their students.[57] The Garden Center of Greater Cleveland, founded in 1930 and located in the old boathouse on Wade Lagoon,

54. Frederick C. Waite to C.F. Thwing, 6 May 1919, "Annual Reports of Professors" folder, box 16, Thwing Office Files; Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 123-34; Kusmer, *A Ghetto Takes Shape*, p. 63
55. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 170-71.
56. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 667.
57. Nancy Coe Wixom, *Cleveland Institute of Art: The First Hundred Years, 1882-1982* (Cleveland: Cleveland Institute of Art, 1982), pp. 22-24, 36, 52-54; Silvia Sverina, *And They Shall Have Music: The History of the Cleveland Music School Settlement* (Cleveland: Cobham and Hatherton Press, 1988).

provided opportunities for gardeners and horticulturalists to observe and learn about plants cared for by professionals. It also instituted a Children's Garden Program in the public schools.[58]

With these programs, and numerous others, the Circle became firmly integrated into the life of the Cleveland and its metropolitan area by mid-century. Its institutions provided a range of services which were indispensable to a modern urban area, and often were in advance of those in other American cities. Yet by mid-century the elite creators of the Circle had not repudiated their discriminatory impulses, nor had the professional managers of the Circle institutions confronted their ethnocentric traditions. In the 1950s and 1960s, despite all the good intentions of the founders of the Circle, the heritage of those attitudes would be tested and found wanting.

58. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 430; *Fifty Years of Growing and Serving: The Garden Center of Greater Cleveland, 1930-1980* (Cleveland: Emerson Press, 1980).

4. System, Sobriety and Shaping the Circle: Jeptha H. Wade, Amasa Stone, and Hiram Hayden

In the 19th century the religious, cultural, and economic fabric of most American cities, including Cleveland, were stretched and reshaped under the weight of rapid population growth, industrialization, and immigration.[1] To many Americans this reshaping was disturbing because it suggested that America was leaving behind the intimate, small-scale society of close-knit churches, town governments, and local markets which many had grown up with, and which had been idealized as the basis of American democracy by writers such as Thomas Jefferson and Alexis de Tocqueville. Some American leaders sought to

1. A leading urban historian has commented that "What characterizes the modern metropolis is the creation of a significant culture of impersonality, a social world of strangers in continuous but limited association": Thomas Bender, "Metropolitan Life and the Making of Public Culture," in John Hull Mollenkopf, ed., *Power, Culture, and Place: Essays on New York City* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988), p. 262.

respond to urbanization by creating more controlled spaces and institutions which they thought could restore families, communities and government to their proper roles and functions. The most active of these concerned Americans adapted the reform impulses and philanthropic means of antebellum temperance and antislavery movements to their efforts.[2] The major legacy of such nineteenth century reforms for the landscape of modern Cleveland was a district on the east side of Cleveland that became known as University Circle.

Jeptha Wade and Amasa Stone, industrialists, and Hiram Haydn, a Presbyterian minister, were leaders in the creation of the Circle. For Jeptha Wade, an itinerant portrait painter who became a founder of Western Union, what became University Circle was part of a broader network of institutions that he created to serve the needs of the rapidly-growing industrial-commercial city, and was an extension of the reformist attitudes of an urban upper class. For Stone the Circle was an expression of the rationalizing and systematizing function of capitalism. For Hiram Haydn, minister of the leading church in Cleveland, First Presbyterian, the Circle was a safe and sober location for training youth. While the three visions were separate, collusion between Wade, Stone, and Haydn was minimal: they blended nicely. The legacy of their visions is still visible in the 21st century.

2. David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *Cleveland: A Tradition of Reform* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1986); Samuel P. Hays, *The Response to Industrialism: 1885-1914* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 94-115; Michael J. McTighe, "Leading Men, True Women, Protestant Churches, and the Shape of Antebellum Benevolence," in Van Tassel and Grabowski, eds., *Cleveland: A Tradition of Reform*, pp. 12-28.

Jeptha Wade (1811-1890) was the first to act. Born in rural Seneca County in western New York, Wade was the son of a surveyor and civil engineer. Skilled with his hands, as a young man Wade was involved in small manufacturing enterprises. He turned to portrait painting in 1835, and took up photography only a few years after daguerreotype technology was brought to the United States from France.[3] At about the same time Samuel F. B. Morse, another portrait painter with a bent for the technological, including photography, invented an electronic telegraph: he laid out the first commercial line from Washington to Baltimore in 1844.[4] Wade was attracted to the new mode of communications and in 1847 took a franchise from Morse to build a line between Jackson and Detroit, Michigan, the first line west of Buffalo. Wade quickly established a reputation for economical and rapid construction of telegraph lines, and became an important supervisor of new lines.

Perhaps Wade's most important effort was the creation of the Cleveland and Cincinnati Telegraph Company in 1849. He purchased the rights to construct a telegraph line between the two cities from the agents of Morse, organized the company in Cleveland, and was elected the company's first president. He then arranged to extend the line to St. Louis. After the initial construction of the St. Louis segment proved faulty, Wade took over operations. He found the line beset with both the problems

3. *Cleveland Past and Present: Its Representative Men* (Cleveland: Maurice Joblin, 1869), pp. 442, 445; Reese V. Jenkins, *Images and Enterprise: Technology and the American Photographic Industry, 1839 to 1925* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), pp. 12-13.
4. On Morse and the relationship between art and technology, see: Brooke Hindle, *Emulation and Invention* (New York: New York University Press, 1981).

of making an infant technology work and a lack of competent and reliable employees in the rural regions between the cities.[5]

According to Wade there was "a very great want of system in the working of the line, and keeping the accounts before it came into my hands" and he undertook "the resurrection, completion and organization of the line."[6] It was probably this experience with bringing order out of chaos on the St. Louis line that led Wade to consider the advantages of consolidating the independent and competing telegraph companies that had sprung up throughout the Midwest. His success as both an entrepreneur and an operator gave him credibility among the proprietors of the new telegraph lines, and by the end of 1853 he was able to persuade those owning a total of 2,500 miles of wire to associate as the Speed & Wade Telegraph Lines, J.J. Speed being Samuel F. B. Morse's patent agent for the region. Three years later a formal merger of the lines took place with the creation of the Western Union Company. Wade served as the new company's "General Agent," established his office in Cleveland, and from 1862-867 served as president of Western Union.[7] Wade's

5. J.J. Speed to J.H. Wade, 2 May 1849, folder 2, box 5, Jeptha H. Wade Papers (hereafter Wade Papers), Western Reserve Historical Society (hereafter WRHS), Cleveland, Ohio; J.H. Wade to Amos Kendall, 30 November 1849, folder 2, box 5, Wade Papers; transfer of rights, J.H. Wade to Cleveland and Cincinnati Telegraph Co., 15 September 1857, folder 2, box 5, Wade Papers; *Cleveland Past and Present*, p. 443; *Annals of Cleveland 33* (1850): 446. The *Annals of Cleveland* series is a compilation of early and mid-19th century Cleveland newspaper articles, and is an invaluable source for that period of the city's history.
6. J.H. Wade to the trustees of the Cincinnati and St. Louis Telegraph Co., 1 July 1852, folder 2, box 5, Wade Papers.
7. *Cleveland, Past and Present*, p. 443; Rose, Cleveland, pp. 263, 277; J.H. Wade to [U.S. Congress?], 21 December 1857, folder 4, box 5, Wade Papers. The earliest letterhead of the Western Union Company in the Wade Papers is dated 1 October 1856, and reads "Western Union

business acumen, and prominent position in Western Union, soon gave him a leading role in Cleveland's business affairs. By the end of the Civil War he was one of the wealthiest men in the city, and in later years he became an investor in a range of the city's industries, banks, and railroads.[8] In 1866 Wade built a fine house on Euclid Avenue at 40th street (Euclid from 22nd to 40th was soon to be known as "Millionaires' Row") and, confirming his rise to social prominence, he entertained President Grant there in 1870.[9]

A man of Wade's wealth in Victorian America naturally received many requests for aid, both from charities and from individuals, and he responded generously to them. He was, for example, an early supporter of the City Industrial School for poor children (organized in the 1850s) and of the Convent of the Good Shepherd (established 1869), a training home for delinquent girls.[10] Yet there was stirring in the 1860s and 1870s a more organized view of philanthropy, a view which must have appealed to a system-thinker like Wade.

Telegraph, Consolidation of the House, Morse, O'Reilly, Wade, Speed & Cornell Lines": Hiram Sibley to J.H. Wade, 3 October 1856, folder 4, box 5, Wade Papers.

8. William G. Rose, *Cleveland: The Making of a City* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1950), pp. 332, 351, 352; *Annals of Cleveland 48*, pt. 1 (1865): 309, 49 (1866): 10, 50 (1867): 31, 64, 53 (1870): 401, 54 (1871): 34, 36; Randall Wade to J.H. Wade, 11 October 1866, folder 4, box 1, Wade Papers; *Cleveland, Past and Present*, p. 445.
9. Randall Wade to J.H. Wade, 10 May 1866, folder 4, box 1, Wade Papers; Rose, *Cleveland*, p. 374; Eric Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society. 1979), pp. 13 19; Warren Corning Wick, *My Recollections of Old Cleveland: Manners, Mansions, Mischief* (Cleveland: Carpenter Reserve Printing, 1979), p. 38, map frontispiece.
10. List of individual benefactions, 1870s - 1880s, box 1, Wade Papers; Rose, *Cleveland*, pp. 263-64, 357.

Many historians have dated the rise of systematic philanthropy in the United States to the early phases of the Civil War when a cascade of early humanitarian support for the Northern armies was perceived by some leaders as out of control, and likely to harm the military effort. One historian of the period has noted that leaders of the urban business sector "believed that this instinct of benevolence if left uncontrolled would wreck the army and then the state."[11] Drawing on earlier methods of the anti-slavery and temperance movements, they created the U.S. Sanitary Commission in June of 1861, which sponsored organized fundraising, attempted to unite all of the relief societies, and tried to apply the best medical and sanitary knowledge in dispensing aid. In Cleveland the Soldiers' Aid Society of Northern Ohio became an agency of the Sanitary Commission. A "sanitary fair" held on Public Square (the center of downtown Cleveland) in 1864 made this new, proto-professional form of philanthropy well-known to all citizens.[12]

The success of the Sanitary Commission initiated the latter 19th-century enthusiasm for the charity organization society movement, an attempt to create city-wide systems of benevolence for the host of urban charities that were being founded.[13] Wade was a leader of the effort that created the Charity Organization Society of Cleveland in 1881.[14] Indeed, from the post Civil War years to his death in 1890 Wade was largely engaged in the creation or administration of institutions

11. Christine Boyer, *Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983), p. 20.
12. *Ibid*, pp. 19-20.
13. *Ibid*, p. 24.
14. *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 11, 15, 18, 29 January 1881.

which were intended to shape and preserve the social fabric of what many observers of his generation saw as the chaotic industrializing city. He successfully transferred his organizational vision from the business environment to the social and cultural environment. Wade gave time and effort to the control of what many thought of as the greatest problems of urban society — caring for the alienated and unwanted — by serving as director of both the Cleveland Workhouse and of the House of Correction (the city prison), and as a trustee of the Children's Aid Society (which operated an industrial school for poor children).[15] Wade was particularly involved with the workhouse, providing virtually daily supervision of operations.

While he utilized much of his time and resources for the poor and distressed, it appears that Wade directed the bulk of the philanthropic use of his wealth toward institutions that provided cultural, educational, and recreational institutions for the emerging middle and upper classes. He was a founder of the Northern Ohio Fairground (at Glenville) in 1870, supported the establishment of the Euclid Avenue Opera House in 1873, and helped construct a new campus for the Brooks preparatory School in 1875. Ultimately Wade focused his philanthropy on what became University Circle.[16]

Wade first became interested in the future Circle through his entrepreneurial activities. When he became president of the Citizens Savings and Loan Association in 1868 he learned much

15. Rose, Cleveland, p. 376; *Annals of Cleveland 57* (1874): 441, 443.
16. Rose, *Cleveland*, pp. 370, 398; Randall Wade to J.H. Wade II, 18 April 1875, folder 4, box 1, and W.H. Eckman to J.H. Wade, 8 July 1879, folder 1, box 1, Wade Papers; *Annals of Cleveland 58* (1875): 788.

about Cleveland real estate that was mortgaged or used as collateral. Wade was often advised by Liberty E. Holden, an employee of the bank and a former educator who had become a speculator in land in East Cleveland, a township east of Cleveland that was annexed by the city in 1872. (Holden's own residence was located in that township, in the heart of the future campuses of Western Reserve University and the Case School of Applied Sciences.) Through their work at the bank and as two of the organizers of the Lake View Cemetery Association in 1869 (located just east of Holden's residence), Holden introduced Wade further to the Cleveland real estate market.[17] Purchasing several east Cleveland tracts in 1870, Wade laid them out into residential lots and streets typical of land developments of the era.[18]

In 1871 Wade purchased the old Samuel Cozad farm lying along the Doan Brook valley and just north of Liberty Holden's property. Almost immediately Wade set aside much of this land as a park, open to the public. How Wade came to the decision to create Wade Park is unknown. As early as 1867 he could have read in the newspaper that a group of citizens had met with the mayor to discuss the need to acquire parkland, and that one area suggested was the Doan Creek valley. He probably knew that Clevelanders had only Public Square and the new, but small, Lakeview Park as places to escape the industrial-commercial bustle of Cleveland, and that green space accessible

17. Samuel P. Orth, *A History of Cleveland, Ohio* (Chicago and Cleveland: S.J. Clarke Publishing, 1910), pp. 149-50, 646; J.H. Wade to Susan F. Wade, 21 August 1870, folder 1, box 1, Wade Papers.
18. J.H. Wade to Susan F. Wade, 21 August 1870, and J.H. Wade to family, 10 September 1870, folder 1, box 1, Wade Papers.

to residential areas was rapidly disappearing. Possibly Wade anticipated that a park would improve the value of his other land nearby, as Central Park had in New York. Moreover, Wade probably agreed with contemporary reformers that parks promoted good citizenship: a writer to the *Cleveland Leader* in 1874, for example, stated that "excepting churches and their collateral agencies, [there is] no better conservator of public morals [than a public park]."[19]

Wade made the Cozad farm into a park by laying out and grading walks and carriageways. Like many other American parks created at this time, Wade's park exhibited some of the qualities of the country: trees, meadows, pools, and wandering lanes, although it was on the edge of a city.[20] With the wooded Doan Creek valley and an old millpond within the Wade Park bounds, it was not difficult to create an environment of trees and woodland flowers thought to "awaken every agreeable passion of the soul," as one contemporary expressed it.[21]

19. J.H. Wade to Randall Wade, 13 April 1871, folder 1, box 1, Wade Papers; Edmund H. Chapman, *Early Cleveland: The Formation of a City, 1796-1875* (n.p., 1951), p. 114; *Annals of Cleveland 50* (1867): 41516, 57 (1874): 439; Richard E. Foglesong, *Planning the Capitalist City: The Colonial Era to the 1920s* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 10708. I.T. Frary, in a memoir of life in the Circle, asserts that Liberty Holden persuaded Wade to purchase the land and create the park, a plausible but unsubstantiated scenario: I.T. Frary, "Doan's Corners," (typescript), ch. 12, p. 6a, folder 2, container 1, I.T. Frary Papers, WRHS.
20. Galen Cranz, *The Politics of Park Design: A History of Urban Parks in America* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1982), pp. 5, 34, 40; Boyer, *Dreaming*, p. 39; Randall Wade to Jeptha Wade II, 28 September 1873, folder 5, box 1, Wade Papers; Orth, *Cleveland*, p. 171.
21. Wilson Flagg, in the *Atlantic Monthly* (1871), quoted in John R. Silgoe, *Borderland: Origins of the American Suburb, 1820-1939* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), p. 190.

Wade Park was almost immediately a great success: in June, 1874 it was reported that the park was "throng[ed] . . . every pleasant afternoon."[22] Later the same year the city council implicitly recognized the addition of a considerable asset to Cleveland by naming a new thoroughfare bordering the park on the north "Wade Park Avenue."[23] The park was quite accessible to Clevelanders who owned horses and carriages because Euclid Road had been paved out to Doan Brook in 1871. In 1876 the *Cleveland Leader* urged Clevelanders to ride out to Wade Park to escape the summer heat.[24]

While Wade Park was open to all of the city's residents, clearly it was designed for (as well as being the most accessible to) the middle and upper-classes, who favored the presumably morally-improving and health-sustaining rambles in the woods, and horse-and-carriage rides along curved, shady lanes that the park provided. It was the kind of setting in which the twelve-year-old John D. Rockefeller, Jr., on a carriage ride with a friend, could discuss his hopes and aspirations for his future.[25] The raucous entertainment of baseball was discouraged (no diamonds, or other athletic fields, were laid out), nor was a beer and polka party acceptable there: East Cleveland was dominated by the temperance movement.[26] A Clevelander of 1874 expressed the

22. *Annals of Cleveland 57* (1874): 439.
23. *Ibid*, 57 (1874): 725.
24. J.H. Wade to Randall Wade, 13 April 1871, folder 1, box 1, Wade Papers.
25. Kate S. Sewell to John D. Rockefeller Jr., 11 March 1937, K.S.S. folder, box 19, RG 3.2, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC), Sleepy Hollow, NY. For comments on the orientation of Victorian-era parks toward upper class and normative behaviors, see: Cranz, *Politics*, pp. 34, 40, and Boyer, *Dreaming*, pp. 33, 34-37.
26. *Annals of Cleveland 56* (1873): 95, 582, 57 (1874): 765, 59 (1876):

opinion that "for the miserable wretches who frequent liquor saloons and other dens of iniquity … a public park would have no charms," a view which helped to justify the style of Wade Park's development.[27] Frederick Law Olmstead, the leading American landscape architect of New York's Central Park and several other major urban parks expressed the similar view that they should be developed for the middle and upper classes, with the hope that (as he observed in Central Park) these pleasure grounds would have "a distinctly harmonizing and refining influence upon the unfortunate and most lawless classes of the city — an influence favorable to courtesy, self control, and temperance."[28]

The concern for sobriety and uplift associated with Wade Park, and with the residents of East Cleveland township generally, were undoubtedly major factors in the choice of Liberty Holden's and Martha Ford's nearby homesteads as the sites for Case School of Applied Sciences and Western Reserve University in 1881. The new campus was on a site which was not only protected from the evils of alcohol but which also provided an environment acceptable for outdoor entertainments. The president of Western Reserve College, in discussing the proposed location with his trustees, specifically noted that it was "opposite Wade Park."[29] For many years spring and fall boating

1057; *Historic Sites of Cleveland: Hotels and Taverns* (Columbus, OH: Ohio Historical Records Survey Project, 1942), pp. 247-67.

27. *Annals of Cleveland 57* (1874): 440.
28. Quoted in Stanley K. Schultz, *Constructing Urban Culture: American Cities and City Planning, 1800-1920* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), p. 158
29. 2 March 1881, minutes, Trustees of Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives

on the Wade Park lagoon, and ice-skating in the winter, were primary sources of recreation for Western Reserve and Case students.

Wade himself had no small role bringing the schools to East Cleveland. He was an original incorporator of the Case School in 1880, and the next year he served as one of the trustees for the subscriptions collected from prominent Clevelanders for the purchase of the land for the two institutions.[30] Many of those who made donations, such as William Halsey Doan, Stephen V. Harkness, Liberty E. Holden, and John D. Rockefeller, and the East Cleveland Railroad Company, were staunch temperance advocates and owned property or had other economic interests in the area.

The creation of the dual campuses on the Circle probably played some part in Wade's decision in June 1881 to transfer his park to the city, though he continued to own considerable land north and east of it. He offered the park as a gift, provided that the city spend $75,000 on improvements, and that the city agree to keep it perpetually as a park with the name Wade Park. After some debate over the terms, including concerns about the park's apparent appeal to a limited segment of citizens, the city council acquired Wade Park by accepting the deed in September 1882.[31]

Wade's terms also included a restriction on the future use of a nearly four-acre tract, called the "college reserve," in the center

30. 19 March 1881, *Ibid*; "Articles of Incorporation," 29 March 1880, minutes, Trustees of Case School of Applied Sciences, Case Western Reserve University Archives (hereafter CWRU Archives), Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
31. Rose, *Cleveland*, p. 453.

of the park and identified it as the future site of an art gallery. Wade had a strong interest in the visual arts: not only did he have practical experience as a portrait painter, but he was a trustee and later president of an art academy organized in Cleveland in the late 1870s.[32]

Throughout his development of the park in the 1870s, Wade had supervised the layout of Lake View Cemetery, about a mile to the east of the park. From its beginning in 1869 the cemetery was aimed largely at a white, Protestant, well-to-do clientele, not only as a future burial ground, but also (in typical Victorian fashion) as a place to walk or ride. In the first year or two Wade, as president of the cemetery association, personally directed much of the original improvement of the land, and erected a burial monument for himself and his wife. In 1871 through his son Randall, who was traveling in Europe that year, he purchased Italian statuary for the grounds.[33]

In 1881 after the assassination of President James A. Garfield, who was a native of Cuyahoga County, Wade joined fellow Cleveland businessmen H.B. Payne and Joseph Perkins (with whom he had collaborated, among others, in the purchase of land for the Reserve and Case campuses) to raise funds for a suitable monument to be erected on the burial site in Lake

32. *Ibid*; Carl Wittke, *The First Fifty Years: The Cleveland Museum of Art, 1916-1966* (Cleveland: John Huntington Art and Polytechnic Trust and Cleveland Museum of Art, 1966), pp. 15-16, 32, 34. Note that in 1876 Wade was among those who recommended to Clevelanders "Dubufe's great painting THE PRODIGAL SON, which is being exhibited at Case Hall": *Annals of Cleveland 59* (1876): 17.
33. J.H. Wade to Susan F. Wade, 21 August 1870, J.H. Wade to family, 10 September 1870, J.H. Wade to Randall Wade, 8 February 1871, folder 1, box 1, Wade Papers.

View that Garfield had stipulated. The next year the Garfield Memorial Association was incorporated with Wade as a leading promoter. The monument was completed and opened to the public in 1890.[34] It features a tower with a balcony overlooking the east side of Cleveland and Lake Erie, and an interior memorial room with a full-sized statue of Garfield.

Jeptha Wade died in 1890, the same year that the Garfield Memorial was completed, leaving behind a substantial legacy of philanthropy, some completed and some in progress, as well as substantial land holdings in Cleveland. After his son Randall Wade died in 1876 Jeptha Wade commissioned his namesake and grandson, Jeptha Homer Wade II, to carry out "the duties, cares and responsibilities that for so long I had hoped would be shared between you and your worthy and beloved father."[35] Jeptha H. Wade II did in fact carry out his grandfather's legacy, helping to realize his dream of an art museum in the park, participating actively in the growth of Western Reserve University, and developing a substantial block of real estate adjacent to the park.[36]

* * *

Hiram C. Haydn (1831-1913) was a graduate of Union Theological Seminary in New York. He filled pulpits in

34. Rose, *Cleveland*, pp. 448, 519. Payne and Wade were close friends: H.F. Biggar, *Loiterings in Europe with Mr. J.H. Wade, Col. William Edwards, Senator H.B. Payne: Summer 1885* (Cleveland: O.S. Hubbell, 1908), p. 15.
35. J.H. Wade to Jeptha H. Wade II, [summer-fall 1879], folder 1, box 1, Wade Papers.
36. Jeptha H. Wade II's disposition of his land holdings in University Circle is taken up at various points throughout this volume.

Connecticut until called to the Painesville (Ohio) Congregational Church in 1866. He quickly became active in various social and educational activities in the region, speaking at Western Reserve College in Hudson, and at the YMCA and the 2nd Presbyterian Church in Cleveland. He was then called to serve as associate pastor at the First Presbyterian Church in Cleveland in 1872, and was so well-known that he was appointed without delivering the usual trial sermon.[37]

First Presbyterian Church, usually known as Old Stone Church, was (and is) located in an impressive building on the north side of Public Square in downtown Cleveland. It was a leader in a closely-knit group of Presbyterian churches in Cleveland that claimed a large number of leading citizens as members. At First Presbyterian such businessmen-industrialists as Amasa Stone, Sereno P. Fenn, and Samuel Williamson, Jr. were pillars of the church: Leonard Case rented a pew and left a portion of his estate to Old Stone.[38] To this group Haydn unhesitatingly preached sermons on philanthropy, temperance, and on "The Getting and Spending of Money." Many prominent members of Old Stone were, or became, leaders in social service, educational, and cultural institutions.[39]

Through his philanthropic and ministerial interests Hayden early became acquainted with Western Reserve College and in the

37. Arthur C. Ludlow, *The Old Stone Church: The Story of a Hundred Years, 1820-1920* (Cleveland: privately printed, 1920), pp. 198-203; *Annals of Cleveland 50* (1867): 105, 55 (1872): 66, 131, 391.
38. Ludlow, *Old Stone Church*, pp. 219, 221; Michael J. McTighe, "Leading Men, True Women, Protestant Churches, and the Shape of Antebellum Benevolence," p. 26.
39. *Annals of Cleveland 57* (1874): 25, 847; 58 (1875): 100, 822.

1870s served as a trustee. The college, located at Hudson, about 25 miles southeast of Cleveland, was a child of the Presbyterian-Congregational Plan of Union in the Western Reserve, an 1801 agreement between the two denominations to join in the creation of congregations to serve the newly-settled Midwest. In 1822 the Plan of Union churches in the Reserve urged the creation of an institution to train ministers for the rapidly-growing region; and in 1826 Western Reserve College was opened. Although its state charter gave it a broad educational mandate, the college for many years had a ministerial orientation in administration, faculty, and student body.[40]

Over time Western Reserve College grew to have close associations with Cleveland. In 1843 the college established a medical department (essentially a medical school) in the city, and by the 1870s the college trustees normally held one of their semi-annual meetings in Cleveland, usually simultaneous with the awarding of degrees to medical graduates. The connections with the city were also strengthened by outreach to Clevelanders for endowment funds, and by the increasing number of their sons (it was until the 1870s a men-only school) graduating from Western Reserve. By 1869 it was reasonable to hold an alumni meeting just for Clevelanders.[41]

However, the college never was financially healthy, and in the 1870s it had declining enrollments. While it had a sound faculty

40. Clarence H. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve: A History of the University 1826-1976* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976), pp. 5-11; *Annals of Cleveland 50* (1867): 105.
41. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, p. 295; *Annals of Cleveland 32* (1849): 36-37, 52 (1869): 89; 1870s, minutes, Trustees of Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives.

and a good academic reputation, it was experiencing severe competition for students from other colleges in northern Ohio. The opening of Wooster College in 1870 was particularly discouraging, because it was Presbyterian and drew away denominational students and financial support. Other than closing Western Reserve College, the obvious solutions were either to increase the endowment or to draw on a new pool of students. Hiram Haydn envisioned a way to do both.[42]

The first public intimation of a plan for an alternative future for the college was an editorial in the *Cleveland Herald* of December 13, 1877 arguing for the removal of Western Reserve to Cleveland, and suggesting that a wealthy Clevelander should become the guarantor of the costs of the move. The editor of the paper was a member of Haydn's Old Stone Church. The president of the college, Carroll Cutler, suspected that Haydn was behind the editorial, probably because Haydn had presented a similar idea at a trustee's meeting.[43]

At the next meeting of the trustees there was further evidence of collusion when Haydn presented a statement of his vision for the college followed immediately by a statement by Dr. John Bennett, dean of medicine, on "the interests of the Medical Department." Both statements argued for a move to Cleveland, and were referred to a committee of trustees which deliberated nearly two years until on March 3, 1880 when "Mr. Haydn reported that a gentleman of wealth desired to know whether the Trustees would be willing to have the College removed

42. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 75-77.
43. Hiram C. Haydn, *Hudson to Cleveland, 1878-1890: An Historical Sketch* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University, 1905), pp. 38-44.

to Cleveland and what they would consider requisite for its successful removal."[44]

The gentleman was Amasa Stone, a Cleveland businessman and a member of Old Stone Church. He had entered the field of bridge building and railroad construction in the early 1840s in New England, and had moved to Cleveland by 1851 to take advantage of the railroad boom in the Midwest. Stone usually took stock as payment for his services, and because the railroads he built were profitable he quickly became quite wealthy; he then invested further in banking, and the iron and steel industries. In the 1860s and 1870s he was superintendent of several Cleveland-area railroads and became known for his skill in coordinating and consolidating operations of intersecting lines. Stone turned to philanthropy in the 1870s, funding buildings for the Home for Aged Women and the City Industrial School. This impulse was probably magnified by Stone's sense of responsibility for the fatalities that resulted from the collapse of a railroad bridge on one of his railroad lines at Ashtabula in northeastern Ohio on December 29, 1876. In 1863 Stone had overruled the company's bridge engineer and had insisted on using an untested iron design for the bridge rather than the usual wooden form. Although iron was obviously a stronger material than wood, little was known about its long-term performance under heavy moving loads, such as trains; the Ashtabula bridge failed when a passenger train crossed it in an ice storm: ninety-two people were killed. An investigation revealed Stone's significant role in designing the bridge.[45]

44. 28 June 1878, 7 July 1880, minutes, Trustees of Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives.
45. Darwin H. Stapleton, "Amasa Stone," in Robert L. Frey, ed.,

Haydn was able to persuade Stone that moving Western Reserve College to Cleveland was the greatest object for his philanthropy, perhaps developing the idea, as Clarence Cramer has written, of "the necessity for some kind of propitiation for [the] disaster at Ashtabula."[46] But Stone was a tough businessman and did not simply donate the money for the trustees to do with as they pleased; he applied his business acumen to the venture, particularly his skills in consolidation and control. While he agreed to the trustees' stipulation that he should provide $400,000 for the college's endowment and set aside $100,000 as a building fund, he insisted that (1) the Cleveland campus be "in close proximity and harmony with" the site chosen for the new Case School of Applied Science, (2) that the undergraduate college be renamed Adelbert College, using the name of his son who had drowned in 1865, and (3) that eleven of the trustees resign and be replaced by his nominees, effectively giving his personal circle control of the board.[47]

By the spring of 1881 the existing trustees (at least one of whom, Hinman Hurlbut, was a former business partner of his) had accepted Stone's terms. All of his appointees were Clevelanders or Ohioans: five were wealthy businessmen (Hurlbut [reappointed], William J. Boardman, Liberty E. Holden, William H. Doan, Samuel Andrews (the latter three being current or

Encyclopedia of American Business History and Biography: Railroads in the Nineteenth Century (New York: Bruccoli Clark Layman, 1988), pp. 379-81.

46. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, p. 81.
47. 20 September 1880, minutes, Trustees of Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives; Amasa Stone to Carroll Cutler, 8 December 1880, in 19 March 1881, minutes, Trustees of Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives.

former residents of Doan's Corners); three were prominent in politics or the military (Rutherford B. Hayes [former President of the United States], James A. Garfield [President of the United States], and Captain William H. Harris); two were churchmen (Rev. Charles T. Collins, of Plymouth Congregational Church, and George H. Ely, an elder of the North Presbyterian Church); and one was his son-in-law, John Hay (later U.S. Secretary of State). The illustrious character of this new set of board members indicates that Stone, and presumably his minister, Hiram Haydn, intended that the relocated college would attain a prominent rank both regionally and nationally.[48] And it was no coincidence that most of the trustees also were well-known for their temperance views.

Stone subsequently took charge of negotiations regarding the division of the Holden-Ford tract with Case School, and supervised the construction of Adelbert College, the first classroom and administration building for Western Reserve University on the new campus. By the time of his death in the spring of 1883 Stone's gifts to the University totaled nearly $600,000 and the students and faculty had completed their first year on their new campus across from Wade Park. The college had also initiated the process (completed in 1884) of obtaining a new state charter as Western Reserve University.[49]

48. Amasa Stone to Carroll Cutler, 18 March 1881, in 19 March 1881, minutes, Trustees of Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives; Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, pp. 30-31.
49. R.P. Ranney to Amasa Stone, 14 June 1881, and Amasa Stone to R.P. Ranney, 14 June 1881, Cady Staley Papers, CWRU Archives; Edward W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 12 September 1882, Edward W. Morley Papers (photocopies), CWRU Archives; 19 June 1883, minutes, Trustees of Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives; Amasa Stone account book, 1880-82, folder 5, container 23, Samuel Mather Family Papers,

Haydn continued to have a strong interest in Western Reserve throughout the early years after the move. He became interim president of the school when President Carroll Cutler resigned in 1886, in the expectation that Charles Thwing would soon succeed him as president. Thwing, a young Congregationalist minister trained at Harvard and Andover Theological Seminary, was known by Haydn through their common work for the Commissioners of Foreign Missions. After three years as acting president Haydn persuaded him to accept the position, which Thwing remained in for over thirty years.

However, even in his brief three-year term Haydn tried to mold the University according to his ideas. In a summary statement joining his sense of vision with his recognition of the role of philanthropy he later recalled that "[I] had one desirable qualification. [I] believed in the future of the College and that here was a great opportunity to create an educational center; [I] also had the confidence of [my] fellow citizens to whom appeals [for money] must first be made."[50]

Haydn immediately directed the end of co-education (women had been attending Western Reserve since 1872), and created a separate female division known as the College for Women. He firmly believed, as did a majority of the trustees, that the University would grow only if it emulated the great institutions of the east, such as Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, which were exclusively male, rather than emulating dangerously liberal,

Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland, Ohio; Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture*, pp. 29-30; Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 94-107.

50. Haydn, *From Hudson to Cleveland*, p. 81.

upstart coeducational institutions such as Oberlin or Swarthmore. His decision was not based upon disdain for female education: he proved to be an effective fundraiser for the College for Women, and when Thwing became president Haydn accepted an appointment as vice president for the College, conducted its chapel, and taught Biblical literature there.[51]

Haydn's other efforts to raise the stature of Western Reserve were not so successful. He wanted to draw into an affiliation with Western Reserve three other institutions: Case School of Applied Science, the Conservatory of Music, and the Cleveland School of Art. Haydn persuaded the trustees that there would be advantages to all parties by such a confederation, and in June 1888 the schools of music and art associated with the University by a merger of faculties. Case School, however, vigorously maintained the cooperative independence it had asserted from the first merger overtures of Western Reserve in 1881.[52]

Although the University went so far as to purchase land to the west of the campus and make plans for a building to accommodate both the music and design of schools, the relationships foundered on the differing natures of education conducted by the schools and the ideals of the liberal arts. For example, the University appointed a dean for the School of Art who emphasized the fine arts, while that school had been founded to promote better design of industrial products. The school's original trustees objected and in 1891 decided to

51. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 97-103.
52. Haydn, *Hudson to Cleveland*, pp. 89-90, 189, 193-94; 24 January 1888, 7 March 1888, 7 March 1888, 19 June 1888, minutes, Trustees of Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives; 12 January 1881, minutes, Trustees of Case School of Applied Science, CWRU Archives

withdraw from the University. A year later Thwing severed the relationship with the Conservatory of Music. Neither school having given up its own boards of trustees, they easily returned to independence, none the worse for their experience. Under Thwing, Western Reserve grew by the gradual creation of entirely new schools and departments rather than the awkward grafting of existing institutions.[53]

Nonetheless, Haydn had promoted an ambitious vision of the future of the University which had set an agenda of expansion. Like Jeptha Wade, and Amasa Stone, Haydn left an indelible imprint on the history of University Circle.

53. Haydn, *Hudson to Cleveland*, pp. 192-93; Nancy Coe Wixom, *Cleveland Institute of Art: The First Hundred Years, 1882-1982* (Cleveland: Cleveland Institute of Art, 1883), pp. 13-16; Orth, Cleveland, p. 453.

5. Case School and Its Neighbor: Community as Co-Existence

"College matters are moving pleasantly. Our students give us as little trouble as possible."[1] Perhaps with intended humor, so wrote Professor Morley of Western Reserve University on October 24, 1886 on his third year at the new campus in Cleveland at what was within twenty years to be known as University Circle. But the tranquility he described was abruptly disturbed two days later when there was a disastrous fire in the only building at the neighboring Case School of Applied Sciences. Notes and perhaps equipment crucial to experiments Morley was conducting with Case professor Albert Michelson were destroyed, and for the next two years the students and faculty of Case crowded into the two Western Reserve buildings.[2]

1. E.W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 25 October 1886, E.W. Morley Papers (hereafter Morley Papers), Case Western Reserve University Archives (hereafter CWRU Archives), Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
2. Clarence H. Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology: A Centennial History, 1880-1980* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1980), pp.

This incident might stand as a paradigm for the history of the interrelations between the two oldest institutions of higher learning in Cleveland. Generally they were content to pursue their own futures, and did so without serious interference from students, donors, or faculty, but on occasion the two schools proved to be indispensable companions.

Western Reserve might have been the only Cleveland college with 19th-century roots had not Leonard Case, Jr. believed that the citizens of the growing industrial region of northeast Ohio needed technical education. The Western Reserve trustees believed so, too, but when they voted in 1877 to begin an engineering course at their institution, they allocated only $150 to support it. No faculty was available at that price, even the instruments and models necessary to teach civil and mechanical engineering would have cost far more than that. The course was stillborn.[3]

But a far bolder plan was in the offing: in February 1877, just a few months before the Western Reserve trustees had taken their action, Leonard Case, Jr. had set up a secret trust fund to provide for the creation of the Case School of Applied Science at his death. Case had been born in the Western Reserve and raised in Cleveland, where his father had acquired large real estate holdings. After graduating from Yale in 1842, the younger

51-52. Whereas several writers have stated that the equipment for Michelson's ether-drift experiment was lost in the fire, Morley's own description mentions only that "Michelson and [Case professor Charles] Mabery lost their books and lecture notes, and also their notes of work done. Mabery lost a good deal of this kind." E.W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 16 November 1886, Morley Papers.

3. 27 June 1877, Trustees' minutes, Western Reserve College (hereafter Trustees' minutes, WRC), CWRU Archives.

Leonard Case returned to Cleveland with decided intellectual tastes. He became an active participant in a group of natural history fanciers led by his brother William.[4]

The group met in a wooden building next to the family home on Superior Avenue across from the northeast corner of Public Square, and accumulated so many stuffed animals and other natural curiosities that they took to calling their building "the Ark." They became known as the Arkites, and from their fertile minds came the origins of many of the earlier cultural institutions of Cleveland, including the Western Reserve Historical Society and the Cleveland Library Association.[5]

The immediate impetus for Case's educational legacy for his native city is uncertain. His father held stock in various industrial enterprises, and the son undoubtedly became acquainted with many technically-inclined men as a result, but Case would not have been impressed by their academic preparation: industry was by-and-large run by people who learned on the job, not in schools.

Two things are certain. First, Case had a strong, philanthropic bent. He believed that he should return to Cleveland a just proportion of what he earned there. When on his father's death in 1864 he inherited a substantial amount of investments in city real estate and industries Case apparently gave little thought to personally spending the income, let alone the principal. He

4. Walter B. Hendrickson, *The Arkites and Other Pioneer Natural History Organizations in Cleveland* (Cleveland, OH: Press of Western Reserve University, 1962).
5. Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology*, pp. 1-5.

began distributing much of his income to worthy charities. Second, Case grew more and more enamored of science, and believed that higher education institutions in the United States were reluctant to encourage its development.[6] The most promising areas for the serious study of science were in the mining and technical schools attached to the state colleges of the Midwest and West, and a few engineering colleges scattered across the country.[7]

In February of 1877 Leonard Case, Jr. turned to his confidant and lawyer Henry G. Abbey to create a deed of trust for five large parcels of land in the heart of Cleveland. At his death these parcels were to be conveyed to a new entity, to be called the Case School of Applied Science, which (he specified) would have teachers and professors of mathematics, physics, civil and mechanical engineering, chemistry, economics, geology, mining and metallurgy, natural history, drawing, and the modern languages. Case made certain that the curriculum for his school was outlined clearly to the future trustees of his benefaction.[8]

When Case died early in 1880 Henry Abbey quickly incorporated the Case School of Applied Science. He chose fifteen prominent citizens of Cleveland as the original

6. *Ibid*, pp. 6-7, 9. In 1872 a Cleveland newspaper reported that Leonard Case, Jr. was worth $7-10 million, and was a "modest, unassuming gentleman whose charitable activities are quiet, but it is believed that he distributes about $100,000 annually in benefits: *Annals of Cleveland 55* (1872): 65.
7. Lawrence P. Grayson, "A Brief History of Engineering Education in the United States," *Engineering Education* 66 (1977): 246-64.
8. Deed of Trust, Leonard Case, Jr. to Henry G. Abbey, 24 February 1877, in Trustee's minutes, Case School of Applied Sciences (hereafter Trustee's minutes, CSAS), CWRU Archives.

incorporators, including Jepha Wade and at least three who lived in the Doan's Corners area: J.H. Devereaux, W.S. Streator, and Samuel Williamson. Others were some of the Arkites, and others were men chiefly known for their contributions to Cleveland's commerce and industry.

In the latter category was Captain Alva Bradley, a wealthy Great Lakes ship-owner who was a friend of Samuel Edison of Milan, Ohio. Samuel had named his now-famous son Thomas Alva Edison as a gesture of appreciation for Captain Bradley's close business relationship with him.[9]

The incorporators (five of whom were later selected as trustees) had two major decisions to make: how to organize the institution and where it should be located. Since none of the men were educators they looked for outside help. Case's close friend John Stockwell, a Clevelander who had published mathematical and astronomical treatises (in part with Case's support), suggested several consultants to the trustees to whom they wrote for advice. Benjamin Gould, a prominent American astronomer with a Ph.D. from the famous German university at Göttingen, drew up the plan that most appealed to the business-oriented incorporators.[10]

Gould told them that some level of instruction should begin immediately, and that the Case homestead, now on their land at Rockwell Avenue in the center of Cleveland, was adequate

9. Matthew Josephson, *Edison* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), pp. 2, 12.
10. Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology*, pp. 19-20, 24-25; Clark A. Elliott, *Biographical Dictionary of American Science: The Seventeenth Through the Nineteenth Centuries* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979), pp. 106-7, 242.

for the purpose. He thought that good teachers and sufficient scientific and technical apparatus could be secured for only $10,000 per year until such time as the trust had generated enough additional income to erect a suitable building.

The incorporators had felt unprepared to carry out Case's wishes immediately, and worried about squandering their trust on bricks and mortar. Taking Gould's advice, they believed, meant that they could learn "experimentally the kind and direction of the instruction demanded by the industries of Northern Ohio, and the extent and character of the accommodation [that is, the building] necessary to render such instruction most efficient."[11] This tough-minded approach to education and finance remained characteristic of Case School throughout the next century.

The school was organized quickly with John Stockwell as the head instructor, and in April 1881 seven students met in the Case homestead to study mathematics, astronomy, French and German for a preparatory term of three months. Regular classes began in the fall and continued at the homestead through the spring of 1885 when the first graduation was held, with five degrees awarded in civil and mechanical engineering.[12] The faculty had by then grown to four, with the addition of professors John Eisenman (civil engineering). Albert A. Michelson (physics and electrical engineering), and Charles F. Mabery (chemistry).[13]

11. 4 April 1881, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.
12. 3 April 1882, 6 June 1885, Trustees' minutes, CSAS. There were also five certificates granted in chemistry for taking a rigorous one-semester course in languages, physics, mathematics and analytical chemistry: William Meriam diary, 1885, CWRU Archives.
13. The faculty was first appointed as instructors, but all were promoted to

Simultaneous with their search for faculty the Case trustees had participated jointly in the search for a site to locate both Western Reserve College and their new school in Cleveland. In September 1880, when the Reserve trustees had a clear commitment from Amasa Stone to fund their move from Hudson, they approached the Case trustees with a proposition to consider "uniting with us in the purchase of a site ample for both institutions, with a view to placing them side by side."[14]

The Case trustees were receptive, but found that some Clevelanders (including, perhaps, some of the Reserve trustees) assumed that agreeing to a joint site had committed them to an eventual merger. In January 1881 the Case trustees recorded their intent to build a site adjacent to Western Reserve, but (in a formula to echo down through the years) declared that they had never discussed merging with their future neighbor and that they sought only complementary educational purposes and the financial advantages of shared resources ("libraries, apparatus, etc. and the ability to engage a higher order of talent… by giving employment to the same person in both institutions").[15]

When the citizens' committee selected a site across from Wade Park the Case trustees suggested that Western Reserve take the east side and Case the west side, which was immediately agreed to.[16] For the Case campus Professor Eisenman designed a

professor in 1884. The CSAS trustees were careful to note that the promotion occurred without an increase in pay: 29 September 1884, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.

14. 20 September 1880, Trustees' minutes, Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives.
15. 12 January 1881, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.
16. R.P. Ranney to Amasa Stone, 14 June 1881. Cady Staley Papers, CWRU Archives; Amasa Stone to R.P. Ranney, *Ibid*. There is no evidence for the

massive sandstone building to include all the classrooms and offices. Ground was broken for it in the spring of 1885 and it was finished when classes began in the fall of 1885. The fire on October 27, 1886 destroyed much of the interior and its attractive cupola, but it was successfully reconstructed and Case Main was the central architectural feature on the school's campus until it was torn down in 1972.[17]

Stockwell, and his successor as president of Case from 1886 to 1902, Cady Staley, were successful in instituting rigorous engineering courses which drew students well-prepared in mathematics and science. Civil engineering dominated the curriculum but in the early years mechanical, electrical, and mining were added as courses of study leading to degrees. Appropriate laboratories, and buildings to house them, followed; booklets were published and distributed extolling the virtues of the chemistry and mechanical engineering facilities.[18]

President Staley, a graduate of one of the earliest private engineering schools in the United States (Union College in Schenectady, New York), recognized that the idea of higher technical education remained novel in late-nineteenth century America, and that Case needed to recruit students if it was to fulfill its potential. He took tours of the industrial cities of Ohio to tell teachers and students of the opportunities an engineering career presented, bought advertisements in *The Ohio Farmer*

oft-repeated story that the Case trustees tricked Amasa Stone by asking for the east half, so that Stone (regarded as a bully) would insist on having the east half, while they really wanted the west half.

17. *Case Tech* (student newspaper), 2 September 1972.
18. 4 January 1892, 3 February 1896, Trustees' minutes, CSAS; Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology*, pp. 54-55.

and other newspapers, offered free lectures in civil engineering, and initiated the creation of sixteen scholarships for outstanding graduates of Cleveland's high schools.[19] Staley also took personal interest in students and student life. The Case Athletic Club was born in his tenure. and Professor Frank Van Horn began his legendary twenty-six year term as the Club's treasurer. Staley also promoted a music club, a photography club, and a literary society, and on his death established the Cady Staley Trust Fund to provide students with short-term loans.[20]

As the school grew under strong leadership and a sound curriculum the trustees struggled to derive sufficient income from the Case endowment. Wisely they did not sell off the land in central Cleveland immediately, but adopted the view that the value of the lots would increase as the city itself grew.[21] It must have been frustrating to have to lease a large downtown tract for no rent in exchange for fencing in order to "protect the property from baseball players and other trespassers."[22] More positively, in 1889 the trustees granted a right of way to the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railroad through two lots along the shore of Lake Erie and the next year sold lake-shore property to the American Wire Company, which was undoubtedly attracted because of the adjacent railroad service.[23] This was not an isolated strategy. At other times the trustees granted the city

19. 16 May 1887, 5 August 1889, 7 April 1891, 21 September 1896, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.
20. 3 November 1890, 6 January 1896, Trustees' minutes, CSAS; Cramer, Case Institute of Technology, pp. 55-56, 132-147.
21. This strategy the Case trustees attributed to Leonard Case, Jr.: 6 December 1897, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.
22. 20 April 1887, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.
23. 13 February 1889, 7 April 1890, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.

land to cut a street through to the lake-shore, gave a right-of-way through their property to Standard Oil (for a pipeline), and allowed a streetcar company to lay track through their downtown land.[24]

With foresight or just blind faith in the future the trustees were participating in the late nineteenth century process of urbanization by permitting new utility and transportation systems access to their lands.[25] Their lands grew in value as rapidly as the rest of downtown Cleveland real estate. When in 1905 the city decided to provide a unified public area by creating what became known as the "Group Plan" of city, county, and federal buildings between Superior and Lakeside avenues northeast of Public Square, Case sold its portion of the site for $1,900,000.[26] This substantial realization of cash from the endowment was not simply banked. The trustees showed enormous confidence in the city's continued growth by using the income to purchase several new tracts of real estate over the next two years, mostly in the University Circle area.[27]

The endowment also grew through new gifts. Leonard Case, Jr's. cousin Laura K. Axtell gave about 60 parcels of land in the city and western Cuyahoga County to the school in 1885, thereby establishing the school's first endowed chair (the Kerr Professor of Mathematics). In 1898, two other cousins of Case

24. 19 December 1885, 4 January 1892, 6 February 1893, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.
25. Jon C. Teaford, *The Twentieth-Century American City: Problems, Promises, and Reality* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), pp. 8-11.
26. 5 June 1905, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.
27. 31 December 1906, 21 January 1907, 12 February 1907, 18 March 1907, Trustees' minutes, CSAS.

gave downtown lots to the school, but they were immediately sold in order to buy a precision astronomical instrument for Professor Howe.[28]

Case's successful endowment growth and curriculum development still left it a smaller school than Western Reserve University.[29] This was perpetually clear to its trustees, who balanced a fear of being swallowed up by Western Reserve with a sincere desire to fulfill their pledge of cooperation. Discussions of merger, coming at intervals of 10-20 years, always originated with the expansion-minded Reserve trustees or with outside agencies such as the Chamber of Commerce, which sought to create a University of Cleveland. Instead, Case jealously preserved its identity. The Case and Reserve campuses were carefully separated by a 40-foot north-south strip with only a fence running down the middle — a no-man's-land on which the two institutions agreed not to build.[30]

This demilitarized zone was perhaps a necessary expression of Case's independence while Western Reserve was constantly expanding its campus during its first fifty years at the Circle.

28. 3 October 1898, Trustees' minutes, CSAS; Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology*, p. 59.
29. Cramer, Case Institute of Technology, pp. 55, 62, notes that CSAS had 353 students and 21 faculty in 1902, and 850 students ("400 more than it had ever had before") in wartime 1918. In Clarence H. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve: A History of the University, 1926-1976* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976), p. 113, he states that Western Reserve University had 246 students and 37 faculty in 1900, and "more than 2,000 students" and 415 faculty in 1921.
30. Charles F. Thwing to H.A. Haring, 10 May 1909, box 3, Charles Thwing Office Files, CWRU Archives). See Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 234-35, for a general discussion of Case-Reserve relationships in the early 1900s.

Reserve leapt north of Euclid Avenue in 1889 when it created a campus for the new College for Women. Thereafter it acquired private land piecemeal along Adelbert Road to provide buildings and land for the professional schools President Thwing added in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The Reserve trustees assisted in purchasing a massive plot east of the main campus in 1915 for the combined site of University Hospitals and the Western Reserve Medical School.

In the latter 1920s President. Robert E. Vinson (who had succeeded Thwing in 1923) carried out a major land-acquisition campaign, including most of the land on the north side of Euclid Avenue not held by the university. A few vacant lots were donated by Jeptha H. Wade II, but most of the purchases were mortgaged in anticipation of a fund-raising campaign to start in 1930, a campaign which never occurred due to the beginning of the Great Depression in 1929. Still, Western Reserve University remained by far the largest landholder in the Circle.[31]

In land acquisition Reserve and Case could act completely independently of one another but in other areas there slowly developed the interdependence which Hiram Haydn, Amasa Stone and Jeptha Wade had anticipated. Professors Michelson and Morley easily bridged the gap in the 1880s through their common research interests. (See chapter 6, following.) In 1906 the Case and Reserve trustees agreed to share chemistry facilities; both student bodies used Amasa Stone Chapel

31. In 1933 President Vinson stated that the University's debt was $6 million: officer's diary entry, 24 May 1933, folder 57, box 4, series 238S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York.

(Reserve) and the football field (Case) and in 1925 when Cleveland College was created as a downtown, night-school division, it was administratively part of Western Reserve University, but relied heavily on Case faculty and facilities.[32]

Generally, when Case and Western Reserve had common needs or serious problems, such as the burning of Case Main in 1886, they found pragmatic means of cooperation. The two colleges had established in the Circle a pattern for the future institutions that would arrive there: a willingness to cooperate for mutual benefit while maintaining institutional identities.

32. 19 June 1906, Trustees' Prudential Committee minutes, Western Reserve University, CWRU Archives; Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, p. 126; Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology*, p. 136.

Part II: Philanthropy

“In the tiny territory around Wade Pond at University Circle, where Euclid Avenue bends sharply on its way eastward, there will be built — there even now is being built — the greatest cultural center in the United States.”

David Dietz, “Great Cultural Center Planned for Cleveland,” *Cleveland Press*, 8 February 1928.

6. The Michelson-Morley Experiment

Underlying the earliest years of University Circle's life as a cultural center was a deep commitment by Cleveland's industrial leadership to scientific and technological research.[1] Leonard Case Jr.'s creation of Case School of Applied Science embodied that commitment, and Western Reserve's scientists and science departments often had wealthy patrons. The support that underlay the historically significant light-wave researches of professors Albert A. Michelson and Edward W. Morley in the 1880s is an example of how philanthropy, in a variety of forms, became interwoven into the lives of Circle institutions.[2]

1. See: Darwin H. Stapleton, "The Rise of Industrial Research in Cleveland, 1870-1930," in Elizabeth Garber, ed., *Beyond History of Science* (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 1990), pp. 231-245; Darwin H. Stapleton, "Technology and Industrial Research," in *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, eds. David Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski (Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987), pp. 953-54, also at https://case.edu/ech/articles/technologyandindustrialresearch, accessed February 23, 2019.
2. For a more detailed examination of the connections of the Michelson-Morley experiment to Cleveland industry and industrialists, see: Darwin

Professor Edward W. Morley of Western Reserve had begun a scientific career even before the college moved to Cleveland. Morley was the son of a minister; he received his schooling at home in the New England towns where his family lived when he was a child. In 1857, at age nineteen, he enrolled at Williams College in Massachusetts, graduating three years later at the top of his class. He then went to Andover Theological Seminary for three years, and was ordained a minister of the Congregational Church in 1864.[3]

On his path to the ministry, Morley had demonstrated a strong interest in science, showing a marked interest in astronomy as an undergraduate. His first professional position was at a New England academy where he taught both theology and general science. In 1868 Morley accepted an appointment to the pulpit of Twinsburg (Ohio) Congregational Church, where he quickly came to the attention of the trustees of nearby Western Reserve College (then in Hudson), who asked him to begin teaching there. He left Twinsburg before 1880, and from that time onward, Morley's professional focus was the sciences, particularly chemistry.[4] He taught undergraduates and, from

H. Stapleton, "The Context of Science: The Community of Industry and Higher Education in Cleveland in the 1880s," in Stanley Goldberg and Roger H. Stuewer, eds., *The Michelson Era in American Science, 1870-1930* (New York: American Institute of Physics, 1988), pp. 13-22.

3. "Edward Williams Morley," in *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, at https://case.edu/ech/articles/m/morley-edward-williams, accessed February 23, 2019; Rom Harré, *Great Scientific Experiments* (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1981), p. 125.
4. In the U.S. Census of 1880 Morley is listed as living in Hudson Township, Ohio, with the occupation of "Prof. of Chemistry": U.S. Census, 1880, Ohio, Summit County, Hudson Township, www.ancestry.com, accessed 23 February 2019.

1873 to 1888, the medical students in Cleveland (commuting by train while he lived in Hudson).

Morley also had a strong streak of the technologist in him. He was interested in telegraphy, and toyed with the idea of stringing wires from the Hudson train station to his home and thence to the college, so that he could keep his wife aware of his comings and goings.[5] He also recognized the monetary rewards of technological skill.

In June 1876 the Cleveland Rolling Mill Company donated a spectroscope to Western Reserve College. Whether this was largely a philanthropic gesture is unclear, but it seems likely that a few months later when Morley undertook a consulting job analyzing iron ore he used the spectroscope and that his client was the iron rolling mill.[6] After Morley moved to Cleveland with the College in 1883 his consulting activities were more frequent. He worked for the city gas works, Standard Oil, a linseed oil firm, and others.[7] He showed a continuing interest in the leading industrial enterprises of Cleveland, especially as sources of experimental apparatus.[8]

5. Edward W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 7 January 1877, Edward W. Morley Papers [photocopies] (hereafter Morley Papers), Case Western Reserve University Archives (hereafter CWRU Archives), Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH.
6. Edward W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 28 January 1877, Morley Papers; 27 June 1876, Trustees' minutes, Western Reserve College, CWRU Archives.
7. Edward W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 16 December 1883, 29 March 1884, 27 December 1885, 13 March 1887, 17 April 1887, 15 December 1887, 29 March 1889, 14 April 1889, 25 April 1889, Morley Papers.
8. Edward W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 4 January 1885, 8 April 1886, 28 December 1886, 10 May 1888, 5 April 1889, 25 April 1889, Morley Papers.

This mix of scientific and technical interests made Morley an ideal research partner for one of the early faculty members at Case School of Applied Science, Albert A. Michelson. A native of Poland whose family immigrated to the United States when he was about age three, Michelson attended the U.S. Naval Academy from 1869 to 1873. There he received what was probably the most rigorous scientific and engineering education available in the United States during the latter nineteenth century.

Michelson became a science instructor at the Naval Academy and in 1878 conducted an experiment to determine the speed of light. Well-received by men of science, the experiment launched Michelson into a career which eventually brought him a Nobel Prize and recognition as one of the pioneers of modern physics.[9] Michelson's collaboration with Edward Morley began two years after his appointment to the tiny faculty of the infant Case School in 1882.

The two men, whose backgrounds seem radically different (Michelson a Pole of Jewish heritage; Morley, a New Englander and an ordained Protestant clergyman), found that they spoke the universal language of science. In the summer and fall of 1884 they traveled to Baltimore together to hear a series of twenty lectures given by Sir William Thomson, a renowned British physicist. Meeting with nineteen others who represented the cream of American physical science, and attending Henry Rowland's lectures at Johns Hopkins as well, Michelson and Morley had their scientific interests honed to a sharp edge. On

9. Dorothy Michelson Livingston, *The Master of Light: A Biography of Albert A. Michelson* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973).

the train ride back to Cleveland and in the weeks that followed, Michelson and Morley discovered in each other a similar love for detailed and demanding work, and some common personal tastes (such as music).[10] Michelson invited Morley to join him in his series of light–wave experiments.

Michelson had been to Germany in 1880-82 to study at Berlin, where he devised an outstanding instrument for studying light waves, later called an interferometer. With it a researcher could actually observe whether the wave patterns of two overlapping beams of light were consonant, or whether they were out of phase and "interfered" with one another. Such interference could be evidence of the different periods of time in which the two beams had traveled a specified distance.

With this device Michelson hoped to be able to determine the rate at which light was slowed down by passing through the "ether," a fluid which physicists believed permeated all space. The concept of the ether, around even before Isaac Newton's day, was necessary for those who believed that waves of light energy needed a medium in which to travel, similar to waves traveling in water.

Though all evidence pointed to the ether as colorless, weightless, and unable to be sensed directly, physicists craved secondary evidence of its existence and its role in light transmission, which Michelson's experiment might provide. His first efforts (in

10. *Ibid*, pp.103-4; Edward W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 1 October 1884, Morley Papers; s.v., "Sir William Thomson," "Henry Augustus Rowland," in Charles C. Gillispie, ed., *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*. 16 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970-80).

Germany) to measure the speed of two light beams traveling at right angles to one another proved that the ether could not be stationary, if the ether's effect was as predicted; but he thought that perhaps the ether was dragged along by the earth to some degree (an "ether drift"). If so, an even more precise measurement of the effect was called for.

In Cleveland, Michelson sought Morley's aid to design and perform a second experiment. Morley's laboratory was better equipped than Michelson's, and Morley was probably the only scientist within hundreds of miles who could understand and critique Michelson's plans. Painstakingly they assembled the apparatus: lenses and mirrors were purchased from John Brashear, an instrument–maker in Pittsburgh; a large sandstone block for a rigid foundation probably came from the bluestone quarries in Berea, Ohio, or possibly from a Doan's Corners quarry; and carefully machined metal parts came from Morley's friends Ambrose Swasey and Worcester Warner, the machine-tool makers of Cleveland. Morley's glassblowing equipment and skill (as well as his access to a glassblower at the Brush Electric Company shops in Cleveland through the courtesy of industrialist Charles Brush) were also important, because a variety of pipes and vessels were required to contain the different gases and liquids Michelson and Morley intended to beam light though.[11]

11. Lloyd S. Swenson, Jr., *The Ethereal Aether: A History of the Michelson-Morley-Miller Aether-Drift Experiments, 1880-1930* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1972), pp. 82, 90-91; Edward W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 4 January 1885, Morley Papers. For evidence that Cleveland machine-tool makers Warner and Swasey provided Michelson and Morley with parts of the interferometer, see Stapleton, "The Context of Science."

Michelson and Morley worked under the handicap of limited financial resources, and severe demands on their time. Neither professor had ample funds for constructing an expensive instrument, although Michelson had a grant from the Bache Fund of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Their respective institutions provided them with research money, far more than any other faculty member, but Michelson and Morley strained against or exceeded the limits of whatever special funds were allocated. The crusty treasurer of Case (Eckstein Case, a nephew of the founder) recalled years later that "[Michelson] was a trifle liberal with other people's money. He would simply go ahead and buy whatever he wanted."[12] Luckily, they obtained a considerable portion of their equipment at or below cost from Warner and Swasey, leaders of Cleveland's industrial community who later became trustees of or donors to several of the Circle institutions.[13]

Both professors also carried full teaching loads, and had families to attend to. The strain on Michelson began to show in the spring of 1885, when his serious miscalculations required an overhaul of the interferometer before experiments could begin. Morley thought the incident "curious."[14] Then, just as the fall session of classes began, Michelson applied for a year's leave of absence to recover his health. He displayed symptoms of nervous exhaustion; Morley called it "softening of the brain." Michelson's wife committed him to the care of a nerve specialist in New York City whose cure seems to have consisted largely

12. Livingston, *The Master of Light*, p. 121, quoting the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 10 May 1931.
13. Stapleton, "The Context of Science," pp. 14-16.
14. Edward W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 8 April 1885, Morley Papers.

of leisure and relaxing massages. Michelson recovered quickly, showing no permanent damage, and in three weeks he wrote to Morley to ask "Have you had time yet to experiment . . . Let me know how everything is going on and how the two institutions agree; in short anything and everything that may interest us both."[15] On December 1, 1885 Michelson was back in Cleveland, now at Case's new campus and new building at University Circle.

For the next two years Michelson and Morley performed a series of experiments which soon were regarded as classics. In the summer of 1886 they measured the speed of light as it passed through moving water and air, finding that the results confirmed the earlier measurements of the French physicist A.H.L. Fizeau. The next summer they carried out the test of the effect of the ether on light waves, and beginning in the fall of 1887 and continuing for some months they measured the length of light waves emanating from burning sodium.[16]

They began their studies in the basement of the new Case Main building, but its disastrous fire in the night of October 26-27, 1886 caused a move. Saved from the fire by the brave action of some of the students of Western Reserve, Michelson and Morley's equipment was moved to the adjoining campus and reinstalled in the basement of the Western Reserve dormitory, Adelbert Hall. This utilitarian building (about a hundred yards

15. Albert A. Michelson to Edward W. Morley, 12 October 1885, in Nathan Reingold, ed., *Science in Nineteenth-Century America: A Documentary History* (New York: Octagon Books, 1979), p. 310.
16. S.v., "Armand-Hippolyte-Louis Fizeau," in Gillispie, ed., *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*; Livingston, *The Master of Light*, pp. 116-18, 121-33, 136-39.

south of the current Adelbert Hall, which was then known as Adelbert College because it contained all of the institution's classrooms and offices) has been torn down, and by the 1970s a parking lot stood in its place. In that basement Michelson and Morley carefully set up a brick foundation for a circular iron trough which held a pool of mercury. On that they floated a wooden doughnut which supported a five-foot square sandstone block. To the block Michelson and Morley fixed their mirrors, lenses, and lamp. The instrument was set up so that a single light beam would be divided into two portions, each traveling thirty-six feet, but one at right angles to the other for most of the journey. At the end the two beams coincided in the viewer's eyepiece.

To conduct the experiment Michelson and Morley first adjusted the mirrors so that the lengths of the two light paths were as close to the same length as possible. They focused the lenses of the viewer's eyepiece for clarity of image, and finally moved an adjustable mirror on one light path until the interference bands showed in the eyepiece. Then, on July 8-9 and 11-12, the two scientists made a series of observations by slowly rotating the stone and looking through the eyepiece at the sixteen points of the compass.

Estimating the shift of the interference bands from the pre-established setting, Michelson and Morley compiled a table of readings which, if the ether had as great an effect on the transmission of light as some scientists thought, should have shown a clustering of similar shifts at certain compass points. There the light beams would be roughly aligned with the Earth's

motion through space, or perpendicular to that motion. One beam would be more affected by the relative speed of the ether than the other.

Michelson and Morley's results (published in the *American Journal of Science*) showed shifts of the interference bands, but they were so small that they could not be regarded as validation of any theory of the ether effect suggested to that point. Yet no one was disposed to question the experiment itself, conducted as it was by two seasoned scientists, both known for accuracy, and one of whom had been engaged in optical experiments for a decade. Michelson and Morley dutifully published their result, or better, their "null result," and moved on to their measurement of sodium light waves, for which they were assured an unambiguous answer. In the first few years after their classic experiment neither Michelson nor Morley took much pride in the ether-drift work, since it did not appear to answer any important question.[17]

Only in historical hindsight can we appreciate what happened in July 1887 at University Circle. After the Michelson-Morley experiment physicists were forced to come to grips with the inadequacy of the existing theory which described one of the supposed phenomena of light, which itself was one of the central constants in the natural world. Within a few years the simplicity and unquestioned accuracy of the Michelson-Morley experiment made it a reference point for the next generation working on the frontiers of physics, among whom was the young Albert Einstein. Einstein himself was not inspired to begin his work on

17. Swenson, *The Ethereal Aether*, pp. 89-97, 273-85.

relativity theory by the Michelson-Morley experiment, and it is even possible that he did not know of it directly until after he had formulated and published the core of his theory, but many scientists later seized upon the experiment as a proof of the validity of Einstein's mathematics and metaphysics.

Michelson's subsequent stature as a Nobel prize winner, based on his development of instruments for research, and Morley's eminence as a recipient of the Rumford Medal of the Royal Society (London), based on his subsequent research, have perhaps made historians too certain that a fine experiment conducted by two great scientists must have been central to the development of relativity theory. Nonetheless, more than a century after the Michelson-Morley experiment it still appears to have been a remarkable achievement, a classic combination of instrument design and theoretical challenge.[18]

The team of Michelson and Morley survived only two years after the summer of 1887. Michelson had never been happy at Case. The trustees initially had been generous, making an appropriation of $7500 for Michelson to purchase scientific equipment for the school while he was in Europe — before they had even met him. But his tendency toward profligate expenditures — apparent soon after his arrival in Cleveland — became too much for the trustees (most of whom were men of financial probity) to overlook. By 1885 they began to examine the physics budget with unusual care. Michelson resented this, and in January, 1887, with the ether-drift experiment in

18. Gerald Holton, "Einstein, Michelson, and the 'Crucial' Experiment," *Isis* 60, pt. 2 (summer 1969): 133-197; Harré, *Great Scientific Experiments*, pp. 124-34.

preparation, he demanded that the entire departmental budget "be placed in his hands." The trustees appointed a committee to negotiate with him, apparently without success.[19]

In September 1888 the trustees found that Michelson had ordered over $2500 in supplies: they had appropriated for his laboratory only $1000 — but more than any other unit at Case had received. This time Michelson was told to have each new purchase approved by the school's president, Cady Staley. But Michelson was recalcitrant. In December the trustees found that he had overspent even the smallest authorization for equipment. They resolved "to notify him that this exceeding of Authority is regarded by the Board as dangerous and unbusinesslike, and that they cannot overlook any repetition of such disregard of a carefully considered appropriation asked for by him."[20]

Michelson showed no repentance, believing that the Trustees had foolishly spent the Case endowment for land and buildings rather than professors and researchers. When in 1889 he was offered a position at the newly-opened Clark University in Massachusetts, which had the avowed purpose of supporting research and graduate study, Michelson accepted.[21]

19. 3 November 1881, 21 January 1887, Trustees' minutes, Case School of Applied Science (hereafter CSAS), CWRU Archives; Livingston, *The Master of Light*, p. 121.
20. 21 September 1888, Trustees' minutes, CSAS, CWRU Archives.
21. 1 April 1889, Trustees' minutes, CSAS, CWRU Archives; Reingold, ed., *Nineteenth-Century Science*, p. 311; Livingston, *The Master of Light*, p. 141. Michelson found "lots of time for research," but no more financial support, at Clark. In 1892 he departed for the University of Chicago, where he worked happily until his retirement. A.A. Michelson to Edward W. Morley, 6 March 1890, Morley Papers; Livingston, *The Master of Light*, pp. 142-70.

Morley remained at Western Reserve for another seventeen years until his retirement. At first after Michelson's departure he had hopes of continuing his collaboration with Michelson, but soon found that Michelson expected to continue his light researches alone. Morley then focused his energies more fully on what had been his long-term research goals prior to 1884: determining the relative atomic weights of oxygen and hydrogen.[22]

Morley, too, had his opportunity to leave Cleveland in the summer of 1889, when he was offered a professorship at the University of Michigan. Hiram Haydn, Western Reserve's president, responded by allocating more money and hiring an assistant for Morley's research. He stayed, and the university seems to have kept its promise to support him. In 1898 the faculty and trustees of Western Reserve took special action to reduce his teaching commitment to one hour per day so that he could pursue his research.

At his retirement, however, Morley was offended by the University's decision not to consult him on final plans for a new chemistry building, and by its haggling over the purchase of his scientific books for the library. He apparently left in a huff and did not attend the dedication of the chemistry building, although it was named for him.[23]

In later years, both Western Reserve and Case, and their

22. Clarence C. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve: A History of the University, 1826-1976* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976), pp. 66-68; Livingston, *The Master of Light*, pp. 147-48; Edward W. Morley to S.B. Morley, 1 June 1889, Morley Papers.
23. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 67-70.

federated descendant, drew liberally on the fame of Albert A. Michelson and Edward Morley, and their famous experiment. Both men, ironically, left University Circle believing that they were unappreciated by those same institutions. Nevertheless, they had helped to initiate a matrix of scientific research, philanthropic support, and interconnections with Cleveland industry that has remained one of the dominant patterns in the Circle's tapestry.

7. Science, Technology, and the Rise of the Military-Industrial Complex

In 1961 President Dwight D. Eisenhower noted in his farewell address to the American people that he had observed a new power, a military-industrial complex, emerge in American society during the Cold War. The massive growth of the peacetime defense budget after World War II had brought into being entire industries that depended on government purchases to keep them in business, and a military bureaucracy accustomed to the availability and continued development of sophisticated weaponry. Eisenhower saw that these changes in national defense and industry were connected to universities because both sectors relied upon universities to conduct research for them.[1]

Eisenhower's observation was accurate, but historically the

1. Carroll W. Pursell, Jr., *Readings in Technology and American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), pp, 461-62.

intertwining of industry and higher education, including in Cleveland, began much earlier than the Cold War era.[2] The Case School faculty, for example, conducted much of its research on behalf of outside institutions from its earliest years. Professor Charles F. Mabery, who came to Case in 1883 from Harvard, published widely on the chemistry of petroleum (Cleveland was the center of American petroleum refining in the 1880s), and pioneered in using infrared spectroscopy for the analysis of distillates. He was also a consultant on the development of a pioneering electro-chemical furnace. Mabery trained Albert H. Smith, who took an instructor's appointment at Case even before he graduated in 1887. Smith then went to Zurich for his doctorate and returned to become the chairman of the mechanical engineering and chemical engineering departments, where he conducted research for both industry and government.[3]

2. For discussion of the pre-Cold War interrelationship of science and industry in Cleveland, and general reviews of the industrialization of Cleveland, see: Darwin H. Stapleton, "The Rise of Industrial Research in Cleveland, 1870-1930," in Elizabeth Garber, ed., *Beyond History of Science: Essays in Honor of Robert E. Schofield* (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 1990), pp. 231-245, Darwin H. Stapleton, "The City Industrious: How Technology Transformed Cleveland," in Thomas F. Campbell and Edward M. Miggins, eds., *The Birth of Modern Cleveland, 1865-1930* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1988), pp. 71-95; and Darwin H. Stapleton, "Industry," in David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987; 2nd ed., 1996): 547-549 (2nd ed., 1996, pp. 566-68). On-line at: https://case.edu/ech/articles/i/industry, accessed 1 March 2019.
3. Clarence H. Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology: A Centennial History* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1980), pp. 25-27, 111-13; 9 February 1887, 16 May 1887, Trustees' minutes, Case School of Applied Sciences (hereafter CSAS), Case Western Reserve University Archives (hereafter CWRU Archives), Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH; Yakov M. Rabkin, "Technological Innovation in

One of Mabery's students was Herbert H. Dow, who became interested in extracting bromine from the brine (saltwater) found underground in certain areas of the Midwest. Attempting to develop a commercially-viable process, Dow worked closely with Smith (who was an instructor when Dow was a student) and eventually drew him into a consulting arrangement. After a series of business and technical failures, the Dow Chemical Company was founded in 1897, with its center of operations at Midland, Michigan. Smith subsequently played critical roles in developing industrial methods for making chloroform (with Professor William O. Quayle) and carbon tetrachloride, and he directed many capable students to employment with Dow.[4]

Among the students was Smith's son, Kent H. Smith who after graduate school at Case worked for Dow from 1919 to 1921 on aluminum-magnesium alloys for automotive uses. Engaging in several business ventures in the 1920s, he eventually became a founder, with his brothers Kelvin and Vincent, of the Graphite Oil Products Company. Searching for a better lubricant for modern high-speed automobile engines, the company hired Professor Carl Prutton of Case to find an effective additive.

Prutton tended to work on the basis of informed hunches rather than systematic experimentation. He was known to take a large kettle, mix ingredients which he thought useful, and test them in

Science: the Adoption of Infrared Spectroscopy by Chemists," Isis 78 (March 1987): 37.

4. Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology*, pp. 111-12; Murray Campbell and Harrison Hatton, *Herbert H. Dow: Pioneer in Creative Chemistry* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951), pp. 9-83; William Haynes, *American Chemical Industry*. 6 vols. (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1948-54), 1: 326.

practical applications, such as automobile engines. If he thought the results were good, he would ask a graduate student to analyze the product chemically. Only Prutton knew what the original ingredients were. Prutton's first successful engine oil additives were aromatic halogen compounds, and the resulting lubricant was named Lubrizol. It sold so well that the company soon took on the name of the product. Lubrizol became a leading Cleveland corporation.[5]

In some instances, these early research relationships had direct benefits for Case. Herbert Dow gave the school money to furnish an electro-metallurgical laboratory. The Harshaw Chemical Company of Cleveland established an industrial fellowship in 1910 to fund a year of post-baccalaureate studies by a graduating student. Harshaw could pick the topic, but the student could apply the research to his master's degree.[6]

The most continuous early Case connection to industry was that with the research department of the National Lamp Works of General Electric. Begun in 1901 as the research arm of the National Electric Lamp Association (NELA), a group of independent light bulb manufacturers, the laboratory moved to a campus of new buildings (called NELA Park) at East

5. Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology*, pp. 202-04; author's interview of Professor Reid Shelton, 5 December 1985, accession A11-010, CWRU Archives; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 803; "Letters to Dow Chemical," box 1, Kent H. Smith Papers, CWRU Archives.
6. 15 May 1906, 10 January 1910, 3 October 1910, 20 February 1911, Trustees' minutes, CSAS, CWRU Archives.

Cleveland in 1912, at the same time that General Electric acquired all of NELA's stock. NELA Park became second only to GE's laboratory at headquarters in Schenectady as a center of the corporation's innovation and development program, particularly for lighting.

Within a few years Case graduates held several top administrative positions at NELA Park. That apparently made it easy for the school to recruit teachers for a course first offered in the 1916-17 academic year, titled "Science and the Art of Illumination," required for senior electrical engineers. Several of the NELA staff were listed as instructors, including Percy Wells Cobb, a researcher in the physiology of light who was a Case graduate and had gone on to receive an M.D. from Western Reserve. Variants of that course remained in Case School's catalogue for thirty years.[7]

Western Reserve University's interactions with industrial research seem to have been more at arm's length through the 1930s than were Case's, probably because its professors were more theoretically inclined. Reserve's most regular connection to industry was through extension courses and in Cleveland College, Western Reserve's the evening division founded in 1925. As early as 1896 Professor Morley had taught a summer school in chemistry for non-degree students, although under the

7. Hollis L. Townsend, *A History of NELA Park, 1911-1957* (Cleveland: Plummer, [1959]), pp. 1-18; Kendall Birr, *Pioneering in Industrial Research: The Story of the General Electric Research Laboratory* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1957), p. 83; s.v., "Percy Wells Cobb," J. McKeen Cattell and Jacques Cattell, eds., *American Men of Science*, 5th ed. (New York: Science Press, 1933); Case School of Applied Sciences, *Catalogue[s]*, 1916-17, 1946-47, CWRU Archives.

auspices of Case. In 1923 the Reserve chemistry department instituted evening classes directed "to chemists; teachers of chemistry, physics and general science; to engineers; to graduate physicians, dentists and pharmacists; to both graduate and student nurses; and to those students who have been temporarily forced to discontinue their academic studies toward one of the professions mentioned."[8]

Reserve's chemistry department continued to serve as a kind of continuing education program for professional chemists in the region through the 1930s and 1940s. Central to this outreach was Professor Harold S. Booth, a graduate of Reserve who had his doctorate from Cornell. He was a consultant to several companies, including Harshaw Chemical and Ohio Chemical in Cleveland, and was an authority on fluoride gases. In the 1940s Booth also developed a technical sales program at Cleveland College, combining science and business curricula.[9]

Meanwhile, Western Reserve University had developed a close association with the Standard Oil Company of Ohio (Sohio).

8. 7 October 1895, Trustees' minutes, CSAS, CWRU Archives; "The University Evening Courses in Chemistry: Report for 1924," folder "Adult Extension Courses," box 1, Charles Thwing Office Files (hereafter Thwing Office Files), CWRU Archives. Note Newton Baker's comment (in the liberal arts tradition) that he believed that "the large amount of scientific work which the City is constantly needing could be done for it in a finer and higher way through the Scientific Departments of a great university than is possible otherwise." Baker was at the time the mayor of Cleveland: Newton Baker to John D. Rockefeller, 10 December 1912, folder 12, container 5, Newton D. Baker Papers, Western Reserve Historical Society (hereafter WRHS), Cleveland, OH.
9. Biographical file on Harold Simmons Booth, CWRU Archives; Harold S. Booth, "Western Reserve University's New Technical Sales Curricula," *Journal of Chemical Education* 21 (June 1944): 1-6.

In 1929 two chemistry professors, R.E. Burk and Herman P. Lankelma set up a research laboratory for Sohio in one room of the second floor of Pierce Hall. Within a few years the staff and projects of the laboratory required a move to larger quarters in the University's powerhouse. By 1940 the laboratory had a staff of twenty and employed several graduate students and undergraduates part-time, and Burk had become a leading researcher in the field of polymerization. Sohio paid rent to the University and to some degree allowed university faculty and students to use its facilities. There was some confusion as to Burk's role, because he served as both a professor at the university and as research director for Sohio. In documents of the period he appears more an advocate for Sohio's interests than the university's.[10]

Booth and Burk were involved in Reserve's efforts in the 1940s to develop further relationships with industry. In 1941 they met with President Leutner and representatives of Sohio, and four other Cleveland area companies: Harshaw, Goodrich, Arthur G. McKee and Sherwin-Williams. Reserve asked that corporate leaders suggest what directions its scientific programs should take in the future, and offered a plot of land along the railroad from Cornell to Mayfield roads for industrial laboratories. In return, Reserve wanted to arrange joint purchases of the analytical instruments which were rapidly becoming central to

10. "Chemistry in the Graduate School of Western Reserve University," [1940], box 4, W.G. Leutner Office Files (hereafter Leutner Offfice files), CWRU Archives; R.E. Burk to W.G. Leutner, 5 September 1940, box 4, Leutner Office Files; Harvey E. Alford, "History of R&D," in *55 Years of Sohio R&D: 1929-1984* (Cleveland: Sohio, 1984), pp. 18-19; Robert E. Burk, *Polymerization and its Applications to the Fields of Rubber, Synthetic Resins, and Petroleum* (New York: Reinhold, 1937).

scientific research, such as infrared spectrographs, electron microscopes, and diffraction equipment. For some years Reserve's chemistry department had recognized that it was seriously deficient in the tools of modern research.[11] Leutner Office files, CWRU Archives; O.F. Tower, "Notes for the Administration from the Department of Chemistry," 21 March 1939, box 4, Leutner Office Files, CWRU Archives.

Sohio responded positively to this overture and in the next year built a laboratory on Cornell Road which remained in use until the 1960s. On that site were developed a boron additive for gasoline and micro balloons which floated on stored crude oil to reduce evaporation losses. In 1957 Sohio moved most operations to a new laboratory in Warrensville (OH), since there was no room for expansion on the University's site.[12]

In 1942 the research laboratory for Sherwin-Williams Paint moved into the powerhouse facility vacated by Standard Oil. Professor Oliver Grummitt of the Reserve chemistry department, who was already a consultant to Sherwin-Williams, became the laboratory's director. When the decision was made in 1966 to close the laboratory, the termination date was delayed more than a year to allow Grummitt's graduate students to finish their studies.[13]

11. "Agenda for Luncheon Meeting of 14 Sept. 1941," box 15,
12. Alford, "History of R&D," pp. 19-22; D.W. Lee, "Memorandum for Construction Administrator," 23 February 1942, 131/23-4, Record Group (hereafter RG), National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C.
13. "From Dean [Benton?]," 26 March 1941, box 4, Leutner Office Files; George A. Olah to Oliver J. Grummitt, 21 February 1966, box 19, John S. Millis Office Files (hereafter Millis Office Files), CWRU Archives;

The experiences of Case and Reserve with industry prepared them to some degree for the infusion of research monies which came with World War II. At Case the total research budget in the last prewar academic year was $26,510; in the final year of the war, only four years later, it was $392,860, almost fifteen times larger. Both industry and government contributed to the rise, but government contracts for the development of wartime technologies accounted for the lion's share. Reserve reportedly had government contracts for 1942-45 totaling $1,000,000, and received an equal sum for providing training and educational programs to various military units.[14]

For both institutions this infusion of government money was intoxicating. They had struggled with finances throughout the 1930s, and suddenly their budgets balanced. What was unexpected was that this government largesse continued after the war's end, because traditionally the United States had demilitarized rapidly with the return of peace. But this peace was the first based on the atomic bomb and superpower confrontations. Research at American universities turned

William Heston to John S. Millis, 1 June 1966, box 19, Millis Office Files; John S. Millis to E. Colin Baldwin, 8 June 1966, Millis Office Files.

14. William G. Rose, *Cleveland: The Making of a City* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1950), p. 1026; "Final Report of the Research Committee," in *Case Self Survey* (Cleveland: Case Institute of Technology, 1951), p. 9; Clarence H. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve: A History of the University, 1826-1976* (Boston: Little, Brown, c. 1976), pp. 145-47. I use Cramer's figure of $1,000,000 for Western Reserve, but see "Western Reserve University Schedule of Gifts and Grants for Current Operations, 1944-45," box 14, accession 1DB8, CWRU Archives, where that year's federal support totaled less than $38,000. Perhaps that year, when military units already had left campus, is unrepresentative of the war years.

quickly to development of nuclear weapons, the airplanes, submarines and rockets with which to deliver them, and a host of related subjects. Avowedly nonmilitary research also received an impetus when the National Science Foundation, an independent government agency, was created in 1950.[15]

Some people in academia became very worried about the growing dependence of universities on government funds. Two years after the end of World War II astronomer Howard Shapley at Harvard argued that "those who were worried about the domination of freedom in American science by the great industries, can now worry about domination by the military."[16] Case's Research Director, Charles W. Williams, who coordinated all of the grants to faculty from government and industry, wrote in his annual report of 1949 that "the fact that our sponsored research is heavily weighted in the direction of Government support seems to the writer to be bad." He was

15. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, p. 147; Daniel J. Kevles, *The Physicists: The History of a Scientific Community in Modern America* (New York: Vintage, 1979), pp. 341, 358-60; Virginia Dawson, *Engines and Innovations: Lewis Laboratory and American Propulsion Technology* (Washington, D.C.: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1991), esp. pp. 93-97 on Case Institute of Technology. In 1947 M.I.T., a bellwether research institution, returned a $50,000 Rockefeller Foundation grant for computer research because an Air Force contract in the same field was for a far larger sum and supported more advanced research. The same year the California Institute of Technology demonstrated its rising expectations by asking the Foundation for $6 million for biomedical research, and when it was turned down, expected to approach the federal government for funding: Warren Weaver, memorandum 17 February 1947, folder 24, series 205D, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives (hereafter RFA), Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC), Sleepy Hollow, NY; Karl T. Compton to Warren Weaver, 26 June 1947, folder 32, box 4, series 226, RG 1.1, RFA.
16. Howard Shapley to Isaiah Bowman, 6 November 1945, quoted in Kevles, *The Physicists*, p. 355.

concerned in part because the federal government added only 50% to grant budgets to cover the institute's overhead expenses, while industrial contracts generally provided 100% overhead.[17] When John S. Millis was installed as president of Western Reserve University in 1950 he called for voluntary support of the university by Clevelanders, whom he understood to have a great tradition of philanthropy. Without voluntary support, he said, there would be a "shifting, by default, of our personal responsibilities to the agencies of government."[18] While these words may have resonated with the tradition of personal philanthropy in University Circle, they did not reflect the changing nature of support for science.

Others were enthusiastic about the new possibilities opening for science, and it seemed impossible to resist the tidal wave of money. In the academic year 1956-57 Case received $1.8 million for research, and six years later it had more than doubled that amount (excluding classified research). The federal portion hovered around 75%.[19] John Gardner, the president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York (a non-profit foundation), remarked in 1957 that "federal funds are flowing to the universities in exceedingly impressive amounts, and no one involved — federal agencies, college presidents, trustees, or faculty members — shows any concerted inclination to stop

17. Case Research Administration, *Annual Report*, 1948-49, p. 14, CWRU Archives.
18. ohn S. Millis speech, in *New York Times*, 7 January 1950.
19. Case Research Administration, *Annual Reports*, 1956-57, p. 1, 1962-63, pp. iii, xi, CWRU Archives; T. Keith Glennan, Case Institute of Technology: 75 Years of Service to American Industry (New York: Newcomen Society in North America, 1954), p. 18.

the flow."[20] A contemporary study of the impact of increased federal funding for the sciences in the United States (made by an advisory committee which included Case President T. Keith Glennan) concluded that this source of funding offered no harm to the social sciences and the humanities. Glennan was in fact proud that Case students devoted 25 percent of their class time to these areas.[21]

Certainly both Reserve and Case fielded a wide variety of programs in this era, and financial support could be had for many of them, some of which brought other departments into contact with science and technology. Reserve, for example, was a post-war leader in the use of television for education, and in teaching how to use the television as a medium of communication. The Cleveland Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation provided some funding for staffing and equipment. Reserve began with a graduate curriculum in television in the fall of 1946, focusing on scripting and producing public interest programs. Since the television courses were part of the university's drama department, live theatric performances were an early part of the programming. *The Plain Dealer's* theater critic, William McDermott, saw the first performance in the spring of 1948 and remarked that "it was interesting and impressive, not so much for what it was as drama, but for the enormous possibilities it suggested. You had the feeling of being at the birth of something revolutionary and important."

20. National Science Foundation, *Report of the Advisory Committee on Government-University Relationships to the National Science Board*. Draft copy, 25 July 1956, box 12, T. Keith Glennan Office Files (hereafter Glennan Office Files), CWRU Archives.
21. Glennan, *Case Institute*, p. 13.

In the fall 1951 semester WEWS (the first television station in Cleveland) broadcast two full courses which any tuition-paying viewer could take for credit through Cleveland College. The *New York Times* reported that this was the first instance in the United States in which credit was offered for a television course. The initial response to the courses was "overwhelming." Courses-by-television remained on the Cleveland College roster for many years, and graduate courses in television programming remained in the university curriculum until the mid-1960s.[22]

The opening a college curriculum to all television viewers was virtually antithetical to the substantially seccret aspect of the academic community's involvement in post-war technological innovation. The incredible potential of modern weapons and delivery systems could be developed rapidly by the military only through the cooperation of leading academic research centers. But accepting classified-status contracts for classified defense research meant the restriction of knowledge, rather than the diffusion represented by television.

Both Case and Reserve had many classified defense contracts from the 1940s into the 1960s, but Case had by far the largest contract, for project Doan Brook. This highly secret Air Force systems analysis research dealt with the aerial seeding of anti-

22. W.G. Leutner to Leyton E. Carter, 6 February 1948, accession 1DB8, CWRU Archives; John S. Millis to Leyton E. Carter, 17 September 1951, box 17, Millis Office Files; John S. Millis to Distribution Committee of the Cleveland Foundation, n.d., box 17, Millis Office Files; *New York Times*, 22 July 1951; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 29 April 1948; *The Voice of Reserve*, 31 May 1946; David H. Stevens, memorandum, 2 September 1948, folder 42, series 238R, RG 1.1, RFA. The Dramatic Arts Department's last listing for a TV programming course appears in the University's 1966-67 *Catalogue*.

tank and anti-personnel mines and accounted for about half of the federal funding received by Case from 1951 to the project's end in 1958. Researching both questions of technology, such as the design and development of explosive fuses, and broader questions of target vulnerability, Doan Brook brought together an interdisciplinary team of scientists, engineers, and a few social scientists and humanists. It had a staff of over 80 at its height, and in its lifetime provided support for about 40 graduate students.[23] Glennan Office Files; R. R. Thomas, "Doan Brook," 22 February 1957, box 36, Case Central Files, CWRU Archives; R. R. Thomas, "Project Doan Brook Review Meeting, 6 February 1958," 5 February 1958, box 36, Case Central Files, CWRU Archives; minutes, 8 May 1958, Faculty Committee on Research, Administration, Case Central Files, CWRU Archives; Stuart P. Cooke to John A. Hrones, 5 February 1958, box 36, Case Central Files, CWRU Archives; Michael Leyzorek, *Air-Laid Land Mines (Project Doan Brook)*. Typescript. (Cleveland: Case Institute of Technology, 1960), pp. 1-7, copy courtesy of Chief, Office of History, Headquarters Munitions Systems Division, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida; author's interview of Professor John Culver, 21 May 1986, in author's files. Intellectually, Doan Brook was an important campus focal point for the development of the field of systems analysis, a field in which Case exercised considerable leadership in the 1950s.[24]

Doan Brook was the equivalent of an academic department on campus, with its own facilities, budget, research program, and graduate students (most of whom were officially in electrical

23. "Project Doan Brook Personnel," 14 October 1954, box 3,
24. David Clark, *Arguments in Favor of Sharpshooting* (Portland, OR: Timber Press, 1984), pp. 35-38, 41.

or mechanical engineering). Yet the differences from regular departments were glaring: only a few of its staff held professorial rank, and virtually all written results were classified and unpublished. They therefore were not subject to the peer review expected of academic research and publication. Graduate students on the staff of Doan Brook could publish only the peripheral, non-military applications of their research, not the most significant results.

In the late 1950s some professors at Case began to object strongly to classified research, but other faculty believed that academic institutions should have some role on the leading edges of national defense. Committees wrestled with the problem without immediate result. With the support of the administration, Case slowly disentangled itself from classified research commitments, and in 1962 the institute's Faculty Committee on Research stated unequivocally that only scholarly publication was the measure of academically-acceptable research.[25]

One reason it was possible to turn away from classified research was that by 1960 the balance of federal research monies had begun to shift from defense toward other topics. The American

25. Minutes, 16 January 1957, 22 March 1957, 19 April 1957, 3 May 1957, Faculty Committee on Research, Administration, Case Central Files, CWRU Archives; T. J. Walsh to Faculty Council, 26 September 1957, Administration, Case Central Files, CWRU Archives; Faculty Committee on Research to Faculty Council, 4 February 1958, Administration, Case Central Files, CWRU Archives; Stuart P. Cooke to T. Keith Glennan, 14 January 1957, Administration, Case Central Files, CWRU Archives; "Report of Faculty Committee on Research, 1961-1962," [1962], Administration, Case Central Files, CWRU Archives.

reaction to the successful Russian launching of their satellite, Sputnik, brought new non-defense research money into play beginning in 1958, and President John Kennedy's 1961 pledge to put an American on the moon within the decade accelerated the trend. Health research also began to become more important.

But in the late 1960s federal funding of research in all areas dropped, and through the decade of the 1970s austerity was the byword. Case Western Reserve suffered considerably. Symbolic of its problems was its inability to lease fully the University Circle Research Center which was composed of two large buildings adjacent to the University Circle rapid station along Cedar Avenue. Planned in 1966 to be a research park similar to those adjacent to campuses in California and Massachusetts, the buildings were completed in time to experience economic stringencies at the height of the Vietnam War, followed by an economic recession, and inflation. The buildings were only partially occupied, and it was reported early in 1972 that the university was losing $20,000 per month on the center.[26]

Difficulties with research funding to some degree promoted a reassessment of the interrelationship between research and teaching. Dean Donald E. Schuele of Case Institute argued in 1976 that "because of our reduction in student population and problems of budget, the emphasis has shifted too far in the direction of research. I believe it is now time to turn our attention to the quality and delivery of our classroom instruction."[27] Three

26. Kevles, *The Physicists*, pp. 384-87, 411-12, 415; *Reserve Tribune*, 19 May 1966; *New York Times*, 11 September 1966; *The Observer*, 21 November 1969, 11 February 1972, 2 February 1973.
27. Case Western Reserve University, *Annual Report, 1975-76* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1976), p. 14.

years later a committee of the trustees reiterated Schuele's concern, but stated firmly that "this is a research-oriented university, widely recognized and respected for the range and quality of its research and generously supported in these efforts by granting agencies. These are features in which we should take pride and which we must preserve and enhance."[28] Clearly, no matter the substantial problems which it brought, the trustees were wedded to research, including research for the industrial corporations that many trustees represented.

The most characteristic aspect of scientific and technical research in the 1980s was the university's establishment of interdisciplinary and inter-institutional units. The Center for Adhesives, Coatings, and Sealants, for example, sought to provide research opportunities to firms that for reasons of expense chose not to have in-house laboratories.[29]

The most notable of these units were three centers which, with CWRU's participation, were established by the state of Ohio to arrest the decline of its industrial base. The Edison Polymer Innovation Center (co-sponsored by the University of Akron) focused on the development of plastics and other materials for construction, for electronics, and for other uses. Professor John Blackwell's world-renowned research on high-strength fibers in both organic and inorganic materials was one source of CWRU's leadership in polymers. CWRU contributed its work in automation and intelligent systems to the Cleveland Advanced

28. Committee on University Plans, *Objectives for the University, 1980-1985* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1979), p. 13.
29. "Case Seals Plans to Open Adhesives Study Center," *Crain's Cleveland Business*, 6 December 1982.

Manufacturing Program (co-sponsored by Cleveland State University and Cuyahoga Community College). Ohio State University and CWRU collaborated in creating the Animal Embryology Research Center to study the means of genetically altering the fertilized embryos of animals. The state of Ohio contributed over $10 million to start these centers in l984-85.[30]

By 1985 the Circle had large investment in scientific research, largely on the campus of Case Western Reserve University. It had continuing traditions of accomplishment in areas such as polymers, metallurgy and materials, systems design, and biomedical engineering. It had close links with industry and government, including the military, links which some regarded as too close, and others as not close enough. It was generally agreed, however, that in the world of the late 20th and early 21st centuries centers of scientific and technological research such as the Circle possessed were the keys to regional and national economic growth and productivity.

Author's note: Much of this chapter was utilized in: Darwin H. Stapleton, "The Faustian Dilemmas of Funded Research at Case Institute and Western Reserve, 1945-1965," *Science, Technology & Human Values* (1993) 19: 303-314.

30. "Ragone Highlights Initiative at CWRU," *Case Reserve Today*, spring/summer 1985; Case Western Reserve University, *Annual Report 1984-85* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1985), p. 24; *CWRU Campus News*, 23 May 1990.

8. Gathering the Circle: Art, History, and Music for the Public

The life histories of the nonprofit institutions that came to be located in or near University Circle follow a pattern that reflects the themes of this book: community, philanthropy, and planning. The institutions came into being largely at the insistence of wealthy Clevelanders who had concerns about the need to serve particular segments of the city's population. Often they were moved by a desire to care for the especially needy: the sick, the disabled, the aged. Just as often they wanted to serve the cultural and spiritual needs of a range of citizens in the community, including their own class.

The institutions were created and sustained almost entirely by philanthropy, often by the individual generosity of one member of Cleveland's business elite. The closeness of the institutions to the city's upper class is symbolized by the frequency with which their former residences became the initial (and sometimes permanent) locations of the institutions. Certainly the early

founders and directors knew there were advantages to acquiring large, well-built houses for institutional purposes, especially when they often had designs easily adapted to institutional use, such as the distinct separation of service functions (kitchens and laundries) from bedrooms and dining areas, and the spaciousness of large entertainment and reception rooms that could be adapted to offices and classrooms. Moreover, these residences were often given or sold at low cost to nascent institutions in order to provide them with suitable quarters.

The institutions gravitated to the Circle over time largely because the planning activities of those interested in the area — the businessmen of the Chamber of Commerce in the early 1900s and, later, the administrators of the existing Circle institutions — tried to create a setting favorable to culturally-oriented and other nonprofit institutions. At first through land allocation by the Wades and the University Improvement Corporation and, later, with the creation of the University Circle Development Foundation in 1957, through the provision of special services such as parking and private police, there developed a kind of centripetal force that pulled nonprofits into the Circle.[1]

Overall, the nonprofits that eventually found their homes in the Circle showed a fairly consistent pattern of geographical movement. Virtually all those established in the 1800s or very early 1900s were first located either in the heart of the downtown to serve the truly needy who lived there or, if culturally-oriented, the institutions were located along the Euclid Avenue corridor

1. Chapters 11-13, following, further describe these developments.

where many of the city's wealthy lived.[2] In any case the siting of the institutions was convenient to the homes and workplaces of the early directors and trustees, who often served as the institutions' first operating staffs or otherwise exercised almost day-to-day supervision over programs.[3]

As the population of the city continued to expand outward from the downtown, and as many of the city's wealthy moved eastward along Euclid Avenue or even into the University Circle area, the institutions followed. They relocated largely according to their clienteles: if they served the middle and upper class (with music and art education, for example) they tended to move out earlier and go out to the neighborhoods where those groups had moved. Thus the School of Art and the Western Reserve Historical Society arrived in the Circle very early. Those institutions that served a broad range of the city's population, or particularly needy groups, often had a slower eastward progress as those groups lagged in the general outward movement.[4]

2. Eric Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture, 1876-1976* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1979), pp. 13-17, 89.
3. I am writing about those institutions eventually sited in University Circle. Although a very large number of Cleveland's most important nonprofit institutions have clustered in the Circle, others have remained at or near where they were established (e.g., settlement houses), and others have followed migration patterns to the west or south of the city, following socio-economic groups in those directions similar to what I am describing here for what were generally elite institutions.
4. The movement of socio-economic groups (and their associated institutions such as fraternal organizations and churches) in distinct pathways outward from the urban core is a common phenomenon in American history. Scholars have not regularly commented on the similar movement of other types of nonprofit institutions. See, for example: Jon C. Teaford, *The Twentieth-Century American City: Problem, Promise, and Reality* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1986), pp. 23-25; Edward R. Miggins and Mary Morganthaler, "The Ethnic Mosaic: The Settlement of Cleveland by New Immigrants and Migrants," in Thomas P. Campbell

After nonprofit institutions reached the Circle they tended to remain there even as the eastward-moving wave of city population washed past the area and as many of those served lived well out into the city's suburbs.[5] This retaining power of the Circle had several facets. The most important appears to be the conscious planning to make the Circle attractive to nonprofits. The increased provision for parking after the 1950s, for example, made it less convenient for institutions to be located in or near neighborhoods containing the people they served. Other factors were the interrelationship of functions (e.g., institutions serving the aged found it helpful to be in an area with excellent medical facilities), and the substantial investment that many institutions have made in their Circle facilities, that they would find difficult to recover if they moved.

* * *

The Cleveland Museum of Art: Elite Management and Mass Appreciation

Historian Carl Wittke has remarked that Cleveland, in its early

and Edward F. Miggins, eds., *The Birth of Modern Cleveland, 1865-1930* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1988), pp. 104-140; Howard L. Preston, *Automobile Age Atlanta: The Making of a Southern Metropolis, 1900-1935* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1979).

5. The apparent exception to this pattern is Cleveland's African-American population, which faced severe racial restrictions on outward migration. Important institutions serving that community have some outward migration, but have ended their movement short of the Circle: for example, the Eliza Bryant Center, Karamu House, and the Afro-American Cultural and Historical Society. See chapters 3 and 10 for discussions of African-American residential patterns. [Author's note: this commentary was written in 1990.]

years, experienced a cultural vacuum that was characteristic of frontier settlements. Art did not contribute to winning the daily struggle for survival.[6] Cleveland's support for the fine arts of painting and sculpture through the mid-19th century generally fit Wittke's description. Still, as early as 1830, when there were only a few thousand souls in the town, a traveling exhibition of a historical painting was a significant event.[7]

As the century wore on some Clevelanders acquired the wealth and leisure for collecting art. A benefit art show in 1878 drew on the possessions of such leading families as the Hays, Haydens, Eells, Wades, Mathers, Nortons, Severances, and Hurlbuts, but the show was an inconsistent melange of curiosities, creations of local artists, and European works. Two decades later the newly-formed Cleveland Art Association sponsored exhibitions, in 1893 and 1895, to raise money for the relief of those suffering from the economic depression of the time. Again, paintings and art objects were loaned by wealthy Clevelanders, but this time reflecting assiduous attempts to collect European art. The director of the so-called 1893 Loan Exhibition, Charles F. Olney, had already found sufficient interest and appreciation of art in Cleveland to support the small private museum on West 14th Street that he opened in 1892.[8]

6. Carl Wittke, *The First Fifty Years: The Cleveland Museum of Art, 1916-1966* (Cleveland: The John Huntington Art and Polytechnic Trust, and the Cleveland Museum of Art, 1966), p. 12.
7. *Annals of Cleveland* (Cleveland: Cleveland W.P.A. Project, 1936 -) 13 (1830): 95.
8. Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, pp. 18-21; David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987), pp. 50-51, 740. The 1893 date of the first exhibition is confirmed in Samuel P. Orth, *A History of Cleveland,*

Such events, and such private collecting, had little relationship to the artistic interests or needs of the vast number of Clevelanders. The occasional exhibitions showed that art as defined by Cleveland's elite consisted mostly of the products of widely recognized painters and sculptors from Europe; socially-acceptable depictions of historical and religious scenes (again, mostly European); and American portraiture.

These artistic interests had a curious relationship to the citizenry of the city, which included growing numbers of immigrants in the latter 19th and early 20th centuries. The upper and middle-class European immigrants, such as many Germans and Jews, often had classical educations and may have been better equipped to appreciate European art than the industrialists of Cleveland (often of ascetic New England stock). In fact, the first organization of professional artists in Cleveland (the Cleveland Art Club, founded in 1876) was nicknamed the Old Bohemians because the majority was of German extraction.[9]

Many other immigrants to Cleveland, especially those from southern Europe, arrived poorly-educated but from peasant societies where crafts and folk art were highly-developed. There is evidence that immigrant Clevelanders cherished those examples of native art which they brought with them from their homelands, but there is little to show that such art was of interest to the early art collectors of Cleveland.[10]

Ohio (Chicago and Cleveland: S. J. Clarke, 1910) 1: 461, while other sources are uncertain whether it was in 1893 or 1894.

9. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 50-51.
10. E.g., Cleveland Museum of Art, *Bulletin* 6, no. 3 (April 1919): 56.

There was a continuing interest in creating a public art museum in Cleveland. As early as 1852 a farsighted newspaper editorial argued for one, stating that Cleveland, "the Philadelphia of the Northwest, enjoys a larger influx of strangers, who come either for business or pleasure, than any city west of New York. Now is the time to lay hold of this matter, while room is yet here to erect buildings for that special purpose."[11] However, Clevelanders did not successfully "lay hold of the matter" for about sixty years, well after most other major cities of the Northeast and Midwest had created art museums.

Meanwhile, separate bequests in the wills of Hinman B. Hurlbut (1884), Horace Kelley (1890), and John P. Huntington (1893) provided money for an art museum. Each of these men had made his fortune in the industrial-commercial expansion of Cleveland and had become educated in the fine arts by traveling abroad. (Hurlbut also had served as a trustee of Western Reserve University.) Since the bequests had varying conditions, and the disposition of the Huntington estate (the largest) was contested in court, it took some time for the trustees of the estates to agree on joint proceedings. In the end the Cleveland Museum of Art was established as the operating agency, and the distinctiveness of the bequests was preserved by formally designating one wing of the museum as the Huntington Galleries and the other as the Kelley Galleries, while the Hurlbut funds were devoted to the purchase of works of art.[12]

The trustees decided that new museum was to be located in

11. *Annals of Cleveland* 35 (1852): 186. It is unclear whether the editorialist conceived of an art museum only, or a general museum.
12. Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, pp. 25-32, 35-39.

Wade Park on the site Jeptha Wade had long before designated for an art gallery. In 1905 Wade's old friend Liberty Holden was selected to head the building committee.[13] After eight years were consumed in negotiations with the city over the use of the Wade Park site, and in considering architectural plans, the trustees selected the Cleveland firm of Hubbell and Benes to design the building and ground was broken in May 1913. Completed in 1916, the museum presented a simple neo-classical front to the north side of the Wade Park pond, while its interior was a maze of galleries surrounding two sky-lighted courts.[14]

The first director of the museum (1913-1930) was Frederic Allen Whiting, whose skills and direction rapidly established the Cleveland Museum of Art as one of the best in the United States. Whiting (1873-1959) came from a New England family, and early in life trained for and entered a business career. However, he turned to social work among the textile workers of Lowell, Massachusetts, and became interested in promoting their financial independence through the development of handicraft skills. In 1900 he became secretary of the Society of Arts and Crafts in Boston, and subsequently organized and became the leader of the National League of Handicraft Societies.[15]

In choosing Whiting as the first director the trustees showed

13. William G. Rose, *Cleveland: The Making of a City* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1950), p. 650.
14. Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, p. 39; Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture*, pp. 124-25
15. I.T. Frary, "F.A. Whiting Resigns from Museum Directorship," press release, c. February 1930, in *Biographical Material about Frederic Allen Whiting* (unpublished, 1949), reference no. U18W598.W59, Cleveland Museum of Art Library, Cleveland, OH; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 23 December 1959.

that they were willing to define art broadly. In the words of the museum's historian

> Whiting was not an artist or an art historian nor had he had any formal training in art education. He approached the problems of the Museum from the point of view of the social worker and was especially interested in children and in making the Museum a service to all elements in the Cleveland community… Museums were to be "community schools for the soul," laboratories for the development of art appreciation, not simply mausoleums in which to store buried treasures.[16]

Whiting lost no time informing the public of his philosophy and of what sort of program he expected to carry out. He instituted the publication of a museum *Bulletin* within a year of his hiring, and in the first issue announced that "the Museum's collections should grow in accordance with the special needs of the community, and certain collections should be formed for the special benefit of our industries. It would seem advisable, for instance, that Cleveland — with its important clothing and weaving industries — should have the advantage of a splendid collection of textiles and laces and a library sections devoted to costumes and fabrics."[17] In this stance Whiting had the early support of trustee Dr. Dudley P. Allen, a distinguished Cleveland

16. Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, pp. 46-47.
17. Cleveland Museum of Art, *Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (April 1914): 2.

physician, who sat on both the executive and accessions committees of the Museum. Allen believed that a department should be devoted to exhibiting examples of household items manufactured to the highest artistic standards as models for the skilled workers of Cleveland.[18]

Whiting's philosophy also led him to create a large education department intended not only to provide classes and lectures within the museum, but to reach out into the neighborhoods and suburbs of the city. This program was immensely successful and the Cleveland Museum of Art continued to be recognized as a leader in museum education.[19]

For all of Whiting's interest in making the museum part of the social fabric of the city he put an equal amount of energy into building its collections and mounting important exhibits. For the museum's opening he combined the existing collections accumulated under the Huntington and Hurlbut trusts, more recent gifts by John L. Severance, Liberty E. Holden, Jeptha H. Wade II, and others, with a range of objects begged and borrowed from other art museums.[20] Visitors at the opening of the museum on June 6, 1916 found the enormous building filled with art from a range of eras and cultures.[21] Thereafter Whiting

18. Cleveland Museum of Art, *Bulletin*, 1, no. 4 (February 1915): 7. Whiting's and Allen's belief that an art museum could inspire industrial workers had been developed more than twenty years earlier in Boston and Chicago: Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Culture and the City: Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago from the 1880s to 1917* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1976), p. 74.
19. Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, pp. 61-71.
20. *Ibid*, p. 45; Cleveland Museum of Art, *Seventh Annual Report, 1922* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, [1923]), p. 139.
21. Katharine Gibson, "The Cleveland Museum of Art During its First Fourteen Years," in *Biographical Material about Frederic Allen Whiting*.

reserved three of the galleries for temporary exhibits, and in the first six years of the museum's life there were 131 of them, typically small showings of prints, drawings, engravings, and bronzes.

The permanent collections grew apace. In the early years there was a particular fascination with prints and with textiles. The prints were largely acquired and donated to the museum by the newly-created Print Club; later a Textile Arts Club followed the same course. These categories of art did not cost a great deal to purchase and were appreciated by a broad audience of museum-goers.[22]

The traditional staples of museums, paintings and sculpture, were much more costly to acquire. In the 1920s the trustees and other wealthy Clevelanders engaged in a lively competition, purchasing and donating a series of valuable pieces to the museum. William Milliken, then curator of decorative arts and painting, recalled in his memoirs that John L. Severance and his sister Mrs. Severance Prentiss (Frances Fleury Prentiss) had a particular rivalry: "If Mr. Severance bought an early Rembrandt, Mrs. Prentiss promptly bought what she felt was a better one … The same pattern was followed in French and English furniture, in tapestries, in prints, and in Chinese porcelain."[23]

While trustees Severance and Prentiss competed in traditional forms, modern art and non-European art had a more limited appeal to both collectors and the public. They had to be educated

22. Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, pp. 82-83.
23. William M. Milliken, *A Time Remembered* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1975), pp. 96-97.

to accept new forms. Whiting and the trustees seemed to agree with Langdon Warner, the museum's earliest curator of oriental art, that the business of the museum was "to get the public in such a receptive condition that mere strangeness will not repel them."[24] An exhibit of contemporary Japanese paintings in 1921, for example, helped to stretch geographically the definition of art for the average visitor; chronologically it was stretched by the *de facto* policy of using the Jeptha H. Wade II endowment (established in 1920) to enlarge the museum's holdings of medieval art.[25]

The latter practice was reinforced in 1931 by the purchase of nine items of the so-called Guelph treasure, a collection of medieval Germanic gold-work, all made for use in Christian worship. When the treasure's owner (a son-in-law of the last German kaiser) decided to sell it, he put the precious relics on a tour of American museums, hoping to find a buyer. The three-week stopover in Cleveland was an immense success, bringing nearly 100,000 visitors. William Milliken, appointed director the year before on Whiting's retirement, subsequently convinced the trustees to part with $570,000 to acquire the treasure.[26]

Collection development in the 1930s continued to be strong, despite the depression. The foundation was laid for a major emphasis on pre-Columbian art by regular purchases, and donors

24. Cleveland Museum of Art, *Bulletin* 4, no. 1 (January 1917): 9; Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, p. 48.
25. *Seventh Annual Report*, p. 140; Harry Bober, "Medieval Art at Cleveland," *Apollo* 75, no. 6 (December 1963): 450.
26. Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, pp. 85-87.

such as Leonard Hanna (prints), and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. (sculpture) made major gifts.[27]

That the Cleveland Museum of Art had become one of the most important institutions in Cleveland was perhaps best symbolized by the success of its exhibit held in conjunction with the Great Lakes Exposition in Cleveland in the summer of 1936.[28] The special exhibition, which included 400 objects, helped bring 418,505 visitors to the museum in 1936, the largest attendance to that point in the museum's history.[29] This great success accentuated the growth of the museum's program, a growth which, Director Milliken dutifully pointed out in the same year as the Exposition, had made "the physical facilities of the Museum increasingly insufficient for the demands upon them."[30] There is perhaps no greater affirmation of institutional achievement than a shortage of space.

Cleveland Institute of Art: Supplying the Need for Designers

The Cleveland Institute of Art began operations in 1882 under the name of the Western Reserve School of Design for Women. Founded by, and initially located in, the home of Sarah M. Kimball, the school's original purpose was training women to work as designers of furnishings, textiles, and household

27. Cleveland Museum of Art, *Bulletin*, pt. 2 (1935): 4; pt. 2 (1939): 5; pt. 2 (1940): 3; Henry Hanley, "Pre-Columbian Art at Cleveland," *Apollo* 75, no. 6 (December 1963): 490-91.
28. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 468.
29. Wittke, *The First Fifty Years*, p. 87.
30. Cleveland Museum of Art, *Bulletin* 14, pt. 2 (April 1937): 3.

products in local industries. That purpose remained fundamental even though the school soon admitted a few male students, and developed a substantial program in the fine arts.[31]

The early survival of the school was ensured by the support of leading women and men of the city, many of whom were industrialists and civic leaders. Their support undoubtedly came from a mixture of motives and concerns, ranging from a general belief in the education and improvement of women to an interest in ensuring the competitiveness of Cleveland's manufactured goods.

Support notwithstanding, the school struggled to balance its books in the first years, and financial problems were probably behind the school's merger with Western Reserve University from 1888 to 1891. But the school's trustees backed out of the arrangement (which joined the art faculties of the institutions) when it became clear that the University did not support their interest in the industrial application of the arts.

The school reorganized on a firmer foundation in 1892 when the trustees, led by Stevenson Burke and his wife, Ella M. Burke, hired Georgie Leigh Norton (a graduate of the Massachusetts Normal Art School) as director, and acquired the former Horace Kelley residence on East 55th Street for classrooms and studios. Kelley's estate had been designated for the support of a future city art museum, so the sale of his house to the school of art was

31. This review of the Institute's history is based on Nancy Coe Wixom's T*he Cleveland Institute of Art: The First Hundred Years, 1882-1982* (Cleveland: Cleveland Institute of Art, 1983). Unless otherwise cited, data on the Institute are drawn from that work.

very appropriate. Norton reconstituted the curriculum for the 85 students enrolled that year, bringing in talented Cleveland artists, such as Louis Rorimer, a furniture designer, to supplement the regular instructors.

In 1904, as the school's increased enrollments and need for studio space pressed against the limits of the Kelley mansion, Jeptha H. Wade II donated to the school a parcel of land in the Wade Allotment at the corner of Magnolia Drive and Juniper Road. Wade was about to begin selling residential lots in this area, and the presence of an art institute was probably regarded as an attraction to prospective buyers. Discussions leading to the location of the Cleveland Museum of Art in Wade Park were also beginning, and the school's trustees probably wanted to be nearby.

A sturdy brick Italian Renaissance building was dedicated on the site early in 1906: the architects were Hubble and Benes, who had designed the Western Reserve Historical Society's new building in the Circle just six years earlier, and who a decade later were the architects of the nearby Cleveland Museum of Art. Half of the construction costs were paid by the Burkes, with the remainder donated by other board members.[32]

The school's new location provided opportunities for program expansion and for cooperative ventures with other Circle institutions. A public school teacher's training program began in

32. In 1906 the School asked John D. Rockefeller for $100,000 toward an endowment of $200,000, but there is no evidence that he made the gift: S. Murphy to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., 22 March 1906, "Cleveland School of Art" file, box 29, Welfare – General series, RG 2, RFA.

1906, and a juried exhibition for Cleveland-area artists was held the same year. Ceramics and commercial illustration were soon added to the curriculum, and in 1909-10 an addition was built for a clay modeling studio. Annexes were added in 1921 and 1923, the first with the aid of a $100,000 gift from Cleveland industrialist Worcester Warner.

The Cleveland Museum of Art opened in 1916, just a few blocks away from the school, and the next year the school's new director, Henry Turner Bailey, began serving as an advisor to the museum's education department. Bailey offered a half-year course in art appreciation at the museum in 1918 — enrolling 506 students and 97 auditors![33] Throughout the 1920s the school tried to develop closer ties with the Art Museum and Western Reserve University. Bailey explored with them the mutual benefits of a new site for the school, an architecture department (Bailey established one in 1921 which was expected to evolve into an independent institution), and an industrial arts museum to be operated by Western Reserve and Case.

The proposed new school site (which indeed became the location of the art school eventually) was at the corner of East Boulevard and Bellflower Road, and its proximity to the Museum of Art led the dreamers to plan for a tunnel to connect Cleveland's major art institutions. Being nearer to Case and Western Reserve more of their students were expected to enroll in art school courses. The College for Women already had a regular arrangement. These plans were one of the major considerations leading to the formation of the Cleveland

33. Cleveland Museum of Art, *Bulletin* 5 (January 1918): 21.

Conference for Educational Cooperation, a loose affiliation of Circle institutions that in the latter 1920s attempted to draw up a coherent design for institutional growth and development in the Circle.[34]

The grand plans for cooperation quickly dissipated with the onset of the Great Depression. From 1930 to 1933 enrollments dropped by 40% at the school, fund-raising was stifled, and faculty salaries were cut drastically. Bailey resigned as director in 1930 and his successor, Henry Hunt Clark, spent much of his fifteen years (1931-46) in the position seeking to maintain the school's standards in the face of uncertain enrollments (reduced first by depression, then war) and strained finances.

The school was sustained through these difficulties by continuing philanthropic support. For example, George Gund, a Cleveland businessman and banker, who had initially become a major donor in 1923 by establishing (along with his mother) an annual travel prize for an outstanding graduate, gave regular gifts until his death in 1966. The school also relied heavily on philanthropic support in the early 1950s when, under a new director and new name — the Cleveland Institute of Art (adopted 1948), it raised funds to erect a $3 million building on East Boulevard. Opened in 1956, the new facilities included expanded studios for painting, sculpture, weaving, metalwork, and many other activities, a 600-seat auditorium, two exhibition galleries, and (for the first time in its history) adequate library space. It was twenty-five years until additional permanent studio

34. *Cleveland Press*, 8 February 1928. See further discussion of the Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation in chapter 10, following.

space was needed, and then the old Ford Motor assembly plant ("The Factory") at Euclid Avenue and E. 116th Street was purchased and renovated.

The Cleveland Institute of Art continued to have a strong focus on industrial design and on craft skills, and joint programs with the Cleveland Museum of Art and Case Western Reserve University were an outstanding example of the fulfillment of the visions of the early leaders of Cleveland's cultural organizations.

Western Reserve Historical Society: Assembling a City's Memory

The Western Reserve Historical Society was founded as a department of the Cleveland Library Association in 1867, and is the oldest surviving cultural institution in Cleveland. It may seem strange that residents of a region just nearing its 70th anniversary of settlement wanted to preserve its "history," but several processes conspired to make Clevelanders aware of the need to conserve the records and artifacts of the past.

One consideration was that by the 1860s the youngest of the settlers of the Western Reserve, and their children, were near or past their biblically-allotted threescore and ten years, if not already dead. If their old letters, diaries, maps, and artwork were to be preserved, there was no time to be wasted. Moreover, the recent Civil War was generally regarded as the end of an era for the nation, and afterward was a time for forging a new national identity. There was both a sense of loss, and a recognition that the war in which so many had died or been maimed for

life would be a major reference point for those who had survived.

The task that the Historical Society set for itself from the very beginning was "to discover, procure and preserve whatever relates to the history, biography, genealogy, antiquities and statistics connected with the City of Cleveland and the Western Reserve."[35] The society was largely the brainchild of Charles C. Baldwin, a lawyer and judge, and Charles W. Whittlesey, a civil engineer and military officer, each of whom had strong amateur interests in geology, archaeology and history.

In an era of less specialization there was considerable overlap between natural history and human history, especially in the study of the American Indian, to which much of Whittlesey's work related. Whittlesey served as the society's president for its first 20 years, and published over 200 local and regional studies. Baldwin's central interest was cartography, and he amassed and donated to the society a large collection of maps dating from the early French explorations of the Great Lakes. He also showed substantial skill in interesting prominent Clevelanders in the society and in raising funds to sustain it.

The Historical Society's first home was the third floor of the Society for Savings building on the northwest edge of Public Square (or, as it was then called, Monumental Park). In 1892 (the same year that the Society received its own charter, becoming independent of the Library Association) the society was able to purchase the entire building, since the Society for Savings had

35. Elbert J. Benton, *Cultural Story of an American City: Cleveland*, part III. (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1946), p. 86.

moved into a much larger structure it had built on an adjacent lot. Major donations by Baldwin, John D. Rockefeller, Jeptha H. Wade II, Rutherford B. Hayes, and other trustees and officers funded the acquisition.[36]

Only three years later the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce offered to purchase the society's building. The terms of the purchase indicate how pivotal the University Circle area had become to the business and cultural leaders of the city, who had seen the Case and Reserve campuses established and part of Wade Park definitely set aside for an art museum. The Chamber's offer included both a lot at Euclid Avenue and 107th Street, and $55,000 in cash to erect a new building there. The society agreed to make the trade and hired the Cleveland architectural firm of Coburn, Barnum, Benes and Hubbell to design a fireproof building with a museum, library, and auditorium. However, John D. Rockefeller intervened because of his behind-the-scenes acquisition of the properties that he donated to the city in 1896 as Rockefeller Park, and insisted that the Historical Society be located adjacent to the new park at Euclid Avenue and 105th Street on land that he had purchased. The new building opened in 1898, adding a third imposing building to the row across from Wade Park begun by Adelbert College and Case Main in the 1880s.[37]

36. Orth, *Cleveland*, pp. 589-93; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 68-69, 1047-48.
37. Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture*, pp. 39-40; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 1041; Elbert J. Benton, *A Short History of the Western Reserve Historical Society, 1867-1942* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1942), pp. 8-9, 11; Amos Townsend to John D. Rockefeller, 6 August 1891, box 46, Office Correspondence, Record Group (hereafter RG) 1.2, Rockefeller Family Archives (hereafter RFA), Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC), Sleepy Hollow, NY; John

The society grew smoothly in its collections of books and artifacts over the next several decades. In 1913 it hired its first paid director, Wallace H. Cathcart, who had previously been a president of the society. Some of his efforts went toward increasing the society's endowment, reported as $10,000 in 1891. It was not much larger in 1915 when the trustees decided to raise enough to bring the total to $250,000, the interest of which was expected to cover the society's expenses. The largest step toward that goal was Ambrose Swasey's gift of $50,000 in 1920.[38]

As Cathcart focused on acquiring an outstanding collection of manuscripts and newspapers, and the interest of the public in museums became more apparent, the society's building on 107th Street became increasing inadequate for housing the collections.[39] In 1938 the society purchased the Hay-McKinney residence on East Boulevard, on the north edge of Wade Park, thus acquiring a second building with 26 exhibition rooms, an assembly hall, work rooms, and storage space. Major exhibits on the history of the Western Reserve were soon installed. Two

D. Rockefeller to Amos Townsend, 13 August 1891, box 2, Office Correspondence, RG 1.2, RFA; C. C. Baldwin to John D. Rockefeller, 27 February 1892, box 2, Office Correspondence, RG 1.2, RFA; J.G.W. Cowles to John D. Rockefeller, 28 January 1896, "Cleveland Boulevard, 1895-1897" folder, box 3, REI series, RG 2, RFA; John D. Rockefeller, memorandum, 30 January 1896, "Cleveland Boulevard, 1895-1897" folder, box 3, REI series, RG 2, RFA; J.G.W. Cowles to John D. Rockefeller, 30 January 1896, "Cleveland Boulevard, 1895-1897" folder, box 3, REI series, RG 2, RFA.

38. Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture*, p. 62; Benton, *A Short History*, pp. 11-12.
39. Amos Townsend to John D. Rockefeller, 6 August 1891, box 46, Office Correspondence, RG 1.2, RFA; Wallace H. Cathcart to John D. Rockefeller, 30 August 1920 box 27, Office Correspondence, RG 1.2, RFA; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 160.

years later the society exchanged its 107th Street building (which was soon demolished) for the Bingham-Hanna residence adjacent to its new museum property, and moved its library there. The two buildings were joined in 1959 by the construction of a central addition.[40]

In this new location the society flourished as never before. It became more of a community resource, and less a club for the historically-minded wealthy. It also began to carry out more fully its mandate as the custodian of the heritage of the Western Reserve, and began to preserve a record of the built environment as well as memorabilia and documents. In 1957 the society opened Hale Farm, south of Cleveland, as an operating homestead of the early 1800s, and in 1965 opened the Crawford Auto-Aviation Museum adjacent to its other East Boulevard buildings. The museum's automobile collection was the most visited site in the Circle in the 1970s and 1980s.[41]

Cleveland Music School Settlement: Music Outreach with Quality

The Cleveland Music School Settlement was founded in 1912 by Almeda C. Adams. Adams was the daughter of a Baptist minister in Ohio, Rev. James Adams. Losing her sight within a few months of her birth in 1865, she obtained an education at

40. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 160. Benton, *A Short History*, pp. 13-14; Meredith Colket, "The Italian Renaissance Buildings of the Western Reserve Historical Society," booklet reprinted from the *Western Reserve Historical Society News* (July-August 1979 and September-October 1979).
41. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 1041.

the Ohio School for the Blind, including training in vocal music. Wanting more specialized training, late in 1891 she decided to seek the scholarship to the New England Conservatory of Music which *Ladies Home Journal* had offered to a woman who could raise a large number of subscriptions. In the course of seeking subscriptions she came to Cleveland and had her story published in the *Plain Dealer*. Through her persistence and the publicity, Adams easily achieved her goal.[42]

In 1892 Adams matriculated at the Conservatory, where for two years she continued voice studies and was trained in music education in public schools. Afterward she taught for five years at the Nebraska School for the Blind, and then went to New York for further training. In 1901, stocked with experience, education, and sound references from her teachers and employers, she returned to Cleveland to assist her ailing mother, and began teaching music at three settlement houses — the Central Friendly Inn, Hiram House, and Alta House.

Working at Alta House, which had been founded by John D. Rockefeller, undoubtedly reintroduced Adams to Rockefeller, who had given her some financial support while she was at the Conservatory. Now he began to give her occasional gifts to further her musical programs, and he paid for her parent's admission to the Baptist Home for Old People. Adams joined the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church, which was a leading missionary church in the city and well-supported by Rockefeller's

42. Unless otherwise noted, the following paragraphs rely on Silvia Zverina's *And They Shall Have Music: The History of the Cleveland Music School Settlement* (Cleveland: Cobham and Hatherton Press, 1988).

philanthropy since he had been a member there throughout his Cleveland years.[43]

Rockefeller's approval of her work (he told her that she was "constantly giving sunshine to all about [her]") undoubtedly gave Adams heightened credibility with those Clevelanders interested in music institutions, and when in 1911 she decided that she would like to start a settlement house devoted to music, she presented the idea directly to Adella Prentiss Hughes, the leading musical promoter in the city.[44] Hughes asked Adams to address the Fortnightly Club on the subject, and that group — which sponsored regular concerts — set up a committee in February 1912 which only two months later founded the Cleveland Music School Settlement. Its purposes were to provide excellent instruction to musically talented youths without regard to their ability to pay, and to contribute generally to the musical life of the city. From the beginning the settlement served students from a mix of social and economic backgrounds.

The incorporators and trustees of the city were largely philanthropic-minded women who had previously been involved in social welfare and musical institutions, including Mr. Dudley S. Blossom, Mrs. L. Dean Holden, Mrs. John Huntington, Mrs. R. Livingston Ireland, and Mrs. Andrew Squire. The trustees also included Newton D. Baker, the new mayor of Cleveland.

43. Martha M. Tuttle to Almeda C. Adams, 20 September 1894, volume 37, John D. Rockefeller Letterbooks (hereafter JDR LBs), RG 1, RFA; John D. Rockefeller to Almeda C. Adams, 31 August 1905, volume 215, JDR LBs; n.a. to Almeda C. Adams, 13 January 1908, volume 223, JDR LBs; "Rev. James Adams," John D. Rockefeller pledge cards, RG 1; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 380.
44. John D. Rockefeller to Almeda C. Adams, 15 August 1908, volume 224, JDR LBs.

With such leadership it is not surprising that within the first year several individuals, as well as the Fortnightly Club, were induced to contribute $1000 or more to launch the settlement, and others made smaller contributions.

The Music School Settlement opened in the fall of 1912 in rooms at the Goodrich House, a social settlement in downtown Cleveland at St. Clair Avenue and East 6th Street. Within a few weeks there were 111 pupils studying under Almeda C. Adams as the voice teacher, and two other musicians as piano and violin teachers. Administratively the music settlement was headed by Linda W. Sampson, a nurse who proved to be an excellent leader.

Although the music settlement's financial future was not clear for years to come, the trustees energetically pursued their programs and goals. Very quickly the student body counted 18 nationalities, and it took an early interest in the needs of Cleveland's African-American community. The music settlement also obtained the assistance of the city government, getting special access to the supplies and instruments of the recently-failed municipal orchestra, and had the tuition for several blind children paid by the Board of Education.

By 1918 the space requirements for handling the pupils required leasing the former Corning residence at 7033 Euclid Avenue and then, in 1922, purchasing and moving to the former Joseph residence at 1927 E. 93rd Street, bringing the Cleveland Music School Settlement into the orbit of University Circle. The president of the trustees, Mrs. Francis E. Drury, was instrumental in raising some $21,000 (from such donors as Mrs.

Dudley S. Blossom and Samuel Mather) to make the move possible. By this time Almeda C. Adams had resigned as vocal teacher, remaining in Cleveland as an independent teacher and director of the Schumann Chorus. Catherine Saunders (formerly of the Boston Music School Settlement) had become the settlement's director, although the trustees remained very active in its operations.[45]

In its second decade the Music School Settlement continued its strong but not exclusive focus on providing music lessons to children of low-and moderate-income families. In 1921 many of its 375 students had been referred to it by other settlements or social welfare agencies in the city. Its thirty-five teachers were providing lessons on seven instruments, with additional classes in voice and chorus, music theory, dancing, and orchestral music. Its successful outreach program had permitted it to join the Welfare Federation of Cleveland in 1920, a new organization created to raise and distribute funds to the city's major charities, an affiliation which stabilized the Settlement's income.[46]

The Settlement had by now become woven into the fabric of Cleveland's musical life. The regular recitals of its students, the benefit concerts held to support the Settlement's scholarship

45. The reasons for Adams' resignation are obscure. She had spent 1918-19 on leave to study at the Mannes School in New York, and on her return referred to having a "most bitter and painful experience" at the Music School Settlement. The trustees accepted her resignation in September 1919. Silvia Zverina notes that new procedures were instituted by the new director (Catherine Saunders) who arrived in Adams' absence; possibly Adams was herself a candidate for the directorship and found it difficult to return to the Settlement in her old role. Almeda C. Adams to John D. Rockefeller, 10 August 1919, John D. Rockefeller, Sr. Correspondence, folder 25, box 3, RG 2, RFA.
46. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 394-95.

funds, and the passage of the Settlement's students into the settlements and schools of the area to work as teachers, had become important and expected functions of the Settlement. Through the 1920s and into the lean years of the 1930s the Cleveland Music School Settlement pursued its program with a dedication and level of excellence that made it a model for similar organizations throughout the United States.

In 1938, at the same time as the Western Reserve Historical Society's relocation, the settlement moved into the heart of the Circle. With the 93rd Street building threatened by the extension of Chester Avenue, the trustees purchased the Edmund S. Burke residence in Wade Park Allotment, arguably the most attractive home in University Circle. The settlement's president, Edward W. Garfield, convinced Burke to convey his house for only $25,000, when it had cost more than ten times that to construct. This new location brought the settlement into even closer contact with the Cleveland Orchestra, whose musicians were often teachers at the settlement; the Cleveland School (later Institute) of Music, with which the settlement shared some teachers and to which it sent students; and Western Reserve University, whose music department frequently sponsored cooperative activities. In its new setting the Settlement was able to increase its enrollments, and in 1946, the first year of the post-war education boom, it had 1,721 students.

In succeeding years the Cleveland Music School Settlement found that its services continued to be in demand. There was a growing need to provide musical opportunities for low-income children, and the musical culture of Cleveland continued to draw

heavily on both its staff and students. The settlement first expanded in 1955 when it purchased the adjacent Charles S. Brooks residence and renamed it the Kulas House in honor of the major donation of Mrs. Elroy J. Kulas. In 1966 through gifts of the Cleveland Foundation and the Leonard C. Hanna, Jr. Final Fund the settlement was enabled to purchase two additional houses nearby to serve as studios. The settlement's programs also spread through the city by opening branch programs in several areas and by establishing affiliations with the Koch School of Music in Rocky River, and the Rainey Institute on East 55th Street.

Musical Arts Association: The Virtuosity of Adella Prentiss Hughes

The Musical Arts Association is one of the great success stories of University Circle. Not only has it created and sustained one of the outstanding orchestras in the world, but it also established an outstanding program of musical education and built and operated Severance Hall, a jewel-like setting for the performing arts.

Cleveland had a growing tradition of musical performance in the first century of its cultural life. A Mozart (singing) Society flourished as early as the 1830s, encouraged by a newspaper editor who wrote that "In sustaining the Mozart, the citizens of Cleveland foster a science that does much to improve and refine society and give character to its social and religious institutions."[47]

47. *Annals of Cleveland 21* (1838): 189.

Succeeding generations of Clevelanders felt much the same way, especially immigrants, for whom music was a way of preserving language and providing entertainment, as well as teaching their children appreciation of the arts. An immigrant group's arrival in Cleveland in significant numbers was often signaled by the creation of singing societies, bands, and orchestras to perform music of their homelands, and, indeed, such musical groups were often closely allied with ethnic churches.[48]

Ethnic groups, particularly the Germans, provided the personnel and often the audience (not only in Cleveland but also in other American cities) for the early attempts to establish the most demanding ensemble of the Western musical tradition — the orchestra. The Cleveland Philharmonic Orchestra was formed in 1886 (although a predecessor group, the Cleveland Amateur Philharmonic Society, was created in 1881), and was able to develop sustained donor support though the mid-1890s. Upon its dissolution a series of ventures followed, including a municipally-supported orchestra in 1914-15. But none of these developed the kind of financial base necessary to recruit and hold players and directors of the highest caliber, or to purchase the music and other equipment necessary to sustain a first-class institution.[49]

48. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 704-6. Under "Music, Drama, Dance" the *Cleveland Ethnic Directory* of 1980 listed many musical groups with an ethnic focus, some with recognizable 19th-century roots: *Cleveland Ethnic Directory* (Cleveland: Nationalities Center of Cleveland, 1980).
49. Mary C. Harvey to John D. Rockefeller, 16 July 1886 and 11 October 1890, folder 143, box 19, Office Correspondence, RG 1.2, RFA; Charles F. Brush to John D. Rockefeller, 17 June 1893, box 5, Office Correspondence, RG 1.2, RFA; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 705; Margaret Lynch, "The Growth of Cleveland as a Cultural Center,"

It was the founding of the Fortnightly Musical Club in 1894 which began the thread leading to the current Cleveland Orchestra. Adella Prentiss Hughes was a founding member of the society who brought her talents as a musician and impresario to bear on the club's affairs. She was a native Clevelander, a Vassar graduate, and a trained pianist. In 1898 she took charge of the club's public concerts and proved able to attract outstanding talent and to keep the books balanced. Within a few years she organized a guaranty fund by which wealthy Clevelanders would pledge substantial amounts of support prior to each season. Her organizational acumen kept the Cleveland appearances of the Pittsburgh Orchestra and of soloist Ernestine Schumann-Heink within budget, and continually increased donors' confidence in her.[50]

In 1915 Hughes drew on this confidence by taking the lead role in the formation of the Musical Arts Association, a not-for-profit corporation with the purpose of "furthering the interests of music in the community, accepting and administering trust funds and guaranty funds for musical purposes, and acquiring, holding and operating property to promote the efficiency of musical enterprises."[51] Here was a commitment to sustain professional music in Cleveland. Adella Prentiss Hughes was the woman who had won that commitment and knew what to do with it.

In 1918 after three years of successful series with visiting

in Campbell and Miggins, eds., *The Birth of Modern Cleveland*, pp. 204, 206; Horowitz, *Culture and the City*, pp. 110-11.

50. Adella Prentiss Hughes, *Music is My Life* (Cleveland and New York: World Publishing, 1947), pp. 44, 51, 56-57; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 418, 531.
51. Hughes, *Music is My Life*, p. 202.

orchestras, Hughes led the Association into creating the Cleveland Orchestra. She persuaded John L. Severance to pay for one year the salary of conductor Nikolai Sokoloff (a Russian-born American), so that he could assist the Cleveland Public Schools in developing an instrumental music program. In the meantime Sokoloff was to create an orchestra out of local talent to perform in the schools, and in other invited settings. As it turned out, the "Spanish flu" epidemic limited Sokoloff's work in the schools and the first performance of the 54-member orchestra was on December 11, 1918 in Gray's Armory in downtown Cleveland.[52]

The Cleveland Orchestra grew steadily and received rapidly increasing recognition through the 1920s. Under the administration of Hughes, who continued to be successful as a fundraiser and organizer, the orchestra had a firm financial base. Corporations were prevailed upon to sponsor concerts, and Hughes was able to obtain substantial gifts from donors. Sokoloff was able to supplement Cleveland's talent with a few musicians from New York, and as soon as 1920 was able to offer contracts for thirty weeks to eighty-five players.[53]

In all of this growth the outreach to the schools was not forgotten. At the beginning the focus was on teaching instrumental music. Members of the orchestra went into the schools to instruct those playing particular instruments, or to lead entire ensembles. By 1922 800 pupils received instruction annually. The orchestra also gave concerts for schoolchildren, at

52. *Ibid*, pp. 254-55.
53. *Ibid*, pp. 263-4, 272, 279, 280-81.

first in the schools, but in 1921 and thereafter at Masonic Hall and other public auditoriums.

In 1929 the Musical Arts Association hired a professional musician, Lillian Baldwin, as Consultant in Music Education, with primary responsibility for developing the children's concerts. She wrote study material to go with each concert, and found ingenious ways to create and sustain interest. She urged students to save their money for concert fees by writing this ditty:

> "Hooray!" cried Quincy Quarter,
> "My owner's saving me
> To hear a Children's Concert
> I'm proud, as proud can be!"[54]

By 1945-46 the orchestra had an annual attendance at children's concerts of 60,000.[55]

The best way for an orchestra to gauge its development and stretch its capabilities is to go on tour. Adella Prentiss Hughes arranged a Pittsburgh appearance for the orchestra in its first season, and numerous other out-of-town engagements thereafter. As early as 1926 the orchestra's appearance at Carnegie Hall in New York provoked an enthusiastic review in the *Herald-Tribune*: "M. Sokoloff has again put us in his debt. His performance moved us to felicitate the happy concert goers of Cleveland, who can hear so fine an orchestra and conductor in

54. *Ibid*, pp. 290-94.
55. *Ibid*, pp. 298.

haughty independence and with pardonable pride."[56] Within a few years of its founding it was generally agreed that the Cleveland Orchestra was one of the best in the United States.

An established orchestra needs a home. In the first years of its existence the Cleveland Orchestra had several venues — the Masonic Hall, Public Hall downtown, and Gray's Armory — but none permanent, and none designed for the sound of a modern symphony orchestra. In 1928 Adella Prentiss Hughes and the trustees of the Musical Arts Association launched a campaign to fund the construction of a concert hall, and to create an endowment for the orchestra. Hughes and the chairman of the trustees, Dudley Blossom, had already laid the groundwork for a successful campaign by persuading John L. Severance to contribute $1 million for the hall (which Severance conditioned on the raising of an endowment of $2 million or more), and Blossom and his wife, Elizabeth Bingham Blossom, immediately donated $750,000 to the endowment fund.

The funds were raised by the spring of 1929 – as it turned out, none too soon with the onset of the Great Depression a few months away. The site for the new hall, to be dedicated as Severance Hall, was on Euclid Avenue at East Boulevard in University Circle. The lot was leased to the Musical Arts Association for $1 a year by Western Reserve University, which had been given the site by Jeptha H. Wade II. In recent years

56. Quoted in "Cleveland's Orchestra," *Fortune* (November 1931), p. 133.

the lot had been considered an ideal location for a cultural institution.[57]

The design of Severance Hall was carried out with utmost care. Hughes and Severance personally selected items for the auditorium such as seating, lighting, and color schemes for comfort and harmony. They consulted with orchestra members regarding proper seats, and planned for excellent rehearsal and storage facilities. A room for broadcasting live music and a chamber music hall were integrated into the plan; and the auditorium was fully air-conditioned. A driveway was to pass through the building at ground level so that limousines could drop off patrons as close to the auditorium as possible.[58]

During the construction of Severance Hall Mrs. Severance died, and Mr. Severance began to look upon the building as a memorial to his wife. He eventually spent more than double his original pledge in order to install the highest quality furnishings. As a result of his generosity the main foyer had a multi-colored marble floor, red jasper columns, and bronze trim. A frieze depicting the musical instruments of antiquity decorated the wall.

57. Hughes, *Music is My Life*, pp. 76-78. Newton Baker first urged that the University acquire the site: Newton D. Baker to Charles F. Thwing, 25 May 1912, folder 5, container 5, Newton Baker Papers, Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland, OH. Note that a plan of the western portion of University Circle prepared in 1922 has a large auditorium-like structure on the future site of Severance Hall: Michael G. Lawrence, *Make No Little Plans: Architectural Drawings from the Collection of the Cuyahoga County Archives and the Western Reserve Historical Society* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1980), pp. 34, 36.
58. “Cleveland’s Orchestra,” pp. 134, 139; Hughes, *Music is My Life*, pp. 79-80, 83-84

In contrast to the warm colors of the public meeting-place, the foyer, the auditorium had the cooler colors of a place of calm and contemplation. The upholstery, carpeting and draperies were originally aquamarine, the ceiling silver and gray, and the trim silver. The acoustics of the auditorium were excellent from the beginning, in part due to the design of the architects, Walker & Weeks, and in part because of the painstaking calculations of Professor Dayton Miller, chairman of the physics department at Case School.[59]

In this setting the Cleveland Orchestra played an opening concert on February 5, 1931, featuring "Evocation," a commissioned work for orchestra and chorus composed by Charles Martin Loeffler. Sokoloff, the conductor, had seen the orchestra evolve from merely a vision he shared with Adella Prentiss Hughes to a role of leadership in the musical world, leadership it sustained over the next 50 years. In 1933 Sokoloff was succeeded by Arthur Rodzinski, who had a particular interest in opera, and exploited the excellent facilities of Severance Hall with operatic productions during his first four years in Cleveland.[60] Many critics regarded the orchestra as the best in the world under conductor George Szell (1946-1970), whose dedication to precision performance gave the orchestra distinction. In 1959 Severance Hall was rebuilt at Szell's

59. "Cleveland's Orchestra," pp. 134, 139; Elizabeth Kirk, *Severance Hall: the First Fifty Years* (Cleveland: Carpenter Reserve Printing, 1981); Kathy Coquillette, *Guidebook: Severance Hall* (Cleveland: n.p., c. 1982); Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture*, pp. 161-63.
60. Hughes, *Music is My Life*, p. 81; Kirk, *Severance Hall*, unpaginated; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 839

insistence in order to allow the audience to appreciate the "Cleveland sound" more fully.[61]

* * *

The histories of the Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland Institute of Art, Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland Music School Settlement, and Cleveland Orchestra are largely representative of the cultural institutions that gathered at University Circle by the mid-20th century. They were created by dedicated citizens, largely members of the wealthy elite, who acted not only out of their own interest, but also in the faith that Cleveland would be a better place if public institutions were established to diffuse the benefits of modern culture. Generally they hired skilled professionals to lead the new institutions, and invariably the founders raised substantial funds (often out of their own pocketbooks) to run the programs created by those professionals.

As historian Margaret Lynch has noted, Cleveland created its art museum, orchestra and several other cultural institutions somewhat later than other Midwestern cities of comparable size, such as Chicago and Cincinnati. But Clevelanders were quicker to put them on a sound operating basis, both financially and professionally.[62] In general, the commonalities of philanthropic processes, and the effects of conscious planning, tended to shape their histories. A community of institutions was formed at the Circle whose commitment was to cultural uplift, care for the

61. E*ncyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 947.
62. Lynch, "The Growth of Cleveland as a Cultural Center," pp. 202, 208-9, 211-12, 214, 226; Horowitz, *Culture and the City*, pp. 159-66, 212-13.

socially unfortunate, and in some instances, religious values. In large measure, they reflected the ideals of the elite that founded and developed the University Circle.

9. The Kinship of Nonprofit Institutions

From about 1930 to 1985 the number of institutions in the Circle grew from about 15 to about 45. The Circle changed from an almost exclusively cultural and educational orientation to a mix that included a substantial group of health-related organizations and several religious institutions. The newer institutions tended to have missions and services more narrowly-defined than the earlier Circle institutions: they aimed at constituencies missed by the first institutions, or that had emerged in the subsequent social-cultural evolution of American society. Some in this latter group were interdisciplinary — serving as bridges between traditionally separate areas of culture. Others were local representatives of national organizations.

The newer institutions usually were more service-and outreach-oriented, and less repositories of objects or cultural tradition than the earlier institutions had been. Most of the newer institutions did not add to the monumental aspect that Circle architecture

had assumed by 1930, but were content to renovate former residences in Wade Allotment or to construct modest office buildings that merged unobtrusively with the visual environment of the Circle.

These newer institutions gravitated to the Circle because an environment had developed that was especially receptive to nonprofits. Initially many of them wanted to share resources with similar institutions in the spirit first established by Western Reserve University and Case School. Adjunct appointments for educators, common access to libraries and laboratories, shared training programs for students, an atmosphere of collegiality for professional staff, and (after the founding of the University Circle Development Foundation in 1957) shared parking and private police services were sufficient attractions to the Circle for many organizations with Cleveland or northeast Ohio orientations. Moreover, outside funding agencies often encouraged the development of interrelationships and shared facilities as a means of maximizing the effect of their support.

The most important group of nonprofits to emerge in the Circle since 1930 were those in the health field. The building of the Western Reserve University School of Medicine and the University Hospitals in the Circle in the 1920s and 1930s was the core of this development, but without other significant health-related institutions the Circle would not have become a major American medical center.[1]

1. For the planning and construction of the School of Medicine and University Hospitals see chapter 2. For further discussion see Frederick C. Waite, *Western Reserve University Centennial History of the School of Medicine* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1946); David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *Encyclopedia of Cleveland*

Mt. Sinai Hospital, a 150-bed facility, was opened in a new building on its 105th Street site in 1916. First established in 1903 in a remodeled residence on East 37th Street, it was partially-supported by the Federation of Jewish Charities. The hospital's new location served the eastward shift of Jewish settlement in Cleveland, although from the beginning the hospital was a medical center for all East-side ethnic groups.

The hospital was a pioneer in the specialized care of children, opening a pediatric clinic in 1915 and establishing a mental hygiene section in 1927 for treating children's psychiatric problems. Education was also a focus: in 1916 the hospital opened a school for nurses, and in 1925 affiliated with the Western Reserve University School of Nursing. Much later, in 1947, the hospital became a teaching unit of the Western Reserve University School of Medicine. Mt. Sinai early supported medical research, an emphasis strengthened on the opening of a laboratory in 1925.

Expansion of the hospital's facilities occurred at regular intervals into the 1980s. The number of patient beds increased more than three-fold, and numerous new departments and clinics were created to keep up with developments in heart, kidney, lung, eye, bone, nervous, and other diseases. Large personal gifts, the support of the Women's Auxiliary, and grants from the National Institutes of Health and the Public Health Service

History (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987), pp. 1000-2; Clarence H. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve: A History of the University 1826-1976* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976), pp. 295-304; and Darwin H. Stapleton, "Abraham Flexner, Rockefeller Philanthropy, and the Western Reserve School of Medicine," *Ohio History* 101 (Summer-Autumn 1992): 100-113.

made possible the expansion of research and facilities. In 1981 the hospital changed its name to the Mt. Sinai Medical Center to reflect the broad range of activities it encompassed.[2] The Medical Center was closed in 1996.

Another major medical institution, the Cleveland Clinic, was established near the Circle at East 93rd and Euclid Avenue in 1921. The idea for the Clinic came out of the World War I military medical corps experience of three surgeons and one physician from Cleveland. Impressed by the efficient yet effective treatment provided to the enormous number of wounded and diseased men, particularly near the battlefront in France, Frank E. Bunts, George W. Crile, William E. Lower, and John Phillips joined to form the Cleveland Clinic Foundation.

The Clinic aimed to have a high degree of specialization in its practice, promising to utilize the latest developments in research and medical practice. Laboratory research was part of the program from the beginning, and fellowships for young physicians were instituted to introduce them to the new system. Because all of the founders held appointments at the Western Reserve University School of Medicine, they designed the programs of the Clinic to supplement, and not compete with, the school. That connection also was manifest by regularly electing presidents of Western Reserve and Case to the Clinic's board.

The Clinic survived a tragic fire in 1929 that killed many patients and some of the staff. Afterward it continued to develop a world-wide reputation for specialized surgery and treatment

2. "The Mt. Sinai Hospital of Cleveland: Historical Highlights," *Mt. Sinai News: Quarterly Report*. parts 1-4 (1976).

for such problems as thyroid and adrenal gland malfunctions, and for abdominal cancers. In the 1950s the research orientation of the Clinic was heightened by reducing the authority of the medical and surgical divisions and introducing new committees to oversee long-term research programs. This change helped to keep the Clinic responsive to new approaches, such as the more conservative surgical techniques which it helped to promote in the 1950s and 1960s.

By the 1980s the Clinic was an international center for treatment of cancers, heart disease, digestive tract disorders, muscle and skeletal problems, nerve tissue damage, and diseases of the urinary and reproductive systems. The vast majority of the Clinic's patients (which included 32,000 hospital admissions and 600,000 outpatient visits annually by 1984) came from outside the Cleveland area, and many came from outside the United States.

The Clinic had physically expanded to serve this enormous population. By the mid-1980s the Clinic had grown eastward along Euclid Avenue to East 105th Street, and had acquired essentially all the land between Euclid Avenue and Carnegie Avenue to the south. That expansion brought it right to the edge of the traditional boundary of University Circle. In many non-geographic ways, including its associate membership in University Circle Incorporated and the numerous interconnections of its faculty and staff with other Circle institutions, the Clinic was well within the Circle.[3]

3. Alexander T. Bunts and George Crile, Jr., comps., *To Act as a Unit: The Story of the Cleveland Clinic* (Cleveland: Cleveland Clinic Foundation, 1971); *The Cleveland Clinic Foundation: A National Referral Center, An*

The newest large hospital in the Circle, the Cleveland Veteran's Administration Hospital, arrived in the 1960s. Although 19 acres of land were purchased between 105th and 108th streets north of East Boulevard in 1948, federal monies for construction were not allocated until 1960. A 300-bed hospital was opened in 1964, and a decade later a 280-bed wing was added. The hospital specialized in treating the spinal-cord injuries of both veterans and non-veterans, and was affiliated with the CWRU School of Medicine.[4]

Two smaller hospitals are also part of the medical history of the Circle. Woman's Hospital, which had evolved from a dispensary established by women physicians in downtown Cleveland in 1878, came to the Circle in 1915 when it moved into a rented building on East 107th Street. Three years later the hospital erected a new building at East 101st Street and, with a largely female staff, remained there until it closed in 1984. Doctors' Hospital was established in 1946 in Cleveland Heights at Edgehill and Cedar Roads in response to a perceived shortage of hospital beds in Cleveland. Renovating an apartment building into a 200-bed facility, Doctors' specialized in cancer treatment and research. In 1968 the building was sold and the staff moved to a new location in Mayfield Heights, several miles to the east.[5] It was renamed Hillcrest Hospital and by 2019 was associated with the Cleveland Clinic.

International Health Resource (Cleveland: Cleveland Clinic Foundation, 1985).

4. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. p. 1010; Adams, Howard and Greeley, *University Circle: A Plan for Its Development* (Boston: Adams. Howard and Greeley, 1957), p. 36.
5. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. pp. 347, 1060-61.

Compared to University Hospitals, Mt. Sinai, and the Clinic, most of the other health-related institutions that were located in or near the Circle seemed small. Nonetheless, to their constituencies, such as the emotionally-disturbed, handicapped, ill, and young and old, they loomed large.

In the area of children's services the Hanna Perkins School (located adjacent to University Hospitals since 1961) educated a population of emotionally-disturbed preschool children and provided them psychoanalysis and treatment. It traced its roots to a therapeutic nursery school established in 1931 by Dr. Amy Katan of the School of Medicine. Another children's institution, the Ronald McDonald House on Euclid Avenue, when founded in 1979 served children with cancer by providing them and their families temporary living quarters when visiting Circle hospitals for treatment.[6]

The disabled and aging have been served in the Circle by several institutions. The Cleveland Association for the Hard of Hearing was founded in 1921 by Mrs. James R. (Helen Newall) Garfield, a civic-minded Clevelander whose husband was a leading legal and political figure in the city. Merging with the speech clinic of Western Reserve University in 1943 to form the Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, a new facility was required, and in 1952 Nathan L. Dauby donated his house on Euclid Avenue in the heart of the Circle. In the 1960s a new building was erected on the same site to provide for the diagnosis, treatment, and

6. Typescript histories of the Hanna Perkins School, in author's files; *Celebrating Ten Years of Love: Ronald McDonald House of Cleveland* (Cleveland: n.p., 1989), a commemorative booklet.

continuing counseling relating to communication disorders in speech, language and hearing.[7]

The Cleveland Society for the Blind was created in 1906 as a result of efforts by the Goodrich Settlement House and the Cleveland Public Library to teach unsighted people to read. Successful programs to employ the blind and to help them to learn and live in a sighted society were carried out at various locations until in 1951 a building was purchased on East 93rd Street and a rehabilitation unit was opened the following year. In 1966 that building was closed and the Sight Center was opened at East 101st Street to provide social, rehabilitative, and recreational services.[8]

For many years the Circle's most important psychiatric institution was Ingleside Hospital, founded in 1935 by Mabel A. Woodruff, a psychiatric social worker at City Hospital. In 1937 it moved into quarters near 89th and Euclid Avenue formerly occupied by the Huron Road Hospital. The hospital aimed to provide emotionally-kind and medically-correct short-term care, and became well-regarded in its field. New buildings were erected on the site in 1954 and 1968, but the hospital closed the following year due to financial problems and a labor strike. Reopened in 1970 as Woodruff Memorial Institute, focusing on drug dependency problems, it served the city for another 16

7. Typescript histories of the Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, in author's files; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 332-33.
8. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 272; "Milestones in the History of the Cleveland Society for the Blind," a leaflet published by the Society, c. 1980.

years when its programs were transferred to St. Vincent Charity Hospital.[9]

Care for the elderly has become an increasingly important element of health-related services in the Circle, and indeed in the United States. The Judson Retirement Community on Chestnut Hills Drive was founded in 1906 by a group of Cleveland Baptist women as the Baptist Home of Northern Ohio. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. contributed heavily to the first fundraising efforts. It first had residential care in the former William P. Southworth residence downtown, and later moved to a building at East 89th Street and Cedar Avenue. In 1940 the current site, the estate of Warren G. Bicknell, was purchased, and in the ensuring years the Bicknell mansion has been augmented by the construction of buildings designed specifically for elder care. Judson expanded its commitment to the Circle in 1983 when it purchased Wade Park Manor on East 107th Street, which had been operated as a retirement residence since 1964 and renamed it Judson Manor.[10]

Another important institution for the elderly was the Eliza Bryant Center, originally the Cleveland Home for Aged Colored People. The first nonreligious welfare institution in the city supported primarily by African-Americans, the Center was named after its founder. Beginning in 1893 Eliza Bryant was

9. *Woodruff Memorial Institute* (Cleveland: Woodruff Memorial Institute, 1971); *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 1068.
10. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. pp. 583-84. See: “Baptist Home of Northern Ohio - Gift from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., 1907- 1951,” folder 36, box 5, series N, Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC), Sleepy Hollow, NY.

the prime mover in a campaign to establish a home for elderly Black residents, and the first home was opened in 1897 at East 71st Street near Lexington Avenue in the Hough district. Underfunded and often relying on inadequate facilities, the home struggled to serve a few clients until it became an early member of Cleveland's Federation for Charity and Philanthropy in 1913. A fundraising drive raised enough to purchase a fifteen-room house on East 39th Street in 1914, which finally gave the home satisfactory quarters. In 1967 the home returned to Hough, moving into a larger building at Addison Road and Wade Park Avenue, a location about a mile west of the Circle.[11]

Another specialized and health-related organization in the Circle is the Free Medical Clinic of Greater Cleveland, founded in 1970 primarily to serve young people with drug problems. Staffed largely by physicians and medical students from Circle institutions, the Clinic was opened on Cornell Road after a telephone counseling service demonstrated the need for a drug-related medical facility, and grants from the Gund, Weatherhead, and Cleveland foundations provided the necessary backing. Very quickly the Clinic became a resource for poor and indigent in the surrounding community, and expanded its program to provide a range of social and health-related services. It moved to a nearby Euclid Avenue location in 1974. The Clinic was the first home of the Cleveland Rape Crisis Center, a counseling service for victims of sexual abuse established in 1974.[12]

11. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. p. 371; Kenneth W. Rose, "John D. Rockefeller's Philanthropy and Problems in Fundraising at Cleveland's Floating Bethel Mission and the Home for Aged Colored People," *Ohio History* 108 (Summer-Autumn 1999): 145-161.
12. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History.* pp. 269, 422.

The second large group of institutions that came to the Circle mostly after 1930 were primarily culturally and educationally oriented. Following in the train of institutions of higher education and museums of art and history, these institutions found that locating near them had decided advantages.

Two major theatrical institutions were founded in 1915-16 that eventually became members of University Circle Incorporated, even though they were not within its geographic boundaries. Karamu House was founded in 1915 by two graduates of Oberlin College, Rowena and Russell Jelliffe, with the aid of Cleveland's Second Presbyterian Church.[13] The Jelliffes' original intention was to establish a settlement house in the heart of the Central district of Cleveland, a mostly-Black neighborhood with few recreational facilities provided by the city. But soon they found that their greatest skills were in the performing arts and, even though social service functions continued to have a role in their program. By the 1920s dramatic productions featuring African-American Clevelanders became Karamu's central activity.

The first performing hall was a neighboring store acquired and remodeled in 1927. It housed a number of well-received plays, including some written by Langston Hughes in the latter 1930s. When the theater burned in 1939 Karamu had sufficient reputation that it was offered the temporary use of the facilities of the Cleveland Play House and Western Reserve University. A fund-raising campaign which received major donations from Leonard Hanna, Jr. and the Rockefeller Foundation slowly

13. David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *The Dictionary of Cleveland Biography* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1996), pp. 244-45.

raised the funds for a new theater. On site at East 89th Street and Quincy Avenue, about a mile southwest of University Circle, a new building with two auditoriums was constructed.

In the following decades Karamu took on a greater role as an exponent of Black culture and aspirations, a role that enabled many people to begin careers in the arts. The Cleveland Foundation and other local philanthropies often supported its programs, which included neighborhood services such as day care as well as arts education.[14]

The Cleveland Play House emerged out of discussions held in the fall of 1915 by a group of literati that met at the home of Charles and Minerva Brooks in the Wade Allotment. The next year the group founded the Play House Company and elected as director Raymond O'Neil, a Cleveland music and theater journalist. The first theater was a barn at East 86th Street and Euclid Avenue, where the first performance opened in 1916. The next year a church at East 73rd Street and Cedar Avenue was purchased and remodeled with the aid of a bank loan.

The Play House was put on a firm footing in 1921 when a trio of young but trained performers was brought in from the Carnegie Institute of Technology's drama program, including Frederic McConnell as director, Max Eisenstatt as set designer, and K. Elmo Lowe as assistant director. These men successfully

14. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. pp. 568-69, 587; John Selby, *Beyond Civil Rights* (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966); Karamu House file, Cleveland Foundation Records, Western Reserve Historical Society (hereafter WRHS), Cleveland, OH; Karamu House grant file, folders 3092-93, box 25, series 200, Record Group 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

ran the Play House until Lowe retired in 1969, having followed McConnell as director in 1958. The Play House established itself as one of the finest regional theaters in the United States, and by the 1930s had a strong affiliation with the Western Reserve University drama department.

In 1927 the Play House built a two small theaters on land donated by the Drury family at East 86th Street between Euclid and Carnegie Avenues, and more than fifty years later, in 1984, the Play House incorporated those theaters into a new $14 million complex with a larger main theater and much larger backstage facilities. Two of the theaters were equipped with special listening systems for the hearing-impaired.[15]

The Cleveland Institute of Music is another performing arts organization which migrated to the Circle. Co-founded in 1920 by Mrs. Franklyn B. Sanders, a major figure in the Fortnightly Musical Club who became the Institute's first executive director, and Mrs. Joseph T. Smith, the Institute had its home for forty years in residences in downtown Cleveland formerly owned by such leading Cleveland industrialists such as the Chisholms, Mathers, and Coxes. The Institute early provided free music lessons for gifted public school children, but most of its students paid to be trained by the professional musicians on its staff, many of whom were members of the Cleveland Orchestra. In 1952 the Institute began joint degree programs with Western Reserve University.

15. Chloe Warner Oldenburg, *Leaps of Faith: History of the Cleveland Play House, 1915-85*. (Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Bros., 1985); *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 12 May 1935; "Welcome to the Cleveland Play House," leaflet (1986).

Needing a larger facility the Institute purchased land along Murray Hill Road in the 1930s, but eventually decided to erect a new building on East Boulevard in the Circle. The Institute's architects designed an International-style building with an striking exterior frame and expanses of glass that opened in 1961. The Institute later developed closer relationships with CWRU, including a joint music education degree with the music department.[16]

The Cleveland Museum of Natural History has a life story remarkably similar to that of the Institute. It was also founded in 1920 and remained at a downtown location for forty years before moving to the Circle. However, there were much different purposes and actors.

The germ of the museum was a 1918 report of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce's education committee, chaired by Harold T. Clark, which called for consolidation of the various natural history collections in the city. A group of twenty-six sponsors was gathered, each of whom promised to donate $1000 a year for twenty years: the group combined amateurs, some physicians and academics, including Case geology professor Frank Van Horn, and a few of Cleveland's civic leaders, such as Mantis and Oris Van Sweringen. Clark, a leading corporate and probate lawyer, became the guiding force behind the museum.

The museum's first permanent home was the former Leonard

16. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. pp. 214, 418; "A Summary of Certain Items...," 1925, folder 2, Cleveland Conference for Education Cooperation papers, WRHS; Adams, Howard and Greeley, *University Circle*, p. 44; Mary-Peale Schofield, *Landmark Architecture of Cleveland* (Pittsburgh: Ober Park Associates, 1976), p. 182.

Hanna mansion on Euclid Avenue. The building quickly became filled with specimens of plants, animals, and minerals, including those obtained on a well-publicized collecting expedition to the South Atlantic financed by Mrs. Dudley S. Blossom. The museum soon developed a program for public school children, and the board of education placed several teachers there to arrange and supervise class visits to the museum.

As early as 1925 the museum intended to move to University Circle: Western Reserve University helped it obtain a site on East Boulevard. However, funding was not forthcoming, and the onset of the Depression delayed plans indefinitely. Not until 1958-61, with Clark still a major figure in developing financing, was the museum able to build in the Circle. The East Boulevard location was no longer available and the new museum occupied part of the northern edge of Wade Park. The collections of the museum had been refocused on the Cleveland region, although some of the new facilities — such as the planetarium — still emphasized general interests in natural science. The new museum immediately drew much larger attendance, and for the next two decades it remained one of the most important visitor sites in the Circle. It also became more closely integrated into the research and graduate programs of Case Western Reserve University.[17]

17. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 193-4, 253; records, 1918-1926, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, OH; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, 7 June 1926; Cleveland Museum of Art, *Bulletin*. 11th Annual Report (1926): 28; *The Cleveland School-Museum Program* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art and Cleveland Museum of Natural History, 1927); *The Explorer 2*, no. 1 (1949): 2; *University Circle*, June 1961, p. 2.

The Garden Center of Greater Cleveland also came to occupy a portion of Wade Park. The Center was established by members of the Garden Club of Cleveland who had first collaborated closely on the Fine Arts Garden in front of the museum of art. The space between the museum and the lagoon in Wade Park had remained undeveloped after the opening of the museum in 1916 — ten years later Cleveland's city manager W.R. Hopkins described it as "squalid beyond description."

The Garden Club decided to beautify the area and in 1923 raised funds by holding an "Italian street fair" in downtown Cleveland. With the proceeds they hired as landscape architects the Olmstead Brothers firm of Brookline, Massachusetts, to provide a design. It called for a highly-ordered arrangement of shrubs and sculpture. The design was implemented in 1927-28 with funds provided largely by the wealthy women who were the leaders and members of the Garden Club. The city of Cleveland cooperated by culverting Doan Brook, improving the banks of the lagoon, and laying sidewalks and installing storm sewers.[18]

The success of the Fine Arts Garden drew the Club's attention to the vacant boathouse at the south end of the lagoon next to Euclid Avenue. They decided in 1930 to deposit their growing library there and create a public center for the encouragement of gardening. To raise funds they again turned to the device of a street fair, but this time it was located in from of the art museum and had a French theme. With the money in hand the

18. W.R. Hopkins to F.S. Harmon, 18 May 1926, and F.S. Harmon to W.R. Hopkins, 24 January 1927, folder 2, container 4, William R. Hopkins Papers, WRHS; history of the Fine Arts Garden, enclosed with I.T. Frary to Mrs. John Sherwin, 4 June 1928, folder 5, container 2, William R. Hopkins Papers, WRHS.

club members obtained Harold T. Clark's assistance to guide a lease through city council and then renovated the boathouse to provide library, exhibit, meeting and office space.

Though two small wings were added to the Center in 1939 it remained physically one of the smallest institutions in the Circle. Nonetheless it was highly active, sponsoring a garden program for city school children, receiving many visitors to the Center, and giving instruction and holding flower and plant exhibitions in other locations.

In 1959 a massive flood of Doan Brook washed over Euclid Avenue into the Garden Center, doing extensive damage. Given the limited space at the Center, the possibility of a similar flood in the future, and the lack of adjacent parking, it seemed wise to move to a new location. A building campaign was initiated in 1962 with large grant from the Leonard C. Hanna, Jr. Fund, which was administered by Harold T. Clark, and other Cleveland foundations, corporations, and individuals soon contributed. A much larger Center was planned for the northeastern border of Wade Park, at the ravine that had contained part of the original Cleveland Zoo. Although some controversy ensued over plans to fill the ravine, eventually a design was developed which incorporated it into the site plan. The Center was opened in 1966 and within a few years model herb, rose, and Japanese gardens were laid out. The Center continued to serve as a headquarters for numerous local garden clubs, as a source of instruction for schoolchildren, and as a source of advice and inspiration for all gardeners.[19] From 1995 to 2014 the Center changed names twice

19. Margaret Keal Knowles, *Fifty Years of Growing and Serving: The Garden Center of Greater Cleveland, 1930-1980* (Cleveland: Garden

(in 2014 due to a merger with the Holden Arboretum), and in 1995, with a remodeling in 2003, constructed a substantial new facility on East Boulevard.

The Circle is the home for two specialized museums that educate and instruct. The Howard Dittrick Museum of Historical Medicine has housed the historical collections of the Cleveland Medical Library Association since the Association's Allen Library building on Euclid Avenue was completed in 1926. Holding one of the largest collections of medical items in the country, the museum has been a resource for scholars as well as a place to view exhibits. The Cleveland Health Education Museum was opened in 1940 to provide public instruction in health and medicine. Its first site was a residence given it by Elisabeth S. Prentiss, but in 1943 the museum acquired the Treadway mansion at 89th and Euclid Avenue, and remodeled and expanded it for educational uses. Over time the museum's major emphasis became the health education of schoolchildren.

The third major group of institutions in the Circle is religion-related. There are more than a dozen churches and other religious organizations in the Circle. In general, these institutions have not been attracted to the Circle because of their nonprofit status, but because their members are or once were residents of the area.

Several churches were erected on Euclid Avenue to the west of the Circle by the late 1800s as the population in the area

Center of Greater Cleveland, 1980); "The Greater Cleveland Garden Center," *University Circle*, August 1962, p. 2; *New York Times*, 24 November 1964.

increased. Euclid Avenue Congregational probably had the longest continuous presence in the area, descending from a Sunday School organized at Doan's Corners in 1828. The current building (1985) was erected at 96th Street in 1887. Emmanuel Episcopal Church was begun as a satellite congregation of St. Paul's Episcopal in 1871 at East 36th Street and Prospect Avenue. Moving to its present location at East 86th Street a few years later, it first had a frame house of worship. In 1900 Ralph Adams Cram designed a stone Gothic Revival building, which was erected in 1902-4.[20] The Logan Avenue Baptist Church was built at East 97th and Euclid Avenue following the formation of a Baptist congregation in the area in 1884. A much larger building in the Georgian Revival style was dedicated on the same site in 1907 with financial assistance from John D. Rockefeller. The congregation (renamed Church of the Master in 1921) moved to Cleveland Heights in 1948. Calvary Presbyterian Church was at first a mission established in 1884 at East 79th Street and Euclid Avenue by the Old Stone (Presbyterian) Church. In 1888-90 a stone Romanesque church was constructed on the same site based on the plans of architect Charles Schweinfurth.

Some of the Circle churches were founded by particular ethnic groups and had to be located to serve them. Holy Rosary Church in Murray Hill was dedicated in 1909 to serve a largely Catholic Italian population that had built up there over the previous two decades. The Temple was built on East 105th Street next to Mt. Sinai Hospital in 1924 because of the eastward movement of the Jewish population of Cleveland, and the largely reform-

20. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. pp. 375, 380-1.

minded congregation of the Temple moved with it. (By 2010 the building was no longer used for religious services, and had become the Maltz Performing Arts Center of Case Western Reserve University.) Mt. Zion Congregational Church, with a largely African-American congregation, after 90 years of services in a series of four church buildings, each located further out from the center of Cleveland, moved eastward into a new edifice in the Circle in 1954.

A few churches were built in the Circle because recently-formed congregations decided to construct monumental buildings and sought spacious, visible locations for them. The Church of the Covenant was created by a union of two Presbyterian churches, one downtown and one already located in the Circle. In 1911 they completed a Gothic-style building, designed by Ralph Adams Cram, on Euclid Avenue adjacent to the College for Women. It was decorated with Tiffany stained glass and contained both a nave for worship and a wing for other activities. Epworth-Euclid United Methodist Church resulted from the merger of the Euclid Avenue Methodist Church, which had been established at Doan's Corners in the 1830s, and the Epworth Memorial Church, a descendent of several downtown congregations. In 1920 the congregations purchased a lot on 107th Street overlooking the Wade Park lagoon and, after several years spent fundraising, commissioned architect Bertram Goodhue to design a new building. Completed in 1928 with a soaring steeple reminiscent of the church of Mont St.-Michel in France, the church has been called one of the most beautiful Protestant churches in the United States. In 2010 it was renamed University Circle United Methodist Church.

The First Church of Christ, Scientist was formed in 1891 from an earlier group of adherents, and erected its first building at East 46th Street and Cedar Avenue ten years later. In the 1920s the church purchased land in University Circle near the corner of Euclid Avenue and East Boulevard where Severance Hall now stands and plans were made to erect a new church there. However, the congregation graciously acceded to rapidly-developing efforts to locate on East Boulevard new buildings for the Cleveland Museum of Natural History and the Cleveland Orchestra, and chose a new site on Overlook Road in Cleveland Heights where a beautiful classical church was dedicated in 1931.[21]

Western Reserve University had two Gothic-style chapels to serve its Protestant students. The College for Women had Florence Harkness Chapel, completed in 1902 on the design of Cleveland architect Charles Schweinfurth. On the Adelbert College campus was Amasa Stone Chapel, designed by Henry Vaughn and erected in 1911 by the daughters of Amasa Stone in honor of their father. These chapels were superseded in the early 1970s by the Interfaith Plaza built on Euclid Avenue next to the Church of the Covenant. Joseph Pigott, then Vice-President of Case Institute of Technology, had been instrumental in

21. Eric Johannesen, *Cleveland Architecture, 1876-1976* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1979), pp. 18-19, 100,160-61, 201; Schofield, *Landmark Architecture of Cleveland*. pp. 129, 166-67, 176; Henry E. Bourne, *The Church of the Covenant: The First Hundred Years* (Cleveland: Church of the Covenant, 1945); Carlton K. Matson and Harold T. Clark, “The Cleveland Educational Group Plan,” *Your Garden* 1 (March 1928): 447; Mary Bopp and Janice McMillin, comps., *More Than a Landmark: Eoworth-Euclid United Methodist Church, 1928-1978* (Cleveland Heights, OH: Creative Copy Associates, 1978); Encyclopedia of Cleveland History. p. 183.

promoting plans for the Plaza. Combining the Jewish (Hillel), Catholic (Hallinan), and Protestant (University Christian Movement) student organizations, the Plaza provided a modern multipurpose place for both worship and social activities.[22]

* * *

In general, the forces that moved institutions toward and into the Circle transcended programmatic needs. Their histories were shaped by commonalities of philanthropic processes, and the eventual effects of conscious planning. A community of institutions was formed at the Circle whose commitment to cultural uplift, care for the socially unfortunate and, in some instances, serving purposes of religious faith and values, reflected the ideals of the elite that developed and sustained University Circle.

22. *The Hallinan Center*, a leaflet (Cleveland: Hallinan Center, c. 1971); Schofield, *Landmark Architecture of Cleveland*. pp. 164-5, 168; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. pp. 22.

Part III: Planning

“That many institutions, the primary purpose of which is education, should become the neighbors of a group which already includes Western Reserve University, Case School, the Museum of Art and others, in a setting ideal for distinctive architecture, was a dream long cherished by a few Cleveland citizens of great vision.”

Canton K. Matson and Harold T. Clark, “The Cleveland Education Group Plan,” *Your Garden,* 1928.

“University Circle did not just happen, it was planned.”

Kenneth Pinkerton, president of University Circle Inc., 1989.

10. Planning the Circle: Land Use and Cooperation, 1870-1940

As the Circle came of age in the twentieth century, professional city planning came to define the Circle's growth and character. By the mid-point of the century, planning, as a means of rationalizing and controlling land-use and developing and maintaining an acceptable system of roads and other services, had become a fully cooperative venture of the Circle institutions.

The planning mentality in Cleveland evolved in association with the creation of the city's parks in the late 19th century, and subsequently received strong support from the progressive-era business establishment. Throughout Cleveland's history planning has been promoted by and sustained by the city's elite. Typically, their vision of planning has been articulated and reified by agencies which they have created or controlled. This pattern has held not only for Cleveland, but also for American cities generally.[1]

1. David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. 1987),

The first planning agency in Cleveland was a board of three park commissioners created in 1871 and charged with responding to the need for parkland. The board concentrated first on improving the old village greens in the city that remained from the layout of the earliest settlement. Then the board purchased land for two additional parks of modest size. The commissioners were empowered to raise funds for new parks by tax levies and bond issues.

The first commissioners were eminent businessmen, and the appointment of Jeptha Wade (one of the city's wealthiest citizens) to the board in 1875 solidified its connection to Cleveland's elite. Wade's 1882 gift to the city of his private park (forever thereafter known as Wade Park) near Doan's Corners was the city's first major acquisition of parkland, but did not require much foresight on the part of the city government, which had a substantial dispute over accepting his largesse.[2]

Systematic planning began in 1890 when the park

pp. 43-44, 187-88; David Hammack, "Comprehensive Planning before the Comprehensive Plan: Planning in the Nineteenth-Century American City," in Daniel Schaffer, ed., *Two Centuries of American Planning* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), pp. 139-65; Judith Sealander, *Grand Plans: Business Progressivism and Social Change in Ohio's Miami Valley, 1890-1929* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1988), pp. 70-71, 82-84, 181-83; Richard K. Fogelsong, *Planning the Capitalist City: The Colonial Era to the 1920s* (Princeton. N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986); M. Christine Boyer, *Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning*. (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1983).

2. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 168, 754; Samuel J. Orth, *A History of Cleveland, Ohio* (Chicago: S.J. Clarke, 1910), pp. 647, 746; Randall Wade to Jeptha Wade II, 18 April 1875, folder 4, box 1, Wade Papers, Western Reserve Historical Society (hereafter WRHS), Cleveland, OH.

commissioners issued a report that noted that Cleveland was far behind most large cities in the United States in its development of parks. They urged the city to acquire open lands on the periphery of the city before they were commercially developed. In 1893 an act of the state legislature enabled the creation of a more powerful park board of five members, which issued $800,000 in bonds. More of that money was spent to purchase land in the Doan Brook valley between Shaker Heights and Lake Erie than the commissioners spent in any other section of the city. Additional segments of land in the Doan Brook valley were donated by the Shaker Heights Land Company, Martha B. Ambler, Patrick Calhoun, and John D. Rockefeller. Segments of the valley were named Ambler Park and Rockefeller Park, the latter of which was adjacent to Wade Park.[3]

The new park commissioners (which included not only the mayor and president of the city council, but three appointed commissioners with strong connections to the city's business class) hired Ernest W. Bowditch, a landscape architect from Boston, to draw up a plan for the parks. His plan for the Doan Brook valley was issued at the end of 1894 and included a

3. Orth, *Cleveland*, pp, 172-74; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 752; Kenneth W. Rose and Darwin H. Stapleton, "Rockefeller, Religion, and Philanthropy in Gilded Age Cleveland," at teachingcleveland.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/Rockefeller%20religion%20and%20philanthropy%20stapletonrose.pdf (accessed 17 February 2020). The history of John D. Rockefeller's involvement in the creation of Rockefeller Park (dedicated in 1896), and University Circle in general, is documented in: "Cleveland Boulevard, 1898-1904" folder, box 3, Real Estate Interests series, Record Group 2, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC), Sleepy Hollow, NY. This folder contains documents dated from 1895.

boulevard running the length of the park.[4] Executing the plan required negotiations with the trustees of Case School, who owned a crucial tract of land straddling Doan Brook. They ceded the tract on the condition that it be used for parkland in perpetuity.[5]

The park board was very successful both in creating a park system and in obtaining the support and cooperation of the city's elite. But opposition to its efforts came from a citizen group styled the Park Board Reorganization Association, which charged that the board was "autocratic, dictatorial, irresponsible, and unaccountable to the people." The association also charged that the new parks were located and designed more for people of leisure than the average citizens. (This would have matched the experience of New York City, where the wealthiest residents lived nearest Central Park and made the most use of it.) Their agitation led directly to the abolition of the park board in 1900

4. Eric Johanessen, *Cleveland Architecture, 1876-1976* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, c. 1979), p. 59; Board of Park Commissioners, Cleveland, Ohio, "Plan of Parks and Parkways on the East Side." (Cleveland, OH ?: n.p., 1894), with handwritten notations from c. 1896, copy in author's files. The original appointed commissioners were: Charles H. Bulkey, brother-in-law of Liberty Holden; Amos Townshend, a former congressman who was a partner in a wholesale grocery firm; and John F. Pankhurst, a leading industrialist. Bulkey and Townshend died in 1895 and were replaced by Holden and J. H. McBride. Some biographical information on these individuals is provided in: David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *The Dictionary of Cleveland Biography* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1996), pp. 71, 223, 450.
5. Trustees' minutes, Case School of Applied Sciences, 17 October 1895, 4 May 1896, 1 June 1896, Case Western Reserve University Archives (hereafter CWRU Archives), Cleveland, OH.

and the creation of a Division of Parks and Boulevards in the city government.[6]

Nonetheless, the elite vision for the park system in Doan Brook valley essentially was fulfilled. A seven-mile boulevard was constructed from the Shaker Lakes to the Lake Erie shore, enhanced by four stone bridges across the valley (designed by Cleveland architect Charles Schweinfurth and funded by John D. Rockefeller[7]) that separated local traffic from the boulevard. The adjacent areas, as well as some other areas of the park corridor, were landscaped and planted with trees and shrubs.[8] This was a perfect route for leisurely carriage or bicycle rides, recreations of the middle and upper classes.

In other aspects, too, the portions of the park adjacent to University Circle were developed with those classes's, rather than the working class's, recreation in mind. Wade Park and Rockefeller Park each had lakes with rowboats for rent, and several tennis courts. Wade Park had special roque courts (for playing a form of croquet). Rockefeller Park's one baseball diamond and its basketball facilities were concessions to citizens without financial resources for rentals or expensive equipment.[9]

6. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 753; Fogelsong, *Planning the Capitalist City*, pp. 117-18.
7. See the "Cleveland Boulevard, 1898-1904" folder cited in n. 3, above
8. *A Study and Report on City Parks and Boulevards of Cleveland* (Cleveland: Community Betterment Council of Cleveland, 1923), n.p.; Johanessen, *Cleveland Architecture*, pp. 57-59; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 838.
9. *A Study and Report on City Parks and Boulevards of Cleveland*, n.p., reports these facilities in 1923. The mention of ballfields at Wade Park in the *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 1021, seems to be an error. On the elite origins and support of early tennis, and the more egalitarian

The park system also had another role in separating the classes. The continuous greenbelt from the Shaker Lakes to Lake Erie effectively created a boundary between the Circle and the core of the city to the west. Parkways and greenbelts in late-19th and early-20th century America often were laid out to follow natural features, or designed to be natural barriers against catastrophic urban fires, but were also used to create boundaries between neighborhoods.[10] Certainly, the parkland along Doan Brook provided a buffer for the University Circle institutions against what their leaders probably thought was undesirable neighborhoods, and the buffer was consciously extended in later years by the University Improvement Company.[11]

The short-lived effort to plan for at least part of the Circle through park boards was succeeded in the first three decades of the century by plans which were developed in committees of, or by leading members of, the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, and subsequently executed by civic groups or the city government. The Chamber's efforts in the Circle followed its successful creation of the Group Plan for government buildings in downtown Cleveland.

Cleveland's Group Plan was one of the early results of the late 19th-century American fascination with classicism so successfully formulated in the arrangement of buildings at the World's Colombian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. The

appeal of team sports like baseball and basketball, see *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. pp. 917, 961.

10. oward L. Preston, *Automobile Age Atlanta: The Making of a Southern Metropolis* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1979); Fogelson, *Planning the Capitalist City*. pp. 121-22
11. See below.

Chamber of Commerce had planned Cleveland's exhibit at the exposition, and afterward showed an enthusiasm for replicating the exposition style (later known as "city beautiful" movement) in Cleveland. In 1899 the Chamber appointed a committee to develop a plan for locating new government buildings in the core of the city, and in 1902 the Chamber sponsored state legislation to create a Group Plan Commission.

The supervising architect of the Chicago exposition, Daniel Burnham, was selected as one of three commissioners. With architects John M. Carrere and Arnold W. Brunner, he drew up a plan in 1903 that called for demolition of several blocks of old buildings to the northeast of Cleveland's Public Square in order to create a wide mall flanked by new buildings of closely-related designs for city, county, and federal government offices. (Much of the land acquired for the Group Plan was owned by the Case School of Applied Science, a legacy of Leonard Case, Jr.) The plan was adopted, and over the next thirty years a series of neoclassical buildings of matched cornice height were constructed in an attempt to fulfill the plan's goal.[12]

The city beautiful impulse also powerfully influenced planning at the Circle, though in the train of the success of the Group Plan. The architects W. Dominick Benes and Benjamin S. Hubbell, designed a monumental neoclassical building (completed in 1916) for the Cleveland Museum of Art on the most dramatic site in the Circle, a slope overlooking the pond, and followed immediately with a plan for a formal grouping of several other

12. Johanessen, *Cleveland Architecture* pp. 70-77; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 469, 654.

cultural buildings at the Circle.[13] Though not officially adopted, into the 1930s their plan generally was followed.

Hubbell also was instrumental in persuading members of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce to establish the University Improvement Company in 1918. This real estate enterprise purchased parcels on the western and southern perimeter of the Circle in order to control their future use. As in the Group Plan, a uniform cornice height was set for future public buildings. However, of the expected public buildings (such as a Roman Catholic cathedral) only a few were completed, including John Hay High School, and Epworth-Euclid United Methodist Church.[14] The University Improvement Company went out of business in the late 1920s, but the idea of a buffer zone for the Circle lingered on in some of the later land purchases of Western Reserve University and Case School.[15]

In the 1910s there were two further attempts to plan for the Circle which reflected the progressive-era desire for rationalization and efficiency. One, the attempt to create a University of Cleveland, had little chance for fulfillment, but

13. Johanessen, *Cleveland Architecture*, pp. 124-25. The Hubbell and Benes plan for the Circle may have been influenced by Warren Manning's 1913 plan for the expansion and development of the Western Reserve University campus: Warren H. Manning to Charles F. Thwing, 22 September 1913, "Future Extension Report for WRU" folder, box 3, Charles F. Thwing Office files (hereafter Thwing Office Files), CWRU Archives.
14. Johanessen, *Cleveland Architecture*, p. 125; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 377; *Cleveland Plain Dealer,* Sunday Magazine, 17 June 1934, p. 11: William G. Rose, *Cleveland: The Making of a City* (Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Co., 1950), p. 867.
15. J. A. House to W.R. Hopkins. 3 December 1928, folder 14. container 6, William R. Hopkins Collection, WRHS.

the other, the creation of a University Hospitals-Medical School complex, was completed with great effect on the future of the Circle.

The idea for a University of Cleveland first surfaced during the mayoral years of Newton D. Baker, a leading Progressive-era politician. Baker proposed to unite Western Reserve and Case to form a University of Cleveland with municipal support and brought the proposal before the trustees of both institutions in 1912. He thought that the city's need for scientific and technical experts could be best supplied by a formal association with the institutions of higher learning in the city. In spite of the city councils' offer of its full support "both in a financial way and in the enactment of appropriate legislation to the establishment and maintenance of a municipal university," neither board of trustees took the proposal seriously.[16]

The idea resurfaced in 1922 when Baker, returning to Cleveland from his post as Secretary of War, broached it while he was a trustee of Reserve. He even approached John D. Rockefeller about donating the Rockefeller estate in East Cleveland and Cleveland Heights as new site for the two institutions.[17] But the idea of a University of Cleveland did not become a significant issue again until Robert B. Vinson, the newly-arrived president at Reserve whose candidacy had been strongly supported by

16. Newton D. Baker to Charles F. Thwing, 27 September 1912, folder 5, container 5, Newton D. Baker Papers, WRHS; Trustees' minutes, 7 October 1912, Case School of Applied Science, CWRU Archives.
17. Newton D. Baker to John D. Rockefeller, 13 March 1922, and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. to Wallace Buttrick, 4 April 1922, folder 663, box 631, General Education Board Archives, RAC; Newton D. Baker to Charles Thwing, 26 June 1922, "Proposed Union of WRU with Case Institute" folder, box 19, Thwing Office Files, CWRU Archives.

Baker, began developing plans for the physical expansion of Western Reserve University in 1924. Recognizing the limited possibilities at the Circle, Vinson looked again to Rockefeller estate (which John D. Rockefeller no longer visited after a fire destroyed his home, "Forest Hill"), and to an undeveloped tract in Shaker Heights. Having other plans in mind for his father's land, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. rejected Vinson's approach. The Van Sweringen brothers, promoters of Shaker Heights, offered a three-hundred acre site on the condition that the long-mooted merger of Reserve and Case would be consummated. Although the two institutions were able to cooperate in several other ventures at the time, including the founding of Cleveland College, a merger still was not seriously considered.[18]

The more successful planning venture initiated in the 1910s was the addition to the Circle of a cluster of new medical institutions. The keystone of the cluster was the Medical School of Western Reserve University, which had been part of the university since 1843 but was located downtown.

By 1911 the forefront of medical education was closely allied with laboratory study and research. Western Reserve University was in the process of raising a million dollars in endowment to support the School's growth and development, and the School had been identified by the Flexner Report (1910) as one of the outstanding medical schools in the nation. But improvement of the school was limited by space and location. The building it occupied had been opened in 1887, and the laboratory adjacent to it completed in 1898: both were inadequate for the physical

18. C.H. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve: A History of the University, 1826-1976* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1976), pp. 122, 134-35.

needs of modern medical research and Instruction. Moreover, the research faculty regarded the downtown site as "deficient in natural light" and as hampered by high levels of smoke and dirt.[19]

Plans for a new building were first drawn in 1912 and new sites along the city lakefront were considered. One location adjacent to Lakeside Hospital (the school's teaching hospital) was selected in 1913, but abandoned a few months later when it appeared that a new railroad terminal soon would be built there (bringing more smoke and dirt from the coal-fired locomotives of the era).[20]

In 1913 the University had joined with Lakeside and the Babies Dispensary and Hospital to form the University Medical Group (in 1926 reorganized as the University Hospitals Corporation), and in 1914 a committee was appointed to plan a site to accommodate all three institutions. The committee was unable to reach a swift conclusion, but the university trustees independently reached a consensus in favor of moving the school to University Circle. In 1913 a group of the wealthiest of them purchased land east of Adelbert Road to accommodate both the hospitals and the Medical School. Wartime distractions

19. Frederick Clayton Waite, *Western Reserve University Centennial History of the School of Medicine* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1946), pp. 413-14, 419; Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 295-99; Darwin H. Stapleton, "Abraham Flexner, Rockefeller Philanthropy, and the Western Reserve School of Medicine," *Ohio History* 101 (Summer-Autumn 1992): 100-113. Similar environmental conditions at about the same time led the National Electric Lamp Association to move its research laboratories from a downtown location to NELA Park in East Cleveland: Hollis L. Townsend, *A History of NELA Park, 1911-1957* (Cleveland: Piummer, [c. 1959], p. 12.
20. Waite, *Centennial History*. p. 420.

postponed action, but in 1922 the trustees decided to proceed with construction at the Circle. Samuel Mather, chairman, personally took responsibility for funding the new medical school, and eventually contributed $2.5 million toward its completion.[21]

The Medical School began operations at the Circle in 1924 and was joined on adjacent sites by the Babies' & Childrens' Hospital and the Maternity Hospital in 1925, and by Lakeside Hospital in 1931. The board of trustees of all the hospitals were merged in 1940.[22] The new group of hospital and medical school buildings at the Circle was much tighter than those of the Group Plan or in Wade Park. They were relatively unornamented, even while generally Beaux-Arts in inspiration and detail, and had their axes aligned with the rectilinear bordering streets: Euclid Avenue, Adelbert Road, and Abington Road.[23]

The University Hospitals complex continued to grow and change over the following decades. In 1956 the Hanna Pavilion was opened to treat psychiatric patients, and from 1953 to 1983 Benjamin Rose Hospital (renamed Abington House in 1969) focused on the treatment and rehabilitation of the elderly. Rainbow Hospital for Children moved to the complex in 1971, becoming a constituent of the new Rainbow Babies' and Children's Hospital. The research programs of the University Hospitals were strengthened by the opening of the Joseph T.

21. *Ibid*, pp. 420-22; Samuel Mather to C.F. Thwing, 16 February 1917, box 3, Thwing Office Files, CWRU Archives.
22. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 1000-1.
23. Waite, *Centennial History*, p. 426. The architect of the medical school/hospital complex was Charles A. Coolidge. See: https://prabook.com/web/charles.coolidge/1345494, accessed 17 October 2019

Wearn Laboratory in 1962, jointly funded by the Hospitals and Western Reserve University. The success of that project was followed by another Hospitals-WRU plan which called for renovating old buildings and constructing new ones. The culmination was the opening in 1972 of the Health Sciences Center that housed offices of the medically-oriented academic departments of the now-federated Case Western Reserve University.[24]

The largest-scale planning attempt for the Circle prior to the 1950s was carried out by the Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation (CCEC) in the 1920s. in 1924 Frederick A. Whiting, director of the Cleveland Museum of Art, approached the Carnegie Corporation of New York (a philanthropic foundation created in 1911 by Andrew Carnegie) for initial funding for a planning organization of the Circle institutions.[25]

Successfully obtaining funding from the Carnegie Corporation (which was interested in promoting adult education through existing cultural institutions), and a pledge from Beardsley Ruml of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund that he would serve as an adviser, the Conference was organized on March 25, 1924 with 18 members: Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland Institute of Music, Cleveland Kindergarten Primary Training School, Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland Museum of Natural History, Cleveland Public Library, Cleveland Public

24. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 1001-1002.
25. For a general view of the Carnegie Corporation's interest in promoting art museums and art education in the 1920s and 1930s see: Paul DiMaggio, "Progressivism and the Arts," *Society* 25 (July/August 1988): 70-75.

Schools, Cleveland School of Architecture, Cleveland School of Art, Cleveland School of Education, John Huntington Polytechnic Institute, Musical Arts Association, The Play House, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Western Reserve University, Western Reserve Historical Society, the Y.M.C.A., and the Y.W.C.A. The Adult Education Association joined the group later.[26]

At the second meeting of the Conference in 1924 "the hope was expressed that some way might be found to enable many of the rapidly growing organizations which were members of the Conference and which would soon need new and permanent quarters, to locate themselves with reference to one another in such a way as to render co-operation easy."[27] This concern for expansion and proximity dominated the subsequent agenda of the Conference, although the members drew up lengthy lists of desired areas for inter-institutional cooperation.[28]

The members of the Conference quickly recognized that possible sites for future institutions locations were limited, and

26. Carlton K. Matson and Harold T. Clark, "The Cleveland Educational Group Plan," *Your Garden* 1 (March 1928): 442-48. This article provides a good overview of planning in the Circle from the 1890s to 1928. Recall that Clark was a moving force in University Circle for many years. Another contemporary article claims that Whiting instituted the CCEC by writing to the heads of the major educational and cultural institutions in Cleveland and asking what their plans were for the next ten years. When Whiting showed them the substantial overlap of plans, the CCEC was born: Robert Bordner, "Whiting Idea Made Art Museum Famous," *Cleveland Press*, 8 March 1930.
27. Matson and Clark, "The Cleveland Educational Group Plan," p. 446.
28. "A Partial Summary by Institutions of Specific Exchanges of Service Desired Among Conference Institutions (1924-5)," Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation records, General Managers Subject Files, Musical Art Association Archives, Cleveland, Ohio.

focused their attention on the vacant tract in the heart of the Circle bordered on two sides by East Boulevard and Euclid Avenue. (The site was subsequently occupied by Severance Hall and, later, Freiberger Library.) Some of that land had been purchased by the Catholic Diocese of Cleveland as the site for a future cathedral, and some by the Christian Science Church, and some was still in the hands of the Wade Realty Company. When Jeptha H. Wade II learned about the Conference's interest he withdrew the company's land from the market, pending the coalescence of the Conference's plans.[29]

The seed which crystallized action on the triangle of land was the Cleveland Museum of Natural History's interest in erecting a new building in the Circle. The museum, founded in 1920, had attractive but inadequate quarters in the former Leonard Hanna mansion at Euclid Avenue and East 26th Street.[30] The museum's trustees, led by their president, Harold T. Clark, sought the cooperation of Western Reserve University in acquiring the land, and received an enthusiastic response from Robert B. Vinson, the University's president. Shortly thereafter both the Cleveland School of Art and the Western Reserve Historical Society, both already located at the Circle, indicated that they were interested in future expansion on the site. After negotiation with the Diocese of Cleveland and the Christian Science Church, the University purchased the land fronting on Euclid Avenue and

29. Matson and Clark, "The Cleveland Educational Group Plan." p. 446; Frederick A. Whiting to Wallace H. Cathcart, 10 May 1924, folder 1, Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation records, WRHS; Cleveland Museum of Art, *Tenth Annual Report*, 1925 (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1926), p. 24.
30. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 253: Johanessen, *Cleveland Architecture*, p. 89.

the parcel on East Boulevard was reserved for the Museum of Natural History.[31]

It was clear from this episode that future competition for land in the Circle could be severe, and that it was in the best interests of all the institutions to share their plans for expansion. By the winter of 1925-26 the Conference members had come to some general agreements about future endeavors. Yet much of the open land remained in the hands of Wade Realty, or had been sold by Wade with certain restrictions. The Conference appointed Harold T. Clark to consult with Jeptha H. Wade II to seek modifications of the existing deeds. Wade's approval was obtained shortly before his death on March 6, 1926.[32]

With this assurance the Conference created a planning commission in 1927.[33] The commission appointed Abram Garfield, B.R. Walker, and W.R. McCornack, noted planners and architects, as consultants to develop a general architectural scheme for the new buildings. The most significant achievement of this commission was helping to formulate plans for what became Severance Hall of the Musical Arts Association.[34] Further cooperative efforts seemed unlikely, however, because,

31. Matson and Clark, "The Cleveland Educational Group Plan," pp. 446-48; Robert E. Vinson to Samuel Mather, 26 February 1926, box 11, Robert E. Vinson Office Files, CWRU Archives. The Museum of Natural History did not move to the Circle until 1958-61, when a different site was chosen on the northern edge of Wade Park.
32. Matson and Clark, "The Cleveland Educational Group Plan," p. 447.
33. *Ibid*, p. 442; Cleveland Museum of Art, *12th Annual Report* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1927), p. 29.
34. University Circle Planning Commission report, 3 May 1929, Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation records, WRHS; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 430-31, 1023; Johanessen, *Cleveland Architecture*, pp. 146-48, 189, 197.

as President Vinson put it at a planning meeting early in 1928, "certain problems…, had arisen in connection with the possibility of cooperation around University Circle, especially that of effectively presenting to trustees and others the advantages of centralizing institutional efforts." In other words, the institutions were unwilling to delegate authority to a joint planning board.[35]

Without substantial support, the idea of a comprehensive plan for the Circle quickly foundered on the first shoals of the Great Depression. When the institutions began to find that merely keeping their doors open was a serious struggle, the expansionary visions of the 1920s were forgotten. The last meeting of the Conference was in April of 1930.[36]

The Circle in the 1930 reverted to piecemeal planning, with individual institutions having to take the brunt of land-use decisions. Epworth-Euclid United Methodist Church is an example. Built in 1926-28 in the Circle's western "buffer zone" created by the University Improvement Company the church had to act alone after 1930 when trying to deal with what it considered unacceptable conditions in the neighborhood.

In 1933 Epworth-Euclid trustees asked the owner of the old Whitehall Hotel just south of the church to tear down the building because it presented a fire risk, and voted to ask the city to take action if there was no response. After the hotel

35. Minutes of joint meeting, Executive Committee and Planning Commission, 1 March 1928, Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation records, WRHS.
36. Minutes, annual meeting, 28 April 1930, Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation records, WRHS.

was gone the developer intended to put a gasoline station and restaurant on the site, and the church attempted to enlist the support of other Circle institutions in order to prevent him from doing so. However, with the University Improvement Company liquidated and the CCEC moribund, the church had to sue the developer on its own. In another case, a representative of the church met with the zoning committee of city council to lobby against commercial development of the frontage opposite the church entrance on 107th street.[37]

The Museum of Art similarly took its own initiative. William Milliken, who succeeded Whiting as museum's director in 1930, claimed that the Museum of Art's role in city planning was "to serve the whole city and to use its influence wherever it is possible for the development of a better and more beautiful Cleveland."[38] Yet Milliken's major planning focus was planting trees and shrubs in the Circle, particularly to screen the unsightly parking lots that seemingly were springing up everywhere.[39]

In spite of the hopes and dreams for a planned "city beautiful" the leaders of University Circle had failed, up to the end of the

37. Minutes of the Trustees, 28 April 1925, 25 March 1931, 12 September 1933, 12 June 1934, Epworth-Euclid United Methodist Church, University Circle United Methodist Church Archives, Cleveland, Ohio; W.B. Stewart to C.E. Hall, 10 December 1935, in Minutes of the Trustees, Epworth-Euclid United Methodist Church, University Circle United Methodist Church Archives. Epworth-Euclid United Methodist Church changed its name to University Circle United Methodist Church in 2010.
38. William M. Milliken, "Radio Talk — WTAM," 7 February 1938, reel #1274. *Archives of American Art* (microfilm), Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
39. William M. Milliken, "Radio Talk — WTAM," 4 April 1938, reel #1274, *Archives of American Art*.

1930s, to find a way to develop a comprehensive plan which would rationalize the competing land use needs of the growing number of institutions in the Circle. The compelling visions that had created the Circle and its institutions had not yet been supplanted by visions of how to bring them to agree on common goals and responsibilities.

11. Decades of Crisis, 1940-1970

The 1940s and 1950s were years of creating new or renewed dreams for urban America to replace those of the 1920s that were shattered by the Great Depression. There were continuities of earlier trends, such as the urban migration of African-Americans and the suburban migration of whites, which yielded neither to war nor economic changes. However, the institutions and patrons of University Circle were as unaware as the elected officials of the city of Cleveland and most of America in recognizing the impending collision between those dreams and the underlying trends, and they faced a series of crises as a result.

One great renewed dream for Cleveland was the replanning of the city in order to provide well-defined growth and development, and to protect the presumed desirable qualities of residential neighborhoods. The City Plan Commission of 1912 had never produced a thoroughgoing city plan, and by the 1940s Cleveland was facing increasingly severe problems of housing deterioration, increasing automobile traffic, and hazardous

industrial pollution. In 1942, following the recommendations of a special committee, Cleveland voters passed a charter amendment creating a new City Planning Commission. Under the leadership of Director John T. Howard, a comprehensive city plan was completed in 1949 that looked toward rationalizing the existing city rather than reforming it.[1]

The identification of "slum" areas (concentrations of presumptive substandard housing) and their association with an increasing Black population was clearly a major factor in the city's renewed concern with planning. The committee report which recommended the new commission spoke of "the slow insidious rot" radiating from the primary Black residential area (along Central Avenue), and in 1941 the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce issued a statement blaming the city's recent population decline in part on the "proximity of races having a depreciatory effect on [housing] values."[2] The Cleveland City Planning Commission did not mince any words in describing why clearing slums was necessary:

> They are unhealthy — and all of us pay the resulting public health bill. They breed crime and delinquency — and all of us pay the resulting police, court, and prison costs. They are fire traps — and all of us pay

1. John T. Howard, *What's Ahead for Cleveland?* Publication no. 10, Regional Association of Cleveland. (Cleveland: Regional Association of Cleveland, 1941), pp. 11, 13; Cleveland City Planning Commission, *Cleveland today. . . tomorrow* (Cleveland: n.p., 1950); David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds, *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington, IN.: Indiana University Press, 1987), pp. xlvii-xlix, 187-88, 549.
2. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. xlvii, 188.

> many times more for the fire department costs here than in better residential areas.[3]

The creation of a comprehensive city plan which had in large part emerged out of a concern with the concentration of Blacks in slums (so-called by the planners) strongly encouraged Cleveland to embrace the federal Housing Act of 1949. The act provided funding for both new housing and slum clearance, and remained the basis of federal policy into the 1960s. Cleveland became one of the leading slum-clearance cities in the nation, often using the imperative of new highway construction (intended to reduce traffic congestion) as the rationale for demolishing structures in vast sections of the Central Avenue district, as well as other areas. Construction of new housing and public facilities seldom followed demolition as quickly as the new interstate highways, which were designed to serve business, industry, and suburban commuters. Displaced Blacks found the nearby Hough area to be the most accessible alternative residential area, and it quickly became overcrowded in the

3. *Cleveland today . . . tomorrow*, p. 19

1950s.[4] John T. Howard argued in 1949, on the adoption of the comprehensive plan that

> [We] can't have any slum clearance, of course, unless we build some public housing first — to rehouse those low-income families that must be displaced. Their inability to pay a fair rent would surely result in creating another slum.[5]

But Howard's argument was almost completely ignored by the city.

Recognition that something was seriously wrong with a system which professed to be planning a better city, but seemed more successful at destroying much of the community life of some of the most needy residents, was one of the major forces energizing the civil rights movement in Cleveland. Although the city appeared to be a leader in promoting positive race relations when it established a Community Relations Board in 1945 "to promote

4. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. xlix-l, 506, 525; Christopher Wye, "At the Leading Edge: The Movement for Black Civil Rights in Cleveland," in David D. Van Tassel and John V Grabowski, eds. *Cleveland: A Tradition of Reform* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1986), pp. 131-32; Eric Johanessen, *Cleveland Architecture, 1876-1976* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1976), p. 216; Scott Greer, *Urban Renewal and American Cities: The Dilemma of Democratic Intervention* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Dobbs-Merrill, 1965), pp. 4-7, 17-19; Jon Teaford, *The Twentieth Century American City: Problem. Promise, and Reality* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), pp. 122-26. Philadelphia's similar experience with urban renewal and Black relocation is described in: John F. Bauman, *Public Housing, Race, and Renewal: Urban Planning in Philadelphia, 1920-1974* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987), pp. 127, 149-51.
5. John T. Howard, *Cleveland's General Plan*. Publication no. 21, Regional Association of Cleveland. (Cleveland: Regional Association of Cleveland, 1949), p. 7.

amicable relations among the racial and cultural groups within the community," the effective policy of city (and suburban) government was to promote segregation in housing and schools.[6] During the 1960s, when the southern-born civil rights movement came north, Cleveland struggled with the consequences of its failure to treat African-Americans as full citizens.[7] The Circle shared in both the failure and its consequences.

Middle-class white Clevelanders, on the other hand, generally had their dreams of the 1940s fulfilled. The housing shortage which followed World War II was relieved substantially by emigration to new housing in the suburbs, where Blacks were either explicitly excluded or unwelcome. Parma, south of Cleveland, grew from 20,000 to more than 110,000 in the three decades after 1950, and during the 1960s the suburban population of Cuyahoga County surpassed that of Cleveland for the first time in more than a hundred years, The Veteran's Administration and Federal Housing Administration programs of guaranteed housing loans for qualified buyers and qualified homes (Black buyers in Black neighborhoods were usually not regarded as qualified) assisted the process of suburbanization considerably.[8]

6. Wye, "At the Leading Edge," pp. 128-35; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 102-3, 224-25, 265-66, 806-7 (quote on p. 224).
7. Kenneth W. Rose, "The Politics of Social Reform in Cleveland. 1945-1967: Civil Rights, Welfare Rights and the Response of Civic Leaders." Ph.D. dissertation. Case Western Reserve University, 1988.
8. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 754, 942; Anona Teska, "The Federal Impact on the Cities," in Melvin I. Urofsky, ed., *Perspectives on Urban America* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1973), pp. 269-70; Teaford, *The Twentieth Century American City*, pp. 100-4; Bauman, *Public Housing, Race, and Renewal*, p. 97.

The federal government had a more direct impact on the Circle through another veterans' program which fulfilled the dreams of many Clevelanders: full tuition and expenses for four years of college-level education. Veterans of World War II provided the first and largest wave of students, but there followed smaller waves of veterans of Korea and Vietnam, and college education was never the same.

A whole generation of Americans came to regard a college degree as standard preparation for employment, and their children began to take it for granted. College was no longer primarily the preserve of those who could afford it or whose status demanded it, and (for a time, at least) the student body no longer fully shared the attitudes and values of the trustees, administrators, and faculty. Therefore campuses, including those of Western Reserve University and Case Institute, became more volatile and less predictable intellectually, socially, and politically.[9] The student activism of the 1960s was nurtured by this environment.

The other major factor in the growth of higher education was

9. Carl H. Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology; A Centennial History, 1880-1980* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1980), pp. 176-79, 181-2; Carl H. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve: A History of the University, 1826-1976* (Cleveland: Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1976), pp. 178-192, 275-76, 280; Seymour M. Lipset and Philip G. Aitbach, "The Quest for Community on the Campus," in B. Digby Baltzell, ed., *The Search for Community in Modern America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), pp. 123-147; Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 41-2, 103-5; Frank A. Darknell, "The Carnegie Philanthropy and Private Corporate Influence on Higher Education," in Robert F. Arnove, ed., *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1982), p. 389.

also the direct result of the largesse of the federal government: support for research. During World War II the government had delegated various weapons-development and other military programs to college and university campuses, allocating millions of dollars for salaries and supplies. With few exceptions, academia had never seen funding on such a scale. Some programs, such as those which created electronic computers and atomic bombs, consumed the research lives of professors and often launched the careers of graduate students.[10]

When the war ended, some of these projects were considered vital to national defense and were continued: but in any case academia had tasted the powerful elixir of federal support and longed to continue it. Dreams of a National Science Foundation came out of the war experience, and after Congress established it In 1950 American universities grew more and more to depend upon federal research monies. What was happening on campus was a paradigm for America as a whole: from the end of World War II through the 1960s reformers and advocates of change generally looked to the federal government for initiatives. The Circle certainly experienced the effects of federal support and intervention. The culminating event of the era, the federation of Western Reserve University and Case Institute of Technology, was in large part the result of federal pressure. On the other hand, private philanthropy continued to provide significant leadership and direction in the Circle, so that its institutions to

10. Nancy Stern, "The Eckert-Mauchly Computers: Conceptual Triumphs, Commercial Tribulations," *Technology and Culture* 23 (October 1982): 569-82; Thomas M. Smith, "Project Whirlwind: An Unorthodox Development Project," *Technology and Culture* 17 (July 1976): 447-64; Daniel J. Kevles, *The Physicists: The History of a Scientific Community in Modern America* (New York: Vintage, 1979), pp. 324-48.

some extent resisted dependence on government solutions to its emerging problems.[11]

The major figures mediating the forces of change in the Circle in the 1950s and 1960s were T. Keith Glennan and John S. Mills, presidents of Case (1947-1966) and Western Reserve (1950-1966). Both were capable administrators, with Millis possessing the personal charm and quiet intellect which helped unify a university containing several discordant units, and Glennan having a forceful and visionary style that was instrumental in pushing Case toward the rapidly advancing fronts of technology and science.

Glennan and Millis worked in harmony from the time of Millis' arrival at Reserve, and quickly began discussions on the economies of sharing buildings and staff.[12] Although those matters remained at the heart of their association, their interests soon began to deal with the larger problems of the Circle and of the city of Cleveland.

There were two major issues to be faced. One, inherited unsolved from the 1920s was the matter of planning future land purchases and institutional growth in the Circle. As one close

11. John S. Millis felt that during his presidency Western Reserve University moved from dependence on personal, individual philanthropy to corporate philanthropy. author's interview of John S. Millis, 11 June 1985, Accession A11-010, Case Western Reserve University Archives (hereafter CWRU Archives), Cleveland, OH.
12. Minutes, Western Reserve University Development Committee, 25 May 1950, box 17, John S. Millis Office Files (hereafter Millis Office Files), CWRU Archives. One example of practical cooperation was Millis's immediate offer to share with Case $10,000 worth of x-ray diffraction equipment that the Reserve chemistry department received in 1953: John S. Millis to T. Keith Glennan, 2 April 1953, box 19, Millis Office Files.

observer of the early 1950s put it "Developments at University Circle … have been disturbing. They appear to be following no plan for the area as a whole and [are] not reconcilable with what the City Planning Commission has worked out as a rational plan for the future."[13]

A rapid increase in automobile traffic combined with the inadequacy of parking facilities was the most obvious pressure on land use. In 1951 a committee of Case Institute reported that "Access to and traffic flow on the campus are awkward and in some places dangerous," and also noted that pedestrians were often on the streets because of inadequate walkways. Parking on the 19-acre Case campus was limited to 370 spaces, and there were double that number of requests for parking permits. Student parking overflowed onto the streets adjacent to the campus, contributing significantly to congestion in the Circle.[14]

In part because of major expansions of existing institutions and in part because new institutions were moving in, the entire Circle faced similar problems throughout the 1950s. Mt. Zion Congregational Church, the Cleveland Meeting of the Religious Society of friends, Cleveland Heart Association and Cleveland Center on Alcoholism were new tenants in the Circle. Western

13. C. DeWitt Hardy, "Report of the Director. Committee for Cleveland Higher Education, 1954-55," folder 57, container 2, Cleveland Foundation Records, Western Reserve Historical Society (hereafter WRHS), Cleveland, OH.
14. "Final Report of the Plant and Facilities Committee," pp. 2-4, in *Case Self Survey* (Cleveland: Case Institute of Technology, c. 1951), mimeographed. Two years later Case had increased parking on campus by 75%, but President Glennan acknowledged that the problem was still severe: T. Keith Glennan to faculty and staff, 25 September 1953, box 14, T. Keith Glennan Office Files (hereafter Glennan Office Files), CWRU Archives.

Reserve University moved the entire Cleveland College from its original downtown site to campus, and in the 1950s built a new library on the East Boulevard site which it had acquired in the 1920s. The Cleveland Museum of Art erected a new wing, and the Cleveland Institute of Art constructed an entirely new building. The Cleveland Museum of Natural History completed the first of its series of buildings. In the 1960s the Garden Center. Cleveland Institute of Music, University Hospitals. Western Reserve Historical Society, and the Benjamin Rose Institute completed new buildings, and a number of dormitories were built by Reserve and Case.[15]

The second major issue faced by Glennan and Millis was the rapid change of the Doan's Corners business district and the Hough neighborhood adjacent to the Circle. At Doan's Corners the defunct Elysium skating rink was torn down (1951). and the grand vaudeville and movie theaters at 105th and Euclid were deteriorating in the quality of their offerings although they still comprised an important entertainment center for Cleveland.[16]

The Hough neighborhood was undergoing a dramatic demographic shift largely because Cleveland's urban renewal

15. John S. Millis, T. Keith Glennan, Neil Carothers, Jack Melizer, "The Story of University Circle." [1960], radio script, copy in author's files; Coverdale & Colpitts, *Report on Parking in University Circle Area, Cleveland, Ohio, Prepared for [the] University Circle Planning Committee* (New York: Coverdale & Colpitts, l954), copy in box 1, University Circle Inc. files, CWRU Archives; Eric Johanessen, *Cleveland Architecture, 1876-1976* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1979), p. 211; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 14, 92, 253, 697, 1041; Mary-Peale Schofield, *Landmark Architecture of Cleveland* (Pittsburgh: Ober Park Associates. 1976), pp. 177, 181, 182, 187; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Sunday supplement, 19 April 1959, p. 2.
16. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 347, 374, 588.

projects — especially in the Central Avenue district of the city — were displacing thousands of Black families, who found that Hough was one of the few neighborhoods into which they could move. In 1950 Hough's population was about 5% Black; in 1960 It was over 70% Black. (In contrast, the three census tracts that included the Circle and a few adjacent streets experienced an increase from 6% to 20% Black in the 1950s, a rate of change closer to that of Cleveland's as a whole.) The population of the Hough neighborhood increased from 65,694 to 71,575, while the rate of overcrowding increased from 11% of the housing units to 21%. To accommodate this shift speculators bought single-family housing, often when white owners were scared into selling by "block-busting" realtors, and had it converted into apartments or rooming houses.[17]

Thus, the prevailing view that Hough was "deteriorating" in the 1950s and 1960s could have been a recognition of poor housing conditions and overcrowding since the most detailed contemporary study of Hough in the 1950s affirmed that its citizens, Black and white, strongly identified with traditional American attitudes regarding neighborliness, education. government services, and community service.[18] But the concerns which leaders of the Circle and of Cleveland expressed about the changes in Hough seem to have been more closely

17. *Ibid*, p. 525; David A. Snow and Peter J. Leahy, "A Neighborhood in Transition: Hough, Ohio," in Edward M. Miggins, ed., *A Guide to Studying Neighborhoods and Resources on Cleveland* (Cleveland: Cleveland Public Library, 1984), pp. 104-107.
18. Marvin B. Sussman and R. Clyde White, *Hough (Cleveland, Ohio): A Study of Social Life and Change* (Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1959), pp. 22-23, 47-77. Note, however, that the authors recognized that racial tensions were high and unresolved.

related to its change in racial composition than to the attitudes of the new and old residents.

The view that many Clevelanders had of Hough was articulated by Philip Porter, long-time reporter and editor with the *Plain Dealer* , the city's leading newspaper. In 1976 he published a review of the city's recent past which stated that by 1960

> The Hough-Wade Park area, once a fashionable residential section full of big apartments and fine single homes had been deteriorating rapidly. Large numbers of uneducated blacks, whose jobs as cotton pickers in the South had been eliminated by automation, had moved into Hough-Wade Park, doubling up with relatives; and by the mid-fifties, this whole section was fast becoming a slum, and badly needed urban renewal.[19]

The ignorance of African-American and urban history represented by this statement can hardly be exaggerated.

One route by which Glennan and Mills attempted to cope with these real and perceived changes in the Circle in the 1950s was the traditional one of engaging with the city's business leaders as represented by the Growth Association (formerly the Chamber of Commerce). In 1955 the Midday Club (a private downtown

19. Philip W. Porter, *Cleveland: Confused City on a Seesaw* (Columbus, Ohio): Ohio State University Press, 1976), p. 181 (quote); *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 781. Porter's statement, a codification of myth and error (e.g., the Black citizens of Hough were not "uneducated," and few of them were former cotton-pickers who left the South due to automation), suggests the bias of the *Plain Dealer*, Cleveland's leading daily, which was likely a major source of information about Hough for the Circle's leaders in the 1950s and 1960s.

club affiliated with the Greater Cleveland Growth Association) issued an invitation to various community leaders, including Glennan and Millis, to study the "various physical problems and deteriorating conditions which exist in the University Circle area."[20] The upshot of the meeting was that Millis agreed to chair an "action program committee" to study and develop a plan for Doan's Corners, east Hough and Wade Park.[21]

The Millis committee was a forerunner of the University-Euclid urban renewal project which was initiated by the city of Cleveland in 1960 as one of several districts in which the presumed substandard housing would be razed and replaced. The University-Euclid district included the Circle and went as far west as East 79th Street (all the way to 55th Street in the area between Chester and Euclid avenues), and was one of the largest urban-renewal districts not only in the city but the entire nation.

However, despite winning federal funds to carry out the University-Euclid project, little positive was done. Far more residential units were destroyed than created; and when the federal Commission on Civil Rights reviewed the early results in 1966 some members argued that the urban renewal program itself was one of the major causes of "the despondency and decay that exist in an acute form in Hough."[22] Neither the

20. Daniel R. Elliott to T. Keith Glennan, 1 November 1955, copy in author's files.
21. T. Keith Glennan to John S. Millis, 17 November 1955, and John S. Millis to T. Keith Glennan, 22 November 1955, copies in author's files.
22. John Herbers, "Urban Renewal Plans Scored as Cause of Decay," *New York Times*, 6 April 1966 (quote); "Cleveland to Get Renewal Funds," *New York Times*, 7 June 1966; John Millis, et al., "The Story of University Circle"; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. l-lii. As late as 1984 Cleveland was being sued by the owners of buildings

University-Euclid district nor Cleveland was alone in receiving such criticism, because by the latter 1960s it was widely recognized that much urban renewal in the United States was ill-conceived, and poorly instituted, and could be blamed for increasing the housing problem rather than solving it.[23] The general failure of urban renewal in Cleveland is one of the factors which contributed to the persistence of strongly segregated housing patterns in Cleveland into the 1980s.[24] But the sharing of a national failure was little solace to either the institutions in the Circle that had high expectation for the success of urban renewal or the residents of Hough whose neighborhood remained heir to many of the ills of modern America.

The frustrations of Hough boiled over in July 1966. On July 18 a brawl at Hough Avenue and East 79th Street erupted into a riot when police arrived. For the next several days sporadic arson, looting, vandalism and assaults occurred throughout Hough, and the National Guard was called in to quell the disturbance. By the time order was restored over 200 fires had burned out numerous commercial and residential buildings.

The Hough "riot" was one of several incidents of major racial violence in American cities during 1965-68. In Cleveland it probably strengthened the hand of those leaders who had been pressing for an effective political response to the needs of the city's growing African-American population. Cleveland's first

demolished in Cleveland's urban renewal program: *Plain Dealer*, 20 May 1984.

23. Teaford, *The Twentieth-Century American City*. pp. 122-26.
24. William H. Frey and Alden Speare, Jr., *Regional and Metropolitan Growth and Decline in the United States* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988), p. 264.

Black mayor, Carl Stokes, was elected in 1967 with substantial support from the city's businessmen.[25]

At about the same time that they helped get the ball rolling on the University-Euclid project, Glennan and Millis were major figures in creating the University Circle Development Foundation, a more limited but ultimately far more successful attempt to cope with planning issues in the Circle. With Stanley Ferguson, director of University Hospitals, they had been discussing the possibility of developing a master plan for the Circle, a project last attempted in the 1920s.[26] This time the catalyst was not the Growth Association, but another traditional actor in the Circle, a philanthropist of the Mather family, Mrs. Elizabeth Ring Mather.

Mrs. Mather's husband, William G. Mather (l857-l951), was a leading figure in the Cleveland-Cliffs mining and shipping company. He had been one of the incorporators of the University Improvement Company; was a former chairman of the City Plan Committee of the Chamber of Commerce; was a trustee of the Regional [planning] Association of Cleveland; and had been president of the Cleveland Museum of Art (1933-49). Mr. Mather also built Gwinn (1908), an estate in Bratenahl (a residential community surrounded by Cleveland on the Lake

25. Peter Clavel, *The Progressive City: Planning and Participation, 1969-1984* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1986), p. 62; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 526, 670.
26. T. Keith Glennan to author, 9 July 1985, original in author's files; "The Beginning of the University Circle Organization [joint interview of T. Keith Glennan, John S. Millis, and Stanley Ferguson]," 29 November 1978, Accession 1U23, CWRU Archives.

Erie shoreline), which had some of the most exquisite landscaping in the Cleveland area.[27]

In marrying William G. Mather in 1929 Mrs. Mather became heir to her husband's interests in landscape and city planning, but she also had strong interests of her own. She was active with the elite women of the Garden Club of Cleveland who, having experience with formal gardens on their estates, raised money for and directed the construction of the Fine Arts Garden in front of the Museum of Art in the 1920s.[28] Subsequently in 1930 she was a founder of the Garden Center of Greater Cleveland, and worked with a landscape architect in laying out the Center's own gardens, located at the south end of the Wade Park lagoon.[29]

Mrs. Mather's interests in landscaping and planning continued over the years, and when her husband died in 1951 she used much of their wealth to create a foundation which directed some of its effort toward supporting Circle institutions and providing for their exterior maintenance. Typical of her endeavors was the "Ivy Project Committee" she headed, which a planted ivy

27. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 120, 172, 222-23, 372, 793; G.B. Tobey, *A History of Landscape Architecture: The Relationship of People to the Environment* (New York: American Elsevier Publishing, 1973). p. 175.
28. Cleveland Museum of Art, *Tenth Annual Report* (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1925), p. 23; Margaret Keal Knowles, *Fifty Years of Growing the Garden Center of Greater Cleveland, 1930-1980* (Cleveland: Emerson Press. 1980), p.7; William M. Milliken, *A Time Remembered: A Cleveland Memoir* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1975), p. 68; "History of the Fine Arts Garden," enclosure with I. T. Frary to Mrs. John Sherwin, 4 June 1928, folder 5, container 2, William R. Hopkins Papers (hereafter Hopkins Papers), WRHS; William R. Hopkins, address at dedication of Fine Arts Garden, 23 July 1928, folder 5, container 2, Hopkins Papers.
29. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 172, 372, 430, 466.

along Western Reserve University property on Adelbert Road and Euclid Avenue.[30]

Aware of the problems of congestion in the Circle and concerned with its appearance, Mrs. Mather had an inspiring meeting with the great urban planner Robert Moses when he and his wife visited Cleveland in the spring of 1955. After a tea party at which she expressed her concerns about haphazard planning in the Circle, Moses wrote to tell her she needed "impartial, expert, critical analysis." He named some planners and architects which he thought could provide it, and stated that their services could cost $50,000-$100,000.[31] Mrs. Mather passed Moses' comments to President Millis, who told her that they were "almost the first specific suggestions as to the people and as to the cost that I have been able to get."[32]

After some consideration Mrs. Mather made a gift of $75,000 to Case Institute to finance the creation of a comprehensive plan of the Circle, "on the condition that Reserve would be a full partner in the project."[33] In 1956 Adams, Howard and Greeley, planners

30. "Agreement between Western Reserve University and Ivy Project Committee," 3 March 1954, and John S. Millis to Mrs. William G. Mather, 8 June 1954, box 17, Millis Office Files; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 372; "The Beginning of the University Circle Organization."
31. Mrs. William G. Mather to John S. Millis, [c. 10 May 1955], and Robert Moses to Mrs. William G. Mather, 3 May 1955, box 4. Millis Office Files.
32. John S. Millis to Mrs. William G. Mather, 11 May 1955, box 4, Millis Office Files.
33. Glennan to author, 9 July 1985. C. H. Cramer argues that Reserve had a long history of land acquisition in the Circle, and that Case was given the putative leadership of the movement to develop a master plan in order that it would not look like a land-grab by Reserve: Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, p. 274.

from Boston, were hired, and they reported eighteen months later with a document which recommended major changes in the traffic patterns of the Circle, substantial new construction, new parking facilities, and land acquisition to prepare for future developments. They also recommended the creation of a new institution to oversee the execution of the plan, to raise its own funds, to create and direct a private police force for the Circle, and to establish a bus service within the Circle. It was estimated that fulfilling the goals of the plan would cost $175 million and take 20 years.[34]

The Circle institutions and their elite supporters responded positively to the Adams, Howard and Greeley plan and moved aggressively to implement it. The recommended umbrella organization was named the University Circle Development Foundation (UCDF), and was incorporated on October 15, 1957. It had a board of trustees of five men eminent in Circle institutions and Cleveland philanthropy, and the first members of UCDF were Western Reserve University, Case Institute of Technology, and University Hospitals.[35] According to the

34. Adams, Howard & Greeley, *University Circle - A Plan for its Development* (Boston: Adams, Howard & Greeley, 1957), quote on p. 16; John F. Huth, Jr., "The Circle Starts to Roll: Master Plan for University Area Gathers Speed in Climb Toward Lofty Goal," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, pictorial insert, 19 April 1959. Adams, Howard, and Greeley appear to have been chosen because the former Director of the Cleveland City Planning Commission, John T. Howard, was a member of the firm. John T. Howard to J.S. Millis, 16 March 1956, box 1, University Circle Inc. Files, CWRU Archives; "A Master Plan for the University Circle Area," 6 June 1956, copy in author's files; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 188.
35. *New York Times*, 16 October 1957. The trustees named at incorporation were Sidney Congdon (representing Case), chairman of National City Bank (Cleveland); Raymond Q. Armington (representing Reserve), general manager of the Euclid Division of General Motors; and L.C.

recollections of President Millis, the small board was acceptable to the other Circle institutions, and even that small group deferred day-to-day decisions to the *de facto* power center of the Circle — the regular meetings of Millis, Glennan, and Ferguson.[36]

The primary activity of UCDF as stated at its incorporation was to purchase, hold, and lease or resell land within the roughly triangular 488-acre area it defined as University Circle: bounded by Wade Park Avenue on the north, Fairhill Boulevard-E. 107th Street-Ansel Road on the west, and the New York Central and the Nickel Plate Railroad lines on the south and east. Secondarily UCDF was to engage in planning and development activities for its member organizations. Essentially the charter empowered UCDF to carry out the Adams, Howard and Greeley plan.[37]

Other Circle institutions were brought into line with the UCDF fairly quickly, in large measure through the persuasive efforts

Wycoff (representing University Hospitals), partner in Arter, Haddon, Wykoff and Van Duzer. Ralph S. Schmitt, vice president of Cleveland Twist Drill, and William C. Truehaft, president of Tremco, were elected in November 1957 as trustees at large: Schmitt was a trustee of the Museum of Art, Institute of Art, and Musical Arts Association; Treuhaft was president of the Institute of Music, and served on Museum of Art and Mt. Sinai Hospital advisory boards. Summary of trustee elections from UCDF minutes supplied to author by Murray Davidson; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Sunday supplement, 19 April 1959, p. 23.

36. "The Beginning of the University Circle Institution"; author's interview of John S. Millis, 12 June 1985, Accession A11-010, CWRU Archives. Six audio recordings of interviews by the author regarding University Circle are in this accession, and in Accession 14-040, CWRU Archives.
37. "Articles of Incorporation of University Circle Development Foundation," 4 October 1957, copy in author's files; *New York Times*, 3 November 1957.

of Harold T. Clark, an estate and probate lawyer who was then president of the Museum of Art. Clark also had served on the boards of several other Circle institutions. His interest in planning the Circle dated from the 1920s when he was a major figure in the work of the Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation, the earliest inter-institutional organization in the Circle.[38] According to President Millis, Clark was able to influence otherwise intransigent figures, and got out the word that "this is the way to go, trust these people [in UCDF]."[39]

Within a few months of UCDF's founding nineteen boards of trustees of Circle institutions had voted to follow the master plan, and representatives of most of them became members of a UCDF advisory committee. Funding was mobilized to support administrative operations. In March 1958 the City Planning Commission reported favorably on the Adams, Howard and Greeley plan, and in June Neil Carothers, an engineer and administrator who had been active in Cleveland nonprofit activities, was appointed president of UCDF. The start-up phase was complete, and implementation began.[40]

During the first five years of UCDF, Carothers was able to carry out significant pieces of the master plan. One of the earliest achievements was the creation of a private police force in 1959 (originally with twelve officers) which was deputized by the

38. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 193-94, 618; *Cleveland Student Life in the Allied Educational Institutions* (Cleveland: Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation, 1930), pp. 177, 179.
39. "The Beginning of the University Circle Institution." Harold T. Clark was a major force in Cleveland philanthropy: s.v., "Clark, Harold T.," www.case.edu/ech, accessed February 25, 2020.
40. *University Circle* (newsletter of University Circle Development Foundation), March 1958, April 1958, July 1958.

Cleveland Department of Public Safety. UCDF also encouraged institutions and the city to install better lighting at certain Circle sites such as the Fine Arts Garden, where dense shrubbery and a secluded location had provided the opportunity for crime. Parking problems were attacked by building a new parking garage under the auspices of UCDF adjacent to University Hospitals, as well as by creating several small parking lots.[41]

UCDF was able to assert its authority through the master plan in instances of potential institutional conflict. One of the earliest examples was in 1957-1958 when the old Cleveland Institute of Art site at Juniper and Magnolia drives became available, a location that Case Institute coveted as a potential dormitory site. Although Case's negotiations with the Institute predated the formation of UCDF, Case permitted UCDF to acquire it for eventual use by Reserve.[42] Similarly, in 1962 Reserve gave up title to property (on which there was a women's dormitory) which the Historical Society wanted, because, as president Millis put it "this property is designated as [a] site for museum purposes and therefore we are under obligation to consent to such a sale."[43]

41. "The First Two Years: A Progress Report on the University Circle Development Foundation (October 15, 1957 to October 15, 1959)," mimeographed report in author's files; *University Circle Development Foundation: The First Five Years* (Cleveland: UCDF, 1962); Frank C. Heath to Joseph Pigott, *et al*., 8 November 1968, box 9, Robert Morse Office Files (hereafter Morse Office Files), CWRU Archives.
42. *Ibid; University Circle*, May 1958.
43. Meredith B. Colket Jr. to Neil J. Carothers, 5 January 1962 (copy), and John S. Millis to Donald Faulkner, 10 January 1962, box 4, Millis Office Files. UCDF had an arrangement with Western Reserve University whereby if UCDF acquired specified residential properties the university would repurchase them within six months: see, e.g., Neil Carothers to

It was to some degree because of the rationalizing of land use, and new provisions for parking and security, that $51 million of new buildings were constructed in the Circle during the first five years of UCDF's existence. However, over half of the buildings were erected by Case and Reserve, and except for the new Cleveland Museum of Natural History, none represented a departure from the existing patterns of land use.[44] Continuing and elaborating the existing relationships was clearly successful: UCDF's difficulties began when Carothers attempted to implement innovative portions of the plan.

Although the Adams, Howard and Greeley master plan for the Circle generally ratified or extended existing patterns, it did suggest that radical changes were required in the heart of the Circle, the Euclid Avenue axis. The plan recognized the hazardous heavy traffic on Euclid and foresaw continual pedestrian movement across it because the Reserve campus had important elements on both sides. In fact, the plan called for substantially increasing the number of student dormitories on the north side of the avenue, while also providing for more classrooms on the south side.

In compensation the plan called for lowering Euclid Avenue (below the existing level of the adjacent sidewalks and lawns) between East Boulevard and Mayfield Road and crossing it with at least two pedestrian bridges. But the avenue would then essentially be divorced from serving the side streets of the

J.S. Millis, 2 November 1965 and J.S. Millis to Neil Carothers, 4 November 1965, box 33, Millis Office Files.

44. *University Circle Development Foundation: The First Five Years*, pp. 3-5.

Circle, so the planners laid out a loop road, to be called "Circle Drive," which would connect with Euclid Avenue as the road started from and exited the lowered area. The loop road was not to go around the perimeter of the Circle like some modern urban beltway around a city, but was to weave through the existing built-up portions, only partly utilizing existing streets.[45]

A major flood of Doan Brook on June 1, 1959 was the earliest sign that this aspect of the master plan would be difficult to carry out. A heavy downpour in its Shaker Heights watershed created a volume of water which could not be contained by the covered-over and culverted portions of the brook between Cedar Glen and Euclid Avenue. Major damage occurred at the Garden Center and other locations as the flood coursed along East Boulevard and cascaded over the avenue seeking its natural discharge through the lagoon. Carothers immediately recognized that floods of any similar proportion would flow into the future lowered portion of Euclid Avenue, turning it into an unintended and unwelcome flood-control basin. With the additional knowledge that twelve different utility lines would have to be relocated in any major reconstruction of the avenue, Carothers tactfully deferred attempting to begin work on lowering Euclid Avenue.[46]

Nonetheless, Carothers decided to move ahead with the

45. See, for example, maps in *University Circle Development Foundation: The First Five Years*, p. 5; Neil J. Carothers, "University Circle Project Moving Ahead at Rapid Pace," *The Clevelander* 32 (July 1961): 12-14.
46. "The First Two Years: A Progress Report"; "After Four Years — A New Look at the Circle," *University Circle*, October 1961; "Circle Advisory Committee Discusses Future Plans, Hears Summary of Progress to Date," *University Circle*, December 1962; minutes, Western Reserve University trustees, 11 February 1960, CWRU Archives.

construction of a loop road, and late in 1962 issued a statement about UCDF's plans for it. Noting that a section between Mayfield and Cornell roads had already been completed, Carothers confidently announced that in the spring of 1963 work would begin on the section north of Euclid along a corridor then occupied by parts of Magnolia Drive, Juniper Drive and East 115th Street.[47]

In February 1963, however, a committee of Reserve students was formed to oppose the road, claiming that UCDF planned to widen Magnolia and Juniper from 66 to 110 feet, creating a 4-lane highway bisecting the north campus that would in the process destroy several elegant houses and many stately trees. With an eye for the dramatic, the students made the route of the loop road visible by putting numbered yellow placards on the 102 trees which they thought would be removed. The *Reserve Tribune*, the student newspaper, became filled with news of the loop road and opposition to it. The committee also circulated a petition opposing the road which in mid-March was presented to President Millis with over 1500 signatures. Concerns about the road spread to students' parents and alumni.[48]

At first both Neil Carothers and John Millis responded to these concerns by pointing out certain inaccuracies in the student newspaper's description of plans for the road, and by appealing to the authority of the master plan. UCDF issued a press release which quoted from the original Adams, Howard and Greeley

47. *Reserve Tribune*, 13 December 1962.
48. *Reserve Tribune*, 7 March 1963, 14 March 1963, 21 March 1963, 11 April 1963; petition, 14 March 1963, box 32, Millis Office Files. See copies of letters to parents and alumni in box 32, Millis Office Files.

report and concluded that "we have seen nothing in the interim since 1957 to cause us to doubt the wisdom of this planning concept."[49] Carothers wrote to Millis that he expected the release "to quell this before it spreads further" because "all the wild statements that are being issued makes us look bad in the eyes of our supporters."[50] When meeting with the representatives of the student government of Reserve a few days later, Carothers reiterated that "we have seen nothing to cause us to want to make a change in the basic concept of the plan."[51]

Carothers misconstrued the cause of the students' concern about the loop road. They were not the victims of misinformation: they diligently published relevant portions of the original Adams, Howard and Greeley report, interviewed various city planners, and called on Carothers and Millis for further explanations. Nor were the issues the precise location of the road or the number of trees which it would destroy. (Carothers gratuitously pointed out that most were elms dying of Dutch elm disease anyway.)

Instead the students were acting in the context of two fundamental values of American life, both of which were idealized at the traditional American college: a closeness to nature represented by a park-like campus, and an education emphasizing the gifts of American democracy, such as the submission of institutions to the will of the people. The students in the Circle, similar to American students on other campuses in the 1960s, reacted to what they perceived as unwarranted

49. "A great deal of misconception has arisen," 8 March 1963, box 32, Millis Office Files.
50. Neil Carothers to John S. Millis, 8 March 1963, box 32, Millis Office Files.
51. *Reserve Tribune*, 21 March 1963.

government intrusion — in this case an apparent plan to insert a heavily-used freeway into the idealized campus — and an institutionalized decision-making process that did not allow for involvement of, or response to, the people most directly affected by the decisions. A generation of students brought up hearing the Cold War rhetoric that their country represented the epitome of liberty and democracy was challenging in UCDF a manifestation of authority which to that generation seemed insulated from the processes of popular referendum.

As the spring of 1963 wore on the loop road controversy became the *cause célèbre* of the campus. By May even the Reserve faculty had joined the ranks of the concerned, sending a resolution to the university trustees asking for a restudy of the loop road. In June Millis announced that UCDF had suspended plans for the road, pending their reevaluation.[52]

Officially the road remained part of the master plan and Carothers continued to make public pronouncements about the necessity of building it. As late as 1968 UCDF constructed about two hundred feet of the road under the guise of installing a parking lot on the Case campus south of Euclid Avenue. But continued student-faculty opposition made the loop road plan a dead letter.[53]

The loop road controversy focused attention on UCDF's method of implementing the master plan. One group of students and faculty, styling themselves "The Friends of the Circle," formed

52. John S. Millis to Faculty of the Arts and Sciences, 17 June 1963, box 10, Millis Office Files.
53. *Reserve Tribune*, 19 March 1964, 11 February 1965, 30 September 1965, 9 December 1966, 13 December 1966, 28 April 1967, 3 May 1968.

in the spring of 1963 to extend the developing critique of UCDF. Their objections were not the need for planning, but to UCDF's apparent capitulation to the needs of the automobile, and to the lack of architectural and environmental coherence in those elements of the master plan already carried out. The Friends saw the design for the new Garden Center, which would fill the scenic ravine at the north end of Wade Park, and of the Historical Society's new Crawford Auto Aviation Museum, which would obliterate some of the architectural features of the adjacent Hanna House, as examples of thoughtless development.[54]

The architectural critic of the *New York Times*, Ada Louise Huxtable, picked up the story of UCDF and its opponents, and characterized the conflict as about "the disruptive effects of growth and change plaguing most American cities. At issue are new buildings versus preservation and parks, the automobile versus the pedestrian and nature, and the elimination of communities to accommodate expanding requirements. In Cleveland everything has erupted simultaneously in one spot."[55]

Huxtable's mention of "the elimination of communities" referred to the other major conflict engendered by the growth of the Circle in the early 1960s: the expansion of Case and Reserve into neighborhoods. From its beginning the UCDF master plan identified residential areas to the north and south as the only possible sources of new land for the Circle institutions. A map

54. *Circle Review* (published by Friends of the Circle), no. 1 (November 1963), no. 2 (March 1964). These are the only two issues of this publication that I have seen.
55. *New York Times*, 24 November 1963.

in the public report issued at the end of UCDF's first five years clearly labeled the intended areas of expansion.[56]

However, UCDF did not formally communicate its intentions to neighborhood groups, and preferred one-to-one negotiations with property owners instead of sponsoring public meetings or sharing decision-making with residents. In an internal report on neighborhood relations prepared in April 1962 Oliver Brooks, Vice-President of UCDF, acknowledged that his organization expected that the residents' acceptance of the inevitability of Circle expansion would be the major reason why they would be willing to sell their land.[57]

Difficulties with this strategy became apparent late in 1962 when Case Institute announced its plan to buy land along Murray Hill Road (south of the campus) for a dormitory complex. The owners of the parcels designated for purchase were alarmed and, as part of the tightly-knit, largely Italian-Heritage, neighborhood known as Murray Hill, they called upon their neighbors and political leaders to support an effort to resist the encroachment. Their anxiety was heightened when at a meeting with representatives of Case Institute, their community leaders could not obtain a promise that land for the proposed complex was the last Circle acquisition in Murray Hill. Many suspected that UCDF would ask the city to exercise eminent domain on its behalf.

Eventually the residents took their concerns to the state

56. *University Circle Development Foundation: The First Five Years*, p. 5.
57. Oliver Brooks, "University Circle and its Surrounding Neighborhoods," 1 April 1962, copy in C.H. Cramer Papers, CWRU Archives.

legislature, and supported passage of a bill which prohibited the use of city-granted eminent domain by UCDF, even though UCDF had already renounced that strategy. The residents on the site of the planned Murray Hill complex did sell their properties, and the dormitories were begun in 1964. But when Case needed more dormitories, it had to locate them on a site not contemplated in the master plan, further south of campus, on the edge of Cleveland Heights. It was an incident which Murray Hill never forgot.[58]

Reserve had similar difficulties with a portion of the Wade Park Avenue neighborhood between East 115th Street and East 118th Street to the northeast of the Circle, where it planned to create a new athletic area, as designated in the master plan. An area with largely middle- and upper-class African-American families, this district had a strong sense of identity and a clear justification for preserving it. UCDF official Oliver Brooks noted that a typical question from an area resident was: "We have struggled to get out of the Negro ghetto. Is your main concern pushing the Negro as far away from University Circle as you can?"[59]

Nonetheless, the residents of the Wade Park Avenue area could not mount an effective resistance to Reserve's expansion, and at least 120 residents were displaced for the construction of Finnegan Fields in the late 1960s. In 1970 it was reported that

58. Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology*, pp. 179; interview with Murray Hill resident Annie Fennelli, 1986, in Jay A. Ruffner, "Construction of the Murray Hill Student Housing Project by the Case Institute of Technology," AMST 280 paper, 24 April 1986, in author's files; Alan Natali, "Another Country, Another Time [Murray Hill]," *Ohio Magazine*, July 1984, p. 47.
59. Brooks, "University Circle and its Surrounding Neighborhoods," p. 24.

some in the neighborhood still looked at the project as "a further step to isolate the community from the university." The university's concession to ill feeling was to open the athletic facilities for limited use by neighborhood youth.[60]

The Circle's expansion did not have a direct impact on the Hough neighborhood, though indirectly it was substantial. By drawing the boundaries of the University-Euclid urban renewal district to include all of the Circle, city authorities were able to claim new building in the Circle as part of the local investment which could be used to obtain matching federal funds. By 1970 the city had obtained over $13 million in federal credits which it applied to various projects in the University-Euclid urban renewal district, but UCDF itself had no influence in the Hough area and many people in Hough thought UCDF looked at their neighborhood as a problem to be contained.[61]

The cumulative effect of poor neighborhood relationships and the ill-fated loop road episode was to diminish the image of UCDF among many of the students, faculty, and residents in the Circle. As early as April 1964 John T. Howard, the former Cleveland planner then with Adams, Howard, and Greeley, stated publicly that UCDF had misconstrued the role of the loop road, and that routing traffic off Euclid Avenue and through the

60. Douglas Smock, "Urban Renewal in the Circle: What Have Been the Costs?," supplement to *The Observer* (student newspaper of Case Western Reserve), 7 April 1970, p. 9. See also documents regarding land acquisition, 1965-67, box 1, John S. Millis Chancellor Files (hereafter Millis Chancellor Files), CWRU Archives.
61. E.g., statement of Franklin Anderson, executive director of the Hough Area Development Corporation in Gary Griffith, "Second Draft of the Dream at University Circle," *Cleveland Magazine*, May 1972, p. 32.

Circle was counter to the interests of everyone.[62] Later even well-established Circle institutions began to question UCDF's methods. In 1966 the Institute of Music became uncomfortable with conforming to UCDF's leadership when its plans for expansion were dealt with unsympathetically by Carothers and Millis, both of whom inflexibly asserted the primacy of the master plan.[63]

Carothers' favorite project, a faculty-staff club complex for Reserve and Case to be located just east of Severance Hall in the heart of the Circle, ran afoul of difficult financial times at Reserve and an unwillingness of private and corporate donors to continue to support UCDF's projects.[64] After Robert W. Morse became president of the federated Case Western Reserve University in 1967 he was pointedly critical of UCDF's plans, writing to Carothers that "the Staff Club is misconceived, impractical, and does not meet priority needs for either the University or the other institutions."[65] Morse had already expressed dissatisfaction with the Circle's relationships with adjacent neighborhoods; and he later asserted that he did not

62. *Reserve Tribune*, 9 April 1964.
63. Neil J. Carothers to Charles M. Bordurtha, 15 March 1966, and John S. Millis to Oliver Brooks. 30 March 1966, box 1, Millis Chancellor Files.
64. Cafeteria and bookstore plans, 1964-65, and Neil J. Carothers to Charles Bassett, 17 August 1966, 4, Millis Office Files; *Reserve Tribune*, 24 September 1968, 18 February 1969. According to one of the UCFD trustees, in the latter 1960s UCDF relied upon annual contributions of $50,000 each from James Ireland and Kent Smith in order to balance its budget: C.H. Cramer interview with William Treuhaft, 6 May 1981, in C.H. Cramer Papers, CWRU Archives.
65. Robert W. Morse to Neil J. Carothers, 2 October 1967, box 8, Morse Office Files.

want the university represented by UCDF in any community relations activities.[66]

Decreasing financial and institutional support gradually required curtailment of UCDF's plans and activities. In the fall of 1968 Carothers announced that the faculty-staff center could not be started for several years, and that student and faculty concerns would help frame any future planning for future on-campus facilities built by UCDF.[67] As financial constraints became more severe UCDF became saddled with mortgages on several tracts of land it had bought in hopes of erecting new buildings but was able neither to sell them nor derive income from them: it was effectively bankrupt.[68] In May 1969 Carothers resigned, noting that UCDF would not soon again be the active organization he wanted it to be.[69] A few months later acting UCDF president Murray Davidson stated that the organization was shifting its emphasis from expansion to a more efficient use of existing facilities in the Circle.[70]

Thus, after twelve years the University Circle Development Foundation had come to the end of a phase of optimistic expansion and implementation of the master plan. Clearly there had been major achievements: UCDF had coordinated a major

66. Smock, "Urban Renewal in the Circle," p. 9; Robert W. Morse to Herman Stein and Louis Toepfer, 13 March 1969, box 8, Morse Office Files.
67. *Reserve Tribune*, 24 September 1968, 27 September 1968, 1 October 1968.
68. *Ibid*, 27 September 1968, 26 November 1968; author's interview of Murray Davidson, 2 February 1985, Accession #A14-040, CWRU Archives.
69. *Reserve Tribune*, 6 May 1969.
70. *Ibid*, 16 September 1969.

series of capital investments by the Circle institutions, and by the end of its first decade could claim completion of 91% of the new construction anticipated in the twenty-year master plan.[71] Parking, one of the very practical concerns underlying the new era of planning in the Circle, had been attacked head-on: UCDF had built two parking garages and several new lots, keeping fees so low that it was in effect providing a subsidized parking service for the Circle institutions.

On the other hand, UCDF eventually was worn down by one quality which appeared originally to be a major strength: its attempt to speak for the Circle with one voice. UCDF was conceived of and carried on as a monolithic entity, representing all of the Circle institutions, but controlled by the most powerful of them: Reserve, Case, and University Hospitals. That power structure worked well enough to insure the smooth implementation of the master plan in relation to other institutions, but proved insular and inflexible when dealing with other constituencies such as students and neighborhood residents.

Neil J. Carothers, president of UCDF throughout nearly nine of its first twelve years, epitomized the virtues and weaknesses of the organization. He was a fine administrator, and his engineering background allowed him to achieve an excellent grasp of all the concrete issues in implementing the master plan. But his definition of problems in financial and technical terms

71. Griffith, “Second Draft of the Dream,” p. 28.

inhibited his grasp of the important social-emotional aspects of projects, such as the loop road, and neighborhood relations.[72]

Perhaps the most ironic result of Carothers' and UCDF's efforts was that it was not much more successful than the city of Cleveland in its avowed intention to create more and better housing in the Circle. Like the city, UCDF found that it was relatively easy to acquire land and demolish existing structures: it was extremely difficult to fund and construct housing for residential purposes, and until the better economic climate of the mid-1980s, virtually impossible to interest private developers in such a venture. UCDF was able to purchase and demolish the mixed commercial-residential buildings at the busy Mayfield-Euclid triangle in the latter 1960s, for example, but despite its intentions to construct apartments could do no better for over fifteen years than turn the site into a rubble-filled parking lot.[73] It was apparent failures like that which, in spite of well-intentioned plans, cast doubt on UCDF's ability to achieve to both the aesthetic and human-needs components of the master plan.

Coincident with the decline of UCDF the Circle witnessed another major struggle: the federation of Western Reserve University and Case Institute of Technology. The groundwork for the federation was laid throughout the 1950s and early 1960s by the continuous and growing cooperation of Millis and Glennan. In their minds federation followed naturally: in Millis's

72. Interview of Morrell Heald (CIT-CWRU faculty), 26 June 1986, in author's files; interview with Murray Davidson, 15 February 1985.
73. *Reserve Tribune*, 8 March 1968, 26 November 1968. The author parked in that lot, 1980-86.

colorful reminiscence, there was a crucial moment early in 1965 when he told Glennan that they "had been going steady for about ten years — we'd been sleeping together for about five years — and it was about time we got married," and Glennan agreed to support federation.[74]

However, the immediate motivation to begin the process actually came from the major private and public sources of funds to which Reserve and Case turned more and more in the expansionary 1950s and early 1960s. In March 1965, for example, Millis told the Reserve trustees that the National Science Foundation (NSF) was unhappy that Reserve and Case each had applied for a $5 million grant under NSF's program to create new "centers of excellence" in the sciences. According to Millis, "we were told that both requests were favorably received, but inasmuch as thirty million dollars had been provided for the whole country, the National Science Foundation could not award ten million dollars to one city and we were asked, therefore, whether the two institutions through collaboration could reduce their requests." In response Millis and Glennan were able to produce new requests for $3½ million each, based upon inter-institutional cooperation, especially in chemistry.[75] NSF responded quickly, making the joint $7 million grant in May 1965.[76]

A second prod to federation came from John W. Gardner, former federal Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, then

74. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, p. 279.
75. Extract, minutes, Western Reserve University trustees, 5 March 1965, box 36, Millis Office Files.
76. *Cleveland Press*, 4 May 1965.

president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. He wrote to Glennan in September 1965 that he felt the time was ripe for federation, particularly as Glennan was to retire at the end of the academic year. After Millis and Glennan met with Gardner in October, they took to their trustees their idea for a blue-ribbon commission to study federation, and got the trustees' approval.[77]

The commission was headed by Henry T. Heald, former president of the Ford Foundation. It reported in May 1966 that not only was merger feasible but that merger offered the possibility of establishing an institution that would rank among the best of America's private universities. The report called for substantial fundraising in order to improve the existing libraries, strengthen the humanities and social science programs, and create new programs in urban, environmental, and computer studies, among others.[78]

The trustees of both institutions accepted the Heald commission's vision, and consummated the official merger on July 1, 1967. Robert W. Morse, who had succeeded Glennan as president of Case the year before, became president of the new institution, styled Case Western Reserve University (CWRU). For two years, until his retirement, John S. Millis moved into the largely ceremonial position of Chancellor.

The initial years of federation were stormy. The financial

77. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 281-82; Jean Calhoun, "He Did it All," *CWRU: The Magazine of Case Western Reserve University* 2 (February 1990): 10.
78. "Vision of a University: Final Report of the Case-Western Reserve University Study Commission," esp. 39-41, May 1966, box 6, Millis Office Files.

problems which were found throughout American higher education in the latter 1960s hit the new university particularly hard, and the founding of two new institutions of higher learning in the city, Cleveland State University (1965) and Cuyahoga Community College (1963) narrowed CWRU's appeal to local students and donors. Resistance by Case alumni to the fund-raising effort called for by the Heald commission also exacerbated the effect of the general decline in the availability of federal funds.[79] Moreover, there were serious problems with faculty morale. Morse and Millis pressed for unified departments of physics, chemistry, biology, and mathematics well before federation was official (joint departments of geology and astronomy had been created already), but had to overcome strong resistance.[80]

After federation it was clear to everyone that whether or not unification with another department was required, few departments in the sciences, humanities, and social sciences could sustain the programs created in the boom years of the 1950s and early 1960s. Faculty struggled with personal decisions to leave or stay, and with departmental decisions to reduce the number of staff positions and consequently the range of courses offered. Coinciding with those reductions was the

79. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 284-85; author's interviews of John S. Millis, 11-12 June 1985, Accession #A11-010, CWRU Archives; Robert W. Morse to heads of academic divisions, 2 April 1970, box 6, Morse Office Files; Ruth Fischer, "Case Western Reserve: Federation Fever," *Change*, October 1978, p. 40.
80. News release, 4 November 1966, box 3, Millis Chancellor Files; F. Albert Cotton, Walter Kauzman and John D. Roberts to L.S. Finkelstein, box 1, Millis Chancellor Files; author's interview of Karl McEachron (CWRU professor), 1 July 1986, Accession # A11-010, CWRU Archives.

diminution of federal and university monies that had supported graduate education. In many areas of the university the decrease in faculty size and graduate support extended to the mid-1970s. It was an agonizing period for much of the university community.[81]

The students suffered from the general belt-tightening, as well, but they often had other things on their minds, such as civil rights, student rights, the draft, and Vietnam. The Circle controversies of the early 1960s such as the loop road proposal were a training ground for more serious and nationally-connected expressions of discontent in the latter 1960s. They showed that students could mount sustained and effective criticism of elitist policies, and change the plans and policies they opposed. Tactics such as forming student-faculty committees, picketing, using the student newspaper to report on issues and events not covered by other media, and gathering names for petitions were well-developed in the Circle by the latter 1960s.

As campuses generally became the focal points of vocal

81. *Reserve Tribune*, 21 May 1968, 11 April 1969, 12 May 1970, 23 October 1970, 9 February 1971, 12 February 1971, 10 September 1971, 15 February 1972, 22 February 1972, 18 April 1972, 25 April 1972, 2 May 1972, 6 April 1973; Martin Pomeranz to Robert W. Morse, 1 July 1969, box 6, Morse Office Files; Marion C. Siney, *Ups and Downs: The History Department, Western Reserve University-Case Western Reserve University.* Harvey Wish Memorial Lecture Series 111. (Cleveland: Department of History, Case Western Reserve University, 1980), pp. 39-41; Linda L. Goldstein, *History of the American Studies Program at CWRU* (Cleveland: American Studies Program, Case Western Reserve University, 1985), pp. 17-24; author's interview of Reid Shelton (CWRU professor), 5 December 1985, Accession A11-010, CWRU Archives; Fischer, "Case Western Reserve," p.41.

resistance to the draft and the Vietnam war, CWRU students acted as responsibly (and on occasion as irresponsibly) as those in other major universities. A few formed a chapter of the left-wing Students for a Democratic Society (1965), but one of its most visible activities, a demonstration of student power at Severance Hall following an address by Columbia University student leader Mark Rudd, was regarded by the CWRU administration as "non-destructive and non-disruptive."[82]

More moderate activists focused on what they thought was an ill-considered war in Vietnam. Many students participated in the first University Circle Teach-in (March 1965), one of the earliest attempts to provide the American public with a comprehensive historical and social understanding of Southeast Asia and the American role there. By mid-1967 the Cleveland Area Peace Action Coalition, led by CWRU professor Sidney Peck, took a national role in education and agitation against American involvement in what many perceived as an immoral and illegal military adventure.[83]

Volatile issues at CWRU were student participation in the Air Force ROTC and the university's relationship with industries that manufactured war materiel. Case's historic connection with Dow Chemical, for example, was a source of irritation when its recruiters came to campus.[84]

In the Circle the most memorable events of the era of student

82. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 932; Thomas E. Baker to Frank E. Joseph, 13 December 1968, box 3, Millis Chancellor Files; *Crisis at Columbia* (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), p. 72.
83. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 1012.
84. *Reserve Tribune*, 12 November 1968.

social-political activism occurred in May 1969 and May 1970. In the first instance, African-American radicalism in Cleveland spilled over onto the campus. The History Department had scheduled a lecture series on "Violence in American History" and the first speaker was Louis Masotti, professor of political science at CWRU, who was head of the Civil Violence Research Center on campus. At the announced time of the lecture a group of Black Panthers took over the microphone and demanded that Masotti release the report he had prepared on the so-called "Glenville Shootout" — a violent confrontation between police and Black militants which had occurred the previous summer in the Glenville neighborhood about a mile north of the Circle.

This disruption was publicly denounced by president Morse the next day, who said he would take legal action to preserve order on campus, while some students and faculty, as well as Black leaders, responded by joining in the demand for the release of the Masotti report. But the Civil Violence Research Center had conducted its research under a contract with the National Committee on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, which had retained the right to publish the results: no one on campus had the authority to release it.

The ensuing stalemate was highlighted by the protesters' four-day occupation of Haydn Hall, where the Research Center was housed; a brief invasion of the administrative offices in Adelbert Hall, at which point Morse obtained an injunction against the trespassers; and a couple of minor confrontations between the protesters and those of different opinions. Ten days after the initial disruption president Morse called a general meeting of

the university community to air differing points of view. As the university historian related:

> The dissidents demanded an open and unstructured meeting in which anyone could speak; this was refused to avoid a babel of tongues. After an hour of backbiting, the forum was crippled when more than a third of those in attendance walked out to hold their own open meeting: subsequently most of the rest of the audience also disappeared, leaving the administration of the university speaking to itself.[85]

At this point the crisis lost its drama, and students and faculty turned their attention to the beginning of final examinations the next week.

The spring of 1970 was the high point of campus activity opposing the Vietnam war. When President Nixon announced the invasion of Cambodia on April 30 there were strong and often violent reactions nationally. On May 3 a group of about fifty (students and non-students) occupied CWRU's Yost Hall, which housed the Air Force's ROTC offices; the next day, May 4, the students vacated the building on a promise that the faculty senate would consider the propriety of ROTC on campus.

But that same day, at a mid-day rally of over a thousand students and faculty on the Case quadrangle, word came that soldiers of the Ohio National Guard had shot and killed four students at nearby Kent State University. In a spontaneous gesture of frustration, the rally moved to nearby Euclid Avenue where about 300 students blocked the street, and traffic was tied up for

85. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, p. 188.

about two hours. A mass of police on foot and horseback finally cleared the street with little injury and only one arrest.[86]

President Morse demonstrated sympathy for the views of the students that evening by joining about 4000 of them in a candlelight march. The next day the faculty senate recommended that ROTC classes be removed from the curriculum (subsequently they were), and made the popular decision to allow students, if they so wished, to go home without taking the spring semester's final exams. These actions defused a volatile situation. A strike committee was established by a few students to try to draw on the energy of the moment to force other changes in a university perceived by them as hopelessly intertwined with the military system, but it found few adherents. When the fall of 1970 came the campus was quiet. The strident student activism of the Vietnam era was on the decline.[87] The discussion of such matters as drugs, co-ed dormitories, and sex, already of great interest to the students, thereafter took precedence over potentially more volatile political matters — presumably to the relief of the faculty and administration.[88]

The Circle's various upheavals and uncertainties of the latter 1960s — the decline of UCDF, the loss of faculty and programs after the federation of Case and Reserve, and the occasionally volatile student activism — left it sapped of strength and a sense of purpose as it careened into the 1970s. Recovering its former vision, or perhaps finding a new one, seemed a daunting task,

86. *The Observer*, 8 May 1970.
87. I have relied on the account of the events of May 1969 and May 1970 in Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 184-92.
88. Note heavy coverage of these topics in *The Observer*, 14 November 1969, 12 December 1969, 16 January 1970.

particularly as Cleveland’s serious financial and racial problems became more visible.

12. Oasis Years, 1970-1985

In the 1970s and early 1980s in University Circle appeared to regain the stability and sense of mission which had eroded in the 1960s. While serious problems remained, there were two factors which helped restore confidence in the Circle. One was, ironically, the rapidly accumulating difficulties of Cleveland's city government, school system, and industrial base, which put into sharp relief the outstanding achievements of the Circle's institutions. The Circle seemed to be a cultural oasis in an urban desert. The other factor in the Circle's revived self-confidence was the growth and new initiatives of many of its institutions. Most visible was the transformation of the University Circle Development Foundation into University Circle, Inc.

By the end of the 1960s it was clear that UCDF's style of operation had alienated the administration, as well as the students and faculty, of the newly-federated Case Western Reserve University, the keystone of any inter-institutional cooperation in the Circle. In 1969 Paul Carré, a consultant hired by UCDF, critically analyzed UCDF's faults and suggested that

only an entirely new organization would cure them. He argued for a broader-based institution which would include in its governance representatives of virtually every Circle institution and business, as well as the adjacent neighborhoods.

Carré addressed his arguments not only to Morse, but also the chairman of the UCDF's trustees. Raymond Q. Armington.[1] Carré was a talented writer and impressed people as perceptive, and his vision was supported by a group as diverse as Anthony J. Garofoli, the city councilman for the area, and James Ireland, the son of Mrs. William G. (Elizabeth Ring) Mather.[2]

The first sign of the transformation was in March 1970 when William Treuhaft, a Cleveland industrialist and civic leader, was elected the chairman of the board of UCDF. In May the organization's name was changed to University Circle Incorporated (UCI), and Joseph D. Pigott, a vice-president of CWRU who had earlier been elected, took over as president. UCI immediately began to expand its membership. A year-and-a-half later it had a board of trustees of 136 members, although the executive committee of the trustees was only a third that size.[3]

1. Paul D. Carré to Raymond Q, Armington, 1 September 1969, box 8, Robert Morse Office Files (hereafter Morse Office Files), Case Western Reserve University Archives (hereafter CWRU Archives), Cleveland, OH; Gary Griffith, "Second Draft of the Dream at University Circle," *Cleveland Magazine* 1 (May 1972): 31.
2. Author's interview of Joseph D. Pigott, 25 July 1986, Accession #A11-010, CWRU Archives. Pigott believed that Garofoli's presentations to the UCDF trustees were critically important to the development of the new vision.
3. *The Observer*, 17 March 1970; *University Circle*, April 1970, pp. 1-2; Griffith, "Second Draft of the Dream at University Circle," p. 32; David

The transition from UCDP to UCI almost got off on the wrong foot when even before officially entering office Pigott announced that the loop road would be built after all, and the CWRU student newspaper quoted him as saying that "crossing the Loop Road on the south campus will be a minor inconvenience."[4] But this revival was soon dropped, and by the fall an officer of UCI told the students that their proposals for new and future uses of Circle facilities would be welcomed.[5]

The major blueprint for UCI's new role came from a study done by Raymond, Parish and Pine, an urban planning firm from White Plains, New York hired by UCI In November 1970.[6] In light of the new attitude at UCI it was appropriate that one of the firm's most visible acts was to survey student needs for housing and shopping. The campus newspaper editorialized that the students might yet motivate UCI to bring new businesses into the Circle.[7]

In one sense this view was naive, since neither UCI nor UCDP had ever financed new businesses; but to those who blamed UCI for the disappearance of commercial activity in the Circle, it seemed logical that it could bring it back.[8] By the spring of 1971 there was also some interest at UCI in the re-commercialization of the Circle, particularly as a result of prodding by Paul Carré, who had joined the CWRU administration as an assistant to the

D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds, *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987), p. 981.

4. *The Observer*, 3 April 1970.
5. *Ibid*, 25 September 1970.
6. *Ibid*, 20 November 1970.
7. *Ibid*, 5 February 1971, 12 February 1971.
8. Griffith, "Second Draft of the Dream at University Circle," pp. 29-30.

president.[9] But those discussions led nowhere: in October 1971, the plans for a new center for campus religious organizations called for tearing down the Campus Supermarket.[10] When opened, the Interfaith Plaza was an architectural gem: but the sole grocery store in the Circle had vanished.[11]

When the Raymond, Parish and Pine study was completed in October 1971 it proposed a five-year plan to radically improve the University Circle environment and to improve its relationships with the adjacent communities. Its report on housing noted that the Circle contained thousands of people during the day, but only 7% of them lived in the Circle at night. Housing in the Circle was relatively cheap, yet unattractive, because of a perceived high crime rate and a lack of amenities in the area.[12] An important aspect of the study was its call for a Circle Center for Community Programs, an attempt to create greater contact between the Circle and the residents of surrounding areas by bussing children to the Circle institutions.[13]

9. Paul D. Carré to Louis Toepfer, 5 April 1971 and 25 June 1971, box 3, Louis Toepfer Office Files (hereafter Toepfer Office Files), CWRU Archives.
10. *The Observer*, 5 October 1971.
11. Mary Peale Schofield, *Landmark Architecture of Cleveland* (Pittsburgh, Pa.: Ober Park Associates, 1976), pp. 117-18.
12. *The Observer*, 9 November 1971, 26 February 1972; Development Economics Group of Raymond, Parish and Pine, *The Demand for Housing and Commercial Facilities in University Circle* (Washington: n.p., 1971).
13. Raymond, Parish and Pine, *Circle Center for Community Programs* (White Plains, NY: n.p.,1971); Joseph D. Pigott interview. According to one informant, Elizabeth Treuhaft had the original idea for the Circle Center for Community Programs: author's interview of Richard Tullis, 31 July 1986, Accession #A14-040, CWRU Archives.

Pigott successfully implemented the new agenda for UCI. During the 1970s a variety of partnerships between UCI, community agencies, and government resulted in the creation of over 1000 subsidized housing units, some within and some adjacent to the Circle. Richard Tullis, who joined the board of UCI in 1970 and later became its chairman, had a personal commitment to building low-income housing. In the latter 1960s he was the keystone of an independent project in Hough that built 36 family units. Later Tullis directed UCI's work with the Hough Area Development Council to construct Community Circle One and Community Circle Two — apartment complexes on the eastern end of Hough Avenue.[14]

The Raymond, Parish and Pine study's proposal for the Circle Center for Community Programs was quickly implemented by UCI, aided by a three-year $75,000 grant from the Gund Foundation in 1983. From the late 1970s into the 1980s the Center was bringing 60,000 children and adults into the Circle annually.[15]

There was irony in UCI's greater outreach to the neighboring communities because at the same time they were undergoing a rapid depopulation, part of the general demographic trend in Cleveland and some other American cities of the Northeast and Midwest that suffered significant population loss in the

14. Tullis interview, 31 July 1986; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 525.
15. Kenneth W. McGovern, "The Story of UCI: A Private Initiative Model," read at the Anglo-American Colloquium on Recent British and American Innovations in Urban Policy, Cleveland, Ohio, 13 April 1983; University Circle, Inc., *Annual Report 1979* (Cleveland; University Circle, Inc., 1979), pp. 12-13.

1970s. Cleveland's population dropped from 876,050 in 1960, to 750,879 in 1970, and 573,822 in 1980, a 35% decline in 20 years.[16] The core area of the Circle lost 28% of its population from 1960 to 1980, declining from 4,758 to 3,449. Areas adjacent to the Circle were hit harder: the population in the Hough area declined more than 65% from 1960 to 1980,[17] and Murray Hill's population fell 40% during the same period.[18]

The loss of residents could be directly correlated with the loss

16. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. lii; Michael I. White, *American Neighborhoods and Residential Differentiation* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1987), pp. 16, 21-23. Contemporary estimates suggested that after 1980 the greater Cleveland metropolitan area began a long-term population loss, a pattern in common with most of the largest Midwest and Northeast urban areas: William H. Frey, "Migration and Metropolitan Decline in Developed Countries; A Comparative Study," *Population and Development Review* 14 (December 1988): 602-9; William H. Frey and Alden Speare, Jr., *Regional and Metropolitan Growth and Decline in the United States* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988), pp. 200, 202, 260.
17. David A. Snow and Peter I. Leahy, "A Neighborhood in Transition: Hough, Ohio," in Edward M. Miggins, ed., *A Guide to Studying Neighborhoods and Resources on Cleveland* (Cleveland: Cleveland Public Library, 1984), pp. 101, 104; *Poverty Indicators: Trends 1980-1986, Cuyahoga County, Ohio* (Cleveland: Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland, 1986), pp. 52, 100. Estimates indicated further population decline in the early 1980s: *Poverty Indicators*, p. 100.
18. James M. Wood, "Little Italy Renaissance," *Cleveland Magazine* (November 1985): 176; U.S. Department of Commerce, *U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960, Census Tracts, Cleveland, Ohio, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area* (Washington: Government Publications Office, 1962), p. 27; *Ibid, 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Census Tracts, Cleveland, Ohio, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area* (Washington: Government Publications Office, 1983), p. 19. The "core area" of the Circle in the U.S. census is tract 1187, bounded by 105th Street on the west, Euclid Avenue on the south and southeast, and Wade Park and Asbury avenues on the north. Estimates suggested a further population decline in the early 1980s: *Poverty Indicators*, p. 105.

of housing units in the neighborhoods, many of which were torn down in the name of urban renewal,[19] but those who left were also seeking to avoid startling poverty conditions. The neighborhoods adjacent to the Circle (except Murray Hill, which was mid-range) were among the poorest in Cuyahoga County by the 1980s, and Hough, Glenville, and Fairfax experienced family poverty rates above 60%.[20]

The city government failed to cope with declining population and increasing poverty during the 1970s and early 1980s. Both factors created a weakening of tax revenues, and contributed to the city's inability to maintain services at previous levels. By 1978 the city's budget was a shambles and it defaulted on its loans, becoming known nationally for its financial failure. The voters approved a 50% increase in the city income tax in 1980, and restored the city to solvency, but the long-term decay of the parks, streets, and buildings was barely arrested, let alone reversed, in the next few years.[21]

19. Not only in Cleveland, but in other major American cities, urban renewal projects (which began with the demolition of so-called substandard housing) usually centered on the densest areas of Black residence. In the 1950s and 1960s critics of government programs often commented that "urban renewal means Negro removal." Few of those displaced found adequate housing elsewhere. See: John F. Bauman, *Public Housing, Race, and Renewal: Urban Planning in Philadelphia, 1920-1974* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987), pp. 127, 149-152.
20. *Poverty Indicators*, pp. 36, 76, 77, 82, 119. The measure of poverty is family income below the poverty level established by the federal government. The census tract for Murray Hill (1188) ranked 188th of 375 tracts in Cuyahoga County for estimated poverty rates in 1986. The incidence of poverty grew nationwide from the mid-1970s through the 1980s and in urban areas was concentrated in a few neighborhoods: Phyllis J. Day, "The New Poor in America: Isolationism in an International Political Economy," *Social Work* 34 (May 1989): 227-28; White, *American Neighborhoods*, p. 33.
21. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. liii-lv, 753-54.

The Circle became a visible oasis amid the decaying city in part because UCI and other organizations began to assume what were formerly city responsibilities. In 1970 the city gave UCI a 99-year lease on Wade Oval in return for UCI's acceptance of the responsibility for keeping Wade Park landscaped,[22] an astonishing admission by the city that it could not maintain a park in the heart of one of the city's showpiece areas. In UCI's view the city's near paralysis forced it to "negotiate and cajole" improvements in University Circle that helped create and maintain an environment in the Circle worthy of the institutions located there.[23]

UCI's work in Wade Oval was successful. David Swetland of the Lester M. Sears Foundation brought in a landscape architect who laid out the plantings in a simple but elegant design, and the three institutions adjacent to the park (Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland Museum of Natural History, and Garden Center of Greater Cleveland) agreed to share the costs of annual maintenance. In the 1980s UCI coordinated the rehabilitation of Rockefeller Park along the western border of the Circle with the aid of an anonymous philanthropist.[24]

22. Author's interview of Murray Davidson, 6, 15, 27 February 1985, Accession #A14-040, CWRU Archives; Irma Bartell, "University Circle Calls for Attention," *The Plain Dealer*, 22 November 1985; University Circle, Inc., *Annual Report 1983* (Cleveland: University Circle, Inc., 1983), p. 19.
23. *Annual Report 1979*, p. 10. In 1985 UCI Vice-President Murray Davidson stated that "One of UCI's functions is to lobby the city for the Circle, and over time we've been very successful": Murray Davidson interview.
24. Murray Davidson interview. The Lester M. Sears Foundation donated $100,000 for the landscape design and initial plantings of the rehabilitated Wade Park. On the Sears Foundation see *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 626.

The general improvement of the Circle was aided by a 25-member University Circle Council established in 1983 and largely composed of prominent Cleveland women who identified areas that were eyesores or safety hazards. They promoted the development of better lighting, and the removal or replacement of overgrown shrubbery and fencing in order to discourage nighttime crimes in the Circle.[25]

Crime in University Circle was perhaps one of the most vexing problems which UCI had to face. Despite the fact that the Circle was one of the safest districts in the city, and that the UCI police force provided more intensive coverage than the city police department could, the Circle had a reputation as a dangerous place to be, particularly at night.

The image of the Circle as dangerous became current in the 1950s as Hough and Doan's Corners became areas of racial mixing. The six unsolved bombings in residential areas adjacent to the Circle in 1952-54 were thought to be a racially-motivated response to that change.[26] Then in 1966 a woman who was a member of the Cleveland Orchestra chorus was raped and murdered at the south end of the lagoon as she walked to a

25. Murray Davidson interview; Richard Tullis interview; Bartell, "University Circle Calls for Attention." While a major reason for improved lighting was greater safety, artful illumination of the facades of the major architectural features of the Circle was another thrust of the Council's work. On the illumination of the Art Museum, see *The Observer*, 6 December 1985.
26. Kenneth W. Rose, "The Cleveland Community Relations Board and the Politics of Race Relations, 1945-1963," presented at the Ohio Academy of History, April 1989. The bombings included the new site of the Mt. Zion Congregational Church on Magnolia Drive: Mt. Zion Congregational Church, *125th Anniversary Observance, 1864-1989* (Cleveland: n.p., 1989).

performance at Severance Hall one evening. The ensuing widespread newspaper publicity tended to suggest that the murderer (though he was never found) was a male from the Hough neighborhood, playing on the volatile issue of Black men victimizing white women.[27] In any case the violent death of a cultured women in one of the most picturesque spots in the city verified for many Clevelanders and suburbanites their growing fear that no one was safe anywhere in Cleveland, and that visitors to the Circle were particularly vulnerable. This fear persisted into the 1980s.[28]

The largest nighttime population on the campus was the students. When a committee of students and the university administration considered safety in 1968 they seemed most daunted by being "accosted by Negroes" as they walked to the bank or post office on the eastern edge of the Circle. In a revealing statement of the "them" and "us" situation as they saw it, the committee argued that

> [UCDF police] officers must be physically able to thwart the attempts of Hough toughs to operate criminally within the Circle. They must also possess the patience,

27. The *Cleveland Plain Dealer* and the *Cleveland Press* began extensive newspaper coverage of the murder of Marjorie A. Winbigler on November 7, 1966, and continued almost daily stories for three weeks, Several northern Ohio newspapers also picked up the story and followed it. Press clipping book, 1966, Musical Arts Association Archives, Severance Hall, Cleveland, OH.
28. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 307; interview with Rev. Albert Jeandheur (senior minister, Church of the Covenant), by Elizabeth (Liz) Palay, 2 July 1986, in author's files.

> intelligence, and discretion to deal with exuberant students and eccentric faculty members without alienating the academic community.[29]

Considering this suggested policy, whereby Hough residents were to be coped with by force, but faculty and students humored, it is no wonder that a 1977 study of American urban life which recognized the great cultural value of the Circle, also stated categorically that "a pall of fear has lain over [the Circle], and its value as an open space has been negated."[30] Clearly, for many citizens crime in the Circle was conceived of primarily as a racial matter, and so long as it was, the actual extent and causes of crime received secondary consideration.

Perceived changes in the crime rate of the Circle probably were related largely to the same forces that drove rates up throughout urban America in the 1960s and 1970s: a large increase in the population of 18-24 year-olds (who committed most of the crimes); skyrocketing drug usage; and high unemployment rates in inner-city neighborhoods.[31] To combat these trends UCI increased the size of its police force to twenty-eight officers and employed increasingly sophisticated technology for communication and surveillance. While the already modest

29. University Student Services Committee, "Safety in the University Circles" 18 April 1968, box 3, John S. Millis Chancellor Files (hereafter Millis Chancellor Files), CWRU Archives.
30. August Heckscher, *Open Spaces: The Life of American Cities* (New York: Harper and Row, 1977).
31. Jon C. Teaford, *The Twentieth-Century American City; Problem, Promise, and Reality* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), pp. 134-36.

crime rates in the Circle did decline in the mid-1980s, that may have been largely the result of the depopulation of the surrounding neighborhoods rather than increased policing.[32]

While UCI under the leadership of Treuhaft, Tullis, and Pigott adjusted to the new realities of urban America by developing better relationships with the neighboring communities, by working with an almost moribund city government, and by struggling to control crime, the institutions within the Circle generally thrived. UCI helped make the Circle an oasis of stability within a city otherwise undergoing painful changes.

The Cleveland Museum of Art continued to flourish under directors Sherman E. Lee (1958-83), and Evan H. Turner (appointed in 1983). Lee emphasized Oriental art, making Cleveland world-renowned in that area, but purchased major works in almost every recognized area of art. *Time* magazine called Lee's $5 million in acquisitions in 1966 "unparalleled in U.S. museum history."[33] Lee described his collecting policies as based on the assumption that "in the long run our judgment

32. University Circle Incorporated, *Annual Report 1983* (Cleveland: UCI, 1983), p. 19; University Circle Incorporated, *Annual Report 1985* (Cleveland: UCI, 1986), p. 19; Case Western Reserve University, *Annual Report 1984-85* (Cleveland: CWRU, 1985), p. 26; *Campus News*, 6 November 1985, pp. 1, 7. Nationally, there was a five-year decline (1982-86) in the number of crimes reported to the Bureau of Census's National Crime Survey, but slight increases in 1987-88: *The Citizen Resister* (Gannett Westchester [Westchester County, N.Y.] Newspapers), April 10, 1989.
33. Quoted in Diana Tittle, "The Agony and the Ecstasy of Sherman E. Lee," *Cleveland Magazine* (January 1979): 61.

depends on discrimination — itself the result of a consciously exercised catholic taste, resting on a touchstone of nuance."[34]

This statement indicated that the museum, under Lee, took the position that the museum was to be guided by aesthetic principles and not social needs. Neither the trustees nor Cleveland's ethnic groups received special attention: there was no attempt to attract attention by "happenings" in the Fine Arts Garden, flower-arranging courses, trips abroad for members, balls or cocktail parties in the galleries. As one local writer put it; "Cleveland's museum is convinced that its aristocratic defense of the faith serves the public good better, in the long run, than the *mélange* of programs served up in the name of democracy."[35]

When Lee left the museum in 1983 it was ranked one of the best in the world. It was the largest American art museum without an admission fee and had a strong education department. But in the judgment of a major art world publication Lee had "made relatively little effort to reach out to the community and build new audiences for the museum."[36]

Evan H. Turner did not announce an immediate change in

34. Sherman E. Lee, "The Art Museum and Antiquity," *Apollo* 7 (December 1963): 435.
35. Adele Z. Silver, "Keeping Behind the Times in Cleveland," *Reporter* 36 (June 29, 1967): 40-42, quote on p. 42. By the mid-1980s flashy events underwritten by major corporations were the rule at many American museums: "A Word from our Sponsor," *Newsweek* (November 25. 1985), pp. 96-98.
36. *Art News* 82 (April 1983): 105. It was characteristic of Sherman Lee that when Isamu Noguchi's gigantic modern sculpture "The Portal" was installed in downtown Cleveland, Lee judged it one of the most important new monuments in the United States, while public reaction was largely negative: *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History,* p. 53.

museum policies, but some differences in style were soon apparent. There was a greater emphasis on nineteenth-and twentieth-century art, although Turner shared Lee's interest in Oriental works. In 1984 the museum opened a new wing, permitting a considerable expansion of its library and adding nine galleries to the exhibition space.[37]

One of the unique programs of the museum was its joint graduate studies program with Case Western Reserve University. From 1968 to 1984 the program awarded over a hundred graduate degrees in art history, providing the students with both classroom preparation and curatorial experience in the museum galleries. Its alumni were teachers and museum staff at leading institutions in the United States and abroad.[38]

The Cleveland Orchestra also flourished during the 1970s and early 1980s. Certainly the death of conductor George Szell in 1970 was the end of an era, because no one could easily match the eminence he had reached during his twenty-four year tenure with the orchestra. His disciplined approach to music gave the orchestra a distinctive sound that was admired world-wide: many observers argued that under Szell's direction it was simply the best modern orchestra.[39]

Under director Lorin Maazel (1972-82) the orchestra struggled

37. Cleveland Museum of Art, "Annual Report for 1984," *Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* (July 1985): 244, 260, 263.
38. Harvey Buchanan, "The Joint CMA/CWRU Program in Art History," typescript prepared for the North Central Self Study Committee, December 5, 1984, in author's files.
39. *Time* (February 22, 1963), pp. 58-65; "The Grace of the Moment" *The New Yorker* (November 6, 1965), pp. 59-85; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History,* p. 947.

to maintain that distinction. In the style of many other modern performers, Maazel's commitment to Cleveland was only part-time: he was also director of the Vienna State Opera. Some critics saw a deterioration of the orchestra's quality and traced it to Maazel's divided loyalties. On the other hand, a worldwide surge in funding for music, and the growth in the number of American orchestras in this period made it far more difficult for any orchestra to remain incomparably excellent. Maazel was succeeded as director by Christoph von Dohnanyi, who seemed to bring a new clarity to the orchestra's image and program.[40]

Perhaps the orchestra's most important new direction was its performances at the Blossom Music Center in the Cuyahoga National Recreation Area south of Cleveland. One of the new American outdoor performance pavilions (such as Wolf Trap Farm and Tanglewood), the opening of Blossom by the Musical Arts Association in 1968 permitted summer performances in which thousands could hear the orchestra (and popular entertainers) in a bucolic setting.[41]

The Musical Arts Association also attempted to draw new audiences (and new income) to Severance Hall by sponsoring ethnic nights.[42] Fundamentally, however, the Orchestra was a money-losing proposition into the mid-1970s. General Manager A. Beverly Barksdale noted in 1971 that "Before the orchestra plays a note, we are thirty thousand dollars a week in the red."[43] In 1978 the Musical Arts Association (the orchestra's parent

40. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 706.
41. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 257, 708.
42. *Business Week* (October 23, 1971), p. 94.
43. *The New Yorker* (May 30, 1970), p. 57.

organization) raised $1 million to match an equal grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, which gave the orchestra a stronger financial base.[44] Four years later the National Endowment from the Arts gave a $1 million grant provided that the Musical Arts Association would raise an additional $3 million for the orchestra's endowment.[45]

Fund-raising generally became a major concern of the Circle institutions, since the city itself was no longer the residence of most potential donors, and their loyalty could not be taken for granted. The residents of the city's suburbs, businesses, and local and national foundations became important sources of funding as professional fund-raisers were hired and development offices were created.[46]

This preoccupation with finances had been foreshadowed at Case Western Reserve University with the forced departure of President Morse in 1970. In the latter 1960s the university had consistently outspent its income, and had begun to invade its endowment. Morse blamed these problems on unavoidable rises in costs and reductions in income, such as cutbacks in federal student aid, the reduction in federal research funding, general price increases, and necessary increases in salaries and benefits. He argued for greater financial stringency, but believed that educational priorities superseded financial ones.[47] He went so

44. "The Orchestra at 60," supplement to *The Plain Dealer*, December 10, 1978, pp. 12-13.
45. Musical Arts Association, *Annual Report 1982-1983* (Cleveland: Musical Arts Association, 1983), p. 14.
46. See David Hammack, "Philanthropy," *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 764-68.
47. Clarence H. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve University: A History of the University, 1826-1976* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976), p. 284;

far as to say that "a university with a deficit is a university worth caring about."[48]

In the fall of 1970 the executive committee of the trustees of the university met to vote on a motion that Morse be asked to resign, noting that he had refused to further reduce the planned budget deficit for that year, and that in their opinion "the president cannot cope effectively with his fiscal and fund-raising responsibilities."[49] The trustees shortly backed up the executive committee and Morse resigned.

The new acting president of the university, soon to be president in fact, was Louis Toepfer, Dean of the School of Law who had shown financial probity by bringing in the just-completed building for the School under budget during a time of inflation. He justified the faith of the trustees by making every effort to balance the budget, and by making his commitment clear to the entire community by such measures as reducing lighting in hallways and classrooms and turning off the hot water in non-residential buildings.[50]

Paper-thin budget surpluses were achieved after 1972, but many

Robert W. Morse, memorandum to heads of academic divisions, April 2, 1970, box 6, Robert W. Morse Office Files (hereafter Morse Office Files), CWRU Archives.

48. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, p. 285.
49. Statement by chair of the Case Western Reserve University trustees on behalf of the executive committee, October 1, 1970, box 6, Morse Office Files.
50. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 288-92; Clarence H. Cramer, *Case Institute of Technology: A Centennial History, 1880-1980* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1980), p. 253. The author recalls his surprise in finding the hot water turned on again in his office building, Mather House, sometime in 1981.

questioned the cost in terms of the educational mission and staff morale. Toepfer's successor in 1981, David Ragone, continued the policy (apparently a dictum of the trustees) of achieving an annual balanced budget. Neither president was known for sustaining leadership in academics; in fact, both chose the elimination of departments and programs as one of their major austerity measures.[51] But those who believed that the survival of the university had been at stake in the financial crisis in 1970 saw the continued viability of Case Western Reserve as confirmation of higher education's need to place fiscal responsibility (some said corporate values) before educational vision.[52]

It was in fact the apparent stability of the university, the Museum of Art, and the Orchestra in the face of the general decline of Cleveland, which led many to regard the Circle as a comparatively fertile oasis which could sustain new ventures. There were several new directions visible in the Circle by the mid-1980s which brought a sense of optimism to the area that ran counter to the general tenor of the city.

Perhaps the most significant was the creation of Doan Center, Inc., a private consortium on the model of University Circle,

51. Cramer, *Case Western Reserve*, pp. 292-93; "Hard Times at CWRU," and "Ragone: After five years at the helm, CWRU chief still a puzzle," *The Plain Dealer*, March 10, 1985; "Faculty Senate favors closing library school," *Campus News*, February 20, 1985; Louis A. Toepfer, *Objectives for the University, 1975-1980: A Report to the Board of Trustees* (Cleveland: CWRU, 1974), p. 20.
52. See a theme issue, "The Corporate University," *Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 75 (January-February 1989), esp. Roger Rollin, "There's *No* Business Like Education," pp. 14-17.

Inc. focusing on the environs of the Cleveland Clinic, which was centered at Euclid Avenue and East 92 Street. Founded in 1984, Doan Center attempted to develop a framework for the rapid expansion of the Clinic (largely in the direction of the Circle) which would be consonant with the plans of other institutions in the area, including CWRU, the State of Ohio (which was building the W.O. Walker Rehabilitation Clinic at Euclid Avenue and 105th Street) and various churches and civic groups.[53]

Similar to UCI, Doan Center worked with a master plan for institutional growth and the development of an appropriate infrastructure for it. That meant the demolition of some residences and the remnant of the old commercial district at Euclid Avenue and East 105th Street. Learning from UCI's sometimes difficult relationships with residential areas, Doan Center also moved to support the creation of commercial centers and housing in areas congruent with its overall plan.

The first director of Doan Center was Kenneth McGovern, formerly a Vice-President of Community Development with UCI. He saw the role of Doan Center as providing a higher standard of service than the city could provide for the area. That is, in order for the Cleveland Clinic — a provider of some of the best medical care in the world — to have an environment which was safe and attractive for its staff and clients, it had to assist in creating the private police service, park areas, and commercial districts that were important to them. Certainly the

53. "Civic Expansion Could Spark a Renaissance," *Cleveland Press*, November 11, 1980; "Beyond the Threshold," supplement to *The Plain Dealer*, November 1980; "Fascinating Pyramid Anchors Clinic Campus," *The Plain Dealer* Magazine, October 20, 1985.

staff and clientele of the world-famous Clinic had expectations which exceeded the standard of normal city services.[54]

Another area which underwent rapid change by 1985 was Murray Hill, which had become a mecca for artists, adding to its already well-known reputation as a restaurant center. It was at the time, according to one writer, the only ethnic neighborhood in Cleveland where retail space was fully rented and continually in demand. An annual public tour of artist's studios that began about 1980 quickly became a major Cleveland attraction.[55]

The revival of Murray Hill was the most dramatic residential change in the area of the Circle, but other changes suggested a possible change in the perception that the Circle was not a good place to live. The Park Lane Villa, a luxury hotel built off East 107th Street in 1923, was restored. A mansion on Magnolia Road, in the heart of the old Wade Allotment, was converted to condominiums. A warehouse at 116th Street and Euclid was renovated and turned into apartments for the handicapped. Plans were being drawn in 1985 for a mixed commercial-residential

54. Author's interview of Kenneth W. McGovern, June 4, 1985, in author's files.
55. Wood, "Little Italy Renaissance," 76-81, 172-80; Little Italy Redevelopment Association, *A 1981-82 Guide to Little Italy* (Cleveland: LIRA, 1982). Norman Krumholz, director of city planning for Cleveland 1969-79, pushed for a redevelopment strategy based on neighborhoods with some success, but could not divert Cleveland leaders from continuing to focus on large-scale, high-cost projects in both urban centers and neighborhoods: Norman Krumholz and Susan Hoffmann, "Revitalizing Urban Centers: Business and Neighborhoods," *National Civic Review* (March 1979): 130-35; "King Plaza: Failed Ghetto-Gilding," *The Plain Dealer*, November 30, 1978; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. liii.

complex at the Mayfield Road-Euclid Avenue triangle that had been vacant since cleared in 1968.[56]

Circle institutions, after a period of minimal growth in the 1970s, began to expand again in the better national economic climate of 1980s. In addition to the new wing of the Museum of Art, the Western Reserve Historical Society opened a new library building on the site of three long-demolished Wade Allotment mansions. The Cleveland Institute of Art remodeled the old Ford Motor Company assembly plant on Euclid Avenue as artists' studios and classrooms: students promptly dubbed it "The Factory," loving its expansive interiors and admiring its Albert Kahn design of 1913. A new Children's Museum was readied for opening at the western gateway to the Circle, near Euclid Avenue and East 107th. At the eastern gateway UCI opened new offices in a remodeled building on Euclid Avenue near East 120th Street.[57]

By 1985 it was clear that University Circle was the hub of Cleveland's culture. Private philanthropy, in part coordinated by University Circle, Inc. but energizing all of the Circle institutions, was leading its growth and development. The citizens of Cleveland could take advantage of some of the leading organizations of the world in art, music, and natural

56. *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, p. 524; *Campus News*, August 22, 1984, April 2, 1986; *Annual Report for 1985*, pp. 4-5. A critique of the interaction between UCI, the private developer, and city government regarding the Mayfield Road-Euclid Avenue triangle may be found in *Point of View* (Cleveland, OH), March 22, 1986, April 5, 1986, June 28, 1986.
57. *Annual Report 1983*, pp. 8-9; *Annual Report 1985*, pp. 6-7; *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, pp. 244, 1041.

history; national leaders in education and medicine; and regional leaders in historical preservation and social services.

As a whole the Circle had many architectural masterpieces and was restoring its parklands. There were leading institutions of worship and important foci of science, technology, theater, dance, and studio arts. Numerous lectures, performances, lessons, exhibits, medical treatments and consultations with experts of all sorts, drew Clevelanders and visitors from around the world to University Circle.

For all those who came to know it, the Circle was a treasure to be used and preserved for future generations.

Bibliography of Darwin H. Stapleton's Publications on University Circle, Cleveland and Ohio History

Articles

2007. “Urban Philanthropy,” in *The American Midwest: An Interpretive Encyclopedia* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press), pp. 1225-1228.

c. 2005. (co-author, Kenneth W. Rose) “Rockefeller, Religion, and Philanthropy in Gilded Age Cleveland,” at teachingcleveland.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/Rockefeller%20religion%20and%20philanthropy%20stapletonrose.pdf (accessed 30 March 2020).

1995. “Pursuit of Mission: The Rise and Fall of Elite Nonprofit

Leadership [University Circle Development Foundation in Cleveland]," *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 5: 393-409.

1995. "Religion, Reform, Race (and Rockefeller): Cleveland History Viewed Through the Lens of Philanthropy," in Gladys Haddad, ed., *From All Sides: Philanthropy in the Western Reserve. Tenth Annual Western Reserve Studies Symposium* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University), pp. 20-29.

1993. "The Faustian Dilemmas of Funded Research at Case Institute and Western Reserve, 1945-1965," *Science, Technology & Human Values* 19: 303-314.

1992. "The Flexner Report, Rockefeller Philanthropy, and the Western Reserve University School of Medicine," *Ohio History* 101: 100-113.

1990. "Baker Motor Vehicle Co.," and "Walter C. Baker," in George S. May, ed., *The Automobile Industry, 1896-1920*. Encyclopedia of American Business History and Biography. (New York: Facts on File), pp. 31-35.

1990."The Rise of Industrial Research in Cleveland, 1870-1930," in Elizabeth Garber, ed., *Beyond History of Science: Essays in Honor of Robert E. Schofield* (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press), pp. 231-245.

1988. "Amasa Stone," in Robert J. Frey, ed., *Railroads in the Nineteenth Century.* Encyclopedia of American Business History and Biography. (New York: Facts on File), pp. 379-381.

1988. "The City Industrious: How Technology Transformed

Cleveland," in Thomas F. Campbell and Edward M. Miggins, eds., *The Birth of Modern Cleveland, 1865-1930* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses), pp. 71-95.

1988. "The Context of Science: The Community of Industry and Higher Education in Cleveland in the 1880s," in Stanley Goldberg and Roger H. Stuewer, eds., *The Michelson Era in American Science, 1870-1930* (New York: American Institute of Physics), pp. 13-22.

1987, 1996. "Automotive Industry," in *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press): 57-59. Second ed., 1996, pp. 67-70. On-line at: https://case.edu/ech/articles/a/automotive-industry.

1987, 1996. "Industry," in *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987): 547-549. Second ed., 1996, pp. 566-68. On-line at: https://case.edu/ech/articles/i/industry.

1987, 1996."Technology and Industrial Research," in *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987): 953-954. Second ed., 1996, pp. 984-986. On-line at: https://case.edu/ech/articles/t/technology-and-industrial-research.

1972. "An Assessment of Historians' Perspectives of Rutherford B. Hayes," *Northwest Ohio Quarterly*, 44: 75-84.

Reviews

Engines and Innovation: Lewis Laboratory and American Propulsion

Technology, in *Ohio History* 102 (Summer-Autumn 1993): 144-45.

Mediating Organizations, Private Government, and Civil Society: Disinvestment Through the Preservation of Wealth in Cleveland, Ohio (1950-1990), in *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 37 (March 2008): 189-91.

About the Author

Darwin H. Stapleton (B.A., Swarthmore College, 1969; M.A., 1970, Ph.D., 1975, University of Delaware), was Executive Director of the Rockefeller Archive Center (1986-2008). He taught at Case Western Reserve University (1976-1986) and the University of Massachusetts Boston (2010-2014), and was Associate Editor of *The Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe* (1974-1984). He has authored, co-authored, edited, and co-edited fourteen volumes, and over 80 scholarly articles, in the history of technology, science, medicine, public health, philanthropy, education, and urbanization.