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THE DUAL HUB APPROACH

Arks formed an important part of the Corporate Regime’s urban growth policy, but other aspects stemmed from two influential early-twentieth-century city planning movements: the City Beautiful and the City Efficient.¹ The Corporate Regime embraced both, and the two models represent the divergent paths that land use control followed. Entrepreneurial land use controls—the central business district civic center (the Group Plan) and the University Circle satellite city, which together formed the Dual Hub—were bold but ad hoc schemes and illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of City Beautiful planning.

The chamber’s professionals, for their part, pursued more measured, comprehensive land use controls in the form of building codes, sanitation codes, zoning, and city master planning, which, taken together, comprised the local expression of the City Efficient movement. The City Efficient would in addition impose institutional order; in Cleveland this was accomplished when, in the twilight of the regime, the beautification projects and the regulatory codes came together under an organizational umbrella beneath which urban growth policy was initiated by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, designed by the city planning commission, and implemented by the relevant departments of the municipality.

As allies in the same policy making regime, entrepreneurs and professionals united on the broad objective of controlled land use, but divided over means. Entrepreneurs would join land use controls with highly individualistic, short-term civic beautification projects, the model pioneered in the Cleveland Park System. Wary of partisan politics, entrepreneurs preferred project implementation in civic sector institutions free from the
influence of elected officials. They chose special purpose districts and private foundations to build the downtown Group Plan and the University Circle satellite city. Realizing late in the regime’s tenure that entrepreneurial land use controls regulated too little of the city’s land and at too high a price, professionals sought government implementation of comprehensive regulatory land use controls, which brought them into a protracted conflict with the emerging Realty Regime.

Entrepreneurs and professionals alike supposed that the two park systems, city and regional, would be forceful physical interventions to effect land use controls at the urban periphery, but land use control in the central business district was a more complicated matter. The central business district was an evolving geography tracking in apparently unpredictable directions. The geographical mutations of the central business district were a perplexing reflection of the deeper currents of local economic change.

The Historical Geography of the Central Business District

Cleveland’s historic business center was the Flats, the place where commercial and early industrial era water and rail long-distance transportation networks fused; however, late-nineteenth-century changes in commuter transportation technology and in the industrial business organization transformed the city’s historic business geography. Electric trolley lines built in the 1890s deposited their passengers at Public Square rather than in the congested Flats, where land was at a premium. This resulted in very high rush-hour pedestrian traffic densities at Public Square, prompting a reappraisal of the commercial and retail potential of the site.

Simultaneously, manufacturing concerns separated—both organizationally and physically—blue collar production from white collar office functions. Blue collar factory jobs remained in the Flats, but white collar management and clerical functions moved to the new multi-story office buildings lining Superior Avenue. Retailing and wholesaling, historically joined, now separated, with wholesalers moving from the Flats to more spacious loft-type buildings constructed on cheaper land between Superior and St. Clair overlooking the river, an area neatly cordoned by West 9th and West 3rd. Carriage-trade stores were in the vanguard of the revolution in retailing, and they, early in the 1890s, leapfrogged Public Square to form a line eastward on Superior in pursuit of guests lodging at the city’s new hotels. Other retailers, lured by the vogue in department store groupings, clamored for Public Square frontage, the gateway to the traffic generated by the electric streetcar system. Unwilling to engage in a bidding war for the
high-cost land at the two Superior locations and Public Square, the financial community began erecting Greco-Roman style financial temples on cheaper land along East 6th and East 9th streets between Superior and Euclid avenues.2 (See figure 7.1.)

At the new Public Square focal point, Cleveland’s past and present were catalogued in warring land uses, pitting New England village, commercial hub, and modern industrial technology against each other. The northwest side of Public Square housed Old Stone Church, now a charming relic of the city’s New England heritage, while on the northeast corner the new Italian Renaissance Cleveland Chamber of Commerce building was under construction. The east side of the square housed the decrepit commercial-era city hall building. The south and west sides of the Public Square were zones in transition, the objects of emerging retail and commercial claimants. The center, a pasture within memory of living Clevelanders and
now a park, was giving way to the new vogue in garden formalism heralded by the recent completion of Soldiers and Sailors Monument (1893). The entire evolving business district, north and south, was surrounded by working class housing and the city’s worst slums and basest examples of retail enterprise.3

A new spatial economic order grounded in land use specialization and competitive ability to pay rent was slowly evolving, but the logic of the new land use order was impossible to fathom because of the density and diversity of transportation routes and technologies at the site. Pedestrians mixed with horses, carriages, wagons, trolley cars, and even the occasional automobile in a hopeless tangle of conveyance.

To bring order to this chaos, land use controls had to be more visionary and more exacting in the central business district than at the urban periphery. In the city’s center, entrepreneurs and professionals joined to create a new urban landscape in the form of a monumental civic center.

Simultaneously, entrepreneurial landscape revisionism erupted at the eastern periphery of settlement. E. W. Bowditch’s design for the municipal park system was based on naturalistic premises and a naturalistic design. But even before the full realization of Bowditch’s park design, entrepreneurs cast naturalism aside in favor of the idea of bringing educational and cultural institutions to a park-like setting at the eastern end of the Euclid Avenue trolley line. Together, the civic center and the cultural satellite city would form a dual hub. Both projects deepen our understanding of the values and divisions within the Corporate Regime.

The Downtown Civic Center

The idea for the downtown civic center was conceived in 1895 at the Beer and Skittles Club, a young professionals’ drinking society which met in the convivial atmosphere of Frau Wohl’s Hungarian Restaurant. Among the club members were Frederic C. Howe and Morris Black, two bachelors who founded the Municipal Association that same year. Howe and Black saw in the land use disorder of Cleveland’s central business district a metaphor for the political chaos of the McKisson administration.

Howe, Black, and other members of the Beer and Skittles Club had heard rumors of several civic building projects that potentially might be joined to form a civic center.4 The local rumor mill churned with the news that Congress would soon allocate money to build a federal court and customs house in Cleveland; meanwhile, municipal politicians launched trial balloons for a new city hall to replace the decrepit Victorian mansard roof
monster at Public Square; a wish list authored by county officials included new facilities for court rooms, offices, and a jail; and the Cleveland Public Library Board sought a new building worthy of its growing collections. Several members of the Beer and Skittles Club were architects who saw in the rumored building projects an opportunity to build a unified civic center in Cleveland. To publicize the scheme, the Beer and Skittles Club sponsored a civic center design competition that drew numerous submissions from local architects, unexpected public enthusiasm, and the welcome editorial support of Liberty E. Holden, who not only published the Cleveland Plain Dealer but also ranked as an active and influential member of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce.\(^5\)

The chamber readily endorsed the civic center concept and took the next step of naming an ad hoc Committee on Grouped Public Buildings. Entrepreneur William Gwinn Mather was appointed chairman of the committee, and other entrepreneurs, architects, and an art history professor filled the other seats. The committee spent months laying the political groundwork for the project by seeking endorsements from prominent citizens and Corporate Regime civic organizations. Meanwhile, local architects hired by the committee drew preliminary designs, prepared cost estimates, assessed the impact of the civic center project on central business district development, and composed some preliminary designs which grouped the public buildings around an 11-acre mall stretching from Superior Avenue to Lake Erie.

The most important issue deliberated by the Committee on Grouped Public Buildings was organizational. The buildings were the projects of three separate units of government—federal, county, municipal—and the Cleveland Public Library, a special purpose district. Each institution was accustomed to acting independently, but the Committee concluded that an umbrella organization would be needed to make uniform building plans and locate the buildings in a site designed for the whole.\(^6\) The Committee on Grouped Public Buildings recommended the creation of a quasi-public Group Plan Commission, similar to the parks commission, as the collectivity to oversee the implementation of the plan. The proposed Group Plan Commission would be supported by an appointed Board of Supervision responsible for the finished design.\(^7\)

The response of the chamber membership and the public in attendance was enthusiastic. But swimming against the rhetorical currents in praise of the city, the design, and the vision of the chamber was former Mayor Myron T. Herrick, who offered a sober assessment of the land use control scheme. In Herrick’s view, the site, stretching from Superior Avenue to the Lake, was too far removed from the emerging Public Square business dis-
trict to have a positive impact on its development. The land at the northern end of the 10.8 acre site, Herrick warned, might belong to the railroads, in which case a protracted court battle would have to be fought with them testing the legality of the railroads’ riparian rights. (In fact, it was.) Lastly, and perhaps most ominously in the short term, former Mayor Herrick did not think the quasi-public commission was constitutional. A similar body created for the municipal park system was at that moment in legal limbo as court cases challenging the legality of the park district dragged on. Failure to heed Herrick’s warnings delayed the project by three years.9

In 1902, even as the last legal obstacles to a quasi-public commission were cleared away (though not the railroads’ claims), the Group Plan project nearly collapsed when Congress unilaterally awarded the architectural commission for the federal court and customs house to Arnold W. Brunner of New York. An endorsement of the Group Plan Commission and Board of Supervision by Mayor Tom L. Johnson brought Brunner’s project into the fold, and, following his instruction, the mayor’s political ally, Councilman Frederic C. Howe, introduced the enabling legislation for the Group Plan, which was quickly passed by the Cleveland City Council. Simultaneously, the Cuyahoga County delegation to the state legislature won the approval of that body for the Group Plan on May 6, 1902, when it passed as Senate Bill No. 188. Governor George K. Nash appointed Daniel H. Burnham, John M. Carrere, and Arnold W. Brunner to the Board of Supervision. Each appointee had been actively involved with the City Beautiful Movement in other cities, and, of course, the appointment of architect Brunner incorporated the federal building into the group plan.9

On August 1, 1903, the Board of Supervision completed its work and presented the finished report and drawings to Mayor Johnson, followed a few days later by a public presentation at the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce Building. The by now less than novel idea was to group the public buildings along a central mall. The Group Plan drawn by Burnham, Carrere, and Brunner fixed the southern boundary of the site on Superior Avenue between Bond and East 3rd streets. It would extend north to Summit Street at the Lakefront. Four monumental buildings anchored the corners of the mall. The buildings on the Superior corners of the site were the federal building, already in the blueprint stages, and the Cleveland Public Library. The county courthouse and city hall were proposed for the northern corners of the site. Slightly north of these buildings, at the northern axis of the mall, the Board of Supervision envisioned a monumental railroad passenger terminal, a new element the architects identified as the keystone of the entire plan. The architectural commission had been awarded
to Daniel Burnham. The east and west sides of the rectangular site were to be lined with other public buildings, including a civic auditorium, a board of education administration building, and others as yet undetermined. A uniform Roman Revival design was proposed for the buildings, with conforming cornice heights and construction materials. The open interior of the mall was an exercise in Baroque geometry incorporating walkways with fountains, monuments, and tree plantings, emulating Paris and the more recently redesigned Mall in Washington, D.C.¹⁰

The text of the Group Plan explained how the architects went about solving the design problem, the problem of “composition” as Burnham, Carrere, and Brunner called it. Cleveland impressed Brunner as “... a cubist—or post impressionist—or super impressionist picture, an extra set of arms and legs but no recognizable head. So we find miles and miles of streets extending in all directions but with no distinctive features or evidence of individuality. The Civic Center is where the city speaks to us, where it asserts itself. Here the streets meet and agree to submit to regulation. They resolve themselves into some regular form, the buildings stop swearing at each other, competition is forgotten; individuals are no longer rivals—they are all citizens.”¹¹

The orderly grouping of classical revival style buildings along the axes of a mall would achieve Brunner’s goal of land use control. The aesthetic inspiration for the Group Plan, and the mall in particular, he said, “will recall in part many of the fine avenues we point to with pleasure, such as the Champs Elysées in Paris, or the Esplane in Nancy.” But the Group Plan was not only a thing of beauty, he added, for it would stand “as an example of order, system and reserve, such as is possible here, [and] will be for Cleveland what the [Chicago Columbian Exposition] Court of Honor of ’93 was for the entire country...”¹²

The focal point of the Group Plan was the Mall. (See figure 7.2.) The north-south axis gave the composition of grouped buildings its harmony and balance. The Mall was to be lined with two rows of tall clipped trees to create the illusion of length, heighten the appearance of formality, and offer a visual contrast with the surrounding granite buildings. At the north and south axes of the Mall, the Group Plan architects recommended courts of honor. The north axis would have a quadrangle at its center and within the quadrangle were geometric paths circling formal gardens surrounding a monumental fountain. The extreme north end of the Mall would be dissected by an esplanade which formed a miniature east-west axis on the north side of the city hall and county buildings. The south axis of the Mall would form a nave in which an imposing example of civic statuary would be erected. The Mall was designed to be a visual experience in its own right,
but more importantly, it brought the grouped buildings in orderly touch with one another and emphasized the lakefront horizon as the “composition’s” vanishing point.\textsuperscript{13}

Implementation of the Group Plan dragged on for nearly thirty years. The buildings anchoring the corners of the Mall went up relatively quickly. The county government, although committed to additional buildings on the west side of the Mall, could not pass levies to build them. Particularly noxious to the voting public was the plan to construct a county jailhouse on the west side of the Mall. A civic auditorium and a public school administration building eventually were built on the east side of the Mall. The crowning failure, however, was the Board of Supervision’s (later the City Planning Commission’s) failure to win an agreement from the railroad companies to surrender the land to build a rail terminal at the north end of the site, a legal obstacle former mayor Herrick foresaw in 1900. In 1918, an agreement was finally reached, but the terminal was built at Public Square (a defining regime succession conflict to be investigated in chapter 11). Delays extended the life span of the project beyond the longevity of the Corporate Regime. By the time the battle over the location of the rail terminal was fought, the Corporate Regime was in eclipse and public and institutional memories of why the project once seemed important had faded. By the 1920s the Group Plan was seen by the reigning Realty Regime as a sterile monument to a bygone era.\textsuperscript{14}
University Circle

In the 1890s, as the entrepreneurs warmed to the idea of a central business district civic center, they simultaneously set in motion the plans for an educational and cultural satellite city on Cleveland’s eastern border. The park-like setting of University Circle during the next twenty-five years became the home of more than a dozen of the city’s leading cultural and educational institutions.15

E. W. Bowditch’s 1893 plan for a naturalistic municipal park at University Circle had an unexpectedly short life. Though the original link in the municipal park system was provided by telegraph entrepreneur Jeptha H. Wade’s donation of east side land bordering Doan Brook, a little noted caveat in the donation precipitated the sequence of entrepreneurial landscape revisionism. Wade donated the land to the city, to be sure, but he held in abeyance one parcel of the donation, the odd acreage surrounding a pond near Euclid Avenue, designated by Wade for an art gallery and grounds. Wade owned significantly more land east of the park site along Euclid Avenue, as well as land north of the site. His grandson and heir, Jeptha H. Wade II (1857–1926), formed Wade Realty to develop the land around the University Circle site as a residential enclave and through Wade Realty made other parcels available to institutions as they made their decisions to locate at University Circle. Jeptha H. Wade I (1811–1890), by virtue of his business, civic, church, charity, and other affiliations, cast a wide net in the fraternity of Cleveland entrepreneurs, and together they built University Circle.16

The key to the University Circle development was the commitment by Western Reserve College and the Case Institute of Technology to build new campuses at the circle. The schools were the magnets that attracted the other educational and cultural institutions.

Western Reserve College, originally located in Hudson, Ohio, was a Presbyterian college foundering under the weight of enrollment competition from other Ohio sectarian colleges. Jeptha H. Wade’s pastor at Old Stone Church (First Presbyterian) in Cleveland was Hiram Haydn, who, like Wade, was a member of Western Reserve College’s Board of Trustees. Haydn proposed moving the struggling college from Hudson to Cleveland. Haydn persuaded another one of his parishioners, entrepreneur Amasa Stone, to underwrite the relocation of Western Reserve College to University Circle (1882–1883). Later, as president of Western Reserve College, Haydn (1887–1890) and his successor, Charles Thwing (1890–1921), transformed the college into a university.17

The Case Institute was founded by philanthropist Leonard Case on land
owned by Case on Superior Avenue near the future site of the Group Plan. When Case died in 1880, his land in the central business district was willed to the school, and it became the institute’s endowment. Sale of this land, coupled with the fund-raising efforts of the Case Institute Board of Trustees, allowed the school to purchase the family farm of Liberty E. Holden, which bordered on the Wade allotment. The Case Institute moved to University Circle in 1885 when the construction of Case Main, the school’s first classroom building, was completed.¹⁸

Entrepreneurs and their wives served on the boards of and were the major financial contributors to the Western Reserve Historical Society, the Cleveland Institute of Art, the Cleveland Museum of Art, the Garden Society, and the Musical Arts Society. When these institutions constructed their new buildings, they built them at University Circle. (See figure 7.3.) Hospitals, churches, public schools, and lesser ranking institutions of higher learning, themselves the beneficiaries of entrepreneurial philanthropy, followed in their wake.¹⁹ Led by Jeptha H. Wade II, Wade Realty built grand apartment buildings and made lots available for the new University Circle mansions of the entrepreneurial class. A graceful new upper class district emerged in a park-like setting.²⁰
By the late 1910s, however, University Circle looked like an urban land use ad hocracy. Entrepreneurial individualism was in danger of running riot. In 1917, the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce took notice and warned that a University Circle “plan of development” was in order. President Thwing of Western Reserve University, initially impatient with the idea of the chamber meddling in University Circle, acquiesced when two of the university’s trustees, Samuel and William G. Mather, seconded the chamber’s concerns. William G. Mather was chairman of the chamber’s City Planning Committee, and he appointed a University Circle subcommittee chaired by architect Benjamin S. Hubbell. Hubbell’s firm had already been awarded commissions for the Cleveland Public Library in the Group Plan and several of the University Circle buildings, the most important of which was the Cleveland Museum of Art. He brought to the enterprise the professional’s ability to see the land use issue whole. Hubbell’s goal as chairman of the University Circle subcommittee was ambitious; he would redesign University Circle as an educational and cultural City Beautiful twin to the downtown Group Plan.

Hubbell’s subcommittee created the University Improvement Company in 1919. The University Improvement Company was a privately held collectivity, an organizational entity which satisfied the entrepreneurs because of its independence from government and politics. The University Improvement Company brought an end to the warring land uses and imposed architect Hubbell’s orderly professional design on the site. The University Improvement Company was a not-for-profit land bank serving University Circle institutions, and it served a valuable purpose in disciplining entrepreneurial individualism at University Circle.

The entrepreneurial emphasis at University Circle was aesthetic and institutional and was realized piecemeal with the help of the University Improvement Company. The professionals hired to administer the nineteen University Circle institutions, however, had a larger and more comprehensive organizational vision; they saw in the autonomous University Circle institutions an opportunity to achieve the managerial goal of organizational synergy. President Thwing of Western Reserve University led the way. He formed male and female undergraduate colleges and founded a graduate school. Paralleling the wave of acquisitions, mergers, and horizontal integration in the world of business, Thwing and his successor Dr. Robert E. Vinson added schools of education, architecture, social work, law, and medicine. These acquisitions created an opportunity for synergistic vertical relationships with other University Circle institutions in art, music, health care, social services, and secondary education. To cement these vertical organizational relationships and plan for a programmatic
future, the professional administrators who headed University Circle institutions in 1925 formed the Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation, chaired by Newton D. Baker, the lawyer and former mayor. The institutions not already located at University Circle were lured there by Wade Realty, the University Improvement Company, and the opportunity to achieve organizational synergy afforded by the Cleveland Conference for Educational Cooperation.26

THE GROUP PLAN AND UNIVERSITY CIRCLE ASSESSED

The Corporate Regime, more than the regimes preceding it and those to follow, was the governing elite most concerned with the symbols of power and the regime most able and willing to erect them, symbols which today survive as an artifactual legacy of the era when they made urban policy.27 The Group Plan and University Circle were symbolic representations of Corporate Regime governance, but more interestingly, the twin land use projects were emblems of the regime’s intent to write an agenda for the future greatness of the city. Corporate Regimers were convinced that Cleveland could become a center of civic virtue, culture, and learning. Cleveland was conspicuously not a center of any of these things when the Corporate Regime came to power in 1895. Although the predecessor Populist Regime made many positive contributions to urban governance and advanced the art of urban policy making, the Corporate Regime dismissed populist political culture as grubby and wholly lacking in civic virtue. As a sprawling industrial boomtown with a large and disparate working class population, Cleveland struck Corporate Regimers as a seat of neither learning nor culture.28

The Group Plan and University Circle symbolized the aspirations of the regime rather than the reality of the city as they found it. The two developments became the charismatic twin loci of the Corporate Regime.29 In the buildings that formed the civic center (including the Chamber of Commerce building) and University Circle, the leading men, the leading ideas, and the leading institutions came together to create an arena, a charismatic core, in which the plans that most vitally effected Clevelanders’ present and future took place. One of the underlying principles of the regime was its desire to create social order. The geography of social order is patterned activity. The Group Plan and University Circle and the later developments in zoning and master planning were patterned activities and were emblematic of the social order the Corporate Regime was trying to create in Cleveland. To be sure, social order, defined by the regime as civic virtue, learning,
and culture, was more a goal than a reality. Historians are inclined to exaggerate the impact of city planning generally and the City Beautiful Movement in particular. The historical literature suggests that in large measure the history of cities is the history of city planning. No untainted observer could possibly believe that city planning made a major contribution to the look of American cities. The City Beautiful Movement was not city planning. The Group Plan and the University Circle developments were projects rather than plans. They were, however, important mileposts on the road that led to city planning. The critique of contemporary professionals, perhaps, puts the City Beautiful Movement in a more balanced perspective. The monumental buildings, the gardens, the statuary, and formal malls brought land use controls to too little of the city’s land, triggering the push from professionals for comprehensive zoning and city master planning, land use control efforts that were comprehensive yet flawed in their own way because they regulated the present rather than planned for the future.

Central to the City Beautiful Movement was the physicalist fallacy that good design will have a spillover osmotic effect on neighboring land uses. Rarely was the osmotic effect realized. In a city sprawling over thousands of acres, the Group Plan and University Circle brought land use controls to no more than a few hundred acres of the city’s land. The rest developed haphazardly, the result of marketplace decision making. Many of these decisions were made by the real estate industry, which scorned city planning generally and the City Beautiful movement particularly because the projects removed valuable commercial land from free market exchange and because the finished works seldom afforded opportunities for retail enterprise.

Still, the City Beautiful Movement, and the downtown Group Plan in particular, meant something. In the Group Plan, the entrepreneurs attempted to redefine urban space and create a new urban landscape. Space, including built landscapes, operates in a dual manner. First comes the belief that space affects behavior; second comes its corollary, that man-made space can be made to affect behavior in deliberate ways. This observation should not be overstated, especially keeping in mind the criticism of the physicalist fallacy leveled above, but the turn of the century educated classes did give varying degrees of credence to environmental determinism.

Group Plan architect Arnold W. Brunner forthrightly stated what impact he thought the Group Plan would have on behavior. Brunner defined American democracy as inclusive rather than exclusive, but inclusion, he cautioned, would not be gained by downward leveling. To be included in the democratic experiment, the masses must be elevated. A
civic center was a positive symbolic step toward elevating the masses. Brunner saw in the stateliness of the buildings and the order, harmony, and balance of the Group Plan design the elimination of conflict, rivalry, and competition. The patriotic legends emblazoned in granite on the buildings and statues of the nation’s founding fathers adorning the Mall and the entrances to the buildings were meant to convey a shared historical experience. The Group Plan was the invention of an urban tradition where none had previously existed. The design conferred upon the beholder a single title and a shared status: that of “citizen.” Brunner’s clients, the Corporate Regime, flattered themselves as being a broadly based, indeed representative, policy making group that carried the custodial obligation of elevating the masses until such time as the masses were able to assume their own responsibilities as citizens. Custodialism more than noblesse oblige motivated Corporate Regime entrepreneurs and middle class professionals. The alternative was class conflict, and the labor relations experience of the entrepreneurs taught that class conflict inevitably leveled rather than elevated. Custodialism was a talisman for all Corporate Regime policy making. The civic center was an upward step.

The Group Plan not only reveals the aspirations the Corporate Regime had for its fellow citizens but also reveals something about the regime itself. A frequently made observation about the City Beautiful Movement is that it was a reflection of its backers’ “search for order,” a characterization that is broadly true, but one that masks other shadings of meaning. City Beautiful designs emphasized centrality, horizontal rather than vertical monumentality, and physical separation of function. Centrality was an entrepreneurial objective, but it took architect Benjamin S. Hubbell to fully articulate it. Hubbell, coming to the projects with fresh insights some fifteen years after their inception, decoded the downtown civic center and University Circle as twin group plans. The two group plans were centralities linked by Euclid and Carnegie avenues, the two axial corridors that joined the two focal points of the design. The design not only satisfied the Corporate Regime’s quest for order, but it symbolically called to the beholder’s attention the central values of the entrepreneurs: civic virtue, learning, and culture. These were the values of the newly invented tradition that architectural symbolism would communicate to all citizens.

Horizontal monumentality and separation of function are linked symbols. City Beautiful site design was formal yet expansive, and the buildings, while conveying mass, were low-rise, visual elements at odds with a city driven to vertical growth by high land costs. Expansive formalism in site planning and horizontal monumentality in building design visibly separated the City Beautiful projects from the rest of the congested, haphazardly
constructed, vertically rising city. Horizontal monumentality was an attention gathering contrivance, a way of highlighting the values of the creators—civic virtue, culture, and learning. Because City Beautiful buildings were exclusively devoted to civics, culture, and education, these functions were spotlighted and cordoned off from the rest of the city's land-consuming activities—housing, industry, and commerce. Some observers have found it odd that businessmen would sequester their City Beautiful projects, in both design and function, from the buildings in which their wealth was created. But this was merely a symbolic representation of the themes current in their business lives. The entrepreneurs were no longer active capital participants in the businesses they had created. Their indifference to economic development policy was a reflection of this new reality. The entrepreneurs flatly rejected Chamber of Commerce appeals to make capital available to new enterprisers, but they gladly channeled millions of their own dollars into the capital circuit which built the cultural and educational institutions at University Circle.

University Circle began not as a City Beautiful project but as a park. The late-nineteenth-century park planning movement brought nature to the city; parks were designed to be a relief from the remorseless advance of urban settlement. That appears to have been the intent of William Gordon, Jeptha H. Wade, John D. Rockefeller, and other entrepreneurs when they donated land for the Cleveland Park System, and it certainly was the intent of park designer E. W. Bowditch. Wade himself opened the door to landscape revisionism when he reserved a parcel of his donation for an art gallery. In the 1890s, even before the completion of Bowditch's design, the purpose of the park district was in the process of revision. Middle class professionals, as we have seen, wanted a functional park system, while entrepreneurs in the University Circle area embraced the revisionist idea of cultural and educational institutions in a park-like setting.

Removing culture and education from congested urban centers to the urban periphery was an increasingly fashionable trend, a partiality which materialized earlier in such diverse places as Paris, New York, Chicago, and San Francisco. In Paris, the Opera House was built on a tightly bound site in deliberate contradistinction to the city around it. Similar design schemes in America were more expansive. In New York, culture and education, the Metropolitan Museum of Art and Columbia University, moved uptown to park-like settings. In Chicago, the Field Museum, the Museum of Science and Industry, and the University of Chicago (funded by former Clevelander John D. Rockefeller) moved south of the Loop to the park-like setting which had recently housed the World's Columbian Exposition. In the San Francisco Bay area, Stanford University and the University of Califor-
nia at Berkeley were built in park-like settings. After more than two decades of transporting culture and education to parks, corresponding to the time when architect Benjamin S. Hubbell became chairman of the chamber’s University Circle subcommittee, the park-like character of the University Circle development was nearly obliterated in a maze of construction. The city had come to the park. Hubbell and the entrepreneurs, using Wade Realty and the University Improvement Company, then attempted to bring their version of City Beautiful urban order to the design of University Circle.

University Circle eclipsed the original intent of the park design. University Circle was a satellite city devoted to culture and learning and with the addition of upper class domiciles became an extension of the city rather than a form of naturalistic relief from it. But it was to be a different kind of city, a deliberate break with the past and a harbinger of Cleveland’s destiny. To entrepreneurs, University Circle symbolized Cleveland’s future as a center of culture and learning. For the middle class professionals who administered the educational and cultural institutions, University Circle symbolized institutional synergy, a major breakthrough in organizational integration and cooperation that itself would be a break from the contentiousness of the recent past. These were far more important attainments than an open-space barrier to urban sprawl.

**CONCLUSION: TOWARD THE CITY EFFICIENT**

Mainstream Corporate Regime professionals, unlike architect Hubbell, reluctantly acknowledged that the grand development projects were diversions from the larger goal of land use control and the City Efficient. Outside the boundaries of the projects, land use development continued haphazardly and chaotically as always. Comprehensive land use control measures were needed, but progress toward this end was slowed because middle class professionals arrived at an understanding of comprehensive land use controls slowly and incrementally. A comprehensive, effective urban growth policy would be achieved only by means of public land use regulation. Government, shunned by entrepreneurs, was the only viable institutional vehicle available to achieve land use controls. Public land use controls were highly inflammatory politically, igniting conflict with small, vote-wielding property owners and a steadily widening community of real estate interests which in time would coalesce as the Realty Regime. Nevertheless, it was obligatory to work within the formal political system to achieve public regulation of land use. This is why, on so many issues, the
middle class professionals were willing to make political accommodations with professional politicians, public servants, and populist elements. Progress toward the City Efficient was slow because the techniques of land use control were new and untested. Public land use controls were initiated in the early years of the twentieth century and continued in fits, false starts, and conflict for nearly three decades, indeed, to the fag end of the Corporate Regime. The price paid for controlled land use was high, for a comprehensive policy of urban growth brought with it the ruin of the Corporate Regime.

The paternity of land use controls can be traced to the public health movement. The public health movement marched in twin columns: germ-theory-based epidemiology and the creation of healthful physical environments. The physical environment included both the workplace and residential quarters. In the early years of the century, state and federal governments responded to workplace public health issues, while the Chamber of Commerce professionals followed a course of investigation that tracked disease to slum ridden neighborhoods. What all such neighborhoods had in common was the dilapidated, overcrowded housing branded by public health crusaders as the incubator of communicable disease. Chamber committees and subcommittees worked on tenement housing codes, which led incrementally to citywide building codes and, finally, when the link was made between disease control and land use control, to citywide zoning. Zoning, in turn, seemed ineffectual and lacking in theme without a comprehensive city master plan. By the time institutionalized city master planning was accepted, urban problems were regional in scope, leading in turn to the regional planning movement of the 1920s. Political battles were fought at each stage in the evolution of land use controls. Tenement and building codes were grudgingly enacted in the first decade of the century, and a city planning commission was established during Mayor Baker’s administration in 1915. Delaying tactics by small property owners and the real estate industry postponed zoning and city master planning legislation until the 1920s. In that decade, with the Realty Regime ascendant in urban policy making, the regional planning movement was crushed and the City Efficient with its core elements of zoning and city master planning was redefined in terms satisfactory to the Realty Regime.