

CLEVELAND HISTORY AND ECONOMICS

a discourse in public policy



Cover art: “Over the Bridge” by Viktor Schreckengost, courtesy of Gene Schreckengost.

Book design by Beverly Simmons, *ffortissimo* DESIGN.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License.

2nd printing: October 2010.

Website: www.teachingcleveland.org

CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

1. Cleveland: Economics, Images & Expectations — John J. Grabowski	1
2. Water as an Economic Tool — Brent Larkin	19
3. Immigration — Elizabeth Sullivan.....	27
4. Regional Government vs. Home Rule — Joe Frolik	41
5. Utility Versus Innovation: A Polemic on Art, Architecture and Cultural Conservatism in Cleveland — Steven Litt.....	51
6. Medicine in Cleveland: From Elixir-Filled Blak Bags to Modern Marvels — Diane Solov	73
7. Healthcare: History & Policy in Greater Cleveland — Chris Seper.....	89
8. The Adult Education Tradition in Greater Cleveland — Thomas Suddes	103
9. Education: Primary & Secondary Schools — Scott Stephens	121
10. Transportation in Greater Cleveland — James Toman	137
11. Economic Empowerment: Dissecting the Challenges and Opportunities for Minority Participation in the New Economy — Randell McShepard	151
About the Authors.....	163

CLEVELAND:

ECONOMICS, IMAGES, AND EXPECTATIONS

JOHN J. GRABOWSKI

INTRODUCTION

Why do cities grow, thrive, and sometimes fail? What holds them together and makes them special places—unique urban landscapes with distinctive personalities? Often we fix on the “image” of a city: its structural landmarks; the natural environment in which it is situated, or the amenities of life which give it character, be they an orchestra or a sports team. Even less tangible attributes, including a reputation for qualities such as innovation, perseverance, or social justice, come into play here. Image, however, is often a gloss, one that hides the core of the community, the portion of its history that has been central to its existence. Many would like to see Cleveland, both now and historically, as a “city on a hill,” one defined by many of the factors noted above. Yet, Cleveland’s image is to an extent a veneer. Underneath that veneer is the economic core that led to the creation of the city and that has sustained it at various levels for over 200 years. Without it, the veneer would not exist. The fact that today, aspects of Cleveland’s veneer have merged into its economic core represents a remarkable historical transformation.

Cleveland’s Public Square is perhaps the best place to begin in examining the history of Cleveland and the interrelationship between economic reality and image. On the northwest quadrant of the square a statue of Tom L. Johnson reminds one and all that Cleveland was in the forefront of the Progressive movement at the turn of the twentieth century. Johnson, whose governmental reforms led to his characterization as the best mayor of the best-governed city in the United States, symbolizes so much of our civic patina—well-organized progressive improvements ranging from the chlorination of water to the creation of what is now United Way.

Just to the north of the Johnson statue is the First Presbyterian (Old Stone) Church, a monument to the role that religion has played in regional history, from its involvement in the anti-slavery movement to the establishment, by various

religious groups, of orphanages, educational institutions, hospitals and hundreds of other charitable endeavors.

Looking toward the east from the Johnson statue one can see the south end of the Mall, a landmark of the national city beautiful movement, and the Metzenbaum Courthouse, a reminder of justice and jurisprudence in the community. Slightly to the south, on the southeast quadrant stands the Soldiers and Sailors Monument, testimony to the role northeastern Ohio played in the American Civil War, one in which the community's core beliefs, ranging from those relating to what we now call social justice to the place of private charity in times of crisis and need, were as important as its military and economic contributions.

In one sense, a good quick look at the Public Square indicates that Cleveland is a special place—and, indeed, in many ways it is. Some may want to think that it is indeed a city on a hill, an example for others. That, perhaps, it has been and continues to be. But, as we complete our visual circuit by coming to the southwest quadrant, we are brought back to the founding reality of the community. There stands the statue of General Moses Cleaveland, the revered founder of the city that bears his name. He stands tall, staff in hand, the archetypical colonial father figure. Yes, he was the community's founder and also a Revolutionary War veteran and a lawyer. That we remember, but what we often forget is that Cleaveland was also an investor. He was one of fifty-six members of the Connecticut Land Company whose interest in Connecticut's Western Reserve was predicated on profit rather than altruism. Cleaveland's intent in coming to the city that now bears his name was not to settle, but to survey. Cleaveland and the partners in the company had purchased 3.4 million acres from the state of Connecticut. That land, its "Western Reserve" was a remnant of its old colonial claims that it managed to retain after the formation of the United States. Stretching 120 miles west from the border of Pennsylvania, it constitutes much of what we consider today as northeast Ohio.

Surveying was the first step in making what was wilderness into a marketable commodity. Cleaveland would return to Connecticut some three months after his arrival at the mouth of the Cuyahoga, sanguine about the company's ability to make a profit from its investment. The Public Square upon which these observations are focused was part of the profit scheme—a communal commons, grazing land for the animals of the first settlers and a nice touch of home, since the town commons was so much a part of the New England heritage of Cleaveland and those he expected to follow him as purchasers rather than sojourners.

FROM REAL ESTATE VENTURE TO MERCANTILE CENTER TO INDUSTRIAL METROPOLIS 1796–1920

Moses Cleaveland's expectations for the community that bore his name (his surveying crew named it in his honor in 1796—its spelling would later be simplified to Cleveland) went unfulfilled for nearly two decades. Indeed, the real estate venture of the Connecticut Land Company did not meet its investors' immediate expectations. Land in the Connecticut Western Reserve sold slowly and settlement in its "capital" Clevealand languished for over two decades. It appeared that all had overlooked a number of critical economic and business factors. There was no easy way to get to the Reserve from the eastern seaboard and, indeed, there was better, more accessible open land along the way, mainly in western New York state. Then too, there were questions about the legal title to the land. Moreover, there were lingering fears that the British (just across Lake Erie in Canada) might try to reclaim the trans-Appalachian west from the recently independent United States. Cleveland had an additional problem—the lands near the mouth of the Cuyahoga river were infested with mosquitoes. Those who attempted to settle in what is now the Flats came down with malaria and soon moved away to higher lands east of the small settlement. The sales situation became so desperate that Oliver Phelps, one of the prime investors in the venture, nearly ended up in a debtors' prison.

It would be easy to accuse the investors of a lack of foresight and planning. Indeed, that was somewhat the case. The company built no roads to provide easy access to the area nor did it provide for any of the basic amenities of life. It simply surveyed and sold the land. Buyers were on their own after they made their purchases. Yet, two of the investors' core beliefs about the land were correct. They knew that there was a huge desire for better land among people in New England and that this desire would continue to grow as the population expanded. They also knew that water was a key factor in colonial settlement—not only for growing crops, but even more importantly for transportation. Waterways, natural and manmade, were the best and cheapest means of transport for people and goods at the turn of the nineteenth century. Cleveland had that advantage and indeed, George Washington and Benjamin Franklin had identified the site on the shore of Lake Erie as one of commercial and strategic importance.

Eventually, when issues of land title were cleared and when the end of the War of 1812 calmed fears regarding any future British invasion, the settlement of Cleveland accelerated. In 1820, 606 people lived in a community that had had a population of only 57 a decade before. Ten years later, in 1830, the population was 1,075. More importantly, by that time Cleveland was at the northern end of a major public works project, the construction of the Ohio and Erie Canal. Begun

in 1825 and completed in 1832, the canal connected Cleveland, on the shores of Lake Erie, to Portsmouth on the Ohio River. More importantly, this was but one link in a global chain of waterways that stretched from European ports to New York and then via the Hudson River and the Erie Canal to the Great Lakes. From Portsmouth, trade continued via the Ohio River to Cincinnati, St. Louis, and eventually New Orleans on the Gulf of Mexico.

Investors and entrepreneurs quickly realized that Cleveland presented enormous opportunities. It became a transshipment point for manufactured goods from Europe and the eastern US to the rapidly developing Midwestern frontier. It also was a point where commodities produced on the farms in the Midwest could be purchased wholesale and then brokered to buyers in Ohio and the East. What Moses Cleaveland had envisioned as a mercantile town serving farmers and farm communities in the surrounding area soon became a mercantile town with trade extending far beyond the immediate hinterland. The ways in which location and transportation spurred economic growth were multiple. As the population continued to increase, land prices in the city rose and land speculators prospered. Builders and tradespeople arrived to serve the community's needs and artisans and laborers came to make consumer products and to take on the heavy work of unloading and loading boats and clearing additional land. Farmers also settled in areas that are now a part of the twenty-first century city's suburban landscape. While the earlier settlers were mostly from New England and New York, those who followed, beginning in the 1820s, were in large part immigrants from Europe. By 1860, on the eve of the American Civil War, Cleveland had a population of 43,417, of which over 40% was of foreign birth, largely from Ireland, the British Isles and the German states and principalities.

New migrants to the city, whether from abroad or the rural hinterlands, supplied not only labor and skills, but often brought with them ideas that would continue the transformation of the community. Several deserve to be singled out because of their impact on the area's economic development.

Alfred Kelly, a lawyer who migrated from New York in 1810, played the principal role in advocating for the Ohio and Erie Canal and overseeing its construction. As noted earlier, that project positioned Cleveland for growth on a scale far beyond that expected by its founders. The potential of the community attracted young entrepreneurs, one of them being John D. Rockefeller, who moved to the area in 1853. Following his graduation from Central High School he attended a local business college and then became a bookkeeper in a commodities house. With its canal and lake transport systems, and, by the 1850s, a growing network of rail connections, Cleveland had evolved into a major trading center for grain, cloth, salt, and various other commodities central to life in the mid-nineteenth century. Rockefeller would eventually become a partner in his own commission house just before the Civil War. That conflict, which vastly increased the need for

commodities, such as food, wood, and wool, provided the basis for his fortune, a fortune that increased exponentially when he began to deal with a new commodity, oil.

Rockefeller's interest in oil can be seen as one of the key moments in the area's transformation from a mercantile to an industrial city: that is, from an economy in which goods are bought and sold, to one in which they are manufactured. Central to that transformation were new, disruptive technologies. Key among them were railroads. Railroads freed the economy from dependence on water transport (which was unusable in the winter) and poor roads and inefficient horse and wagon transport. It was a railroad linking Cleveland to the oil fields of Pennsylvania that helped to make Rockefeller's new industry possible, along with the development of new methods to "crack" raw petroleum by separating it into constituent components such as kerosene and paraffin, each of which provided important new fuels for lighting. . The need for sulfuric acid in the cracking process lured chemist Eugene Grasselli to Cleveland in 1857, thus laying the basis for a chemical industry that would later make possible the paint and varnish manufacturing companies led by Henry Sherwin, Edward Williams, and Francis Glidden.

The rail network, which expanded enormously in the 1850s, allowed two other migrants to further transform the economy. David and John Jones had learned ironworking in the Dowlais Mill in Glamorganshire, South Wales. They brought their skills to the United States, first practicing their trade in Pennsylvania. In 1857 they opened their own mill in Newburgh, just southeast of Cleveland. The mill was situated along the Cleveland and Pittsburgh Railroad, which provided access to coal from southern Ohio and iron ore from the upper Great Lakes region via the port of Cleveland. The growing needs of the railroads for iron rails and other iron products was central to the economic equation that linked immigrant skills with raw materials and transportation.

As was the case with Rockefeller's commission business, the Civil War served to catalyze industrial development in Cleveland. It also created a cadre of very wealthy individuals whose political and economic influence over the community would continue for decades. Crisfield Johnson in his 1879 history of Cuyahoga County succinctly noted: "...the war found Cleveland a commercial city and left it a manufacturing city. Not that it ceased to do a great deal of commercial business, but the predominant interests had become the manufacturing ones." During the war the city's population increased by nearly one third, from 43,417 in 1860 to 67,500 in 1866.

Industry would become Cleveland's *raison d'être* during the post-Civil War period and remain at the core of its economy for nearly a century. The patterns of migration and entrepreneurship evidenced in the years before the war would be replicated and multiplied decade after decade. New products—nuts, bolts,

screws, sewing machines, bicycles, automobiles, and even aircraft—would be flowing from the city’s factories by the 1920s. New disruptive technologies, such as electrical power, would challenge old and established ones as inventors such as Charles F. Brush created dynamos and electric arc lighting for the city. As industry grew to dominate the economy, it also drove the concurrent development of banking and corporate law.

The city’s post-Civil War industrialization coincided with major changes in migration patterns, both globally and within the United States. By the 1880s the predominant movement out of Europe had shifted from the northern and western parts of the continent to the central, eastern and southern sections. Cleveland, which had begun to diversify from its New England roots with the addition of Irish, German and British-born individuals to its population in the years before the Civil War, now saw the arrival of Poles, Hungarians, Italians, Slovenes, Croatians and dozens of other nationalities and ethnicities to its population. By the mid-1870s, the equality that had been promised to freed African-Americans in the post-war South had been replaced with new forms of oppression and economic hardship. They began a mass movement out of the South known as the Great Migration during the latter years of the nineteenth century arriving in northern industrial cities at the same time as thousands of European immigrants. What Cleveland offered, as did many other industrial cities in the north, was economic opportunity and the promise of equality.

The labor needs of the city’s growing industries were huge. By 1920 they employed 157,730 people and produced products valued at over one billion dollars. Cleveland’s industrial production ranked fifth among American cities and, coincidentally, its population of nearly 800,000 ranked it fifth as well. Of that population, two thirds were of foreign parentage or foreign birth, representing twenty-nine distinct nationalities. This transformation had occurred, essentially, in one century, from 1820 to 1920.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF UNEXPECTED CHANGE AND THE CREATION OF IMAGE

By 1920 Cleveland already had in place many of those attributes that now comprise part of its contemporary image. It had established major cultural institutions including the Cleveland Museum of Art and the Cleveland Orchestra. It had begun to address environmental issues with a growing system of parks and parkways. Its Community Chest, the forerunner of United Way, had unified and systematized charitable giving, and the Cleveland Foundation, the first community trust in the world, served as a paradigm for modern philanthropy. Within the realm of education, its public school system was well on its way to national

recognition, and Western Reserve University and the Case School of Applied Sciences anchored the academic-cultural district that had become known as University Circle. Its system of government and the manner in which government worked with business was viewed as a progressive model for the nation, one that had created the Group Plan of public buildings and had, after some contention, modernized and systematized its urban transit system.

All of these markers of civilization and forward thinking were consequences of the enormous changes the community had undergone in the previous century. They came about both because the wealth generated during that period supported their creation and, in many instances, because they addressed major social and economic issues that arose in the wake of industrialization. If many of the inventions and industrial processes that moved Cleveland forward could be viewed as disruptive in the technological sense, so too were their effects on the community. Equally disruptive was the rapid growth in population and size of the city—far beyond that which had occurred in the eighteenth century. Compounding all of this was the diversity of the population. The only tools the community had at hand to deal with such issues in the early years of change were those that derived from the social and religious structure of the relatively homogeneous pre-industrial communities of colonial America.

When the community began to expand during the 1820s and 1830s it turned to such traditional systems to deal with issues such as poverty, health care, the need for public education, and general civic well-being. Those systems, in substantial part, were carried over within the New England model on which the city was based. Charity, for example, emanated largely from the church. Later, as was usual in early America, a community poorhouse was opened to house the indigent. It was one of the few governmental contributions to what we now call social welfare. But as the city grew larger and, importantly, religiously and demographically diverse in the 1840s and 1850s, the problems grew both in scale and complexity. Orphan homes, which became common in the nineteenth century (replacing the tradition of relatives taking in children) multiplied: not only because of a larger number of orphans but also because of religion. By the 1860s Cleveland would have separate agencies for Protestant, Catholic and Jewish orphans. When it became necessary to take care of the elderly, the poorhouse, which had in part taken the place of the family, was augmented and eventually replaced by homes for the aged. In Cleveland, these were subdivided by religion and ethnicity. By century's end the city had homes for the Protestant, Catholic, African-American, Scottish, German, and Jewish aged.

Continued growth and diversification of population also challenged established forms of community governance. Cleveland, which officially became a village in 1815 and then a city in 1836, was bound by state regulations in regard to how it could structure its government. The state-dictated structure was ideal

for small communities, but not flexible enough for growing urban centers. As the city expanded in the years after the Civil War, it struggled to accommodate growing needs for police and fire protection, for adequate operating revenues, and for a truly representative legislative structure within the bounds those regulations imposed. By the end of the nineteenth century many saw Cleveland, and other growing industrial communities, as divorced from the rurally focused state government.

Growth also had severe consequences for the environment. The city's waterfront was given over to the railroads in the 1850s; its river became a convenient dumping ground for industrial waste products. In 1881 Mayor Rensselaer Herrick characterized the Cuyahoga River as "an open sewer through the center of the city." The lake, which comprised the chief source of drinking water, became increasingly polluted—so much so that by the early twentieth century the water intake had to be placed 26,000 feet offshore to insure a clean supply of water. Within the city living conditions worsened as migrants and immigrants arrived in ever larger numbers. The city's population would, for example, more than double in the twenty years between 1900 and 1920. Although part of the increase came through the annexation of surrounding communities such as Glenville, the bulk was from in-migration, which put a severe strain on housing and infrastructure such as water and sewers. The Haymarket and Lower Woodland, two areas close to the central city, were not only severely overcrowded, they were environmental wastelands. Yards and parks were nearly nonexistent. Outdoor privies remained the rule and bathing facilities were rare—in the sixteenth ward, home to 7,728 people, there were only eighty-seven bathtubs. One immigrant Italian mother, upon being given flowers by a social worker, noted that they were the first she had seen in America. Perhaps that was an overstatement, but it was nonetheless true that Cleveland, which had prided itself on being called "the Forest City," had in fact been losing many of its trees to airborne pollution for years. The quick and easy solution was to replace the trees with hardier species and not to deal directly with the main issue. At this point in the city's history, the need to do business trumped all calls for smoke abatement or ending the use of the river as a disposal system for local industry.

Beyond these specific issues, perhaps the overriding consequence of the city's rapid growth was the challenge it presented to the sense of Cleveland as a single community. That it had been, albeit for a relatively short period in the early 1800s, but by the 1840s there were already divisions. As industry and commerce grew the Flats, that area along the river became the least desirable residential area in the city. Known as the "under the hill" district, it was home to the poor, a number of whom were Irish Catholics. The houses of the wealthier residents, in contrast, were located on top of the hill in what is today's Warehouse District. A

separate city, the City of Ohio, existed across the river valley, a fairly formidable obstacle to cross at that time.

The situation would be far more complex by the early 1900s. Dozens of migrant and immigrant neighborhoods grew up around the manufacturing plants in which the immigrants worked. The plants generally were sited on the rail lines that spread away from the central city. In an era before cheap, relatively quick public transportation became available, people lived where they could walk to work. Migration chains created a preponderance of one nationality or another in these areas. The neighborhoods were largely self-sufficient, with their own churches or synagogues, and stores selling familiar goods in which the owners spoke the language of the district. Cleveland was, in reality, a series of communities defined by ethnicity, religion and economic status, and the communities' names—Karlin, Warszawa, Praha, Dutch Hill, Little Italy, Big Italy, Poznan—testified to their particularistic identities. To many observers, they were foreign entities sitting within an American city.

These factory neighborhoods existed in stark contrast to Euclid Avenue, whose mansions housed the individuals made wealthy by the burgeoning industrial economy. The homes on Euclid Avenue stretched for miles, from the eastern edge of downtown nearly all the way to University Circle. A youngster from the lower Woodland Avenue immigrant neighborhood marveled at the structures when he was on a field trip sponsored by a local social settlement. He thought the houses were all schools, since the only building he knew of that rivaled the homes in size was his school.

Underneath these very visible differences was a major fault line, one which stretched through every industrial city in the United States. It was the line that divided labor and capital. Beginning in the 1870s, Cleveland witnessed a number of strikes, many accompanied by violence. Workers at Rockefeller's Standard Oil refinery struck in 1877. Two violent strikes occurred at the Cleveland Rolling Mills in 1882 and 1885, and in 1899 troops were called out to control a strike on the city's streetcar lines. Such struggles over the rights of labor and capital usually had political overtones, with some individuals advocating governmental and economic solutions from outside the American system. Socialists and anarchists were involved in the Standard Oil and Rolling Mill strikes. Indeed, there was a growing "radical" segment in the city's population. Charles Ruthenberg ran credible campaigns for mayor as a Socialist. Socialists in the Czech community established a newspaper, a summer camp, and a gymnastic organization. A young, mentally unbalanced Polish-American from the Warszawa neighborhood, Leon Czolgosz, fancied himself an anarchist and in 1901 assassinated President William McKinley. Events such as these unnerved many Clevelanders and raised the specter of a social revolution. Indeed, one Clevelander wrote a novel, *The Breadwinners*, which focused on a labor revolt in the mythical city of

Buffland. The author was John Hay, a former secretary to Abraham Lincoln, and the husband of Clara Stone, a daughter of railroad magnate Amasa Stone. Like his in-laws, he was a resident of Euclid Avenue.

RESPONDING TO CHANGE, CREATING THE MODERN INDUSTRIAL CITY

Cleveland was not alone in confronting the consequences of industrialization. It was a national crisis. Excesses of wealth characterized the American Gilded Age. Labor violence, poverty, and a sense of a lost national identity were hallmarks of the period from 1870 to World War I. Historian Robert Wiebe has characterized this period as one in which Americans engaged in a “search for order”—that is, ways to create cohesion within a geographically huge and increasingly diverse nation-state and to make rapidly evolving systems of charity and governance, as well as emerging professions, more orderly. What is remarkable about Cleveland is the manner in which it pursued its own search for order. Its success in coming to terms with the new “urban normal” during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was nationally recognized then and today. That success remains part of the city’s image.

As was the case in its industrial development, several individuals can be seen as representative of the city’s approach to reform in what we term the Progressive Era.

The pivotal figure is Tom L. Johnson, whose statue, as noted at the beginning of this essay, now stands on the city’s Public Square (a second statue of Johnson can also be found on the grounds of the Western Reserve Historical Society). Johnson was an entrepreneur and his interests lay in urban transportation. He was one of many individuals who capitalized on the need to provide effective transportation in America’s growing cities. That transport took the form of street railways—initially horse drawn, then cable driven and finally electrically powered. By the time he arrived in Cleveland around 1883, Johnson had become wealthy through investments in street railways around the country—possible at that time, since such enterprises were private, not municipal. It was a lucrative but often shady business, for entrepreneurs such as Johnson needed to secure legislative permission to build and operate street railway franchises. That permission often came only after bribes were paid and deals were struck with the right politicians. Johnson could work the system as well as any man—and he became very wealthy doing so. But Tom L. Johnson had what might be called a conversion experience, and as a consequence he became an outspoken advocate of reform. He read the works of the single-tax reformer Henry George and began to question the system that had made him wealthy. He entered politics in order

to effect the reforms he believed in. He served two terms in the US House of Representatives and in 1901 became the mayor of Cleveland, serving in that office for eight years.

Johnson worked to secure the municipal ownership of utilities, including urban transit, and he espoused the concept of professionalism in governance. He filled his mayoral administration with people who had expertise as managers, rather than political connections. His appointees included a young lawyer from West Virginia, Newton D. Baker, and Peter Witt, a former foundry worker and union advocate. Together, Johnson and his cabinet reformed the police force, modernized the water supply system, updated the prison system, and forwarded the cause of municipal ownership. He constantly challenged the state-mandated structure for municipal governance and pushed for home rule—that is, the right of a city like Cleveland to structure its own government to best meet its needs. Nationally recognized journalist Lincoln Steffens wrote, “Johnson is the best mayor of the best-governed city in America.”

While Johnson often offended the wealthier segment of the population, a group to which he belonged and with which he associated, that segment of the population was nonetheless also moving toward reform, most notably in the area of philanthropy. As wealth grew in the city in the mid-nineteenth century, those who had acquired it often donated some of it to benefit the community. Much of this followed in the tradition fostered by the religious groups to which the wealthy belonged. However, the scope of their gifts far exceeded what had once been considered as normal charity. John D. Rockefeller, a Baptist, was a prime example. He began to make charitable donations from the time he received his first pay as an employee of the commission merchants Hewitt and Tuttle. As he grew wealthier his gifts increased in both number and size. Eventually, his fortune would become the basis of a foundation that systematized the distribution of funds. Unfortunately, he was by that time no longer a full-time resident of Cleveland. Other similar, individual charitable endeavors were numerous. Jephtha Wade gave part of his private parkland to the city. William J. Gordon did likewise. Members of the Severance family helped create the rich cultural life that the city still enjoys through their donations to art and music. The Mather family was at the forefront in the support of higher education at Western Reserve University, health care at what would become University Hospitals, and assistance to the inner city with gifts to settlement houses such as Hiram House and Goodrich House.. Those who had achieved wealth and status supported the increasing needs of the city, be they educational, social welfare or cultural. While some of these gifts derived from the particular donor’s religious affiliation and beliefs and others from a particular cultural avocation, such as music or fine art, all were given in a time before tax deductions provided a fiscal reward for personal altruism.

Yet, the needs of the city were so vast that the wealthy felt hard pressed as to where to place their benevolence. Judgment as to what was worthy, effective, and legitimate needed to be made when request after request came to the doors on Euclid Avenue. A system was needed—and Cleveland's leading industrialists and entrepreneurs were strong advocates of rationalized processes of production and what would become "scientific management." They would apply that mindset to charitable giving as well, and in doing so create another historical landmark for the city.

This drive for efficiency in production and modernization in industrial processes was strongly reflected in the city's Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber, as a modern progressive body, helped transform the city as much as did Johnson's administration. The Chamber served as the principal advocate for foster economic growth in Cleveland, and its minute books from the early twentieth century indicate how rationally and methodically it approached this goal. But the members of the Chamber also realized that business could not prosper in a community that was not healthy, cohesive, and politically stable. They needed to provide a viable alternative to counter proposed solutions such as socialism. To this end, they proceeded to attempt to organize, stabilize and regularize the workings of the often chaotic city. The Chamber's Committee on Benevolent Associations, established in 1903, would develop into the Community Chest and eventually the United Way campaign, which unified charitable giving and also rationalized (through the Cleveland Welfare Federation) the distribution of the funds it raised. In addition, the Chamber created the basis for housing code legislation which would help end overcrowding and shoddy construction. Its activities also encompassed a committee to study the need for bathhouses in an inner city largely devoid of indoor plumbing.

Although often violently in disagreement, the businessmen represented by the Chamber and the Johnson administration often shared goals. Certainly, business interests fought Johnson on the issue of municipal ownership. Indeed, Johnson's ardent support of municipal transit and the staunch opposition to it would cost him his mayoral career and even arguably lead to his early death. Yet, the desire on the part of both parties to find a workable solution to the problems of the industrial city often placed them in partnership. The Group Plan, which resulted in the construction of the Mall (which replaced a decrepit section of the city with a nationally significant grouping of public buildings), was one such example, as was the desire to replace politicians in municipal administrative positions with experts who could rationally manage the functions held by the government. This alignment between sometimes starry-eyed political reformers and the business community of Cleveland has endured, albeit with some rough passages, for over a century.

Recognizing this drive for a system to manage the urban city provides the key to understanding what happened in Cleveland at the turn of the twentieth century and during the next two decades. One can find examples of Taylorism, or scientific management, everywhere. Frederick Goff, a banker who played a leading role in establishing the Cleveland Trust Company through the consolidation of an assortment of regional banks, also rationalized the system of philanthropic bequests. His Cleveland Foundation set a standard for melding multiple bequests into an independently administered fund that could be used to deal with larger issues and to insure that those funds met the needs existent at any given time within the community. William Stinchcomb, an engineer for the city's Parks Department, took a holistic view of parks and created a unified system now referred to as the Emerald Necklace, a series of parks encircling the Cleveland area. Even social work, once the purview of individuals with a strong desire to help their fellow citizens, became regularized when Western Reserve University established its School of Applied Social Work to train those who wished to serve.

It was with these systems—a rationalized approach to civic issues and a public-private partnership—that Cleveland entered the 1920s. Implicit was an assumption that the industrial economy upon which the community had built its own city on a hill would endure. However, within four decades, that notion would, as was the case with the assumptions made by Moses Cleaveland and the early pioneers, be tested by the development of unforeseen economic changes—in this instance the development of a truly globalized economy.

MANAGING LEGACY AND LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

In 2009, a century after the height of the Progressive Era reforms, Cleveland, with an estimated population of 431,363, ranked as the nation's 43rd largest city, two steps above its rank in 1840, when it had been the country's 45th largest city. Its primary employment areas were in health care, research and the service economy. Industry, while still apparent, was no longer the key economic underpinning of the city. Ranked among the most poverty-stricken areas in the nation and characterized by a problematic racial divide, it seemed that the city had moved back in time rather than forward. What had happened—how had the Progressive reformers followed Moses Cleaveland in misinterpreting the community's future? Or had they?

It can be argued that by 1920, the community's industrial era had only one more decade to endure. Cleveland's industries may have roared during the 1920s, but they nearly collapsed during the Great Depression of the 1930s. At times during the Depression as much as 30% of the workforce was unemployed. While the Depression was the ultimate working person's crisis, it also served, under the guidance of the Roosevelt administration, to provide the impetus to legitimize

the worker's right to unionize. When jobs returned, they often came with wage levels and benefits that labor had long sought. Only with the advent of World War II did full employment return. Highly unionized industrial jobs survived after the war, supported in large part by the fact that major global competitors, both prior (Germany) and potential (Japan), had been decimated by the conflict. However, by the late 1960s Cleveland, along with other industrial centers in the Great Lakes region, began to lose jobs to more competitive locales both within and outside the United States.

Certainly, the civic and business leadership of the 1920s could not have clearly foreseen the future—otherwise they would have sold short in 1929 and reinvested heavily in the late 1930s. But, there were signs all around them that presaged enormous and challenging changes in the years to come[—changes whose general nature could be divined to some extent, even if the specific debacle of the market crash and the subsequent temporary renaissance of Cleveland as an industrial city could not have been predicted. And by and large, the leadership remained oblivious to these signs].

That impending change was exemplified in the careers of Mantis J. and Oris P. Van Sweringen, real estate dealers who not only created Shaker Heights as a landmark in American suburban development, but also reshaped the core of the downtown area with the construction of the Terminal Tower complex. Essentially, the Van Sweringens were the successors to the Connecticut Land Company. They bought, developed and sold vast tracts of land outside of the central city. They were not alone: real estate was a booming local industry in the early twentieth century, both because the city's growing population needed new home sites and also because many people were by this time striving to escape the central city. While such individuals' motivations can never be clearly defined, they rested upon the desire for something better—better in the sense of greener, in the sense of larger, and in the sense of being away from the unpleasant, which might be categorized as smoke, pollution, and people not like them.

What was even more important about these new suburban developments is that they were planned to be separate from Cleveland. The city's growth during the later nineteenth century came about in substantial part through the annexation of previously independent outlying communities. Those communities wanted to link to the city and its services. Yet in the first two decades of the twentieth century four major communities—East Cleveland, Lakewood, Cleveland Heights, and Shaker Heights—were established as separate corporate entities along Cleveland's borders. In the decades that followed, particularly after World War II, the creation of discrete suburban communities would increase substantially. The process was and remains a rejection of the central city based, one might argue, on its political culture, its polluted landscape, and the nature of its population.

Transportation, the key component enabling suburban expansion, also pre-saged a different future for Cleveland. For nearly a century, Cleveland's industrial hegemony was virtually locked in by its access to water transport and major rail lines. However, by the late 1920s automotive and truck transport had grown in importance. By the 1930s new roads and highways were being built, some with the aid of federal WPA dollars. After the war the network would expand enormously with the construction of the interstate system. Now freer to relocate, many industries left for more modern facilities in the distant suburbs or, often, for the lower wage rates and non-unionized labor available southern states. Eventually, some would decamp to places outside the boundaries of the United States.

The city's leadership during the 1920s also witnessed the beginning of a major demographic change in the city, one that would challenge its attempts to promote harmony and cooperation among its many ethnic communities. Ironically, the process of building harmony within a diverse population was apparently well under way during the 1920s, symbolized most tangibly by the establishment of the Cleveland Cultural Gardens. While many American cities promoted a strong 100% American agenda during World War I and the decade thereafter, Cleveland stood apart by creating public programs that allowed various communities to retain and celebrate aspects of their heritage in a public manner. . . They included folk festivals near the Cleveland Museum of Art, the accumulation of a strong folk arts collection by that agency, and the series of Cultural Gardens stretching along what was then called Liberty Row as a memorial to Clevelanders who died in the war. All were initiatives sanctioned by either the local government or those who oversaw the community's cultural agenda.

The real irony of this was that the movement to Cleveland of Europeans, whose cultures were the focus of these programs, began to wane at the outbreak of World War I and then was largely ended by restrictive immigration legislation in the early 1920s. Their place as laborers was taken up in substantial part by African American migrants. Cleveland's black population grew as a consequence of the Great Migration from the South. It stood at 2,062 in 1900, increased to 8,447 a decade later, and by 1920 had risen to 34,451. Within the next decade it would more than double, to 71,899. African Americans had always been present in the region. Indeed, during the antebellum period, the city's New England roots made it a bastion of antislavery sentiment and a stop on the Underground Railroad. At that point Cleveland was a place where a free African American was treated with reasonable equality. Within four decades after the Civil War had ended, this tolerance was being eroded by growing racial bias. When large numbers of blacks arrived in Cleveland during and after World War I, they found themselves segregated into the Cedar Central area, with their economic opportunities limited by prejudice. Absent European migration and given the increasing need for workers during the Second World War, the black population

again expanded during what is known as the Second Great Migration, growing to 147,850 in 1950, and rising to 250,818 at the beginning of the 1960s. The racial division in the city, combined with a declining economy, led to the Hough riots of 1966 and the Glenville shootout of 1968, the most intense episodes of communitarian violence in the city's history. At that time, the Cultural Gardens, adjacent to both neighborhoods, lacked a site that specifically honored African-American heritage.

Racial tension, out-migration to the suburbs, and the loss of industry made the 1960s and 1970s one of the most complex periods in the city's history. Cleveland's population peaked at 914,808 in 1950. Twenty years later it was 573,822. During this same period, the population of Cuyahoga County, excluding Cleveland, rose from 474,724 to 924,578. Manufacturing employment reached its highest point in 1969, and then declined by one third over the following twenty-one years. The impact of out-migration and loss of industry on tax revenues was considerable. In 1978 the city defaulted on \$14,000,000 in loans to six local banks.

In many ways the decades of the 1960s and 1970s were as significant an historical watershed for the community as the decades centered on the Civil War. Both marked transitions, each of which was problematic. While in retrospect one can see the switch to an industrial economy as the beginning of a local golden age, it needs to be remembered that wrenching change occurred because of this shift. We easily forget about farmers and skilled independent producers such as shoemakers, blacksmiths, and seamstresses whose livelihoods were damaged or destroyed by industrial production. Indeed, we celebrate the image-building consequences—governmental reform, private-public partnership, philanthropy, modern social services, and a strong cultural infrastructure—which were catalyzed by disruptive industrialization.

In many ways, but not all, these community assets have assisted the city and region in moving forward in their search for a new economic basis and social stability. Tangible entities, such as community centers and foundations—most particularly the Cleveland and Gund Foundations—have played significant roles in areas such as neighborhood redevelopment, the fostering of intercultural relations, and the provision of feasibility studies or seed funding for entrepreneurs and businesses. Importantly, some of the not-for-profit entities created by the wealth of the industrial period have emerged as major players in the new economy. Modern health care, perhaps the key “industry” in twenty-first-century Cleveland, has its roots in voluntary organizations such as the Ladies Aid Society of Old Stone Church, and the benevolence of industrialist-philanthropists such as Samuel Mather: the former laid the groundwork and the latter then helped secure the funds for the growth and modernization of what is now University Hospitals of Cleveland. Cultural institutions such as the orchestra, art museum, and natural history museum help to make University Circle a tourist destination

at a time when tourism and the service industries that support it are seen as critical economic contributors to post-industrial Cleveland. Additionally, non-industrial entities such as corporate law firms and banks, which were created to serve the industrial expansion, continue as active and important components of the service economy.

It can also be argued that the intangible aspects of the city's image can catalyze actions that benefit the community in times of crisis. Despite the intense local racial divide in the twentieth century, a tradition of liberality seems to have continued. It led to the establishment of fair employment practices legislation in the late 1940s; played a significant role in the election of Carl B. Stokes as mayor—the first African American mayor of a major US city—in 1967, and underpinned the creation of organizations such as the Lomond and Ludlow associations, which worked to insure desegregation and a balanced population mix in two neighborhoods in the once exclusive suburb of Shaker Heights. Altruism seems almost ingrained in the community's psyche. Some would claim it derives from the tradition of stewardship brought to the region by the early Protestant settlers from New England. Today, thanks to that tradition, fortified by similar impulses in the Catholic, Jewish, and non-Judeo Christian communities, and abetted by a variety of federal laws, Cleveland and northeastern Ohio are home to dozens of philanthropic foundations, both private and corporate.

Yet, the issue posited at the beginning of this chapter still looms for Cleveland and northeastern Ohio. Cities are economic entities, and those attributes of civilization that come to make up their public image or persona are the consequences of vibrant economies. The wealth created in Cleveland and northeastern Ohio during the region's industrial apogee was enormous, so much so that it has continued to support culture, charity, and education up to the present. The question remains as to how long the residue of that wealth can continue to support communal needs and cultural amenities, and also whether prosperity generated by the evolving medical and service economy can make up for any loss and secondarily, even increase the legacy generated by the industrial period. There is reason to be sanguine here, for if one carefully reads the names on new buildings in educational, cultural, and medical complexes, one sees a shift to surnames that do not reflect the heritage, both ethnic and entrepreneurial, of nineteenth-century industrialists. Rather, they belong to individuals whose migration stories are more recent and whose fortunes were created, in part, in real estate, building, and finance.

If there is one matter that tends to lessen this sanguinity, it is the matter of definition—definition of the community in terms of legal boundaries and demographic composition. The essential economic substructure of the community tells us that “Cleveland” is more than the area within the city's borders. Interestingly, the broader economic community today roughly fills the outline

of what Connecticut held as its Western Reserve. Similarly, the amenities of Cleveland, the city, are enjoyed by an audience that lives throughout the region—sports teams belong to residents not only of Cleveland but all of northeastern Ohio as do is orchestra, art museum, and other cultural treasures. Major health care providers centered in the city operate branches throughout the region. Despite this regional unity based on economics and shared amenities, there is still a struggle to develop a [coordinated approach to governance, education, and policy. The movement toward regional government, which began in the 1930s, is an unfinished item from the early post-progressive agenda. There have been successful efforts toward regionalism in the park system, water and sewage, and public transit which have extended such services beyond the city’s boundaries. However, the economic, ethnic and racial divisions that endure within Cleveland and its surrounding communities complicate any move to a system of governance that would have pleased those who made Cleveland an efficient city and a national model some one hundred years ago.

The Public Square of Cleveland has, true to its New England origins, endured as a communal area for over two centuries. It has been in turn a village commons, the “Monumental Square” of a growing mercantile center, and the busy hub of the fifth largest city in the nation. Yet, it has remained geographically intact through major, and for many individuals, cataclysmic changes in the community’s economy. It is surrounded by buildings that seem to show that the city and the community can deal with vast demographic change. First Presbyterian Church stands near the Metzenbaum Court House, named after a Jewish US Senator; near the Square are the Lausche State office building, named after a Slovenian mayor, governor, and senator, and just beyond it, the Stokes Federal Courthouse, named after another mayor, the grandson of a slave. These buildings have a potent symbolism, one that is reflected even more strongly in the diversity of the crowds who come to the Square on July 4th to hear the annual open-air concert by world-famous Cleveland Orchestra. These symbols auger for what needs to come next to insure that the community survives. It is not so much the move to a new economic base: that is already largely underway. It is the need to move beyond the parochial and to construct a functional regional community—a twenty-first century Western Reserve which identifies with its economic cohesiveness and fully accepts, rather than simply celebrates its global heritage.

WATER AS AN ECONOMIC TOOL

BRENT LARKIN

Northeast Ohio should regard building a vibrant water-based economy as a priority so important that the future of the entire region depends on it.

It probably does.

Water isn't the only key to a prosperous future. World-class medical facilities, biosciences, renewable and alternative energy all show promise of contributing to our 21st-century economy.

But the unquestioned key to that future is an asset whose origin dates back more than a billion years—the world's most abundant supply of fresh water.

Of all the world's water, 97 percent of it is salty. Another 2 percent is locked in ice or snow. Of that remaining 1 percent that is fresh water, the Great Lakes contain just under 20 percent of it.

Lakes Erie, Ontario, Michigan, Huron, and Superior boast a total of 11,000 miles of shoreline. Recreation alone on the lakes is a \$6 billion-a-year industry.

In considering the magnitude of the importance of Northeast Ohio's most precious asset, consider that 46 percent of the world's population does not have water piped into their home, that in undeveloped countries people must walk an average of 3.7 miles to get fresh water.

We have 6 quadrillion gallons (that's 15 zeros) of it at our doorstep.

Cleveland's past greatness was rooted in its relationship and reliance upon that water. Lake Erie and the large albeit crooked river that flows into it (the Cuyahoga) made the city a giant in manufacturing, shipbuilding and rail transportation.

Manufacturing will remain a significant part of Northeast Ohio's economy for the foreseeable future, but its decline as the centerpiece of that economy has been inexorable and—when viewed with the benefit of hindsight—inevitable.

But booming economies in the West, Southwest and Southeast are now running out of the water they so desperately need to sustain their growth. Indeed, some aquifers in California are down to 25 percent of capacity.

So as other parts of the country—and world—dry up, cities with great quantities of clean, fresh water have the potential to enjoy an economic resurgence.

By 2025, an estimated one-third of the world's population will not have access to fresh water. As a 2008 Goldman Sachs report concluded, fresh water has become "the natural resource with no substitute."

But as Northeast Ohio plans a water-based economy, that planning requires an understanding and appreciation of history. So before explaining how water can return the region to prosperity, let's us examine its paramount role in the greatness of our past.

In 1772 and again in 1786, a missionary and geographer named John Heckewelder visited the Indian-occupied territory along the Lake Erie shoreline at the mouth of the Cuyahoga River. Heckewelder was captivated by the location, which featured the vast lake and countless streams feeding into the river. It was, he thought, the ideal place for a settlement as the young nation expanded west.

On his second visit, Heckewelder established a small trading post along the Cuyahoga, close to what is now known as Tinkers Creek. He also prepared a map of the region.

Relying in part on that map, in 1796 a group of eastern investors purchased from the state of Connecticut what is now the Greater Cleveland region, paying \$1.2 million for about three million acres (a little more than 30 cents an acre). They named it the territory of the Western Reserve.

In May of 1796, investors in the Connecticut Land Co. designated Moses Cleaveland as their agent to visit the territory. On July 4, 1796, Cleaveland and his sailing party of about 50 men reached Conneaut. About two weeks later, the group mistakenly thought they had reached its final destination, disappointing surveyors at the small size of the river.

So unhappy was Cleaveland's group that legend has it they named the small river the Chagrin. More likely is the Indians had already given the Chagrin its name.

Having discovered its likely error, Cleaveland's party continued west, and on the morning of July 22, 1796, slipped into the Cuyahoga and embarked near the area of the Flats east bank, now known as Settlers Landing. On the day the Cleaveland party landed, the east bank of the Cuyahoga represented the most western point in the United States, or its territories, not controlled by Indian tribes.

Cleaveland was exhausted, but wrote that the location—with its crystal clear lake, magnificent rivers, rich forests, fertile soil, and rolling hills—exceeded investors' expectations. Within days, Cleaveland had struck a deal with the Iroquois to plot a village east of the river, just south of Lake Erie.

Three months after arriving, Cleaveland left the city that now bears his name—absent that first "a."

He never returned.

In the late 18th century, both George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were known to ponder ways of moving goods from the west (the area now known as the Midwest) to population centers in the east. Both centered on the idea of a canal that would move products east along the Ohio River, and at one point Washington was said to recommend a canal that would connect the Ohio to Lake Erie, alongside the Cuyahoga River.

Absent access to a market, farmers in and around the new village of Cleveland struggled in the town's early years. Then, in the early 1820s, Ohio's leaders concluded the only way to ensure economic prosperity for the entire state was to construct a canal from the Ohio River north, through Columbus, to Lake Erie.

Many thought the canal's northern terminus should be in Warren or Sandusky. Alfred Kelley believed that terminus should be in Cleveland. And Alfred Kelley turned out to be a very persuasive man.

A lawyer, county prosecutor, the youngest elected member of the legislature, and the first president (1815) of the village of Cleveland, Kelley became the state's most outspoken and effective promoter of the Ohio & Erie Canal.

In 1821, the state legislature began deliberating issues relating to the canal's funding, route and construction. Kelley's relentless lobbying paid off, and in 1825 ground was broken on the northern section of the canal that would link Akron to Cleveland. On July 4, 1827, the first boat to travel the canal route from Akron arrived in the Cleveland harbor.

By the early 1830s, construction on the canal was complete. Economic growth was now all but guaranteed. And Alfred Kelley had earned his place as one of Cleveland's greatest citizens.

Consider the canal's economic impact:

In 1830, about three million pounds of goods traveled the canal. By 1838, that number had grown to nineteen million. Products from central Ohio's farmlands poured into Cleveland's port, filling the harbor with steamboats and other vessels awaiting their turns at the dock. The dramatic increase in business at the port sparked a building boom along the river and on Superior Avenue, as schools, churches, warehouses, and office space gave birth to what was becoming one of the most vibrant and successful ports on the Great Lakes.

Cleveland could offer something unique—direct access east to New York or southeast to New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. No other city on the Great Lakes had water access to New York or New Orleans.

Water was pushing this new young village on a path to prosperity.

In the summer of 1860, the *Cleveland Leader*, one of the city's daily newspapers, complained of the city's plight, "We continue to make nothing and buy everything."

That was about to change.

Railroads had dramatically reduced the importance of the Ohio & Erie Canal. By the start of the Civil War, five major rail lines passed through the city. At war's end, iron from the Lake Superior region began arriving by lake carriers in record amounts.

Much was then shipped by rail to steel manufacturers in Pittsburgh, Wheeling, and Youngstown. But by 1868, Cleveland itself was home to more than a dozen steel rolling mills.

As the Industrial Revolution generated startling economic growth across the country, for a time no city grew faster than Cleveland. Water and rail made Cleveland a manufacturing giant, the country's second largest automotive city, and the largest shipbuilding port on the Great Lakes.

Cleveland's water-based economy was huge, diverse, and—as the 20th century arrived—seemingly recession-proof. In 1860, Cleveland was a relatively tiny town of 43,000. Seventy years later, it was home to a world-class port and a population of more than 900,000—the nation's sixth largest. Access to water had made it a vibrant and prosperous city. But the end of that prosperity—and the city's wise use of its water—was nearing the end.

Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland's world-renowned industrialist, once said the Depression hit his hometown harder than any city in the country. Indeed, the loss of jobs and the post-war flight to the suburbs launched Cleveland on a path of slow, albeit relentless, economic decline.

As the city began to lose residents and jobs, Cleveland also paid a price for not tending to its greatest asset. By the 1960s, both Lake Erie and the Cuyahoga River became dangerously polluted, significantly damaging the Northeast Ohio fishing industry and dealing a crippling blow to the city's reputation.

On June 22, 1969, an oil slick on the Cuyahoga caught fire. Flames on the river reached five stories high. Wooden bridges burned. The city's water, the primary source of its greatness, made it the butt of jokes that linger to this day.

Three things must happen with our fresh water is it is to play a pivotal role in Northeast Ohio's economic recovery. We must:

1. Keep that water here.
2. Keep it clean.

3. Rebuild the port as an economic hub.

For decades, Lake Erie and the river suffered as phosphorous and other industrial pollutants poured into the water unchecked, killing fish and other helpful species, giving the water an untenable odor, closing beaches, and spreading contamination north to the Canadian shoreline.

In 1972, Congress finally acted, passing the Clean Water Act, which regulates the discharge of pollutants into the nation's surface waters, including lakes, rivers, streams, wetlands, and coastal areas. The act dramatically curtailed the discharge of untreated waste water and sewage from government and industrial sources, and eventually made both Lake Erie and the Cuyahoga River safer for swimming and fishing.

The results were remarkable. But eventually, problems returned. Lake Erie today again faces significant problems—largely invasive species, sediment, and the vestiges of pollution. The lake and the river are back from the dead, positioned to play a vital role in the 21st-century economy. But it is worth restating that this rebirth will be sustained only if we keep our water clean, wisely build an economy around it, and prevent other parts of the country from tapping into what is Greater Cleveland's most precious resource.

Toward that end, in 1986 Congress passed the Water Resource Development Act designed, in part, to prevent diversion of Great Lakes water. But many legal scholars thought the act vulnerable to a legal challenge, so in the mid-1990s representatives of the eight Great Lakes states and two Canadian provinces began negotiating a basin-wide approach to decisions on water usage.

The result was the St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact—commonly called the Great Lakes Compact—a product of more than four years of negotiations by the governors, a 39-member advisory committee, and input from thousands of U.S. and Canadian citizens.

Canada enacted the compact rather quickly. Approval by the eight states and the congress took more than five years.

The Ohio House twice ratified the compact, the second time by a vote of 90–3. But Ohio was one of the last states to give its final approval because the compact stalled in the Ohio Senate for more than a year. An April 27, 2008, editorial in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*—one of many the newspaper wrote urging Ohio to ratify the agreement—angrily suggested the Senate's foot-dragging “represents one of the most unforgivable public policy abuses perpetrated upon the people of Northeast Ohio in decades.” The paper accused more than several senators of concocting “some crackpot theory” that exposed “all of Ohio to economic harm.”

After allowing some face-saving for the Senate, Ohio became the sixth state to ratify the compact. In October of 2008, President George W. Bush signed it,

just days after its approval by the U.S. House and less than a month after passing the U.S. Senate.

Now the law of the land, the Great Lakes Compact essentially bans diversion of large amounts of water outside the Great Lakes. In the United States, each of the eight Great Lakes states has a seat on a water resources council. Any water withdrawal exceeding five million gallons daily must be approved by a majority of the council. Similar diversion rules apply in Canada.

In Ohio, only counties straddling the Great Lakes basin are allowed to use Lake Erie water. Diversion approved prior to the compact's ratification, like Akron's large scale use of Lake Erie water, are allowed to continue.

The importance of preventing diversions is enormous, as public officials in arid parts of the country have been publicly talking of preying on Great Lakes water since the early days of the 21st century. In late 2007, when he was running for president, New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson called for a national policy to consider redistribution of water to needy areas, remarking that the West was drying up while places around the Great Lakes were "awash in water." It was around then that a professor at the University of Alabama produced a plan to pipe water out of the Great Lakes into the Sun Belt.

David Naftzger, a former director of the Council of Great Lakes Governors, predicted in 2008 that an eventual water grab is a certainty.

"Look at a map showing water shortages and population growth and see how they match up," Naftzger told the *Plain Dealer*. "Now look at us and you can see a concern that, as times move on, those areas will be looking at the Great Lakes to bring them water—through either a tanker, pipeline, or natural channels."

While Congress has the power to repeal the Great Lakes Compact, for now the world's largest supply of fresh water appears safe. But as a great many commentators have observed, while 20th-century wars were often fought over oil, 21st-century wars will be waged over fresh water.

But even—under a worst-case scenario—if some Great Lakes water ends up being diverted later in the century, the advantages enjoyed by the bountiful supply of fresh water enjoyed by just 8 of the 50 states argue strongly for future economic growth.

President Barack Obama has championed a proposal, as of this writing not yet law, that would spend an additional \$5 billion over a 10-year period to continue Great Lakes cleanup as part of a plan to revive the lakes' economic, recreation, and navigational potential. A 2008 Brookings Institute report concluded that such a cleanup would provide Cleveland with an economic boost between \$2.1 billion and \$3.7 billion—with the overall economic benefit to the Great Lakes states estimated at a staggering \$100 billion.

The logic is irrefutable. A cleaner Lake Erie for fishing, boating, swimming, and other water activities would not only drive up property values, but would

also make the region more desirable for businesses—creating jobs and generating wealth. As Greater Cleveland Partnership President Joe Roman correctly noted, “With 300 miles of shoreline, Cleveland and the rest of Northern Ohio could thrive if we are able to fully realize the economic potential of this tremendous asset.”

Officials in Wisconsin figured this out years before it occurred to those in Greater Cleveland. Four of the world’s 11 largest water technology companies are located in Wisconsin. Milwaukee alone is home to 120 water-related companies. Marquette University Law School now has a water-law curriculum. And planning is underway for a \$30 million lake-front headquarters of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee’s Great Lakes Water Institute

Board members and leaders at the Great Lakes Science Center are now engaging in similar water technology efforts, but no one disputes that Greater Cleveland lags behind Milwaukee in planning for a water-based economy of the future.

Another significant problem is the troubling growth of toxic algae in Lake Erie and the spread of zebra mussels. The algae colors the water green and can be dangerous to humans, pets, and wildlife. Zebra mussels harm the fishing industry and pollute beaches. These festering problems only underscore the importance of a sizeable, federally-funded Great Lakes cleanup plan.

Rebuilding Cleveland’s port as a significant shipping center is proving an even more daunting challenge. The Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority, a vision of former Mayor Carl Stokes and Council President James Stanton, was created by county voters in 1968 to oversee what was then one of the Great Lakes’ busiest ports. For the first few decades of its existence, the port thrived. For decades, shipping raw materials to make steel was the port’s main business. But even with the steel industry’s decline, an economic impact study in the late 1990s found the port directly accounted for 4,700 jobs, generated \$400 million in spending annually, and \$64 million in taxes.

But the port also engaged in an obscene amount of over-ambitious thinking, devoting an inordinate amount of time on plans for a World Trade Center, cruise ship and ferry service, an aquarium and lake front retail—none of which materialized. Throughout the first decade of the 21st century, shipping at the port declined steadily.

With shipping revenues in a free-fall, the port has struggled to raise its \$158 million share of the \$600 million tab the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers needs to dredge mountains of muck from the port and Cuyahoga River. Without that dredging—and a place to dump the muck—federal officials have warned that the Cleveland harbor could be shut down by 2015.

By the summer of 2010, Cleveland’s port was in clear crisis mode. The nine-member board fired its director and hired a new one. It scrapped a costly, \$1

billion plan to build a new port several miles east of downtown. There was no clear game plan to raise the funds needed for dredging, nor one to revive its slumping shipping business. Adding to those woes was the city's need to secure federal funding to fix a crumbling slope above the river that threatened shipping to sites downstream.

In a series of news stories and editorials, *The Plain Dealer* outlined the port's many "immense challenges," underscored the need for dramatic change, and correctly linked the need for that change with the necessity of the port playing a major role in reviving Greater Cleveland's economy.

An old, now somewhat trite, saying holds that, in determining the success of a business, the three most important factors are always location, location, and location. The visionary pioneers who settled this territory more than 200 years ago understood that.

Northeast Ohio and, indeed, the entire Great Lakes region, has something the rest of the world desperately needs. What's more, we have a lot of it

More than ever before, the fresh water that served us so well in the past represents our best hope for the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives, *The Atlantic* "Water Summit." October 29, 2009.

Archives, *The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. 2009.

Archives, *The Plain Dealer*. 1991–2010.

Miller, Carol Poh and Robert Wheeler. *Cleveland: A Concise History, 1796–1996*. 2nd edition. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Rose, William Ganson. *Cleveland: The Making of a City*. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1950. Reprinted with a new introduction. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1990.

Van Tassel, David D. and John J. Grabowski. *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. 2nd edition. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Wallen, James. *Cleveland's Golden Story: A Chronicle of Hearts that Hoped, Minds that Planned and Hands that Toiled, to Make a City "Great and Glorious."* Cleveland: William Taylor & Son, 1920.

Water: Our Thirsty World. Washington, DC: National Geographic Society, April 2010.

IMMIGRATION

ELIZABETH SULLIVAN

Cleveland long has been a city of steel and autos, a city that boomed with ore men, oilmen and corporate titans and then busted not long after the oil price shocks of the 1970s helped push steel onto life support. It's a city whose burning river sparked the cleanup of all the Great Lakes, a place that's finally willing to spark the reinvention of itself through biotech, high-tech, wind energy, green jobs, and medicine.

But through all these years—even going back to 1796 when Moses Cleaveland and his team of land speculators arrived as descendants of English settlers—it's also been a city of immigrants and migrants. Immigrants from England, Germany, Ireland, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia, Hungary, from the Ottoman Empire, and Lebanon, from the South, including the great African-American migrations of the early 1900s, from Lithuania, Latvia, Belarus, Puerto Rico, and Mexico, from the Czech Republic, Romania, Ukraine, Russia, and Italy, from Albania, the ex-Yugoslavia, Guyana, and Jamaica, from Korea, China, and India, from Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and South Africa, from scores of other nations, and from a mix of religions, Judaism to Lutheranism, Catholicism to Buddhism.

These continuing waves of new arrivals helped set Cleveland's cultural tone. They established its first hospitals, houses of worship, and other institutions. They settled neighborhoods that bear their marks to this day in architecture and urban landscapes.

Immigrants stoked the great open hearth furnaces of Cleveland's steel mills and sewed the fabrics that made the city an early center of the garment industry. They worked the docks and the railroads. They brought a multiethnic flavor to city politics—ward heelers heeling by last name and country of origin—but they also created one of the great, high-octane metropolises. They did that through the sheer audacity of what it means to be an immigrant, to leave the familiar place of home and family to find a new start—and then to work together, organizing sometimes by national origin, by family roots, by religion, by language to help seed the small businesses and family stores that propelled jobs from the factories to the street corners.

At one time, Cleveland was home to so many Slovenians that it was the largest “Slovenian” city in the world, surpassing Ljubljana, capital of present-day Slovenia; to so many Hungarians that it was the second largest “Hungarian” city in the world, after Budapest; and to three times as many Slovaks as lived in Bratislava, now capital of an independent Slovakia but that, in 1910, was a largely Germanic and Hungarian city.

They brought their art and music with them: Following the Hungarian and Slovak factory workers to Cleveland were Roma musicians who for decades made Cleveland the New Orleans of the north, their rousing musicians’ funeral processions and plaintive nightclub Gypsy music part of the stimulating mixture of peoples, cultures, and religions that gave the city its flair.

So, too, the progenitors of Cleveland’s diverse button-box accordion and polka music, with Polish, Italian, Czech, German, and Croatian styles, but whose most important heir was Frankie Yankovic and his Cleveland-style Slovenian polka. Yankovic was the son of Slovenian immigrants who’d met in a West Virginian lumber camp and moved to the Collinwood neighborhood of Cleveland in the early 1900s, reportedly after his father’s bootlegging business came to the attention of West Virginia police. It was in Cleveland that the young Yankovic learned the accordion from one of the boarders his father took in to supplement the family’s income from construction work and, later, a hardware store. The National Cleveland-Style Polka Hall of Fame was established in Euclid in 1987, the year after Frankie Yankovic became America’s first recipient of a Grammy for polka music.

The Cleveland Public Library showed the adaptability that was to make it one of the country’s foremost research libraries by quickly adding foreign-language collections to its offerings, starting with German, and then Yiddish, Italian, Hebrew, Czech, and Polish by the early 1900s—expanding rapidly into other languages, from Hungarian and Romanian to Vietnamese and Swahili. According to the *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, the city’s library system was the first in the country to include Belorussian language materials, starting in 1973; by 1995, its foreign-literature offerings, with books in 45 languages, as well as a variety of foreign-language periodicals, tapes, and cassettes, were, according to the online Cleveland encyclopedia article by Jerzy J. Maciuszko, posted at ech.cwru.edu, the most extensive for a public library in the United States.

The presence of so many diverse peoples and religions, and their connections to home countries, also made Cleveland a bridge to world politics. It was in Cleveland that Czechs and Slovaks came together in 1915 to agree, via the Cleveland Pact, on a union of what was to become Czechoslovakia. Then there was the rise to leadership positions within Cleveland’s Jewish community of two influential rabbis who were fierce Zionists, Rabbi Barnett Robert Brickner of the Anshe Chesed congregation and, especially, Lithuanian-born Rabbi Abba Hillel

Silver, who led the Temple in Cleveland for more than four decades. Their intense advocacy for the state of Israel helped win U.S. and U.N. support for creation of a Jewish homeland.

Later in the 20th century, financial support from some ethnic groups in Cleveland became a factor in nationalist movements back home, from the IRA and the Irish nationalist cause against the British in Ireland, to the 1991 Croatian independence struggle. The significance of Cleveland contributions drew to Cleveland two Croatians who later became Croatian president, Franjo Tudjman and Stipe Mesic, as well as Gerry Adams and others from Sinn Fein's top political leadership in Northern Ireland.

Today, as Cleveland tries to reinvent itself as a smarter, savvier, more highly educated, more adaptable 21st-century city, it must not dismiss or overlook the core energy and drive that defines the immigrant experience. Immigrants still are helping to make our neighborhoods tidier, livelier, and more diverse. They are bringing economic focus and jobs. Immigrants—particularly highly educated immigrants, but also entrepreneurial family groups and immigrants who continue to act as a bridge to their home countries for attracting businesses and investors—may be the most overlooked economic drivers, both in Cleveland and the nation, of urban revitalization and future wealth.

Cleveland can do much—and much, much more than it's doing now—to attract and nurture this sort of immigrant. Indeed, such immigrants already are effecting change in Cleveland. If you look closely, you may find them transforming a neighborhood near you.

HISTORY OF IMMIGRATION IN CLEVELAND

As long as Cleveland was a sleepy backwater, it attracted few immigrants apart from those early settlers, who descended largely from original English colonists.

But the Ohio and Erie Canal, which opened in the early 1830s, made Cleveland the important terminus of an economic lifeline extending deep into the country's heartland and linking the city into a nationwide water transport network. Helped by industrial innovations from steel barons who pioneered what could be called the Cleveland system of manufacturing, in which factories no longer had to be located right next to mines or other sources of raw materials, but could take advantage of water transport to move heavy cargo and finished goods long distances, Cleveland boomed.

The expansion of the railroads reinforced the city's manufacturing might, including in chemicals and oil refining—as did the Civil War, with its demands for iron and steel. Cleveland's population exploded, growing almost 90-fold from

1830 to 1870, the year John D. Rockefeller incorporated his Standard Oil company in Cleveland.

From a tiny hamlet modeled on small New England villages with their central squares, Cleveland had transformed into the nation's 15th largest metropolis by 1870, with nearly 93,000 residents. And it was still growing.

In 1920, with a population that had ballooned to nearly 800,000, Cleveland was the nation's 5th largest city. The early decades of the 20th century were the halcyon days of the city's economic power, nationally and internationally, a time during which immigration success paralleled economic success.

Immigrants were attracted not just by jobs, but by earlier waves of immigrants who brought familiar foods and other cultural attributes with them. Yet immigration was not just a mirror for Cleveland's power. Immigrants themselves also enhanced the city's economic prospects through their work ethics, craftsmanship, deep sense of social and religious structure, and other skills. Many of Cleveland's earliest hospitals were started by German church groups, including the former German Hospital in Fairview Park, now Fairview Park Hospital, and Lutheran Hospital on the near West Side. So were its breweries.

Well-educated dissidents from the unsuccessful 1848 revolutions in Europe and their descendants put their distinctive mark on the intellectual life of Cleveland. One such was physicist Albert Abraham Michelson, whose Jewish family emigrated in 1855 from Strelno, Prussia (later Strzelno, Poland), when he was a toddler, settling first in Western mining camps. In 1907, Michelson became the first American to win a Nobel Prize in the sciences, for his physics experiments at Cleveland's Case School of Applied Science, measuring the speed of light.

The skills of old-world craftsmen can still be seen in the stonemasonry of LakeView Cemetery monuments, many carved by Italian masters who settled in nearby Murray Hill, and the incredible carved wood, iron, and stone work and murals of the city's ethnic houses of worship, from the intricately carved imported German white oak installed in the 1890s that decorates the interior of the old St. Stephen's Church on West 54th Street—a church for which German craftsmen used locally available wood and iron in place of traditional stone interiors, according to *Cleveland Sacred Landmarks* by Cleveland State University researchers—to the elaborate carvings and hand-hewn red oak pews lovingly created by Polish craftsmen for the Shrine Church of St. Stanislaus in the Little Warsaw section of Slavic Village. Not to mention the massive stone blocks hoisted by Italian immigrant brawn that in the 1950s became St. Rocco's Church on the West Side.

Sadly, some ethnic churches with their hand-carved woodwork, marbles, and distinctive stained glass and murals were closed as part of the 2009–2010 retrenchment by the Cleveland Catholic Diocese, in which 50 Roman Catholic parishes in the diocese were closed or merged because of declining numbers of

worshippers. The closures were an especially poignant commentary on the relative loss of population in neighborhoods of Cleveland originally settled by immigrants; affected parishes were home to some of the city's oldest Catholic churches built by Eastern European immigrants between 1880 and 1930—a period when the owners of Cleveland's mills actively recruited Czech, Polish, Croatian, and other migrants.

Yet the city's diverse artistic heritage finds ongoing expression in a variety of ethnic arts displays—from the folk-art, costumery, and ceramics of the Romanian Ethnic Art Museum on the West Side, the Hungarian Museum in Tremont, and the Czech and Slovak Bohemian Hall on Broadway to the annual Cleveland Fine Art Expo of African-American and ethnic art. A thousand years of Jewish culture in Europe, largely eradicated by the Holocaust, is celebrated not just in the city's temples, but also in the Maltz Museum of Jewish Culture in Beachwood.

The city's revitalized cultural gardens along Martin Luther King Jr. Drive from Lake Erie to University Circle now include a restored statue of Marie Curie by Polish sculptor Frank L. Jirouche, an arresting stainless steel bowl-like sculpture entitled "Hearth" that was unveiled in 2008 by Azerbaijani artist Khanlar Gasimov, and, next to it, the local Armenian-American contribution, the 2009 geometric "Alphabet" sculpture by architect Berj Shakarian.

But immigrants to Cleveland didn't just impact the city's religious life and its arts and intellectual culture.

TAMMANY CLEVELAND

The tight-knit nature of some immigrant groups also translated into influence on city politics, with the Irish in particular adept at turning numbers into political clout. Robert E. McKisson, Cleveland mayor from 1895 to 1898, although himself descended from settlers of probable Scots-Irish derivation who'd arrived in northern Summit County early in the 19th century, ran one of the country's earliest—albeit, shortest-lived—political machines based upon the tight-knit Irish immigrant community.

Even after that machine unwound at the end of the 19th century, ethnic political power persisted through ward heelers from neighborhoods of immigrants, whether Polish, Italian, Irish, or Hungarian. The ethnic loyalties were reinforced by the tendency of many immigrants to follow in the wake of friends, neighbors, or family, effectively transporting village and kinship loyalties to Northeast Ohio.

Most Irish immigrants to Cleveland, for instance, came from one county in Ireland—Mayo—and many of them were from the even tinier Achill Island off the Mayo coast. In 1995, when *Plain Dealer* reporter Mike O'Malley asked school children in one classroom on Achill Island to raise their hands if they had family members in Cleveland, almost every child raised a hand. A plaque on the wall of

a Catholic church on the island thanked donors to the church's 1964–1965 restoration, “especially our exiles in Cleveland.”

The tiny hamlet of Aitaneet in the Bekaa valley of present-day Lebanon exported most of its sons and daughters to just a handful of destinations—Cleveland, Montreal, or Detroit.

Likewise, many of Cleveland's Italian immigrants traced from a small number of towns in Sicily and the Campania and Abruzzi regions. Gene P. Veronesi in his 1977 book, *Italian-Americans and their Communities of Cleveland*, cites Josef Barton's seminal 1975 study of differing patterns of immigration to Cleveland as indicating that half of all Italian immigrants to the city arrived from just 10 villages in southern Italy. That was in contrast to Romanian and Slovak migration patterns to Cleveland, in which such relationship chains were relatively rare.

For the Irish and Italians and some other immigrant groups, such as Croatians and Slovenians who came from relatively small Balkan enclaves, the propinquity of origin and destination helped solidify political power, and perpetuate ties with the “old country.”

John J. Grabowski of Case Western Reserve University and the Western Reserve Historical Society, the area's leading expert on immigration and settlement patterns in Cleveland, has charted how these migration chains impacted Cleveland area neighborhoods, for decades drawing waves of related immigrants to certain addresses, intersections, and city areas. These ranged from “Dutch Hill” and “The Angle”—the city's oldest Irish neighborhood—both on the West Side, to the St. Clair (Croatian, Slovenian, and Serbian), Kinsman (Jewish), Cedar Central (African-American), and Buckeye (Hungarian) neighborhoods on the East Side.

In Lakewood, the “Bird's Nest” neighborhood was created more or less as a company neighborhood by the old National Carbon Company (later Union Carbide), which in the 1890s laid out the streets named for birds, as part of a recruitment drive of Slovak factory workers.

Some of these settlement patterns persist to this day. The St. Clair neighborhood east of downtown continued to attract Balkan immigrants from Serbia, Albania, Bosnia, and Croatia throughout the Yugoslav wars of the 1990s.

Although the Buckeye neighborhood near Shaker Square now is largely African-American—four of every five residents—2 percent still listed Hungarian ancestry in the 2000 census.

Politicians with eastern European roots continue to exercise influence: Joe Cimperman, first elected to Cleveland City Council in 1997, is a first-generation Slovenian—as was former Ohio Governor Frank Lausche decades before him. Lausche became the first Cleveland mayor of eastern European descent, when he was elected in 1941.

Former Cleveland mayor and seven-term (as of 2010) congressman Dennis Kucinich is a second-generation Croatian, while the politician who unseated Kucinich as Cleveland mayor, George Voinovich, who then became a two-term Ohio governor and two-term U.S. senator, is descended from Slovenes and ethnic Serbs from Croatia.

Immigration continues from eastern Europe to this day, notably Germans, Romanians, Russians, Italians, and Poles following co-nationals to Cleveland.

In the early 20th century, area steel mills also began recruiting in the Western Hemisphere, primarily in Mexico.

Large-scale Puerto Rican migration to Cleveland and Lorain began after World War II, when area auto and steel plants such as National Tube Company, later part of U.S. Steel, recruited heavily in the Commonwealth, whose residents have been U.S. citizens since 1917 (many serving in the U.S. armed forces in both world wars and in every war since).

As of 2008, the U.S. Census Bureau estimated that more than 34,000 people of Puerto Rican heritage or birth lived in Cuyahoga County, making it the 28th largest county for Puerto Rican residence in the United States—and the primary reason the U.S. Justice Department demanded in 2010 that Cuyahoga County begin printing all election ballots in both English and Spanish.

But large blocs of immigrants also have come from the Palestinian territories, Jamaica, Vietnam, Ukraine, China, the Philippines, India, Guatemala, Somalia, West Africa, Bosnia, and Iraq—to mention only some.

The Cuyahoga County Board of Elections began providing Russian- and Chinese-language speakers in some voting districts. And despite the U.S. Justice Department's focus on the voting rights of Spanish-speaking voters of Puerto Rican descent, the Cleveland neighborhood with the highest percentage of residents with deficient English skills in the 2000 census was the Little Asia neighborhood of Goodrich/Kirtland Park on the near East Side, where Chinese and other East Asian languages are the impediment. That neighborhood ranked first in Cleveland in 2000 both in number of foreign-born residents and in number of Asian immigrants, the bulk from mainland China.

NO WELCOME MAT FOR IMMIGRANTS

All has not been smooth sailing for new arrivals to Cleveland, even in the years when immigration boomed. Immigrants to Cleveland confronted discrimination in housing, employment, and education, and attempts by some white Protestant groups to acculturate other groups, both linguistically and religiously. Often, immigrants experienced infighting within their own immigrant communities over ideology and religion.

The Cleveland Encyclopedia, prepared for the city's Bicentennial in 1996, says that bilingual education was offered in Cleveland public schools as early as 1870—not for altruistic reasons, but as an attempt to induce the city's large Germanic population to abandon nationality schools taught only in German and to assimilate to English-language education instead.

Protestants sent “missions” into ethnic neighborhoods while the city's Catholic diocese, under its first bishop, French-born Louis Amadeus Rappe, resisted in the late 19th century setting up ethnic parishes—until lobbying of Rome by the city's Germans and Irish ended the prohibition. By 1908, *The Cleveland Encyclopedia* reports, more than half the city's Roman Catholic parishes were “nationality” parishes, rather than neighborhood ones.

Adding to the diversity were the early 20th-century migrations of African-Americans to Cleveland, seeking the opportunities denied them in a South constricted by Reconstruction and later Jim Crow. This wholesale migration, following the rail lines north, established in Cleveland what scholar Kimberly Phillips called “Alabama North,” in her award-winning 1999 book of that name, describing the impact of this migration chain. It indelibly affected neighborhoods from Central to Mount Pleasant. More than half of all southern blacks in the Great Migration northward in 1916–1918 came to just five cities, Phillips writes—Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit, New York, and Pittsburgh.

African-Americans brought with them their southern customs, cooking, music, and values, including a focus on the church and family as the center of the community. They also made Cleveland a locus of black intellectual life, ranging from author Charles Chestnutt, born in Cleveland in 1858, to Langston Hughes, who in the early part of the 20th century boarded in a number of homes on the East Side of Cleveland, as he worked for his education.

But by 1915, reversing earlier, more liberal trends, black migrants to Cleveland faced a backlash of intense prejudice in finding homes, jobs, and cultural and educational acceptance. Unlike the assimilation efforts aimed at most immigrants, African-Americans faced closed doors and extreme segregation, from beaches to neighborhoods, schools, and educational avenues of mobility. The effects of this segregation remain painfully apparent to this day in the many Cleveland neighborhoods that are more than 95 percent African-American.

Cleveland's ethnic enclaves also boiled with rivalries that reflected conflicts in home countries. These were seen in Cleveland Slovaks' successful 1902 veto of the Hungarian community's attempt to build a statue on Public Square honoring Hungarian nationalist Lajos Kossuth—the statue was built at University Circle instead. Slovaks had successfully mobilized against the monument by lobbying many of the Cleveland region's Slavs, whose countrymen had been absorbed into the Austro-Hungarian empire.

Immigrant Jews of German origin who favored more liberal tenets and assimilation confronted, sometimes uncomfortably, newer arrivals from eastern Europe with more conservative religious notions, and deeper social needs.

Serbian Orthodox Christians split down the middle into an anti-Communist church that opposed anything emanating from then-Communist Yugoslavia and those who still looked to the home-country church for guidance. This split was resolved only by the wave of Serbian nationalism that arose during the 1990s Yugoslav wars.

IMMIGRATION AS AN ECONOMIC DRIVER

In the America of the early 21st century, immigration has become a negative word, often paired with the adjective “illegal.”

Yet this attitude obscures the real trends in U.S. immigration, ignores the stabilizing, family-friendly, and entrepreneurial nature of most immigrants, and diminishes the positive impact that immigrants can make, especially in communities such as Philadelphia that have worked hard to attract well-educated, well-heeled immigrants, who can make an immediate economic difference.

Recent studies of immigration trends by think tanks as diverse as the conservative Hoover Institution and Rand Corporation and the liberal Brookings Institution suggest that only in states such as California that are overwhelmed by very poor immigrants with low educational attainment has immigration become a net drain on the economy. One inference from these findings is that a smarter economic strategy would be to do more to erase discrimination and to lift other barriers to productive employment for these poorer immigrants, including a greater investment in education, thereby making them net contributors.

Yet immigration is changing. In many if not most U.S. cities, the studies suggest, a new generation of what might be called new-economy immigrants is expanding economic opportunities for all residents by creating new companies, revitalizing neighborhoods, driving the new innovation economy, and attracting investments from overseas.

So even as the stereotypical view persists that immigrants take jobs from native citizens, immigration is changing fundamentally into a value-added proposition.

The Brookings studies in particular suggest that post-1990 immigration has drawn educated immigrant groups not just to cities such as Philadelphia, Boston, and Indianapolis, which have specific programs to lure them, but also to Cleveland, where the city’s emerging power in biotech and affordable neighborhoods close to Cleveland State University and Case Western Reserve University have attracted clusters of highly-educated immigrant Indians, Chinese, and others. Immigrants within these clusters then lure other immigrants to provide the food and services

they crave. And these new-economy immigrants, initially drawn by educational opportunities, later team to start their own firms, including the next generation of high-tech startups.

In the 2000 census, the Cleveland neighborhood with the highest percentage of foreign-born residents—14.5 percent—was the University Circle area around CWRU, the Cleveland Clinic, and University Hospitals. (The top five non-native nationalities living there were Chinese, Indian, Russian, Japanese, and Thai, in that order.) More than three-quarters of this population had immigrated since 1990, in contrast with the city's older immigrant neighborhoods, such as South Collinwood, where 41 percent of the foreign-born arrived before 1965.

In marked contrast with their 19th-century counterparts, these new-economy immigrants tend to think globally in how they see their roles, their firms, and their personal opportunities. That's certainly true of Japan-born, CWRU-educated physicist Hiroyuki Fujita, who in 2006 started Quality Electrodynamics LLC in his CWRU lab, making parts for Magnetic Resonance Imaging machines. Now headquartered in Mayfield Village, QED is one of the Cleveland region's biotech success stories. Yet Fujita didn't draw inspiration from the old Cleveland manufacturing system. Instead, as he told Mary Vanac of Cleveland's *Medcity News* in a 2010 interview, he drew the model for his firm from one of Japan's early globalists, the entrepreneur-philanthropist Kazuo Inamori, who in 1959 founded a Kyoto ceramics company that was to become the electronics giant Kyocera.

Brookings studies of the impact of such immigrants suggest that the communities that are best able to attract and retain new-economy migrants will see a huge economic spinoff in job creation and innovation. These impacts can happen organically, but Brookings notes that Philadelphia has greatly accelerated them, using a welcome center to recruit and retain immigrants.

Yet even as Philadelphia and other cities worked hard in recent years to attract immigrants, Cleveland lagged, without the political will and vision to make similar moves, and with Cleveland Mayor Frank Jackson late to the table on the immigration issue. Fortunately the Cleveland area's Jewish community—which helped assimilate tens of thousands of Russian Jews and has successfully used immigrant ties to Israel to attract Israeli medical businesses to locate in Cleveland—in mid-2010 stepped forward with a strategic study and plan to establish an International Welcome Center in Cleveland.

At the same time, immigrant Eddy Zai of Pepper Pike was setting up the Cleveland International Fund to take advantage of a U.S. program that offers green cards, a step toward citizenship, to foreign investors who sink substantial sums in depressed parts of the United States. Zai recruited potential Cleveland investors in countries as diverse as England, India, and China. The result: a \$20 million initial investment in 2010 in the Flats East Bank project, a critical component of that project's financing. Zai expected to pull together millions more in

immigrant investments for that East Bank redevelopment as well as for health-care opportunities, real estate, and movie-making efforts in Cleveland.

Zai's personal story of immigrant success may, unfortunately, have been necessary to counteract perceptions overseas that Cleveland is not welcoming to immigrants. That view has gained currency in China, in particular, because of the prominent opposition of Cleveland-area politicians such as Senator Sherrod Brown to recent free-trade deals and aspects of U.S. trade relations with China.

These perceptions may be inaccurate—the Cleveland region relies heavily on exports to support tens of thousands of jobs in steel, metalworking, chemical, appliances, large machinery, and other industries, and Brown says he supports free but fair trade. The city continues to welcome immigrants, with the help of the networks of prior immigrants, who tend to form entrepreneurial as well as political and cultural bonds.

However, such perceptions underscore how critical it is for a metropolis to be seen as a player on the international stage—not simply as a place where the barricades are up.

The truth is that Cleveland is competing successfully in the tech-oriented immigrant bazaar, thanks to its biomed and university anchors and the entrepreneurial dollars that have been attracted by state-supported Third Frontier seed money. But how far it has to go was made clear by a recent book, *Immigrant, Inc.*, by Cleveland authors Richard T. Herman, an immigration lawyer, and Robert L. Smith, a *Plain Dealer* reporter.

Herman and Smith subtitled their 2010 book *Why Immigrant Entrepreneurs Are Driving the New Economy (and how they will save the American worker)*. The authors' numbers are striking:

- Immigrants make up 12 percent of the total U.S. population but “nearly half of all scientists and engineers with doctorate degrees.”
- Nearly one-fourth of Silicon Valley startups during the computer boom of 1980–1998 were started by immigrants from India and China.
- Immigrants helped launch an astounding 25 percent of all new technology and engineering firms nationwide from 1995 to 2005. That figure was higher in California (39 percent), New Jersey (38 percent), and Massachusetts (29 percent). In Ohio, it was 14 percent.
- In 2006, noncitizen immigrants were listed as inventors or co-inventors of 24 percent of U.S.-filed international patent applications. That compared with 7 percent in 1998.

Herman and Smith contrast Cleveland City Hall's closed door to immigration policy with the open door of Philadelphia, which "welcomed 113,000 immigrants between 2000 and 2006," while Cleveland lost "another 7 percent of its population and became almost entirely native-born."

Fortunately, the Brookings studies suggest that cities can quickly alter their immigration profile through astute policies.

In this regard, Cleveland, where many pre-1965 immigrants retain ties to the "old country," has assets that other cities do not. In its most vibrant neighborhoods, the city retains the character of an ethnic mixing pot. And diversity can mean a big payoff in neighborhood revitalization.

Cleveland Council Member Matt Zone, for instance, attributes the recent development successes in the Detroit-Shoreway neighborhood that he represents on the West Side—the neighborhood that has seen construction of one of the biggest concentrations of new housing in Cleveland, and the advent of trendy eateries and restored theaters as part of the Gordon Square Arts District—to planners' efforts to retain economic, racial, and ethnic diversity. A small Italian neighborhood complete with backyard bocce courts exists side-by-side with upscale homes for young professionals. Subsidized housing was included in the planning, and the neighborhood should get a further boost by plans to turn the West Shoreway into a more pedestrian- and bike-friendly mall, with easier access to the Lake Erie shoreline.

No major ethnic or racial group dominates in Detroit-Shoreway, with 23 percent of residents listing Hispanic heritage, 18 percent African-American, 13 percent Irish, 12 percent German, and 7 percent Italian in the 2000 census. And the neighborhood continues to attract immigrants—with more than 1,000 foreign-born residents as of 2000, the largest numbers from Romania, Mexico, Italy, Guatemala, and Nicaragua.

Immigrants don't just seed new businesses. They're also a key driver of population growth—highly desirable in an advanced industrial nation such as the United States that has a low birth rate, since it helps assure that jobs will be filled by working-age people supporting social programs, even as the native-born population ages. The importance of immigration as a population driver was underscored in 2009 when, in part because of declining immigration tied to the Great Recession, the U.S. birthrate dipped to its lowest level in at least a century, 13.5 births for every 1,000 people.

In 1900, according to the Brookings Institution, Cleveland was the nation's fifth most important immigrant gateway city, with nearly 33 percent of its population foreign-born.

In 2006, it wasn't even in the top 10.

But that can change.

Philadelphia—the country’s third largest immigrant gateway in 1900—initially fell as fast and as hard as Cleveland, to become another rusty former gateway and aging industrial city fallen on tough times. Yet Philadelphia changed that trajectory through policies focused on attracting immigrants to revitalize neighborhoods and seed jobs, doubling its foreign-born population after 1970, with 45 percent growth in the 1990s alone.

Cleveland can do the same—or better, building on assets it already has.

It not only can, it must.

Immigration isn’t a negative word. It’s a word that spells opportunity, growth, jobs, and the future. It has done that for Cleveland before. It can do so again.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

vs. HOME RULE

JOE FROLIK

In the summer of 2004 a lot of the people who had labored to create Cleveland's much-touted "comeback" in the 1990s were dismayed—if not exactly shocked—when a new Census Bureau report declared it to be America's poorest city. Christopher Warren was no exception.

Warren started out as a community organizer in Tremont long before Barack Obama gave that career path a patina of Ivy League cool and long, long before the words trendy and Tremont became joined at the hip. The Tremont Warren worked in was an aging neighborhood of poor white ethnics, isolated from the rest of Cleveland by geography, crumbling roads and closed bridges.

Then in 1990, newly elected Mayor Michael R. White invited him to join his first Cabinet as director of community development. After years of organizing protests against bankers, downtown developers and political power-brokers, Warren was literally at the table with them.

The decade that followed was a heady time for White, Warren—who eventually became his economic development director—and the city of Cleveland. Blessed with a friendly Republican governor in Columbus (former Cleveland Mayor George Voinovich), a powerful member of the House Appropriations Committee in Washington (Louis B. Stokes, the brother of another former Cleveland mayor), a Democratic president who understood the importance of Ohio's electoral votes (Bill Clinton) and a willing partner at the Cuyahoga County Board of Commissioners (Tim Hagan), White's administration marched one big project after another across the finishing line: The Gateway complex of new homes for the Indians and Cavaliers, the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum and the Great Lakes Science Center, the rebirth of Tower City and a new Cleveland Browns Stadium.

But for all the energy and money that went into downtown, White never lost sight of the city's neighborhoods. With Warren as his consigliere and the Community Reinvestment Act as his muscle, he leaned hard on local banks to reverse decades of redlining. On their watch, the first new, market-rate housing in anyone's memory was built in Cleveland neighborhoods. The new Mill Creek

subdivision in South Broadway, clusters of upscale townhouses in Tremont and Ohio City, even the rambling McMansions of Hough rivaled anything developers were building in Cleveland's suburbs. More new houses were built in Cleveland (850) between 1995 and 1997 than in Brunswick (839), Strongsville (838), Avon (798) or Twinsburg (746).

But all that did not reverse decades of middle-class flight. Cleveland's population dropped during the 1990s as it had in every decade since 1950—to below 500,000 for the first time since 1900. Because so many of those left behind were poorly educated and lacked the skills needed in the modern workplace, Cleveland became an older and poorer city as it hollowed out. That was the snapshot taken by the Census Bureau's American Community Survey. The numbers really should have been no surprise—even at the height of its “comeback,” Cleveland had been always been among the 10 poorest cities, if you were simply looking at the income of those people who actually lived within its city limits.

To Warren, part of the problem was where those limits had been drawn many decades ago. Unlike Columbus—whose seemingly elastic boundaries were a source of endless fascination and frustration to him and many of those with whom he served at City Hall—Cleveland was locked in by suburbs. It encompassed only 77 square miles—barely a third the footprint of Columbus. That meant that when a business told Warren's economic development department that it needed more land to expand, he often had nothing to show within the city limits except brownfields that would require years of expensive, environmental clean-up. In Columbus, his counterparts would have plenty of options, including open space—greenfields, in the lexicon of development—where a business could build immediately, add payroll and start paying more taxes. Warren took great pride in one modern office park he did manage to develop—Cleveland Enterprise Park—but that was on land that the city happened to own in suburban Highland Hills.

Just imagine, Warren mused one day at lunch, if Cleveland's boundaries were not the meandering zig-zag that appears on maps today, but squared off like those of most cities. Just imagine if the city limits stretched from the Rocky River on the west to SOM Center Road on the east and from the shores of Lake Erie south to Interstate 480.

“I don't think anybody would be talking about Cleveland as the poorest city in the country then,” said Warren, pointing out that neither county nor the metropolitan area had poverty rates above the national averages. “We'd look pretty good.”

Well, thank you, Tom Johnson.

A century after he left City Hall, Tom Loftin Johnson remains the gold standard against which every Cleveland mayor—and maybe every mayor in America—is measured. Elected in 1901, after making a fortune operating private

streetcar systems in Cleveland and other cities, Johnson turned Progressive movement ideals into concrete political action.

He created municipal utilities and public baths, enforced inspection standards for meat and milk, built playgrounds in crowded immigrant neighborhoods, expanded the city's park system and—convinced that city dwellers occasionally needed a dose of bucolic country life—purchased the land in far eastern Cuyahoga County on which Chris Warren would one day locate the back offices of downtown banks. He promoted Daniel Burnham's Group Plan for public spaces and public buildings downtown. He turned City Hall into a laboratory for innovation and a showcase for how an city could and should be run. Even the great muckraking journalist Lincoln Steffens declared Johnson to be "the best mayor of the best-governed city in America."

Oh yes. And he also pushed for Home Rule.

For the century before Johnson took office, Ohio law had constricted the power of city governments. The state had a hodge-podge approach to issuing municipal charters, which resulted in wildly inconsistent rules for what individual cities could or could not do. The state also retained the right to override local laws, giving it final say over anything that Cleveland or any other city might decide to do. It even dictated the structure of local government.

This bothered Johnson and his allies on two levels. Their Progressive ideals held that people should have as much say as possible over how they were governed. Thus the idea that officials in faraway Columbus could override the will of Clevelanders was an affront to their notions of democracy. Ohio's cities, Plain Dealer associate editor Arthur B. Shaw would write in 1916, were "handicapped and humiliated. They were governed by a Legislature controlled by rural members"—a complaint still heard today.

On a more practical level, Johnson and the many able people he brought to City Hall—his most notable protégés included Newton D. Baker and Dr. Harris Cooley—believed that they were more than capable of running Cleveland without the big brother of state government looking over their shoulders. When it came to the daily work city government, they wanted to be left alone. "Home rule" was the first plank in Johnson's 1901 platform, but try as he did, he never managed to sell it to Ohio as a whole.

That task eventually fell to Baker, who was elected mayor in 1911, two years after Johnson had been defeated for re-election and just months after his death. Baker convinced Ohio's 1912 Constitutional Convention to add strong home rule language to the state's newly amended governing document. It gave cities wide latitude to do almost anything that did not conflict with the general laws of the state and federal governments. With Baker stumping throughout the state, the new amendments were approved by voters that fall.

The victory freed Baker and his administration to do what they were already doing rather well—govern the city efficiently and innovatively. Baker became chairman of Cleveland’s first Charter Commission and helped draft a document that did away with partisan ballots or labels in municipal elections. It was swiftly ratified by city voters and Baker, initially elected as a Democrat like Johnson, served a second term before heading off to Washington as Woodrow Wilson’s Secretary of War.

The city he left behind was unquestionably well-governed and booming. Cleveland’s population had mushroomed from 381,000 in 1900—just before Johnson’s election—to 560,000 in 1910 on its way to 797,000 in 1920. By the end of World War I, it was the fifth-largest city in the country. Its steel mills, factories and port pulsated with energy and activity. Immigrants, especially from eastern Europe, poured in to fill all those jobs. Entrepreneurs and inventors sprouted like weeds in a city that might fairly be called the Silicon Valley of the Industrial Age.

But all that economic and political success, says Cleveland State University urban affairs professor Norman Krumholz, helped set in motion the city’s eventual decline and some of the problems that bedevil it now in the Information Age.

As more and more people moved in to the city and the output of its factories increased, so did the unpleasant by-products of rapid urbanization and industrialization. Neighborhoods became overcrowded. Pollution darkened the skies and befouled the air. Faced with these obvious quality of life issues, those who could afford to, moved away from the sources of irritation.

Initially, they didn’t move very far. When Cleveland was basically a walking city, only the wealthiest could afford to live even a short distance from their livelihoods—hence the “Millionaires Row” that sprouted along Euclid Avenue just east of downtown after the Civil War. But first street cars and then commuter rail systems pushed the practical boundaries of where a white-collar worker could live. “Finally, the automobile comes along and blows the place apart,” says Krumholz, who was Cleveland’s planning director under Mayors Carl B. Stokes, Ralph Perk and Dennis Kucinich. In 1900, only 50,000 Cuyahoga County residents did not live within the city limits; by 1920, that number had tripled. It would double again during the run up to the Great Depression.

But if those who might have wanted to move beyond the city limits had motive and means—and Cleveland was surely not the only big city where they did—the success of Johnson and Baker and their “home rule” triumph also provided added incentive.

Within a year of Johnson’s election, a cordon of suburbs began to tighten around Cleveland. By 1911, Linndale, Bay, Bratenahl, Brooklyn Heights, Lakewood, Cleveland Heights, Newburgh Heights, North Olmsted, North Randall, Idlewood (later University Heights), Fairview Park, Shaker Heights and

Dover (later Westlake) had all incorporated as villages. For many, full city status would come by the end of the “Roaring ’20’s.”

By contrast, when the small, lakeside village of Nottingham, at the western edge of what it now the city of Euclid, merged into Cleveland in 1912—a few years after the formerly independent communities of South Brooklyn, Glenville and Collinwood had been annexed because their residents wanted the better public services Johnson’s administration was providing—the city as it still stands a century later was essentially complete.

Charles Zettek Jr. of the Center for Governmental Research in Rochester, N.Y., has studied the proliferation of governments across America’s once-booming industrial heartland from New England through the upper Midwest—the Rust Belt, if you must. In city after city, as people moved away from the old urban core, they set up new governments that pretty much mirrored what they had known. The New Englanders who settled the Western Reserve brought along a tradition of autonomous villages and multiple layers of government. The European immigrants who followed had learned about turf from big-city political machines. And those moving out of Cleveland at the beginning of the 20th century had heard the Progressive gospel of “home rule” and seen the value of a well-run City Hall—though the fact that there may not have been enough Tom L. Johnsons and Newton D. Bakers to go around probably didn’t seem so obvious to them at the moment of creation.

Mixed together here—in a region where ethnic and class divisions were never too far from the surface—those ideas and experiences led to suburbanization as Balkanization. Many Cleveland suburbs essentially began as ethnic enclaves that resolutely reproduced the old cultures in which their new residents were steeped. You can see it today in the eastern European architecture of Parma and the Tudor homes of Shaker Heights. “The whole idea was that you could control your environment” by using tools such as zoning that Progressives and their city planning movement had pioneered to make urban design more rational and improve the quality of life and city services, says Hunter Morrison, who followed Krumholz as planning director to Voinovich and White.

“The Vans”—brothers Oris and Mantis Van Sweringen, developers of Shaker Square, Shaker Heights, the Shaker Rapid line and Terminal Tower—“used home rule and zoning very explicitly as a way of differentiating the new community they were building in Shaker,” says Morrison. “The whole idea was that you could control your environment. You could have a nice house without the people you didn’t want as neighbors.” For decades, exclusionary zoning and covenants limited the presence of blacks and Jews in Shaker Heights.

Other communities may have been slightly less overt, but Morrison says the goal of incorporation was often very clearly to create an enclave for “our people.” Sometimes that was people who looked or prayed alike. Other times,

the restrictions were more economic in nature. Early on, East Cleveland and Lakewood banned apartment houses. Almost everywhere the implicit message was: Leave us alone.

“The impetus for zoning in Northeast Ohio was exclusion,” American Planning Association researcher—and Cleveland native—Stuart Meck told a City Club audience in 2002. “It was about keeping out people that we didn’t like, who lived in residences we didn’t care for, or who worshipped in a manner that made us uncomfortable.”

The great migration of African Americans out of the South that began around the time of World War I added another layer to the distrust that came to divide Greater Cleveland. Very few suburbs welcomed blacks; most quite frankly would resist until the Civil Rights Movement and the laws it produced forced them to change. But as decades passed and the city’s black population—largely segregated within Cleveland, too, thanks to race-conscious real estate agents and even federal housing programs—grew larger and more politically prominent, the urban-suburban gulf grew wider.

By the beginning of the 1960s, the sight of once solid neighborhoods in decline confirmed to many suburbanites that they had made the right decision to get out of Cleveland. Any remaining doubts vanished in 1966 and 1968 when riots, fires and gunshots ravaged Hough and Glenville, two East Side neighborhoods that had once included some of the city’s finest—and most integrated—addresses. Nuanced discussions of job discrimination, police racism and overcrowded housing had little impact on that mindset.

The nadir may have come shortly after the riots when the Stokes administration issued its “fair share” proposal for scattering public housing throughout Cuyahoga County. The lion’s share of the new units proposed by the administration—in conjunction with the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority, a nominally countywide-agency—would have been located within the city, included some in all-white West Side neighborhoods. But about a dozen units were even allocated to exclusive upper-crust Hunting Valley. It was regionalism on steroids—or perhaps, considering that it was the 1960s, on hallucinogens.

Krumholz remembers calling a meeting to discuss the proposal, inviting every suburban political leader he could think of and having no one from outside the city show up “except good old Seth Taft (the Republican county commissioner who had lost to Stokes in 1967). Everyone else answered in the newspapers.” That message from suburbia was pretty clear: Over our dead bodies.

Home rule, the great goal of Cleveland’s greatest mayor, had reached its logical conclusion.

Those who wonder what Cleveland could have done differently to exert more control over its fate often point to Columbus. It is important to note that until the late 20th century, Columbus was a much smaller city. In 1900, Ohio’s capital had

only 130,000 residents. By 1950, when Cleveland hit its peak of about 900,000 residents, Columbus had a population of 376,000. It was still largely surrounded by farmland. And that gave Maynard Edward (Jack) Sensenbrenner the opening he needed.

Sensenbrenner was a political novice who shocked the Columbus establishment when he was elected mayor in 1953. For starters, he was a Democrat, the city's first since the height of the Depression, elected by fewer than 400 votes after one of the first municipal campaigns anywhere to make extensive use of television. Maybe his ground-breaking campaign style should have been a clue that Sensenbrenner had his eye on the future. In any case, he moved quickly to secure his city's future.

Convinced that any city that wanted to control its destiny needed to have room to grow and the ability to manage that growth, Sensenbrenner made water his weapon of choice. The former Fuller Brush salesman decreed that any community, neighborhood or subdivision that wanted to tap into the Columbus water system or its sewers first had to agree to be annexed by the city. By the time Sensenbrenner left office in 1972—his service interrupted for four years after he lost a re-election bid in 1960—Columbus had grown from 39 square miles to 135. Today, it is more 210 square miles, sprawls into three counties and is still growing. While Cleveland is home to barely a third of Cuyahoga County residents, Columbus still accounts for two-thirds of Franklin County's population.

Columbus' annexation strategy certainly does not explain its economic success—being the home of two massive, essentially recession-proof jobs engines like state government and a huge public research university is a pretty nice base for any metro area, as residents of Austin and Madison can also testify. And covering so much ground clearly makes it more challenging to deliver some city services. But it also means that Columbus can offer potential residents or investors a far wider array of options than Cleveland can—and that keeps them and their tax dollars coming.

In simplest terms, says Morrison, who's now teaching at Youngstown State University and advising Mahoning Valley leaders on how to rebuild their decimated corner of Ohio, "The energy (of development) goes to the new"—and when a business or a developer wants to build something new in Central Ohio, Columbus has room for them to do it. Without space to grow, adds Krumholz, even the most innovative mayors hit a brick wall: "As your population goes down and your housing ages, you want, you need, to redevelop, to rebuild your aging infrastructure. But you can't because your tax base is going down, too."

Could Cleveland have done what Columbus did and essentially forced its suburbs back into the fold of what former Mayor Jane Campbell used to call the "mother city?" After all, Cleveland's Division of Water provides water to most of Cuyahoga County as well parts of several adjacent counties.

In theory, the answer is yes. But the reality is that Cleveland's leaders faced their moment of decision much earlier than Columbus and Sensenbrenner did. Based on the view from their City Hall, Cleveland's leaders—including the sainted Johnson and Baker, who were in charge when the suburban fence around the city began rising—chose to see water as a commodity to be sold, a profit center that enabled them to serve their own citizens better. To them, more suburbs meant more customers. Keep in mind that Cleveland in those days wasn't built out either. There were still vast tracts of vacant land within its city limits; much of what are now the West Park and Lee-Harvard neighborhoods were not developed until after World War II. And almost no one in pre-war America could have anticipated the emergence or the impact of the freeway which allowed Greater Cleveland to sprawl east, west and south—while Cleveland's 77 square miles could not change.

Only lately, at the beginning of the 21st century, have Cleveland leaders begun to think of ways to leverage the fact that their water system is in fact a regional asset. Campbell established a joint development district in Summit County, agreeing to supply water to a new office park in Richfield in return for a share of tax dollars generated there. Her successor, Frank Jackson, struck a major blow for regional thinking when he offered to assume the cost maintaining water lines in any community that agreed not to “poach” employers from other cities in the region by using tax abatements or other incentives. Some suburbs, especially those in the “inner-ring” around Cleveland, quickly signed on. But some of the most affluent cities have been slow to come the party.

Their reluctance underscores a long-standing problem of Cleveland and many other older cities. It's one thing to talk about regionalism, it's another to live it.

Look at it this way: advocates of regionalism—a frankly mushy term that can mean everything from support for Indianapolis-style uni-gov to a vague sense that economically, at least, this is a single labor market—love to point out that when people from Greater Cleveland travel and someone asks where they're from, they generally say “Cleveland.”

And on many levels, that's true. We all root for the Cleveland Indians, the Cleveland Browns and the Cleveland Cavaliers. Our children take field trips to the Cleveland Metroparks Zoo and the Cleveland Museum of Art. We impress visitors by taking them to the Cleveland Orchestra and the Cleveland Air Show. When a LeBron James disses Cleveland, the pain extends far beyond even the borders that might exist in Chris Warren's wildest dreams.

The problem, of course, is that when those same travelers get home and someone asks where they're from, the answer is likely to be some very specific community. In Cuyahoga County alone, there are 58 other municipalities besides Cleveland to choose from. Add in school districts and special taxing districts and

there are about 100 units of government in Cuyahoga County. Zettek and Bruce Katz, who studies urban issues for the center-left Brookings Institute think tank, say that's actually fairly common for older industrial areas.

But many of the subdivisions that might have made sense in the go-go days of the early 20th century are almost impossible to justify in the more challenging landscape of the 21st. Researchers hired by The Fund for Our Economic Future—a foundation-driven consortium that is trying to jumpstart development in Northeast Ohio—have identified the “legacy cost” of excess government as a drag on this region's growth because it adds to the bottom-line of doing almost everything. In follow-up work commissioned by the Fund, Zettek concluded that when all governments are accounted for, Cuyahoga County spends almost \$800 million a year more than Franklin County. Think of that as the cost of home rule run amok.

So, what now? The Fund has begun offering prizes to communities that come up with the most promising plans for collaboration. The fact that some of the early finalists have been as mundane as a shared maintenance garage for one suburban city and its school district shows how far the discussion has to go. Many of the candidates for Cuyahoga County's new chief executive and council promise to encourage policy cooperation, joint buying and shared services. A few brave souls even suggest that the new, streamlined county structure could eventually lead the way to a single metropolitan government.. However they come down on that grand question, almost everyone who thinks about the future of this area says we simply can't do business as usual.

Bruce Akers couldn't agree more. Akers was at Cleveland City Hall almost a generation before Warren—now mayor Frank Jackson's regional economic development czar—arrived. He was Ralph Perk's chief of staff in the 1970s. Eventually, he became mayor of Pepper Pike, a bedroom community that in 1924 was carved out what was once Orange Township. As a leader of the Cuyahoga County Mayors and Managers Association, Akers has spent more than a decade trying to convince other suburban officials that they need a new model of cooperation—one premised on two central ideas:

One, that every community in Greater Cleveland will sink or swim together. And two, that Cleveland's fate will dictate everyone else's.

That's led Akers to embrace Hudson Mayor Bill Currin's call for regional tax sharing. He understands what a tough sell that will be. But he thinks Northeast Ohio has no choice but to change. Instead of pulling apart, he says, it's time to pull together. Akers notes that now some of his neighbors have become more interested in the collaborations he's been pushing for years. The dismembered pieces of Orange Township—Pepper Pike, Orange, Woodmere, Hunting Valley and Moreland Hills—already share a school system and recreation center. Now

even these mostly affluent communities have begun to realize they can't afford to stand alone in other civic enterprises.

"I think someday we'll see those five communities back together," Akers says. "Sheer necessity is going to force us to think that way."

Tom Johnson also saw home rule as a matter of sheer necessity. To make Cleveland great in the new 20th century, it needed the power to stand alone. Perhaps one key to its revival in the 21st century will be enough communities surrendering that power—in hopes of finding even more by standing together.

UTILITY VERSUS INNOVATION

A POLEMIC ON ART, ARCHITECTURE, AND CULTURAL CONSERVATISM IN CLEVELAND

STEVEN LITT

Archibald Willard had no way of knowing it at the time, but when he completed his eight-by-ten foot painting, *The Spirit of '76* for the 1876 Centennial celebration in Philadelphia, he launched what would become the single most famous artistic image produced in Cleveland in the city's history. Reproduced and copied, celebrated or lampooned in illustrations, cartoons, or parodies by other artists, Willard's brainchild entered the national mainstream in the 19th century a manner that anticipated Norman Rockwell's highly popular magazine covers for *Saturday Evening Post* in the mid 20th century.

Based on memories of a parade witnessed by the artist when he was a child, Willard painted two grizzled men playing the part of veterans of the War of Independence, marching alongside a young boy in a Revolutionary War outfit. While the image is famous, it is less widely known that it originated in Cleveland and arose out of purely commercial impulses. The concept grew out of a commission from publisher James F. Ryder, who realized that the centennial of the Declaration of Independence in 1876 represented a fantastic opportunity to sell chromolithographs as patriotic souvenirs in Philadelphia, the site of a major national celebration.

In 1875, Ryder recruited Willard, then supporting himself as a carriage painter and a part-time maker of fine-art easel paintings in rural Wellington, Ohio, to move to Cleveland to work on the assignment. Following the success of the lithograph and the original painting, Willard spent the rest of his career creating subsequent versions, one of which now hangs in Cleveland's City Hall, where an adjacent park at the northwest corner of Lakeside Avenue and East Ninth Street bears the artist's name.

The success of Willard's painting, described in detail in the catalog of a 1996 exhibition on the history of Cleveland art at the Cleveland Museum of Art, would appear to be little more than an odd historical footnote. From a larger

perspective, however, its prominence is not accidental. It embodies the practical, moneymaking role often assigned to artists in Cleveland, an industrial city in which art has often been closely linked to commerce. The Cleveland Institute of Art, the city's four-year independent art college, crystallized this utilitarian, business-oriented view of art memorably in its catchy, longtime motto: "Making Art Work." Embedded in the motto is the notion that Cleveland is a place where no one should be squeamish about exploring connections between creativity and commerce. The motto also conveys a fundamental skepticism about the value of art for art's sake, or about art as a way to express innovative new ideas. In other words, the motto is unintentionally revealing as a description of less than positive aspects of the city's artistic and intellectual climate.

Today, public and private philanthropic support for the arts in Cleveland is stronger than ever, and the arts are being called upon to perform a truly big job: to help revive the city's struggling economy and to make it a more attractive place to live. The question arts supporters and audience members should be asking is whether success in the arts should be evaluated primarily in quantitative economic terms, or according to the more subjective, qualitative benchmarks such as quality, originality, and critical and scholarly esteem. Put in a different way, if economic impact is the primary measure of artistic success and importance, we can all be proud of Archibald Willard and his *Spirit of '76*. If, on the other hand, artistic quality is the truer measure of the impact of a city's cultural contributions, it should be cause for at least mild concern that the author of the most famous artistic image in the city's history is an obscure 19th-century painter whose work borders on kitsch and whose name is all but forgotten outside Cleveland.

Such concerns are worth discussing, now that the arts are being asked to play a bigger role than ever in the city's economy. Cleveland's urban predicament as a shrinking industrial city in a troubled region is widely known. Its population is hovering just over 400,000, roughly sixty percent lower than it was in 1950. The old industrial base is fading rapidly, but new industries, such as health care and biotechnology, are not growing fast enough to reverse decline. Decades-old tensions over race and poverty have caused an exodus of middle-class residents, both black and white. Meanwhile, low-density residential subdivisions in the suburbs consume more and more open land every year, creating a pattern of sprawl without growth.

Within this urban context, the arts, measured by activity levels at major and minor institutions, are certainly working hard. The cultural calendar in Cleveland is packed; venues across the city offer a range and quantity of plays, concerts, exhibitions, and recitals that far exceeds what one might expect for a metropolitan area of Cleveland's size. Cleveland still compares well in cultural terms with fast-growing cities in states such as Florida, Arizona, Texas, and California. For example, the Cleveland Museum of Art ranks as one of the top 10 institutions of

its kind, as measured by endowment wealth. The Cleveland Orchestra is regularly touted as one of the top five in the nation. PlayhouseSquare, which draws a million visitors a year to Broadway touring shows and local productions, is the second largest unified arts complex in the nation after Lincoln Center in New York. The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum steadily attracts a half million visitors a year.

Financial support for the arts in Cleveland is at an all-time high. Evidence of this enthusiastic backing includes the Cleveland Museum of Art's ongoing \$350 million expansion and renovation, described as the largest single cultural project in Ohio history. Other indicators include the 10-year, 1.5 cents per cigarette tax approved by Cuyahoga County voters in 2006 to create a \$15 million annual fund to support arts and culture. The fund is the first of its kind in county history. Across the city, developers and planners tout local arts districts as key tools in the fight to preserve struggling neighborhoods.

THE PERILS OF A PRAGMATIC APPROACH TO THE ARTS

What's problematic here is that arts funding is based primarily on a utilitarian view of cultural activity as a lifestyle amenity and as a generator of economic activity, not as an expression of the city's ability to foster original creative thinking of global significance. Artists and architects in Cleveland rarely attract much notice outside the city. In architecture, local firms rarely win the biggest and most prestigious assignments. Instead, clients prefer to hire prestigious out-of-town firms, which often do less than their best in Cleveland. In painting and sculpture, most of the most famous artists associated with the city have left to pursue their ambitions elsewhere, a telling example of a creative brain drain.

In this context, it's haunting to consider that Cleveland's conservative views on the arts have at least until now paralleled the city's economic decline. This doesn't necessarily mean that, if Cleveland had been a hotbed of artistic radicalism throughout the past century, it would be in far better economic shape today. But it is true that throughout history, artistic breakthroughs have occurred most often in vibrant and growing cities where innovation and originality in the arts are related to breakthroughs in business, science, and technology. This makes it worth considering whether new and different approaches to the arts could help reverse Cleveland's decline by making it a place more open to fresh and innovative ideas it has traditionally disregarded or even shunned.

No city is entirely homogenous in its cultural outlook, and this is certainly true of Cleveland. At any one time, the city has had its share of mavericks in art, architecture, and other branches of the visual arts. Perhaps most important among them is Peter B. Lewis, the chairman and former longtime CEO of Progressive Corp. in Mayfield. Starting in the 1980s, Lewis built one of the largest and most

dynamic corporate collections of contemporary art in the country. Curated for more than 20 years by his ex-wife and friend, Toby Lewis, the collection had the explicit goal of dynamic intellectual climate in the workplace as a way to challenge complacency among employees. The Lewises hung multi-colored portraits of Mao Zedong by Andy Warhol in the boardroom. They displayed a racially charged painting by the black Chicago artist Kerry James Marshall outside a cafeteria. Elaborate chandeliers made of dripped wax, by Petah Coyne, graced a stairwell.

The idea was to irritate, provoke and remind employees that they lived in a world of constant change, and that they had better grapple with it. The ultimate goal, of course, was to make Progressive a stronger company. Apparently, it worked. While building the collection, Lewis also guided Progressive's growth from a tiny company with 100 employees in the mid-1960s to its current ranking as the nation's third largest auto insurer, with 26,000 employees. Lewis also made himself a billionaire in the process. The company's success certainly derives from as much from Lewis's leadership and management practices, but cutting-edge art is a strong part of the corporate culture. It could be argued that Lewis's use of art as a motivational tool is a utilitarian approach to art, but what makes it different from the norm in Cleveland is its profound emphasis on embracing innovation, change, and new ideas.

As the Lewis example shows, a "progressive" approach to culture just might change the city's traditionally conservative mindset. There's ample room for similar efforts. These could include rebuilding the region as a center for industrial and product design, based on the rich legacy of creativity left behind by the greatest visual thinker in the city's history, industrial designer Viktor Schreckengost. Equally important would be a revolution in the city's architectural and urban design culture, signaled by improvements in the design of buildings, streets, parks, and public places of all kinds. The Cleveland Museum of Art, whose conservative tastes have had a chilling effect on the city's artistic community, could take a bolder approach. Greater financial support could flow to the Museum of Contemporary Art Cleveland, which has done an outstanding if underappreciated job of championing the cause of progressive thinking in the visual arts.

THE ROOTS OF CONSERVATISM

Before considering the city's future, it's important to understand the strengths and weaknesses of its legacy in the visual arts. Cleveland has certainly played a role in the history of modern and contemporary art and architecture, but not a big one, and it's important to understand why. The 20th century unleashed a concatenation of new ideas, movements, and artistic breakthroughs across Europe, but emanating primarily in the early decades from Paris, Berlin, Vienna, and other

cities. These ideas, ranging from a plethora of art movements such as Cubism and Fauvism, to modernist architecture and design, were introduced to America first in the New York Armory Show of 1913, and the Museum of Modern Art's first exhibition on modern architecture, in 1932. Following the Depression and World War II, New York replaced Paris as the global center of the art world. Modernist architecture spread across the country, producing vibrant results, especially in Los Angeles and Chicago, but also in New York, Detroit, Philadelphia, and other cities. The same was not as true in Cleveland.

While it's obvious that Cleveland has had a fairly conservative artistic climate for decades, scholarly work on local art history is fairly thin, which indicates a lack of interest among art historians—a negative comment in and of itself. There exists no large, single-volume historical survey providing a broad overview of local developments in the visual arts in Cleveland and relating them to political, social, and economic trends. Nor does there exist any large study relating the city's creative output with that of other cities in America and Europe. Such a study would create a clearer understanding of the place Cleveland truly occupies as an artistic and cultural center.

Mostly, the city's art history is revealed through narrowly focused monographic books on individual artists. The Cleveland Artists Foundation, a small non-profit organization devoted to the visual arts of Northeast Ohio, has published many of these studies. Though valuable, they don't provide the bigger picture. The Cleveland Museum of Art attempted a larger overview in 1996 with its exhibition *Transformations in Cleveland Art, 1796–1946*. Valuable as it was, the exhibition only covered the first 150 years of the city's artistic history, leaving the rest of the story for a future show. Organized by curators David Steinberg and William H. Robinson, the 1996 exhibition was accompanied by a catalog with an essay that said, “almost nothing has been written about how economic, social, and political events affected the character of Cleveland art.”

Nevertheless, historical and anecdotal information suggests strongly that the city's cultural conservatism has several roots. One is ethnic heritage. After its initial settlement in the early 19th century, Cleveland's population grew quickly as waves of immigrants arrived from New England and, later, from countries across Europe. Often, immigrant communities wanted to preserve traditions from their homelands. “Whatever was brought over in the late 19th century stayed that way,” scholar Holly Rarick Witchey, author of *The Fine Arts in Cleveland* told *The Plain Dealer* in an interview in 1996. “When Greeks look for historical folk dances, they come to the U.S., where you are not allowed to innovate. You are preserving the homeland tradition.”

Elite taste also remained conservative throughout the city's rise to industrial prominence, from 1890 to 1930, and in the decades following. For much of the city's history, powerful backers of the arts were primarily members of the city's

wealthy and white Anglo-Saxon families. Members of this group included the Severances, the Hannas, and the Mathers. They and others were extremely interested in art and culture, and were extremely generous. Through donations and bequests, they built a large collection of cultural institutions in the early 20th century, starting with the Music School Settlement in 1912, Karamu and the Cleveland Play House in 1915, the Cleveland Museum of Art in 1916, the Cleveland Orchestra in 1918, and the Cleveland Institute of Music in 1920.

The cultural largesse of the city's leading industrial families was motivated by *noblesse oblige*, a desire to acculturate immigrants newly arrived from poor countries in central and Eastern Europe, and the impulse to compete in terms of prestige with other growing cities. Unlike arts patrons across the industrial Midwest, Cleveland's wealthy appointed professional managers to guide major institutions, especially the museum and orchestra, to ensure high standards of performance and achievement. Even so, the museum, for example, largely pursued a conservative approach to art history, thereby honoring the tastes and preferences of trustees, who actively discouraged directors and curators from investing in modern and contemporary art.

CONSERVATISM AT THE CLEVELAND MUSEUM OF ART

Conservatism in culture isn't necessarily a negative value. In the best sense, it means conserving the finest expressions of the past, maintaining high standards of excellence, and focusing on appreciation of the best of the past, rather than exploring the more risky and unsettled field of contemporary art. In essence, this was the core philosophy of Sherman Lee, the highly influential director of the Cleveland Museum of Art from 1958 to 1983, a period in which the museum rose to international prominence but also gave short shrift to new art. A serious, sober, deep-voiced authority with an imposing personal presence, Lee was considered during his tenure the opposite of the flamboyant director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Thomas Hoving, who first made popular the notion that art museums should cater to a broad public with blockbuster exhibitions and glamorous social events.

When Lee became the third director of the Cleveland museum in 1958, the institution received a massive bequest of \$34 million from the estate of industrialist Leonard C. Hanna, Jr., worth roughly \$250 million in 2010 dollars. The gift, the single largest in the museum's history, made it for a time the wealthiest art museum in America, in terms of endowment wealth. Following his mission of conserving the best of the past for the future, Lee used the bequest systematically to build up the museum's collection of European Old Master paintings, acquiring important works by Francisco Zurbaran, Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio,

Nicolas Poussin, Antonio Canova, and Jacques-Louis David. Simultaneously, he built a world-renowned collection of Asian art.

Meanwhile, the museum spent relatively little on modern and contemporary art made after the first decade of the 20th century. The museum assembled a strong collection of Blue, Rose, and Cubist paintings by Pablo Picasso, but satisfied itself mainly with works of secondary importance by such important contemporaries as Arshile Gorky, Willem de Kooning, or Jackson Pollock. To this day, the seminal art movements of the 1950s and '60s, including Abstract Expressionism and Pop Art, remain under-represented in the museum's permanent collection, or are represented by works of secondary quality. Other significant gaps exist throughout the 20th-century collection, which is noticeably weaker than the museum's highly respected holdings in everything from ancient Greek and Roman art, through Medieval European and Asian art to 19th-century American paintings.

Lee is often pigeonholed as an archenemy of new art, but his story is more complex. He realized in the 1960s and '70s that prices for modern and contemporary art were rising, and he tried on occasion to persuade trustees to become more open-minded, but he faced heavy opposition. In an oral history interview after his retirement, he recalled a meeting with museum trustees in which he described how a Cubist painting by Picasso had enormously increased in value after the museum bought it. In response, a trustee jokingly shot back: "Sell!" In another instance, Lee recalled how a trustee donated a sculpture by Henri Matisse to the museum after having received the work as a gift from a friend. The trustee thought so little of the bronze, which depicts a pair of lesbians embracing, that he used it as a doorstop.

Such negative attitudes, made manifest subtly through art acquisitions and exhibitions that focused primarily on pre-modern art, communicated a powerful disdain for the 20th century and had a dampening effect on contemporary art in Cleveland. To counteract this tendency and provide encouragement to local artists, the museum started an annual series of juried exhibitions on Cleveland art in 1919, called the May Show, which stimulated the competitive spirits of local artists and inspired local collectors to acquire works selected for display. As popular as it was, however, the May Show failed to place local art in a broader national or international context and in that sense contributed to a prevailing sense of cultural isolation. The museum underscored the message by rarely exhibiting works it purchased from the May Show among other works in the collection. It wasn't until the opening of the museum's new East Wing in the summer of 2009 that it created special galleries dedicated to the art of Northeast Ohio.

Nevertheless, artists, collectors, and architects in Cleveland battled local orthodoxy and fought to introduce fresh ideas from abroad. Recent scholarship by William Robinson, the museum's curator of Modern European Art, has shown that

leading Cleveland artists in the 1910s, '20s and '30s, including William Sommer, Frederick Gottwald, August Biehle, and Carl Gaertner, drew direct inspiration from trips to Europe, particularly Germany. The post-Impressionist and Social Realist paintings work of these “Cleveland School” artists is fascinating, in that it illuminates the history of Cleveland and evokes an extraordinary sense of place. A 1908 painting of a fire tug on the Cuyahoga River, painted by Biehle, exhibited in the 1996 exhibition on Cleveland art, conveys a sense of the smoke-shrouded Flats during the city’s industrial heyday in broad strokes of sooty browns and beiges. Gaertner’s 1926 *Pie Wagon*, purchased by the museum, shows steel workers gathered outside a soot-shrouded factory on a patch of blinding snow, eating snacks sold by vendors.

Such paintings offer vivid impressions of the city’s industrial heyday. In purely artistic terms, however, they don’t qualify either Biehle or Gaertner as leaders of the 20th-century American vanguard. A powerful local exception was the immensely gifted Charles Burchfield, whose Expressionist-inspired landscape paintings throb with ecstatic energy. One of the most important American artists of the time, Burchfield left Cleveland for Buffalo in 1921 to support himself as a wallpaper designer, and later, starting in 1929, as a full-time painter. Cleveland can claim him only partially.

VIKTOR SCHRECKENGOST AND HIS LEGACY

By focusing primarily on the fine arts, the Cleveland museum’s 1996 exhibition inadvertently made the point that the most important artistic contributions from the city in the early to middle decades of the 20th century lay in ceramics and industrial design. Examples in the show included a silver tea and coffee service created by designer Louis Rorimer and an Art Deco decorative screen fashioned by Rose Iron Works. The best works in the show were a handful of ceramics produced by the great industrial designer Viktor Schreckengost, then still living.

In 2000, the museum gave Schreckengost the long overdue recognition he deserved with a major retrospective exhibition called Viktor Schreckengost and 20th Century Design. The show was incidentally the first major solo exhibition in the museum’s history devoted to a living Cleveland artist—another telling comment on the subtle disdain with which the museum had long viewed local art.

Born in Sebring, Ohio, in 1906, Schreckengost was the son of a potter who worked at the French China Company. After studying at the Cleveland Institute of Art with leading Cleveland artists, such as Frank Wilcox and Paul Travis, he won a scholarship and attended the Vienna Kunstgewerbe School for a year, gaining direct exposure to one of the most artistically fertile cities in Europe. After returning to Cleveland, Schreckengost worked for Cowan Pottery and joined the

faculty at the art institute, where he soon founded the Department of Industrial Design.

It was around this time that Schreckengost completed what may have been his most famous assignment. Without realizing who the client was, he created a design for a large punch bowl glazed in black and a rich faience blue, based on Art Deco themes related to jazz clubs in New York. Covered with images of skyscrapers, martini glasses, streetlights, stairs, and musical instruments, the bowl brims with the energy of Schreckengost's upbeat personality. It was only after completing the assignment that he found out that the client was Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of the then-governor of New York State and future president, FDR.

In his work as an industrial designer, Schreckengost combined artistic and functional brilliance in designs for everything from trucks to bicycles, furniture, industrial equipment and dinnerware. He invented the cab-over-engine truck, a design that enabled truck owners to carry more cargo, which allowed them to amortize their vehicles more quickly. During the Depression and the post-World War II period, Schreckengost's designs stoked consumer desire and kept entire factories humming—a striking demonstration of “making art work.” Modest, pragmatic, and deeply concerned for the consumers of his highly affordable creations, Schreckengost showed that high artistic achievement could be unified with Cleveland's commercial spirit.

Today, experts consider him one of the greatest American industrial designers of the 20th century, along with Russell Wright, Raymond Loewy, and Norman Bel Geddes, although Schreckengost is much less widely recognized than the others. He created enormous wealth for his corporate clients, but never sought the fame or riches that might have been his if he had moved to New York—as he was often urged to do during his lifetime. Instead, he remained in Cleveland throughout his 70-year career, teaching, designing useful objects, and making art in his free time. While teaching and designing for industrial clients, Schreckengost quietly produced hundreds of watercolors, ceramics, and sculptures in the skylighted attic studio of his home in Cleveland Heights. As an artist, his greatest achievement may have been *Apocalypse '42*, a ceramic sculpture parodying fascist dictators of Germany, Italy, and Japan, now in the collection of the Smithsonian American Art Museum.

Schreckengost's impact on Cleveland's and the nation's economy has been profound. In addition to the direct effect of his designs on local and regional manufacturers, he educated generations of students at the art institute, many of whom achieved enormous success in their own right. Among them are Giuseppe Delena, a chief designer at Ford Motor Company; Joe Oros, designer of the Ford Mustang; and Jerry Hirschberg, head of Nissan Design International. Locally, former Schreckengost students John Nottingham and John Spirk founded a wildly successful industrial design company now headquartered in the

renovated Christian Scientist Church overlooking Little Italy on the western edge of Cleveland Heights. Nottingham once estimated that more than 1,000 industrial designers studied with Schreckengost, collectively producing a huge impact on the national economy.

Today, Schreckengost's work has inspired new initiatives aimed at reviving his legacy. The designer's family has donated his extensive archive to Cleveland State University, and the city recently renamed East 17th Street "Viktor Schreckengost Way." The university has donated storage and office space to a new for-profit venture, called American da Vinci, led by entrepreneur Wally Berry. The goal is to re-commercialize Schreckengost's designs by licensing them to manufacturers. Profits will be shared with the university in the form of scholarships for students. The art institute has also partnered with the university to create the District of Design, a portion of downtown between PlayhouseSquare and the CSU campus, which will be devoted to showrooms for product designers and manufacturers in Northeast Ohio.

While Schreckengost's designs were highly spirited and functional, they also reflected the inherent conservatism of Cleveland. They refined and adapted artistic and stylistic currents he absorbed from the leading movements and design theories of the 20th century. His aim always was to appeal to a broad public, which required that his designs be understandable and acceptable, not highly inventive in the development of entirely new forms. In other words, he thoroughly embodied the city's pragmatic spirit, while also achieving a high standard of creative brilliance.

Other artists were not so fortunate; for them, Cleveland's conservative climate has had an inhibiting, muffling effect; it led to an atmosphere that kept innovators on the fringe or forced them to leave the city to realize their visions elsewhere. It cannot be assumed, however, that Cleveland was devoid of globally significant moments of artistic innovation. For reasons that have yet to be thoroughly explored by scholars, the Cleveland Institute of Art became a haven in the early 1960s for artists who promoted the eye-tingling, high-precision patterns of Op Art. Members of the group, including Ed Mieczkowski, Julian Stanczak, and Richard Anuskiewicz, earned international attention in 1965 when they showed their work in the important exhibition, *The Responsive Eye*, at the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Op Art was a short-lived trend, however.

Quickly condemned by critics as superficial and shallow, Op went out of favor. Stanczak and the other Ohio Op artists soldiered on quietly, producing paintings that have recently been rediscovered by collectors. Their works from the 1960s and '70s now sell in the range of \$50,000 to \$100,000 at galleries in New York and Santa Fe, New Mexico. It's a vindication, of sorts, but it also underscores how difficult it can be to build an artistic career in Cleveland.

THE LOCAL ART MARKET

Today, the art market in Cleveland remains relatively small; serious collectors do their most serious buying in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, or cities in Europe. An unofficial price ceiling of \$5,000 to \$10,000 for individual works of art ensures that artists who remain within the region will never achieve the financial success accorded leading artists in other cities. Today, the city lacks a central gallery district, which would facilitate comparisons among artists and instill a competitive creative climate.

Artists in the region often make a living by teaching at area universities, where the pay is low, tenure-track positions are rare, and many work in part-time jobs without health insurance. A strong negative synergy exists between the modest size of the local art market, the conservative nature of local taste, and the annual drain of talent. The list of important artists who left Cleveland over the 90 years because the city failed to provide optimal conditions for a successful career have included such luminaries as Charles Burchfield, Hughie Lee-Smith, Roy Lichtenstein, Robert Mangold, Joseph Kosuth, Heidi Fasnacht, April Gornik, and Dana Schutz.

The stylistic and conceptual range represented by this loss of talent is enormous. In many cases, the artists involved knew that Cleveland would never provide the audience, market, and employment needed to achieve the highest success. Roy Lichtenstein, for example, graduated from Ohio State University in the late 1940s and spent close to a decade in Cleveland before moving to New Jersey to teach at Rutgers University. Soon, he was exhibiting at the Leo Castelli Gallery in New York the comic-style Pop Art paintings that would make him famous around the world.

The story is a somber one. And yet, the rise of academia as a non-commercial support system for artists has created a certain stability, which enables many artists to persevere in the region. The bargain accepted by these artists is that they must teach in order to earn the studio time necessary to pursue their own work. More than a handful of local artists have built successful careers in this manner. Among them are the sculptor and painter Brinsley Turrell, painter Joseph O'Sickey, and glass artist Henry Halem, all affiliated with Kent State University. Cleveland State University has supported the careers of painter Ken Nevadomi and draftsman George Mauersberger. Case Western Reserve University has served as a base for the Pop-influenced painter and photo-collagist Chris Pekoc. The Cleveland Institute of Art provided the bedrock support needed by Stanczak to continue his exacting, precise, and highly rarefied Op Art explorations of color and form.

The decorative arts continue to be a particular point of strength in the Cleveland art scene. The Cleveland Institute of Art has enabled glass artist Brent

Kee Young and ceramists Judith Salomon and William Brouillard to build careers of national significance in Cleveland. All are represented in major museum collections around the country. Jeweler John Paul Miller, who also taught for decades at the art institute, created a following among wealthy patrons in Cleveland, who acquired his exquisitely crafted gold jewelry. With its fusion of machine-like precision and natural forms based on insects and crustaceans, Miller's work ranks among the best of its kind in the 20th century and is also very well represented in museum collections nationwide.

THE RISE OF LOCAL ARTS DISTRICTS

Every year, a trickle of new talent enters the Cleveland scene, as a percentage of art students graduating from local colleges and universities elect to stay in the city, motivated by the visual power of its industrial landscape, the richness of the best parts of the city's artistic legacy, and the low cost of living. In recent years, city planners and community development officials have recognized that, when artists act as urban pioneers, property values rise, safety improves, and neighborhoods stabilize. The city has encouraged such settlement patterns in art districts in Tremont, Collinwood, St. Clair-Superior, and other neighborhoods.

The phenomenon is not unique to Cleveland nor is it new; it is fundamentally a reprise of the massive revival of real estate values in New York's SoHo district. Starting in the 1960s and '70s, artists occupied vacant lofts in the cast iron industrial buildings south of Houston Street in Manhattan, which dated back to the Civil War era. By the 1980s, real estate values had surged to the point where artists and galleries were pushed out of the district by chic restaurants, hotels, boutiques, and stores for luxury furniture and lighting. The artists and galleries decamped to Chelsea, the next Manhattan neighborhood to undergo transformation. Other cities around the country noted the phenomenon, and consciously tried to emulate it with public policies that encouraged artists to settle in formerly run-down areas. Economist Richard Florida boosted awareness of the positive economic impact of artistic activity in cities with his highly influential 2003 book, *The Rise of the Creative Class*. In it, he promoted the notion that high-tech workers are attracted to cities with strong physical and cultural amenities, where young, creative people feel at home. Businesses need to follow workers to such cities, not attempt to lure them to corporate cubicles in suburbs.

In part based on Florida's theories, foundations, developers and community development corporations are encouraging the formation of widely dispersed arts districts in Cleveland. On the surface, this would seem to be a positive trend. The danger is that the "peanut butter" approach of spreading resources thinly over a large city will prevent the coalescence of a central arts and gallery district. The enthusiasm for arts districts is also based on values that have nothing to do

with the core purpose of art, which is the pursuit of quality, not the creation of “positive externalities” caused by the mere presence of artistic activity in a neighborhood. A sharp distinction needs to be made between the quality and merit of the artistic products coming out of neighborhood arts districts and the secondary economic benefits produced by the presence of artists in a community. To date, the arts districts in Cleveland have certainly boosted real estate values and investment, and they’ve also contributed to striking advances in the quality of the city’s restaurants over the past 15 years. But while arts districts have made certain neighborhoods—including Tremont, Detroit-Shoreway, and Little Italy—better places to live, they haven’t sparked a true artistic renaissance.

CONSERVATISM IN CLEVELAND ARCHITECTURE

If the history of the fine arts in Cleveland is a mixed picture, the same is true of the city’s architectural history. Architecture gives enduring physical form to Cleveland’s cultural conservatism and shapes the city’s mind-set in countless ways, marking it as a place that imports and refines ideas developed elsewhere, not as a place of innovation in its own right.

The irony is that during the first half of the 20th century, the Great Lakes industrial region was a global hot-bed of architectural creativity. Chicago architects such as Louis H. Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright launched modern architecture with nature-based theories of “Organic” design. After World War II, the great German modern architect, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, designed some of the most elegantly skeletal steel and glass buildings of his career in Chicago, including the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology. In Detroit, the Finnish-born Eliel Saarinen fused inspirations from Finnish vernacular design, Art Nouveau, and modernism in his masterpiece, the campus of Cranbrook in Bloomfield Hills. The architect’s son, Eero Saarinen, rocketed to fame in the 1950s and ’60s with the swooping forms of his TWA Terminal at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York. Although these architects were active throughout the region in Detroit, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and other cities around Cleveland, none ever received a single assignment in Cleveland.

In 1937, Wright designed his most famous work, Fallingwater, for the Pittsburgh department store magnate, Edgar Kaufmann, as a retreat in the Pennsylvania mountains east of the city. Wright did receive commissions in the Cleveland area, but they came much later in his career, shortly before his death in 1959. His most widely known local patron was Louis Penfield, a high school art teacher with a modest income, who asked Wright to design a small but elegant “Usonian” house in a flood plain next to the Chagrin River in Willoughby, near the future path of Interstate 90. Wright created the term Usonian late in his career to denote a line of small, affordable houses he designed for middle-class clients,

primarily across the Midwest. The contrast between Kaufmann—a wealthy merchant prince of Pittsburgh who sought Wright’s talents at the height of his career—and Penfield, a man of modest resources who caught up with Wright in his waning years, says a great deal about the skepticism with which business, political, and civic leaders in Cleveland viewed the latest ideas in art, architecture, and other areas of culture in the mid-20th century.

The city’s taste is instead embodied fully by the neoclassical civic buildings inspired by the 1903 Group Plan for downtown Cleveland, masterminded by Chicago architect Daniel H. Burnham. A brilliant planner and motivator of civic energy, Burnham launched the City Beautiful movement in American city planning with his plans for the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago. The movement adapted Beaux Arts neoclassical architecture to American urban settings. The basic thrust was to sweep away the grime and slums of the Industrial Revolution and to impose the elegance and grandeur of Paris and Rome. Cleveland possesses a fine effort by Burnham—the May Company Building, along with the Society for Savings Building, designed by his partner, John Wellborn Root. But his greatest legacy is the 1903 Group Plan for downtown Cleveland, perhaps the largest intact example of City Beautiful planning in America, after the Mall in Washington, D.C., also influenced heavily by Burnham.

In Cleveland, the Group Plan called for a series of neoclassical civic buildings organized around a 12.5-acre central Mall, stretching from the Cleveland Public Library and the old federal post office and courthouse, north to an overlook between City Hall and the Cuyahoga County Courthouse. Burnham intended the three-block Mall to function as a vast promenade in the heart of downtown, with a large train station on the north end, overlooking Lake Erie. When the train station was built at Tower City Center, however, the Mall was deprived of its major activity generator. For decades, it has been a mixed legacy—a monumental space largely devoid of civic life. Plans for a new medical mart and convention center below Malls B and C, the northern sections of the space, offer the best chance in decades to complete Burnham’s vision and to inject fresh vitality into downtown’s largest public space.

If the Mall is an equivocal legacy, Burnham’s emphasis on neoclassical architecture—and essentially conservative taste—heavily influenced the city for decades. Neoclassicism, fundamentally a backward-looking style, was chosen for all major buildings in the city, from the Federal Reserve Building and Public Auditorium to the Cleveland Museum of Art, Severance Hall, and the Terminal Tower. Out-of-town firms designed some of the structures, but many were designed by some of the very fine local firms then operating in Cleveland, including Hubbell & Benes and Walker and Weeks. By the mid 1930s, however, when the Terminal Tower was finished, Burnham-style neoclassicism was utterly passé; New York had by then moved on to the far more progressive Art Deco styling of

the Chrysler and Empire State buildings, Rockefeller Center, and the New York Daily News buildings.

Cutting-edge modernist architecture remained a minority taste throughout the 20th century in Cleveland, although it was embraced on occasion by a handful of private patrons. The Cleveland Artists Foundation, in an effort organized by local historian Nina Gibans, illuminated the history of a small group of modernist houses designed in Cleveland's East Side suburbs in the 1950s, '60s, and '70s by local architects such as John Terrence Kelly, Don Hisaka, Robert A. Little, and Ernst Payer. The impression left by the show was that this handful of houses represented a high-water mark for design innovation during the period.

Tellingly, the Cleveland Chapter of the American Institute of Architects published a guide to Cleveland buildings in 1994, which avoided critical perspectives on local architecture. The one pointed exception is a comment in the introduction, by Theodore Sande, a Cleveland architect and preservationist, which stated that Cleveland architecture is "conservative or cautious" and that it tends to "reflect the end of a stylistic period, rather than the beginning."

A TOLERANCE FOR MEOCRITY

The pattern continued after World War II, and in many ways, continues to this day. Architectural clients, including CEOs of the city's largest banks, elevated the city's skyline in the 1980s and '90s with skyscrapers designed by some of the biggest names in contemporary architecture, including the national firms of HOK, SOM, Charles Luckman, Wallace Harrison, Hugh Stubbins, and Cesar Pelli. Local architects fumed at having been sidelined, even though most lacked the expertise to design skyscrapers. The local clients, however, weren't able to coax the best work from the out-of-towners. Most of the postwar towers in downtown Cleveland are mediocre, grade B efforts by big, brand-name firms. Downtown gives permanent form to the impression that in architecture, Cleveland is a follower, not a leader. The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum, designed by I. M. Pei, is a prime example of the city's conservatism. Designed relatively late in the architect's career, it reprises themes he developed in earlier and better designs, such as the glass pyramid in the courtyard of the Louvre Museum in Paris.

The conservatism of local architectural tastes is underscored by the city's tepid response to the success of the most famous architect associated with the city, Philip Johnson. The son of a prominent Cleveland attorney, Johnson was briefly fascinated by fascism and Nazism in the 1930s, a phase he later bitterly regretted. With historian Henry Russell Hitchcock, Johnson curated a pivotal 1932 exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, which introduced European-style modern design to America. After World War II, he established himself as one of the most influential American architects of the second half

of the 20th century. In 1948, he designed his famous Glass House residence for himself in New Canaan, Connecticut, now owned and operated as a house museum by the National Trust for Historic Preservation. His other credits include skyscrapers in New York, Denver, Houston, and Minneapolis, as well as the Fort Worth Water Garden and the Amon Carter Museum, also in Fort Worth.

As an architect, Johnson was a complete chameleon; he changed styles rapidly and capitalized on every new idea that emerged between the 1930s and the 1990s, often winning extensive media attention, which may have been the point. His outspoken style and flamboyant personal lifestyle—he was gay and came out of the closet proudly in the latter decades of his life—did not go over well in his hometown. He never got a major assignment in Cleveland until he was asked in the early 1980s to design a “post-modern” expansion of the Cleveland Play House complex at 85th Street and Euclid Avenue in an abstracted version of Byzantine architecture. Today, the Play House faces an uncertain future; the Cleveland Clinic purchased the complex in 2009 and, as of the fall of 2010, it had not yet announced whether it would demolish or keep Johnson’s building.

At times, Cleveland embraced innovation, but only at its most destructive. The 1961 Erieview plan, masterminded by a young I. M. Pei, led to the wholesale demolition of 200 acres of downtown fabric, and paved the way for the sterile towers erected in the 1970s and ’80s. Along Superior Avenue and East Ninth Street, large towers are interspersed with parking garages, creating streetscapes of deadly and long-lasting dullness. During the same period, the city allowed building owners to demolish half of the buildings in the Warehouse District, to make way for surface parking lots that would serve the new City-County Justice Center.

CONSERVING THE PAST: THE RISE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND THE GREEN MOVEMENT

In response, Cleveland’s cultural conservatism found an extremely positive outlet in the rise of a strong historic preservation movement. A modernist architect named Peter van Dijk, a native of Holland who grew up in Venezuela and suburban New York, played a key role in the movement. Van Dijk moved to Cleveland in the 1960s, after having spent a decade working for Eero Saarinen in Detroit on assignments including the Gateway Arch in St. Louis. Van Dijk overtly adapted Saarinen’s great steel parabolic arch in the design for his most important work, the Blossom Music Center, in 1968.

Frustrated thereafter by his inability to capture an assignment to design a major skyscraper downtown, van Dijk became a preservation architect, almost by accident. He played a key role in unifying the movie palaces of PlayhouseSquare with interconnected lobbies. His firm, capitalizing on the expertise in theater

renovation it gained at PlayhouseSquare, subsequently renovated more than 150 historic theaters across the country—showing how a single assignment in Cleveland led to the strengthening of a hometown architecture firm. Today, Cleveland has a national reputation for high quality historic preservation, and for having saved much of its historic fabric. Ohio is a national leader in architecture and development firms taking advantage of federal historic tax credits to complete detailed, historically respectful renovations of important early 19th- and early 20th-century buildings. And within Ohio, Cleveland ranks first in tax credit work.

The industrialists who built Cleveland took little interest in the amenity value of the city's waterfronts, which they used exclusively for commercial and industrial purposes. Consequently, residents and elected officials put up little opposition in the 1950s, when highway engineers walled off Lake Erie and the Cuyahoga Valley. Unlike Chicago, which pursued civic beauty with a passion in the creation of one of the world's great waterfronts, Cleveland has tacitly expressed the attitude that beauty is enshrined inside the city's art museums, not in the public realm.

At the outset of the 21st century, a broad social movement is underway to reclaim polluted industrial landscapes and turn them into parks and bikeways. Progress is slow, painfully so. But the landscape urbanism movement, also present in other cities around the country, is a highly positive trend and absolutely necessary if Cleveland is to survive in the future. If anything, it needs greater public and political support to speed up the creation of regional amenities that could do an enormous amount to change the city's image and erase the memory of the 1969 fire on the Cuyahoga River.

RADICAL RESPONSE: THE RISE OF MOCA

No city is monolithic in its cultural tastes and that is certainly true of Cleveland. Throughout the 20th century, artists, collectors, and architects have championed new ideas, sometimes with truly amazing consequences. In 1968, progressive energies in the visual arts coalesced around a tiny institution called the New Gallery, later known as the Museum of Contemporary Art Cleveland. It was founded by art impresarios Marjorie Talalay and Nina Sundell, daughter of the highly influential New York art dealer, Leo Castelli. When Talalay and Sundell opened their gallery in a former dry cleaning storefront on Euclid Avenue, the tiny space upstaged the Cleveland Museum of Art by hosting important exhibitions on the works of artists including Robert Rauschenberg, Andy Warhol, and Christo. At a time when the Cleveland Museum of Art had few Jewish representatives on its board of trustees, MOCA, by then known as the Cleveland Center for Contemporary Art, provided an outlet for progressive and forward-looking

tastes of many of the city's Jewish art collectors and patrons. Chief among them were Peter and Toby Lewis.

In one celebrated instance, a creative spark ignited at the center had global significance. In the mid 1980s, the institution staged a lecture series on contemporary architecture, which brought the pioneering Los Angeles architect Frank Gehry to town. After the talk, Talalay introduced Gehry to Peter Lewis, by then a major MOCA supporter and art collector. Lewis challenged Gehry to design a house for him in Lyndhurst big enough to show off his collection—and to mark Lewis as a visionary patron of the arts. The project went through 15 major iterations, by which time the estimated cost of the house reached \$80 million. Lewis, who no longer wanted to live in a big house, pulled the plug on the assignment. Lewis also asked Gehry to design a downtown skyscraper headquarters for Progressive next to Burnham's Mall, overlooking Lake Erie. The project failed due to lack of political support from mayors George Voinovich and Michael White, and ambivalence on Lewis's part.

Lewis's patronage, meanwhile, had an enormous impact on Gehry. It enabled him to master computer technology as an aid in designing and building highly sculptural forms never before attempted by the architect. The ultimate outcome of these years was Gehry's design for the path-breaking Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, Spain, completed in 1997, which turned the city overnight into a global tourist attraction. Gehry has publicly acknowledged the importance of Lewis's support, a point made visible in a documentary film Lewis commissioned to record his interactions with Gehry. Lewis subsequently paid for half of the construction cost of the Gehry-designed Peter B. Lewis Building at Case Western Reserve University, completed in 2002. Compromised by rapid turnover in the president's office at CWRU and by uneven oversight, the project is not one of Gehry's better buildings, which demonstrates how difficult it can be, even with a great architect, to achieve a great result.

The connection between Cleveland and Bilbao is especially poignant because Bilbao is a global example of the ways in which a dying industrial city can help reverse its decline through calculated investments in cutting-edge art, architecture, and urban design. Gehry's Guggenheim branch is the most famous international symbol of the new Bilbao. It is less widely known that the museum was part of a carefully thought out plan for Bilbao and environs, which called for a shining new subway system, designed by Lord Norman Foster of England, an airport designed by Spanish architect-engineer Santiago Calatrava, and a waterfront business district on the Nervion River, designed by American architect Cesar Pelli.

Bilbao offers one example of how a progressive cultural agenda can help turn a city around. For Cleveland, the key is not to imitate Bilbao, but to figure out how to address its own challenges in a uniquely local way, while spending money as wisely as possible. Today, the biggest public policy question facing the arts in

Northeast Ohio is whether the cigarette tax supplying income for the county's annual arts fund should be renewed when it expires in 2016. Closely related to this question is whether government and philanthropy working together can maintain the existing collection of cultural institutions in the city, or whether a smaller audience and philanthropic base will mean that some institutions will die.

PICKING WINNERS AND LOSERS THROUGH CULTURAL PHILANTHROPY

In recent years, the city witnessed the demise of both the Cleveland San Jose Ballet and the Health Museum, both of which failed to raise enough endowment support to see them through lean times. The Health Museum's collapse is noteworthy because it followed the museum's construction of an architecturally ambitious building in the 1990s, which it could not afford to occupy once it was finished. The Cleveland Botanical Garden, which also expanded during the favorable economy of the 1990s, now faces a similar strain in the more difficult economic climate of the early 21st century. The Western Reserve Historical Society lavished millions of dollars on an expansion plan it ultimately abandoned, but not before having seriously damaged its finances.

No one knows exactly how much money exists for the arts and culture in Cleveland. But it's fair to ask, for example, whether the ambitious expansion of the Cleveland Museum of Art will mean greater fiscal challenges for the Cleveland Orchestra, for example, or the Cleveland Museum of Natural History. It's likely that arguments for and against funding of particular institutions will be grounded in quantitative measures, including numbers of school visits, attendance, and membership, along with economic impact studies of tourism, employment, and taxes. All those measures are important. However, when choosing which institutions or artists to support, it's always important to remember that the core values of are based on the pursuit of quality, originality, and creativity, not easily measurable economic effects.

The mission statement of Cuyahoga Arts and Culture, the public agency charged with deciding how \$15 million in county arts grants should be spent, makes it sound as if artistic quality is a primary objective. It states that the goal of the CAC is to "sustain the excellence of Cuyahoga County's arts and cultural assets that enrich our lives and enhance our community's appeal." But the CAC language presumes that the institutions it supports have already achieved artistic excellence, which is essentially a boosterish, self-congratulatory notion. It also implies that preserving existing institutions and jobs should be a primary goal of arts funding. This is a fundamentally unexciting proposition. Can we expect more?

The Cleveland Museum of Art, which is in the midst of a transformation, may provide some of the answers. With its expansion and renovation only half-way complete, it's unclear whether it will finally give modern and contemporary art the same level of attention it has paid to Ancient Greek, European medieval, or Asian art. Signs are the museum under new director David Franklin will finally address the shortcomings of its 20th-century collection, and hold major exhibitions on modern masters whose works have never been explored seriously in Cleveland.

As the museum considers its next moves, progressive cultural energy in Cleveland has focused on the Uptown development in University Circle. Uptown is an eight-acre, \$150 million-plus real estate development that will combine rental housing, cultural institutions, retail, and restaurants on the triangle of land east of the intersection of Euclid Avenue, Ford Drive, and Mayfield Road. The project will be anchored on the west by a new, \$26 million building for MOCA Cleveland, and on the east by an expanded campus for the Cleveland Institute of Art, centered on the Joseph McCullough Center for the Visual Arts.

In between, the real estate development company MRN, Ltd., will build approximately 150 apartments on both sides of Euclid Avenue, along with a Barnes & Noble bookstore, street-level cafes, bars, and restaurants. The new development will replace a dull, suburban-style strip shopping center built in the 1980s, surrounded by surface parking lots. Uptown, sponsored by Case Western Reserve University and University Circle, Inc., echoes dozens of campus-edge developments around the country, in which universities and medical centers have rebuilt the empty acres around the fringes of their campuses to create lively urban environments, aimed at attracting and retaining the best and brightest students, faculty, and workers.

The success of Uptown, with a healthy, expanded, and more popular MOCA, could do an enormous amount to shift the city's cultural values and make it a more broad-minded place open to new ideas. Other progressive new ventures in the visual arts in Cleveland are also under way. The Cleveland Institute of Art, working with partners including Cleveland State University, wants to reignite interest in the Viktor Schreckengost legacy by making the city a major haven for industrial design. Someday, the Cleveland Institute of Art could also create a graduate school in the visual arts, which would entice mature artists to settle in the city. Kent State University could expand the footprint of its satellite Architecture and Urban Design Program in the city and enrich debate on how Cleveland shapes its future physically. Nonprofit organizations devoted to excellence in the design of parks and public spaces, such as ParkWorks and Cleveland Public Art, are thriving.

For civic leaders and philanthropists, the question is whether the flow of money to the arts should be determined by a true appreciation of artistic quality

and innovation, not simply measurable economic impact. In a city with a shrinking population and diminishing resources, demands for arts funding may rise, even as the supply of available cash becomes scarce. Foundations, donors, and government will have to make tough decisions about where to invest. Quality is never a bad investment, but innovation is equally important. As a city whose history of cultural conservatism has paralleled its long economic decline, Cleveland needs to consider how it can preserve and celebrate the best of the past, while also becoming a place where new and original thinking is not only encouraged, but demanded. Cleveland needs to become a place that generates new ideas, not just one that imports artistic concepts or popularizes existing ideas in order to realize quick financial gain. Cleveland needs more people like Charles Burchfield, Viktor Schreckengost, and Peter Lewis—not another Archibald Willard.

SOURCES

- Adams, Henry. *Viktor Schreckengost and 20th Century Design*. Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, distributed by Washington University Press, 2000.
- Gaede, Robert, and Richard van Petten. *Guide to Cleveland Architecture*. 2nd ed. Cleveland: Cleveland Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, 1997.
- Johannesen, Eric. *A Cleveland Legacy: The Architecture of Walker and Weeks*. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1999.
- . *Cleveland Architecture, 1876–1976*. Rev. ed. Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1981.
- Litt, Steven. “Cleveland’s Long-time Love Affair with Culture.” *The Plain Dealer*, Special Section: The Life of a City/Cleveland Celebrates its Bicentennial, December 31, 1995.
- . “The Forgotten Valley” (series of 5 articles). *The Plain Dealer*, November 19–25, 2000.
- Miller, Carol Poh, and Robert Wheeler. *Cleveland: A Concise History, 1796–1996*. 2nd ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- The New American City Faces Its Regional Future: A Cleveland Perspective*. Edited by David C. Sweet, Kathryn Wertheim Hexter, and David Beach. Columbus: Ohio University Press, 1999.
- Transformations in Cleveland Art: 1796–1946*. Edited by William Robinson and David Steinberg. Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1996.
- Witchey, Holly Rarick, and John Vacha. *Fine Arts in Cleveland: An Illustrated History*. Vol 3, *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

MEDICINE IN CLEVELAND

FROM ELIXIR-FILLED BLACK BAGS TO MODERN MARVELS

DIANE SOLOV

Nearly all men die of their medicines, not of their diseases. So said Moliere, and it was mostly true in the days when David Long became the first doctor to make Cleveland his home in 1810.

The “regular” physicians treated patients with purging through vomiting, laxatives and enemas, bloodletting and blistering, burning the skin with hot plasters to induce pus, all part of the so-called Heroics tradition. Medicinal solutions included mercury, arsenic, opium, and peppermint oil. The main tools of a surgeon were a scalpel, a bone-saw, boiling water, and gauze. Pain was numbed with whiskey.

Today’s “regulars” in medicine have become heroes of a far different sort, and they loom large in both Cleveland’s history and its future. Seismic shifts in the makeup of Cleveland’s economy have made medicine the region’s largest employer and one of its brightest hopes for the region’s successful transition from a city built on steel and autos. Cleveland’s leading healthcare organizations have earned bragging rights to a long list of medical “firsts,” including the first successful defibrillation of a human heart at University Hospitals in 1947 and the first successful coronary artery bypass surgery at the Cleveland Clinic in 1967.

From routine surgeries accomplished through tiny incisions in the belly-button to a face transplant of a woman mauled by a chimpanzee, from a pharmacopeia that spans aspirin to therapy that corrects abnormal genes, from X-rays to detailed, color-coded images of our vascular systems, medicine marches to seemingly endless new awe-inspiring innovation. The average life expectancy of Americans today is about 80, twice what it was in 1850.¹

But still far too many patients die of their medicines. No longer are they victims of their doctors’ lack of knowledge about the mechanisms of human disease, as at the dawn of modern medicine. Preventable medicine and treatment errors

claim an estimated 98,000 lives a year nationally; deadly infections that people get in hospitals kill more.

Our cities no longer lose hundreds to outbreaks of typhus or cholera, as they did from poor sanitary conditions as Cleveland's growth swelled after the Ohio and Erie Canal increased access to the region. Among our modern day epidemics are obesity, diabetes, heart disease, and high blood pressure. Premature death and costly, debilitating complications like amputations and strokes occur too frequently, even though doctors long ago learned how these conditions can be managed to avoid them.

In America's colonial years, Benjamin Rush, a founding father and Philadelphia physician and important figure in early American medicine, so exuberantly applied his bloodletting "cure" that his front yard buzzed with flies from the blood he spilled. It was only after renowned British journalist William Cobbett declared Rush's work "one of those great discoveries which have contributed to the depopulation of the earth" that Rush's practice waned.² Today, scholars of the history of medicine still debate his place in history because he continued using treatments despite factual evidence that discredited both his theory and his methods.

Too often today, doctors prescribe treatments that overlook what the latest science has determined to provide the most benefit and the least risk to their patients. Chalk it up as an unintended consequence of the breakneck speed of discovery and the way our health care system has evolved: Modern medicine churns out so much new research that it is impossible for any one doctor to stay current. But it is well understood that geographic regions differ greatly in their use of practices that are well established by "science." One reason may be information overload; another is that certain practices become part of an accepted routine of regional peers. Another may be that the way we pay for health care sometimes obstructs our ability to get the best care that modern medicine can deliver, instead of the most.

"'Evidence-based medicine' is not just a catch phrase," wrote Dr. Donald Berwick, the so-called father of the movement for safe, high-quality medicine, "it is a promise we want to make to our patients—to use all the care—and only the care—that can help them."

When David Long moved west from New York to become the first doctor to make Cleveland his home, he was 23 and one of the rare practicing physicians to have graduated from a medical school. Only 300 people lived in the area, but a local resident told him that Cleveland's burgeoning growth would provide a good income. He opened a dry goods store and other businesses to supplement visits

to sick residents, and he cut his teeth as a surgeon in the war of 1812. Later, he became an active business and civic leader, too.

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century, a doctor's visit cost 50 cents if the patient lived within one mile; twice that if further; the price of a tooth abstraction a dime. There was little that Long and the growing number of physicians really could do for residents who took ill. The germ theory, anesthesia, and penicillin were decades in the future. Competing theories of disease determined treatments, and there were many of both. Homeopathic medicine took root in Cleveland, a school of thought based on the teachings of a German who espoused that disease could be cured by tiny amounts of whatever would cause the same symptoms of the illness. No wonder this approach appealed more to patients than swallowing mercury (a metallic element now known to be toxic) to cleanse the bowels and being relieved of numerous pints of their own blood.

In 1837, as poverty and smallpox plagued the growing Cleveland, the poorhouse was designated as City Hospital. The city was in the throes of a financial crisis, and the new hospital, located next to the Erie Cemetery across from what is now Progressive Field, soon overflowed with people who had chronic disease, mental illness, or were too poor or old to care for themselves.

The population explosion that came with Cleveland's industrial growth attracted more physicians, and physician-led medical schools. These included a homeopathic medical school, as well as a "regulars" school that was the antecedent of Case Western Reserve University's School of Medicine. By the time the first cannons fired to start the Civil War in 1861, the homeopaths had opened a hospital (evolving into what is now Cleveland Clinic's Huron Hospital in East Cleveland), followed in 1865 by the opening of St. Vincent Charity Hospital, which the first bishop of the Cleveland Catholic Diocese built. Not to be outdone, the Protestants responded by opening their own, eventually taking over a Marine hospital that would later be renamed Lakeside Hospital and evolve into University Hospitals Case Medical Center. By 1887, Lakeside was treating more than 900 patients, each at the high cost of \$1.20 a day.³

Dudley P. Allen was a well-heeled and forward-thinking surgeon, schooled at Oberlin College and Harvard University, a third-generation Cleveland doctor when he returned to the city to build his career in 1883. While he was one of the first to use rubber gloves in surgery, he also was known for making liberal use of his connections to Cleveland's industrial titans to achieve his career goals. Allen was short, brusque, and ambitious, the son-in-law of Louis Severance (grandson of David Long and treasurer of the Rockefeller Standard Oil trust). He had battled his way to the chairmanship of surgery at the medical school and to become chief surgeon when the new Lakeside Hospital opened in 1898 at East Ninth Street and St. Clair Avenue, just up the hill from where the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame sits today.

Allen's political prowess and power was tested when hospital trustees implemented a plan to address the growing need to bring in funds to supplement charitable donations. George W. Crile was 36 years old, handsome and charming and so popular with patients and prolific in his operations that he sometimes was called "The Carver Kid."⁴ Crile and his associates had a prominent and successful medical practice on the west side that catered to well-to-do patients, who trustees hoped would choose Lakeside for surgeries. On their urging, Allen brought Crile on board as an associate.

Almost from the start, Allen and Crile began to bicker. They would engage in years of full-throttled battles for control of surgery, patients, and research space before it became clear that Crile was using his talents and charm to clear the way to succeed Allen as chief surgeon. Neither of them knew that Crile and his colleagues would one day build their own new medical organization, The Cleveland Clinic, and become the chief competitor to University Hospitals Case Medical Center, Lakeside's successor.

For most of the nineteenth century, hospitals primarily were for poor, sick patients. Private physicians collected fees for prescriptions; hospital dispensaries did not. Still, poor people were invaluable for training new physicians, and hospitals were, after all, charitable organizations. As for the middle-class, hospitals were places that were to be assiduously avoided, because of the associated poverty, as well as the non-trivial risk that they could die from infection. Penicillin wasn't discovered until 1928, and it took nearly 20 years more to figure out how to produce it in large quantities (the first large batch in the United States was produced just in time to supply troops for the 1944 Normandy invasion.) As rubber gloves and other antiseptic measures became accepted and chloroform and nitrous oxide became routine anesthesia, hospitals increasingly became more accepted by the non-poor. As the new century began, hospitals asked more patients to pay, but doctors did not receive the fees. Arrangements were negotiated, such as private wards for their own patients, where doctors could charge fees.

By 1900, Cleveland had 16 hospitals. City Hospital, the precursor of MetroHealth, in 1899 had built a new facility to replace the poorhouse. A new homeopathic hospital that evolved into Huron Hospital in East Cleveland was built in 1879 to accommodate homeopathic doctors, which the "regulars" wouldn't accept.

A breakthrough study published in 1910 on the state of physician education and training that became widely known as The Flexner Report would spur more. Commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation, the report decried the commercialization of medical education, low admission standards, and the harm being done to patients because of poorly trained doctors.

It is a singular fact that the organization of medical education in this country has hitherto been such as not only to commercialize the process itself, but also to obscure in the minds of the public any discrimination between the well trained physician and the physician who has had no adequate training whatsoever. As a rule, Americans, when they avail themselves of the services of a physician, make only the slightest inquiry as to what his previous training and preparation have been.⁵

One hundred years later, American consumers still are largely clueless about their health and health care—a contributor to the state of things today—but we'll get to that later. The reason that the Flexner Report was so important is that it spurred standards for medical education, including the requirement of a high school diploma and at least two years of college, preferably replete with science classes, and a four-year medical school curriculum at a school that was part of a university or college with good access to clinical facilities. When the report was published, the Homeopathic Medical College that opened in 1849 required a high school diploma or equivalent, but Western Reserve University, at the urging of Dudley Allen, in 1909 became the third medical school in the country to require at least a bachelor's degree. Western Reserve, whose ties to what is now University Hospitals Case Medical Center were growing, was praised in the report for its modern laboratories, including a new clinical lab at the hospital to link bedside and lab work, a mutually beneficial arrangement the report said schools in Boston, Chicago, and New York might emulate.

The watershed report recommended that commercial medical schools be closed or folded into universities, as well as others that were ill-equipped to teach basic science and provide clinical experiences in nearby hospitals. It succeeded in swiftly raising standards on medical education, but it also affected the diversity of the profession for decades. The medical schools that remained became more expensive and selective, greatly reducing educational and training opportunities for women, African-Americans, and Jews, who were particularly affected in the great immigration periods following World War I.^{6,7}

Hospitals such as Cleveland's Mt. Sinai Medical Center, which had started as a religious charity to serve the influx of poor and meet their religious observance needs, also became necessary to train Jewish doctors who could not get internships and residencies at non-Jewish hospitals. The city's first African-American and women's hospitals were established to serve the training needs of minority physicians.

A new emphasis on medical research also began to shape hospitals, in Cleveland and across the country. When Crile took the reins from Allen to become chief surgeon at Lakeside, he declared "a new era" for the hospital, and indeed it was. More physicians were working full-time in the laboratory, and Western Reserve medical students were required to rotate through laboratories.

Lakeside and Western Reserve began to consider a unified vision and lasting affiliation, one that would have top clinicians forgo their private medical practice and make research and teaching, rather than strictly patient care, their primary role. University Hospitals Case Medical Center's academic medicine roots were planted.

The casualties of war always bring new opportunities for medical innovation, and World War I was no exception. Crile, who led a medical unit in France with volunteers from the hospital in World War I, returned to Cleveland with a new vision of how health care should be delivered. While known for his interest and accomplishments in medical research, he had seen in war the benefit of working in concert with physicians who were particularly knowledgeable in certain medical disciplines. His friendship with the Mayo brothers, who had developed a group practice of doctors from different medical fields in Rochester, Minnesota, began to take on new significance. Like patients seen in the Minnesota clinic, those in Crile's clinic would pay the clinic, not the doctor who treated them.

In February 1921 the Cleveland Clinic opened for business in a new building on Euclid Avenue. In a speech to 500 physicians, including William J. Mayo, M.D., who visited for the occasion, Crile said the Clinic would pledge at least a quarter of its net income to the Cleveland Clinic Foundation, whose ongoing focus would be research on diseases. Its successors would carry its knowledge and legacy into future generations through fellowships offered to young doctors:

With the rapid advance of medicine to its present-day status in which it evokes the aid of all the natural sciences, an individual is no more able to undertake the more intricate problems alone, without the aid and cooperation of colleagues having special training in each of the various clinical and laboratory branches, than he would be today to make an automobile alone. We have, therefore, created an organization and a building to the end that in making a diagnosis or planning a treatment, the clinician may have at his disposal the advantages of the laboratories of the applied sciences and of colleagues with special training in the various branches of medicine and surgery.

The Clinic doctors continued to bring their patients to local hospitals, including Lakeside Hospital (University Hospitals' precursor). But Lakeside had been unable to interest Crile in forging a relationship between the new clinic and the hospital. The day after an open house that drew 1,500 people to the new clinic on a Sunday, 42 signed on as Clinic patients. The founders decided soon after that their group practice would need its own hospital. When its growth in patients outpaced the beds it was able to add by buying houses and refurbishing them as hospitals, the Clinic opened a modern 184-bed hospital in 1924, the same day Crile officially retired from Lakeside; a new research building was added a few years later.

Fierce competition between University Hospitals Case Medical Center and the Cleveland Clinic has ensued ever since.

At the turn of the twentieth century, doctors didn't make much money, because it was hard to find paying patients. Most patients still were treated in their homes and treatments were limited, so costs were low. But the status of physicians as a dignified profession began to take shape, even before the standardized rigor of medical education made it so. A book that was popular and revised with multiple editions from 1882 to 1922 advised doctors to wear a clean shirt with a clean collar and fashionable clothing. They were advised to follow five "cardinal" duties at each visit: feel the pulse, check the tongue, ask about appetite, sleep, and bowels.⁸ Doctors should post their fees in their office with a sign that priced consultations from \$1 to \$10, so that patients who pay the lowest are pleased but that everyone knows they are "skillful enough to attend ten dollar cases."

After the Flexner Report, the smaller number of medical schools greatly reduced the number of doctors. Between medical advances, greater trust in physicians and fewer doctors, medical care became more costly. Hospitals began to charge those who could afford to pay, and medical bills were taking a bigger bite out of a family's income, reaching about 13% in 1929, when an average urban family's annual income was less than \$2,000.⁹

It was during his family's own financial problems from medical bills that Clevelander John R. Mannix got the idea of "pre-paid" hospital care, while working as a clerk at Mt. Sinai Medical Center.

By 1934, Mannix's efforts had led to the creation of the predecessor of what is now Medical Mutual of Ohio, a not-for-profit organization that became the first to offer health insurance policies to an entire region that was good for groups of hospitals. Launched by a consortium of hospitals to help with operating costs in the Depression, the first policy issued by what was then Blue Cross of Ohio charged subscribers 60 cents a month, which would cover expenses of a three-week stay in the ward of any of 13 hospitals; 15 cents more each month for a room with just two beds. Benefits received for the subscriber fees included bed and board, general nursing care, routine lab tests and x-rays, anesthesia, ordinary drugs, and surgical dressings.¹⁰

In 1938, Cleveland's Blue Cross became the first plan in the United States to pay hospitals based on the cost of care provided to Blue Cross enrollees¹¹—a key feature that would loom large in escalating health care costs in future decades. The money generally moved like this: Employers paid health plan premiums for each worker who signed up. Health plans, in turn, paid hospitals and doctors when they treated one of their members. The hospitals benefited from having a

steady source of income and patient volumes, and so gave health plans, and thus employers, discounted prices.

Insurance for doctors' bills didn't come until 1945, when employers got into the act because of stiff competition for workers during World War II. With a government freeze on wages, they could offer more to employees by adding health benefits.¹²

Then came the boom years.

At the start of the 1950s, health care accounted for 4.5% of the Gross National Product. Infections were conquered with penicillin and other new antibiotics, modern anesthesia had replaced ether, and federal tax deductions to companies for health benefits provided to their employees gave more Americans the means to access health care. Cleveland's modern medical infrastructure had firmly established roots and was ready to play its part in modern medicine.

Western Reserve University's School of Medicine had moved to a new building on University Circle in 1924, and in 1925 the new Maternity and Babies' and Children's Hospitals were completed next door. University Hospitals was formed, taking administrative control of the two new hospitals and Lakeside, which would soon close its outdated hospital on East 9th Street and open a modern new one in 1931, alongside them.

The medical staff at City Hospital (now MetroHealth Medical Center) had become affiliated with the medical school, as had Mt. Sinai Medical Center, whose 160-bed hospital built in 1916 on East 105th Street had more than doubled in size. These completed the set of Cleveland academic medical centers through the 20th century.

Other non-teaching hospitals, such as Fairview and Lutheran, had been established in the sprawling Cleveland neighborhoods and suburbs, and larger hospitals distinguished themselves with new nursing schools and other ancillary services.

While the Great Depression and World War II had triggered financial and staffing crises throughout health care and the region, the economic boom that followed produced medical advances and growth at hospitals within University Circle and beyond. Contagious disease and crippling viruses filled hospital beds. Tuberculosis raged in the 1930s; polio became the scourge in the 1940s and '50s. Both became major foci of clinical and research faculty at City Hospital (now MetroHealth), underscoring its important role in public health. The expanding number of medical specialties, discoveries, and advances accelerated in all Cleveland's major hospitals in the decades following the war. To wit:

- MetroHealth pioneered research that established the link between strep throat and rheumatic heart disease, and one of its physicians was awarded the Nobel Prize for research that led to isolating the polio virus.
- The research department at the now defunct St. Luke's Hospital developed the world's first heart-lung machine at St. Vincent's Hospital.
- Cleveland Clinic heart surgeons performed the world's first successful "stopped-heart" surgery, while a pediatric cardiologist accidentally discovered imaging techniques for coronary arteries, ushering in decades of life-prolonging cardiac surgeries, including the first coronary artery bypass surgery at the Clinic in 1967.
- University Hospitals Case Medical Center's Rainbow Babies and Children's launched one of the first centers on cystic fibrosis research and treatment.¹³
- In 1965, when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the historic legislation creating Medicare and Medicaid, health care growth exploded, as if a match was tossed into a barrel of gasoline.

When Medicare was enacted to provide low-cost health insurance to people age 65 and over, an average man born in 1950 was expected to die by age 66; a woman by age 72.¹⁴ With accelerating medical advances and increased access to care, life expectancies grew rapidly. So did medical costs.

By 1970, the U.S. was spending about \$75 billion, or \$356 per resident, on health care, which accounted for 7.2% of GDP. An estimated 86 percent of Americans had some kind of health insurance, allowing them to pursue virtually any care and treatment they wanted, without feeling the sting of a big bill. Because their employers paid the insurance company, which, in turn, paid the doctors and hospitals, employers and patients had little notion or reason to inquire about the costs of the care received. Likewise, the growing number of drugs produced by pharmaceutical companies cost little or nothing to people with pharmacy coverage.

Cost pressures began to intrude on what seemed to be unlimited expansion of health care services, technology, and life-extending care in the 1970s. Hospitals were changing fast, particularly those affiliated with medical schools and the associated responsibilities of teaching and research.

Cleveland's large teaching hospitals became magnets for specialists and subspecialists, who brought the latest treatments and most sophisticated medicine for tough cases. Keeping pace with technological innovations required them to

acquire the latest in diagnostic and treatment devices, which had to be paid for, whether patients filled their beds or not. The demands for space to accommodate the growing specialization and the cost pressures to draw more patients spurred the large medical centers to their first efforts to offer more routine care in satellite medical offices and outpatient surgical facilities in neighborhoods distant from the city center. They also forged relationships with smaller hospitals that could refer their patients to their flagship medical centers.

As the medical centers pursued research and other advances, each of the large centers began to take on their own character and to become recognized for particular expertise, locally and nationally. For the Clinic, which had performed its first heart transplant in 1968, it was heart disease. For University Hospitals, which had become one of the first hospitals in the country to successfully treat leukemia with bone-marrow transplants, it was cancer and pediatrics at Rainbow. At MetroHealth, which had been owned by Cuyahoga County since 1958, it was trauma and emergency services, burns, rehabilitation, and being the “safety net” for care of the county’s poor and uninsured.

By 1983, when LifeFlight’s canary-yellow medical helicopters first took flight, the doctors and nurses crouched over gurneys as they raced from the helipad had become symbols for the hero status that the march of medicine had caused patients to confer on their doctors.

Bigger was better, or least a better bet. That was surely the chorus sounded in hospital board rooms across Greater Cleveland as the 20th century began its last decade. Rising health care costs and the 1992 election of President Bill Clinton, who promised health reform, triggered rapid changes in health care markets across the country.

“Managed care” had become the buzzword of the day, a model that made primary care, not specialty care, the centerpiece of the health delivery system. It was a good theory, but it became a code word for cost-cutting, the way most insurance companies implemented it. Health insurance enrollees were required to first see their general practice doctors—pediatricians, general internists and family docs—who would decide whether to refer them to a high-cost specialist. Filling hospital beds promised to get more difficult for the region’s prestigious hospitals.

Conventional thinking was that health insurers, many of them now national public companies whose stock traded on the New York Stock Exchange, would contract for their customers’ health benefits with hospital systems that could offer a full menu of services across the wide swaths of geography that its members inhabited. The Cleveland Clinic and University Hospitals set out to build their comprehensive health systems, filling in gaps so that each had all the components

a patient would need from cradle to grave, as the span of services often was described. The flurry of activity re-ignited the historical tension between UH and the Clinic.

To match the neonatal intensive care unit at University Hospitals' Rainbow Babies' and Children's Hospital, the Clinic built its own; to compete with UH's Ireland Cancer Center, the Clinic built Taussig Cancer Institute. UH set out to capture a third of the market, "to feed" the specialists housed in its flagship tower in University Circle, and added its own health plan. To build its capacity in cardiac care—whose care was long dominated by the Clinic—it hired an entire group of cardiologists from Mt. Sinai Medical Center, an increasingly frequent casualty in the medical arms race waged by the Clinic and UH.

The one-upmanship spilled into primary care, a battle that was fought in the suburbs. With primary care doctors as gatekeepers to specialists, the big hospitals would have to get more of them in more places to refer to its towering flagships. Multi-storied medical buildings popped up along highways on suburban commuter routes with the Clinic logo; UH added new outpatient centers, too, and hired more primary care doctors.

Within each of the storied institutions came reminders of the relative advantages of each model. UH's doctors practiced medicine as private doctors and were professors, with the independence afforded by academic freedom; Clinic doctors were Clinic employees, making its organization more nimble in changing times. The historical competition was played out in hospitals and medical offices across the region as UH and Clinic leaders fought to win the hearts and minds of physicians, hospital administrators, and paying patients. Farah Walters, UH's chief executive officer, seemed to be channeling the prickly Dudley Allen of 1899, while Floyd D. Loop, the Clinic's chief, personified the cool George Crile. To those they courted, it often seemed to be about choosing sides.

The battle for market share heated up dramatically when the largest for-profit hospital system in the country stuck its flag in Cleveland soil and declared that it soon would command a third of the health care market. Community hospitals across the region started looking for a friendly merger to ensure their futures. The Cleveland Clinic and University Hospitals fought vigorously to win the most prized among them, battles that often landed in newspapers and the courts.

When the dust settled, the health care landscape was forever altered. The rapid consolidation in the 1990s left Cuyahoga County with three health care systems (not counting the federal Louis B. Stokes Veterans Administration Hospital), when the beloved and beleaguered Mt. Sinai Medical Center closed in 2000. Remaining are two large organizations that account for the lion's share of the county's health care, the Cleveland Clinic Health System, which has more than \$5 billion in annual revenues and University Hospitals Health System, which has nearly \$2 billion in annual revenues. The MetroHealth System, the

county-owned safety-net health system has just one hospital and a \$760 million budget. In Cuyahoga County, only two other general hospitals, Parma Community General Hospital and St. Vincent Medical Center, are not owned or in some way linked with the Clinic or UH.

The Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, and the MetroHealth System continue to bring distinction to Greater Cleveland. For all the changes that ensued in the tumultuous 1990s, Cleveland is fortunate to have some of the top-ranked health care organizations in the country. Health care is the region's largest employer. The sector continues to grow, one of the few to do so, as the economy continues its transition from its historic manufacturing base.

The Clinic and UH continue to add new buildings and enhancements to their existing campuses and patient care.

The Clinic, which has drawn kings and princes from around the world to Cleveland, has become truly international, with a new medical center opening in 2012 in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates; and a facility in Toronto. It employs 2,000 physicians and scientists, who represent 120 specialties and subspecialties, and recorded more than 4.2 million visits from patients across the region, the United States, and from 80 other nations. In *U.S. News and World Report* rankings, its heart program has topped the national list for 16 years.

University Hospitals Case Medical Center has two new hospitals in the final phase of construction that will bring the latest thinking about hospital care to the Ahuja Medical Center when it opens early in 2011 in Beachwood, and to cancer patients at its new Ireland Cancer Center on the main hospital campus. Its pediatric neonatology program at Rainbow Babies' and Children's Hospital was ranked fourth in the country in *U.S. News's* last report. Case Western Reserve University's School of Medicine and University Hospitals, CWRU's primary teaching partner, together form the largest biomedical research center in Ohio.

MetroHealth Medical Center continues its historic commitments to serve those who are most in need, as well as to research and education. Its Emergency Room is the region's busiest, posting more than 92,000 visits in 2009, and its rehabilitation program ranks among the top centers in the country and includes one of 14 model centers for treating spinal-cord injuries. MetroHealth's nine community health centers provide access in neighborhoods where residents live and shop, and a new health center catering to the elderly replaced a shuttered hospital on which the aging neighborhood had relied. It was the nation's first safety-net hospital to fully implement an electronic medical record system, a vital tool for delivering high-quality care.

To be sure, Cleveland is a great place to be, if you become seriously ill or are injured in an accident. But it's become clear that medical technology and

scientific knowledge alone are insufficient to address our modern-day epidemics of lifestyle-related conditions, such as obesity and diabetes. Chronic diseases, such as diabetes, account for 75% of the nation's \$2.3 trillion annual health care bill.

The ever-rising cost of health care and the high prevalence of chronic disease demand some new ways to think about what constitutes high quality health care. No matter how “good” a doctor is, the best outcomes come when the right care is delivered at the time that is right for the patient. That means that care is based on the best available medical evidence, that it is coordinated among a patient's doctors, and that it includes and respects the patient in decisions about treatments.

Consumers have to play a part in this intellectual shift, too, by asking questions, being informed about healthy behaviors and demanding high-quality care. And we have to understand that quality of care is not the same as the quantity of care. Often, more care is not better care, it is just more—or worse—it is harmful. And it costs everyone too much, without making us healthier.

A typical family spent about \$15,000 in 2009 for health care¹⁵—more than you'd pay for a spanking new Nissan Cube. Health care has become a huge part of the U.S. economy, accounting for 17.3 percent (!) of spending. The federal government, which foots the bill for nearly half of the nation's health care tab through its Medicare and Medicaid programs, since the 1970s has tried different strategies to rein in costs. It's been a tough road, because new medical technology is expensive and because we pay doctors and hospitals to treat sick people, with little or no payments to help their patients stay healthy and out of the hospital.

For example, if you have health insurance and go to the doctor for a sore throat, your doctor may test for strep infection and write a prescription. The doctor can bill your insurance company for your visit. But if someone is diagnosed with diabetes, the doctor can't be reimbursed for a visit to teach them how to change their diet, test their blood sugar, and do other things to manage this serious, ongoing condition—one that without good self-management can cause blindness, amputations, heart disease, and kidney failure. In the end, these complications cost everyone more, especially in the quality of life for patients and their families.

The good news is that, while Greater Cleveland's large medical centers still compete, they also are collaborating to help make our region healthier. Greater Cleveland has become a recognized leader in the national movement to improve the quality and value of health care by “competing” on quality, by measuring and publicly reporting their achievement on meeting nationally accepted standards of good care and optimal outcomes. By measuring their performance, they identify gaps in the care they provide and the outcomes that their patients receive, then find ways to improve them.

New federal incentives promise to help, too, by encouraging health care providers to switch from paper medical charts to electronic medical records. Electronic records can be programmed to remind doctors to order a test, to provide information on evidence-based treatments, and to show progress toward improving their patients' care. Did they remember to check for up-to-date vaccinations?

Today, the federal government reports the performance of nearly all hospitals on selected standards of quality care at HospitalCompare.hhs.gov. In Greater Cleveland, more than 400 primary care doctors in 45 practices from different health care systems publicly report their achievement on standards for effective care of people with common chronic conditions through a collaboration known as Better Health Greater Cleveland. These rankings soon may get more ink than the "best hospitals" lists in glossy magazines, which speak more to popularity than actual patient outcomes. That will require a mental shift for consumers, one the Flexner Report noted in 1910.

Also gaining steam in Greater Cleveland is a new model of care that once again looks to generalist doctors and the supporting casts in their medical offices to play a bigger role in our health care—and to give patients the access, information, and help they need to coordinate their care in this complicated health care system. Why shouldn't we get postcards to remind us that we are due for a check-up? Our pets' veterinarians send them. Why can't we use e-mail or phone calls to follow up with doctors or nurses? It sounds like simple stuff, but it hasn't happened, because the payment system won't pay the offices for it. And the generalist doctors, the ones who best know us, our families, and our medical history, already are paid far less than specialists.

But the other way that health care will get smarter and our region will become healthier is if consumers stop thinking of their health insurance card like it's a Visa card that never has to be paid. Even with rising costs to the consumer through co-payments for doctor's visits and other out-of-pocket expenditures, those of us with insurance are still insulated from what medical care really costs. Just because we pay only \$35 for the \$1,200 MRI the doctor orders for the sore back we got after doing yard work all weekend doesn't mean we shouldn't ask why such a costly test is necessary.

As consumers, we should be asking our doctors more questions, not just because of the cost, but because the risk of harm from some treatments may exceed the expected benefit.

Shouldn't we know at least as much about our health as we do about our smart phones?

ENDNOTES

1 Michael Haines, "Fertility and Mortality in the United States," in *EH.Net Encyclopedia*, ed. Robert Whaples (March 19, 2008).

2 Robert L. North, "Benjamin Rush, MD: assassin or beloved healer?" *Baylor University Medical Center Proceedings* 13, no. 1 (January 2000): 45–49.

3 Mark Gottlieb. *The Lives of University Hospitals of Cleveland: The 125-Year Evolution of an Academic Medical Center* (Chesterland, OH: Octavia Press, 1991)

4 Ibid.

5 Abraham Flexner, *Medical Education in the United States and Canada: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, Bulletin No. 4 (New York: Carnegie Foundation, 1910).

6 Barron H. Lerner, "In Time of Quotas, a Quiet Pose in Defiance," *New York Times*, May 25, 2009.

7 Robert A. Katz, "PAGING DR. SHYLOCK!: Jewish Hospitals and the Prudent Re-Investment of Jewish Philanthropy," in *Religious Giving: For Love of God*, David H. Smith, ed. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010).

8 Lester S. King, *American Medicine Comes of Age, 1840–1920: Essays to Commemorate the Founding of the Journal of the American Medical Association July 14, 1883* (Chicago: American Medical Association, 1984).

9 Gorman, Linda. "The History of Health Care Costs and Health Insurance," *Wisconsin Research Institute Report* 19, no. 10 (October 2006).

10 David D. Van Tassel and John J. Grabowski, eds., *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, 2nd ed. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996).

11 Ibid.

12 Melissa Thomasson, "Health Insurance in the United States," in *EH.Net Encyclopedia*, ed. Robert Whaples (April 17, 2003). <http://eh.net/encyclopedia/article/thomasson.insurance.health.us>

13 *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*.

14 Linda Gorman, "The History of Health Care Costs and Health Insurance," *Wisconsin Research Institute Report* 19, no. 10 (October 2006).

15 David Leonhardt, "Challenge to Health Bill: Selling Reform," *New York Times*, July 21, 2009.

HEALTH CARE HISTORY & POLICY

IN GREATER CLEVELAND

CHRIS SEPER

It took healthcare a mere 35 years to transform itself from a benevolent healer in a gritty blue-collar metropolis to Greater Cleveland's economic and political powerhouse. In 1972, healthcare made up less than 6 percent of the work force. Meanwhile, manufacturing employed 30 percent of all workers, according to the U.S. Department of Labor. But by 2007—thanks to national changes in health insurance, a global shift in manufacturing and the serendipitous innovation of generations of Cleveland physicians—the worm turned. Manufacturing employed 13.44 percent of the work force. Healthcare: 13.55 per cent.

For quite some time, Cleveland's healthcare industry had clout through numbers: the ability to rally thousands of voters for personal objectives. Often, the majority of the local industry's focus—an industry dominated by hospitals as opposed to medical device companies or big pharmaceutical firms—was on federal initiatives, where health systems could tap into lucrative federal dollars to spur research and growth. But in the last decade, the region has hitched its economic future to the concept that creating a true medical industry of biotech companies, medical device startups, health IT businesses and similar companies—supported largely by healthcare giants like Cleveland Clinic—will replace manufacturing as the region's economic provider. To create this new industry, the region is relying heavily on state dollars through programs that funnel public money into promising research, institutions and private businesses. What's more, state aid and tax credits subsidize private investors who ostensibly will take some of their own money to invest in promising medical businesses.

This new strategy is far from a sure bet. The realities of the economic evolution have changed as dramatically as the Cleveland economy from 1972 until today. Companies are significantly less likely to go public—a real economic breakthrough—as they are to be acquired by larger businesses, taking the companies, talent and jobs with them. And in an era of outsourcing and virtual companies, the number of jobs private medical companies can create is limited.

Meanwhile, the big-bucket opportunities—such as nursing and health policy—are developing alongside these initiatives, albeit less well-funded and hampered by state legislation.

EARLY BEGINNINGS & CLEVELAND CLINIC

Early policy influences from Cleveland’s medical community came largely in the public health sphere. For example, the establishment of what is now University Hospitals’ MacDonald Women’s Center in the early 1890s helped make Cleveland’s infant mortality rate the lowest among the nation’s 10 largest cities. A series of charity hospitals primarily assisted the indigent. Two of these hospitals, Sisters of Charity St. Vincent Medical Center and the publicly funded MetroHealth System, still exist today.

The crucial moment for the region’s medical fortunes occurred in 1921, when Cleveland physicians returned from World War I to create Cleveland Clinic. The doctors—George Crile, Frank Bunts, John Phillips and William Lower—modeled the practice after the concept of collaboration between physicians, known as a “group medicine” approach, commonly found in the military. The Clinic’s growth was consistently fast, save a 1929 fire that almost shuttered the facility.

As the Clinic grew, it coupled its patient care with innovative practices—particularly in the field of cardiovascular medicine. It linked causes of high blood pressure with diet, and in 1958 performed the first heart catheterization—in which a narrow tube is placed within the heart to improve blood flow. Nine years later, the Clinic performed the first heart bypass surgery using a leg vein. Other doctors have made advances in the design and use of artificial organs, organ transplants, and the treatment of kidney disease. In June 2010, Clinic doctors announced the potential breakthrough of a vaccine that could prevent breast cancer in adult women.

Cleveland Clinic isn’t alone in the region’s prosperity, particularly in the area of employment and innovation. University Hospitals in Cleveland has over 150 offices and is adding 500 new jobs in Cleveland in 2010. Case Western Reserve University collects more than \$12 million annually in revenue related to licensing commercialized technology. The university is among the top research institutions nationally in licensing revenues and new inventions, according to the Association of University Technology Managers.

Northeast Ohio also has 34 percent of the state’s bioscience jobs—from agricultural biotechnology companies to testing laboratories—and nearly 39 percent of the state’s bioscience businesses, according to research by BioOhio, the state’s bioscience industry developer, and Cleveland State University. Bioscience jobs in the state grew 18 percent from 2000 through 2008, compared to a 4.2 percent drop in total state employment overall.

But Cleveland Clinic has evolved well beyond an employment engine and into a commercialization hub. The health system is considered among the most influential healthcare venturing divisions, has spun off more than 25 companies through Cleveland Clinic Innovations, and recently opened, with the help of state funding, the Global Cardiovascular Innovation Center to attract and incubate new businesses. Its breast cancer vaccine, if successful, could generate millions upon millions of dollars of licensing fees for the health system.

By the 1990s, the Cleveland Clinic Foundation was the second largest employer in Cleveland second only to the government.

Cleveland-area employment changes (by percentage)

	1972	1977	1982	1987	1992	1997	2002	2007
Health Care	5.86	7.22	9.18	10.14	11.03	11.02	12.75	13.55
Manufacturing	30.67	28.64	25.32	20.83	19.55	18.2	14.92	13.44

*Covers Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor area | Source:
Department of Labor, *Wall Street Journal*

NATIONAL CHANGES, LOCAL BATTLES

Today, healthcare makes up 16 percent of the Gross National Product. Any look at the future of Cleveland's healthcare system has to include an understanding of national healthcare shifts. Spending on healthcare increased as health insurance flourished. The earliest experiments started in the late 1800s, but the first health insurance policies began in the 1910s. By the mid- to late-1900s, private insurance companies covered costs of some procedures and subsidized others. Meanwhile, Blue Cross organizations in the mid-1920s began subsidizing payments for hospital procedures.

The success of "The Blues," which also included Blue Shield groups, triggered interest from private insurers, who initially considered medicine an unpromising market, to enter the field. Employee healthcare benefits expanded in the 1940s and unions bargained for better benefit packages as they maneuvered around a wartime wage freeze.

As health-insurance costs rose during the 1970s and 1980s—driven both by improving medical technology and by the growing inefficiencies of the healthcare system—health maintenance organizations, which had been around since the beginning, began to proliferate, along with other managed-care schemes. Like the Blues, HMOs became victims of their own success. Initially they were mainly nonprofit, but once again businesses spotted an opportunity and for-profit HMOs displaced nonprofit HMOs. According to Jonathan Cohn, a senior editor at the *New Republic*, 12 percent of the market was served by for-profits in 1981.

By 1997, it was almost 65 percent. (Noah, Timothy. “A Short History of Health Care,” *Slate*, March 13, 2007.)

The influence of insurers as well as price pressures and competition triggered some of Cleveland’s modern-day political battles. The Ohio “Blues” in the 1980s battled with the rapidly expanding University Hospitals System by excluding it from important insurance products, and later suggested that UH’s beloved Rainbow Babies and Children’s Hospital should join Cleveland Clinic. During the same period, University Hospitals officials thought that Blue Cross helped Cleveland Clinic acquire a local hospital. Due in part to that hostile relationship, University Hospitals formed QualChoice in 1991 to insure University Hospitals and Case Western Reserve University employees. This era, coupled with a history of discord between University Hospitals and Cleveland Clinic and a massive and aggressive expansion by the two institutions in the 1990s, intensified a bitter competition and contributed to the closure of several hospitals including Mount Sinai Medical Center, Deaconess Hospital and St. Michael Hospital.

But consumers and the medical industry found federal help as well. In 1994, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Ohio—now known as Medical Mutual of Ohio—filed suit to enjoin the federal government from barring “Most Favored Nation” clauses under the Sherman Antitrust Act. Most Favored Nation, or MFN, clauses typically require healthcare providers to give an insurance company the lowest rates compared to any other payor. In some instances, Medical Mutual would receive as much as a 15 percent difference in its rates, providing a significant advantage over its competitors. At the time, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Ohio provided more than one-third of the insurance coverage in the Cleveland area.

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Ohio lost its case, and the federal government in 1999 went on to bar MFN clauses from Blue Cross insurance contracts, and also kept Medical Mutual from requiring hospitals to reveal rates or charges levied by other insurance companies and payors.

CHASING FEDERAL DOLLARS

Critical to the clout of Cleveland healthcare institutions is their lobbying power—particularly at the federal level, where institutions can gather lucrative federal grants and contracts to fuel research projects and keep a competitive edge. Many hospital systems and other medical institutions contribute to and rely on their national association such as the American Medical Association and American Hospital Association to lobby on topics such as Medicare reimbursements or federal tort reform. But individual hospitals use their own lobbyists to capture federal dollars for their institutions.

“Health is the new defense,” Michael Heaney, an assistant professor of political science at the University of Florida, said in January 2009. “All the margin in lobbying was in defense, and lobbying was about trying to get your new weapon system picked up by the Pentagon. What’s really happened in the last 10 years is that defense is being displaced by health.”

There are reasons why corporations and institutions lobby go beyond mere education, however. Simply put, it pays off. A study by University of Kansas researchers showed that a single tax break in 2004 earned companies \$220 for every dollar they spent lobbying on the issue.

Invacare, a suburban Cleveland company that makes power wheelchairs, oxygen delivery devices, and other medical equipment, was the top spender among Ohio health companies at \$1.2 million in 2009. Most of its sales are through government programs, particularly Medicare, so any proposal to cut reimbursement rates on hospitals or other customers has a big impact on the company.

In 2009, Cleveland Clinic spent \$740,000 on lobbying and in 2008 spent \$1.15 million to lobby its interests in Washington, D.C. Lobbying on the Clinic’s behalf to the Defense Department helped secure \$10 million of a \$42 million research grant to find ways to treat severe battlefield injuries. It also led to a Clinic-Army Reserve program that gives reservists priority for jobs at the Clinic, as well as millions in research grant dollars dealing with traumatic brain injuries.

But the competition between institutions spills over into federal lobbying efforts. University Hospitals long sought a federal Medicare exemption that would have bolstered payments to the cancer center at its hospital. The amendment would have provided a coveted Medicare exemption for UH and three other hospitals across the country by removing limits on Medicare reimbursements. That could have meant several million dollars annually for the new free-standing Ireland Cancer Center, which is set to open in 2011. But intense efforts by Cleveland Clinic, as well as other Ohio institutions, have kept lawmakers from including the clause.

THIRD FRONTIER & INCREASED STATE AID

As Northeast Ohio continued to look at sustaining industries to substitute for manufacturing, interests in the Cleveland medical industry began planning ways to capitalize on marketable innovations coming from its academic and medical research institutions. The strategy was mostly to leverage state funding to create more opportunities for investments. On one hand, private investment firms would be lured to open an office in the region with the promise of state money for their funds, and these investors would in turn put some of those investment dollars into

Cleveland companies. In addition, for smaller local investors, the state would provide a tax credit that would deliver a 25 percent to 35 percent credit based on the amount of money invested by an individual into a startup company.

More significantly, the state started to campaign in 2003 for Third Frontier, a state-backed bond issue that would invest money into private businesses and fund research at various institutions.

Created in 2002, the Ohio Third Frontier is an unprecedented commitment to create new technology-based products, companies, industries and jobs. In May, the Ohio Third Frontier was extended through 2015, indicating a widely held understanding by the populace that technology and innovation will lead to economic prosperity both today and for future generations.

Today, the Ohio Third Frontier is all about innovation creating opportunity. The \$2.3 billion initiative supports applied research and commercialization, entrepreneurial assistance, early-stage capital formation, and expansion of a skilled talent pool to support technology-based economic growth. The Ohio Third Frontier's strategic intent is to create an "innovation ecosystem" that supports the efficient and seamless transition of great ideas from the laboratory to the marketplace.

The Ohio Third Frontier is successfully building an innovation economy as evidenced by the major contributions in the following areas:

- Dramatically increasing the availability of early-stage equity investment capital;
- Improving the entrepreneurial environment for technology-based companies;
- Improving research and development collaborations between Ohio's research universities and institutions and for-profit companies;
- Driving employment growth in Ohio's technology sector;
- Contributing to the diversity and competitiveness of Ohio's existing manufacturers; and
- Attracting non-Ohio companies into the state.

These processes were a dramatic expansion of the way a state invests public dollars into private interests. And judging from the past eight years, they worked—to a point.

Since its 2002 inception, the Ohio Third Frontier program has created nearly 55,000 jobs and helped create, attract or capitalize more than 600 businesses (this is without the 2010 renewal that added another \$750 million in state investment—for a total of \$2.3 billion). In addition, it attracted nearly \$4.8 billion in investments to Ohio by making \$548 million in grants—a 9-to-1 ratio.

In Greater Cleveland, medical trade groups have used state money and new investor interest through state incentives since 2002 to create or recruit 90 companies, locate \$925 million in new funding for the businesses and generate \$135 million in revenue. In addition, there are 45 venture, angel and seed funds operating in Northeast Ohio—all of which have a focus on the medical industry. These groups have combined to provide \$835 million in equity investments. In addition, Third Frontier funding has helped create stem cell research centers and the Cleveland Clinic-based Global Cardiovascular Innovation Center.

These successes have created one gigantic opportunity. In 2013, Cleveland will have a medically focused convention center—known as the Medical Mart—that will become the commercial hub of the medical industry. Located downtown, it hopes to host dozens of medical conventions every year and provide permanent showroom spaces to scores of medically focused businesses. Cleveland hasn't had a convention center in years, so its presence could generate millions of new dollars annually and further burnish the reputation of the healthcare industry. The mart is largely coming to Cleveland because of the opportunities around the region's major health systems: Summa, Akron Children's Hospital, University Hospitals, MetroHealth and Cleveland Clinic. Merchandise Mart Properties Inc., which is building and managing the mart, describes the project this way:

Cleveland MMCC will house approximately 120,000 square feet of permanent showrooms for major medical manufacturers and service providers. Showrooms focused on cardiology, surgery, OBGYN, imaging, orthopedics, sterilization, healthcare furnishings, patient care, healthcare IT and medical devices will fill the Medical Mart, paving the way for the newest generation of innovation and distribution in the healthcare sector.

Cleveland MMCC will be designed with approximately 300,000 square feet of high-quality exhibit space, featuring high ceilings and industry-standard column spacing. Suited to the needs of medical trade shows and conventions, the facility can host simultaneous events and is ideal for events that need to be paired with conferencing capabilities.

Cleveland MMCC will feature approximately 100,000 square feet of high-tech, flexible meeting rooms of varying sizes to accommodate keynote sessions, seminars and panel discussions, which are the core offering of many medical conferences, meetings and conventions.

Like Third Frontier, the medical mart project will be publicly subsidized. Hundreds of millions of local tax dollars will funnel into the project through a Cuyahoga County sales tax.

The new medically focused economic environment also led the region to attempt a new initiative: a "health-tech corridor" designed to gather promising businesses together in proximity to other research institutions. The plan mimics

the success of other medical innovation hubs, like Research Triangle Park in North Carolina, which concentrated its industry around the research institutions in the Raleigh-Durham area.

Third Frontier has great appeal with its broad array of opportunities: from research at Cleveland Clinic to clean tech businesses to smaller medical startups. Nevertheless, when breaking down the numbers, it costs about \$26,000 in state money to create a new job. In addition, most startup companies—which are a significant beneficiary of the state’s incentives—fail. What’s more, particularly in the medical industry, it’s increasingly unlikely that a Third Frontier initiative will help create a company that, even if successful, remains in Ohio for a long period of time. Companies in the medical field—medical device, pharmaceuticals, health IT—largely aspire to be acquired by a larger company. For example, Cell Targeting is a promising Third Frontier-funded company that helps guide stem cells to the parts of the body they need to heal. Such a technology would cut down on the amount of stem cells needed for treatment and, therefore, cut down on the cost and increase the effectiveness of treatment—even potentially cut down on side effects. However, Cell Targeting Chief Executive Joseph Wagner said his company will grow—at most—to about 35 jobs. If the company is successful, Wagner would expect a larger company to buy the business. At that point, any jobs would most likely be moved to the location of the acquiring company. Those who would benefit from the sale would largely be the investors.

Advocates of the program admit the risk of many companies moving out or disappearing through acquisition or failure. But they point out that the leadership of successful and acquired companies will remain in the region to continue to manage new companies. While Cleveland is flush with medical innovations that can be turned into products, the region does not have a comparable amount of management talent needed to build the businesses. BioEnterprise, a state-funded medical industry trade group in Cleveland, offers an executive-in-residence program that has helped pair executives with promising companies. So even if some—or even many—of the successful companies will leave after being acquired, a more seasoned leader could remain in Cleveland to start another company. Eventually, the advocates say, by creating an ecosystem that starts new companies, seeds them with private and state dollars and connects them with skilled managers, there will be several companies that in the long term decide not to be acquired and to blossom into permanent job-creators in the region.

Quality Electrodynamics is a potential success story. The company has leveraged its Third Frontier investment to create a growing 40-employee business located in suburban Cleveland. It continues to grow and expand on its own, moving into new international markets and estimated to employ 100 workers by 2011.

There is also a different kind of trickle-down benefit to local companies. AxioMed Spine, another Cleveland area medical device company, only employs

15 people. However, it has worked with 60 different Northeast Ohio companies, including specialty-manufacturing businesses that help craft its \$10,000 spine disc replacement tool.

STATE POLICIES AND BIG-BUCKET JOBS

But will that be enough? Will it be enough to satisfy voters, who by 2015 will have invested \$2.3 billion dollars and spent \$26,000 per job in companies that in many instances will not remain in Cleveland—even if the businesses are successful? Will it be enough that skilled managers, enriched by the sale of the companies they run, will remain in Cleveland to again start new companies that rely on state money with the expressed purpose of being sold, primarily to fatten the wallets of the manager and a handful of (state-supported) investment funds? Will voters tolerate tax credits that encourage investment but are, in essence, delivering tax credits to extremely wealthy individuals?

And, most important, will these programs create enough work in Cleveland? The medical industry is the leading employer in Northeast Ohio. But employing 13 percent of the work force is a figure that is only one-third the percentage that manufacturing employed in its heyday. Many of the jobs created in the medical industry—medical device, pharmaceutical and biotechnology in particular—require significantly more education than the general population currently holds. How will these companies provide a broader array of work for a broad population across the region?

To a certain extent, they won't. Medical companies creating devices, biotechnology applications or pharmaceuticals are overwhelmingly expected to be acquired by larger companies, if only to pay back their investors. Regulatory approval processes in Europe and the United States that allows these devices to be sold and used require an increasing amount of money to complete, and require additional private investment. While companies can still bypass acquisition by going public, the market for public companies has plummeted. It is increasingly less likely that a private company will decide to trade shares on the stock market. That's bad news for regions like Northeast Ohio. Public companies are much more likely to remain in their communities, grow jobs and acquire other, smaller companies and bring those jobs and technologies to a region. Right now, that model is largely the exception rather than the rule. As the Cell Targeting CEO said: "No one wants to be the next Merck. They want to be acquired by Merck."

But Cleveland can benefit from the reinvestment of profits when promising small companies are sold. For example, in 2008, Cleveland's NDI Medical sold a medical device to Minnesota medical device titan Medtronic for \$42 million. The company's CEO, Geoff Thrope, has used that money to develop new companies: Checkpoint Surgical and SPR Therapeutics. In addition, Thrope has become a

member of a new early stage investment group in Cleveland called the Medical Growth Fund, which will also invest in promising startups.

However, it's likely the Cleveland medical industry's share of Third Frontier—and its popularity as an economic growth engine—could be eclipsed by another industry: clean tech or “green” technologies that develop clean-running cars, wind turbines and other devices. More manufacturing companies in Northeast Ohio are FDA certified to develop medical devices than most states. This is beneficial to the local economy as medical companies outsource their manufacturing to local companies that used to do the more throwback manufacturing of engines and other products that have since been outsourced overseas. But clean tech, in many instances, is a more lucrative opportunity. Cleveland-area manufacturing giant Timken, for example, can quickly become a global leader in the manufacturing of pieces and parts for wind turbines. In June 2010, the Cleveland Foundation launched a \$1 million initiative to help regional companies reach out to the global clean tech market and attract two to four clean tech businesses to the region. Clean tech already represents \$12.5 billion—about 7.5 percent—of Northeast Ohio's economy, according to the local trade group Team NEO. Plus, clean tech is expected to grow more than 20 percent in the next five years. The medical industry strategy to draw in investors and new businesses into the region has worked. In fact, the emergence of the medical mart will create a broader array of jobs and deliver more money into the local entertainment and retail sectors. That couldn't have been done without the recent efforts to build up the local medical industry. But this same industry will still face increasing pressure to maintain the levels of funding as state legislators consider where to invest their money—using job growth as a primary driver.

A much less ballyhooed— but significantly more beneficial in terms of numbers—job growth opportunity is happening in Northeast Ohio's universities. Large-scale employment opportunities are being created in areas such as nursing and health care policy. Slowly, universities have leveraged public dollars and changed their curriculum to retain the region's work force. In short, while the relatively new medical device industry is helpful, it may be more worthwhile for the broader work force to continue to focus on job training at hospitals, Cleveland's traditional strength, in areas such as nursing and other health-care workers.

Nursing is experiencing a shortage of numbers already and a broader, more acute shortage is on the horizon. For example, there are more than 135,000 registered nurse openings nationwide. But the key to solving the nursing shortage isn't applicants, but supplying enough faculty to teach them. There are almost two open teaching positions at every nursing school, according to the American Association of Colleges of Nursing. As a result, schools turned away nearly 50,000 students in 2009, according to the association. Registered nurses can make \$60,000 or more, depending on the assignment.

Universities have focused on retraining opportunities to increase the number of nurses as well as encourage nurses to enter the teaching ranks.

- Nursing programs at Lorain County Community College and four campuses of Kent State University in 2009 welcomed their inaugural classes of paramedics who want to become registered nurses in a new paramedic-to-RN program. These students will end up with associate degrees in nursing and will be eligible to take the licensing exam to become registered nurses.
- Case Western Reserve University received more than \$900,000 in 2009 from the federal Nurse Education Loan Repayment Program — more than double its usual amount—which tries to cut the nurse-educator shortage. Nursing students going through doctoral programs — like the research-oriented PhD program or the clinically focused Doctorate of Nursing Practice — typically receive the repayment loans. The government forgives 85 percent of the loan if recipients hold a faculty position at an American nursing school for four consecutive years. With the additional funding, CWRU will now offer the loan program to some of its master's degree students.
- Universities throughout Northeast Ohio—including Cleveland State University and Kent State University—have used private and public dollars to expand their “accelerated nursing program” that retrains college-educated workers who have left their previous field. The hope is that these students will also choose to remain and move on to teaching positions.

Nursing initiatives are only part of the educational efforts. The Association of Schools of Public Health in 2008 predicted the United States will need an additional 250,000 health educators, epidemiologists and others in the public health arena by 2020. Kent State University began offering a master's degree in public health in the fall of 2010. It is the school's third public health degree. In 2009, the university opened enrollment for bachelor's and certificate programs in public health. This program is one of only two in all of Ohio.

But Cleveland and the state will need to change its policies and culture to maximize this opportunity. Legislators and medical interest groups—largely hospitals and physicians—have, year after year, opposed expanding responsibilities for nurses. There are some exceptions: House Bill 457 introduced in 2010 would make it easier for nurses to work as faculty members while they pursue a certificate that allows them to write prescriptions. The law would allow nurses more time—up to an additional year—to complete course requirements.

However, these interest groups have largely been successful at quashing proposals that would let nurses pronounce death in certain situations, prescribe prescription drugs and play a larger role in the “medical home,” an approach that focuses on preventive medicine with all patients in the hope that it will cut down on more expensive treatments later in life. A bill passed in 2010 that offered new opportunities and incentives for doctors did not include a role for nurses, despite calls from nurse educators and lobbyists to do just that. While the educational system is changing, our attitudes and willingness to share power are not.

CHALLENGES: BIG DOLLARS vs. SMART IDEAS

Building medical companies costs big dollars. Attracting the talent and investors costs big dollars. But should jobs—sustainable jobs that will raise families, educate children and purchase homes—cost \$26,000 each?

What would happen to Ohio’s nursing shortage—and the opportunities to attract nurse educators from throughout the country—if Ohio used \$100 million in public funds annually to create well-paid, endowed positions for nurse educators in public universities? What would happen if Cleveland’s Warehouse District, a mile away from the promising medical corridor, worked with educators and hospitals to create a “Nurse’s Village” to provide lower-cost housing to anyone employed or pursuing degrees in nursing? These are likely the questions George Crile, Frank Bunts, John Phillips and William Lower would address if they were to create a current collaborative environment to foster health-based economic innovation, just as they did when they established the innovative and collaborative environment that gave birth to today’s Cleveland Clinic.

The medical industry being created through tax credits and billions of dollars in statewide private-public initiatives is creating jobs that many can aspire to. And it is largely a program that works. But the state incentives may be leaning too far toward the private industries. What needs to happen is:

- A less-costly but similar approach to attract workers en masse to fill high-demand jobs that are guaranteed to remain in Cleveland.
- A change in thinking by hospital and physician interest groups to provide nurses with more power.

The latter is harder than the former. The private sector has moved to a certain extent to fill these jobs. A Cleveland Clinic donor has provided money to purchase cutting edge technology to help educate nursing students there. But the position of nurses—and other healthcare employees who aren’t doctors—as being less worthy of medical responsibilities is a situation that only legislative

change can provide. Changing that attitude will pay off by enhancing the region's clout, its job and economic fortunes and even the welfare of the patients.

One of the important things in reforming health care is that we recognize the role of advanced practice nurses in delivering care to patients. I think giving them a greater role would lower some health costs. One of the problems with health care in the country is we don't have enough family doctors in rural areas and I think the government is missing a big opportunity if we don't take advantage of advanced practice nurses who'd be able to help out with rural patients. They could be the ones to first see a patient, do an assessment and tentative diagnosis, then consult with a doctor.

THE ADULT EDUCATION TRADITION

IN GREATER CLEVELAND

THOMAS SUDDER

To the New Englanders who founded and settled Cleveland more than 200 years ago, education was more than a matter of childhood and schoolmasters. That's because the way of life and the manner of politicking that Moses Cleveland and his fellow land speculators knew from Connecticut were practices they aimed to transplant along Lake Erie's south shore.

Upholding those New England ways depended on tutoring newcomers from other regions about the New England outlook. What Greater Clevelanders today describe as adult education may seem as modern as tomorrow—evening classes, say, at Cleveland State University or Cuyahoga Community College, neighborhood workshops at a Cleveland Public Library branch, or learning the Italian language in a class at Alta House, the Murray Hill social settlement. But it was Cleveland's pioneers, late in the 1700s, who promoted such teaching and learning.

Later, in the 1800s, the Connecticut settlers' Cleveland successors promoted lectures, libraries and the like to advance adult education—education to help govern Greater Cleveland; education to give Greater Cleveland a common cultural lingo; and, ultimately, education to promote prosperity—prosperity, to be sure, as the powerful defined it.

Finally, in the 1900s, such builders of modern Cleveland as Mayor Tom L. Johnson and his aide Newton D. Baker made adult education a city priority. Johnson, Baker, Frederic Howe, Linda Eastman and their allies saw lifelong learning as a golden door to better living and a guarantee of cleaner government for every Clevelander, rich or poor, native-born or immigrant. According to historian Kevin Mattson, “The democratic strain within Progressive Era activism ... was to provide citizens with the necessary skills to learn about political issues and become engaged citizens.”¹

Cleveland's settlers set the new city on a foundation built from their own cultural background. At least during Cleveland's first thirty years or so (1796–1825), “The population of Cleveland was, by a substantial majority, from the Connecticut

cultural area.”² Thus, an early observer of life on the Western Reserve noted “the [local] tendency to support schools and churches—‘exceedingly like the parent people from which they sprung.’”³

True, the New England-in-Ohio perspective was reshaped by the arrival of Americans from other regions of the new nation. But the New England accent remained, according to historian Lois Roseberry:

As in New York, the man from Massachusetts or Connecticut had been forced to compromise [on the Ohio frontier] with his neighbor from Pennsylvania or Virginia whose ideas of institutions differed from those of the Puritan. *But the change had not concealed the original type, nor obscured the ideal* which lay at the foundations of [the school, the church, and the town-meeting].⁴ [Emphasis added.]

Thus, the assumptions Greater Cleveland’s Connecticut founders made about how life should be lived in community helped determine what Cleveland became politically and culturally, and, for a time—before the arrival of large numbers of Catholics and Jews—religiously.

Consider General Moses Cleaveland, who founded Cleveland in July 1796. He was born (in 1754) and died (in 1806) in the town of Canterbury, in northeast Connecticut’s Windham County. Cleaveland was a Yale graduate and one of 36 founders and seven directors of the Connecticut Land Co., which surveyed and sold the Western Reserve’s land.⁵

According to the 1790 Census, the population of Canterbury was 1,881 people.⁶ (The 2000 Census counted 4,692.) The people of Canterbury, like the people in other New England towns, self-governed themselves by holding periodic, face-to-face town meetings. Any resident could attend the town meeting to speak his or her mind about a local matter. Voting followed. In a town with Canterbury’s population, government by town meeting was practical, and it was the rule. It still is, albeit modified for today’s circumstances.⁷

But in 1950, 154 years after Moses Cleaveland arrived at the Cuyahoga River’s mouth, his namesake city, Cleveland, had 914,808 residents. In contrast, Canterbury, Cleaveland’s Connecticut birthplace, had 1,321 residents.

So the dilemma for Clevelanders over that century-and-a-half and even now, in a smaller but still quite large Cleveland, was how people in urban Ohio could find enough in common to speak on political matters in the same language. That is, how could they live the political ideals of their Connecticut founders?

Politics-decided-in-debate was the kind of politics the Connecticut founders idealized: Government tethered to the common consent of the people to be governed, after free discussion among them. The romantic portrayal of town meetings by philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson—a Cleveland lecture-platform favorite⁸—helps explain the passion many Greater Clevelanders had for New

England's approach to government and to the determination, by a community itself, of its collective goals:

In a town-meeting, the great secret of political science was uncovered, and the problem solved, how to give every individual his fair weight in the government, *without any disorder from numbers*. In a town meeting, the roots of society were reached. Here, the rich gave counsel, but the poor also; and moreover, the just and the unjust. . . . In this open democracy, every opinion had utterance; every objection, every fact . . . its entire weight.⁹ [Emphasis added.]

Greater Cleveland's geography and heritage encouraged two early and highly successful approaches to adult education in what had been Connecticut's Western Reserve. One approach was known as the "lyceum." The other approach, still popular today, promotes public libraries to diffuse knowledge.

A lyceum, by one dictionary definition, is a place or organization for instruction by lecture. Perhaps predictably, given the New England drive for personal self-improvement, the lyceum movement began in Connecticut. It was devised and promoted by Josiah Holbrook of Derby, Connecticut, a Yale graduate.

In an October 1826 manifesto, Holbrook called for the establishment of lyceums, which he described as "associations for mutual instruction in the sciences, and useful knowledge generally." Holbrook termed his own model of such an association "a Society for Mutual Education . . . to procure for youths an economical and practical education . . . to diffuse rational and useful information through the community generally . . . [and] . . . apply the sciences and the various branches of education to the domestic and useful arts, and all the common purposes of life."¹⁰

Holbrook proposed that annual dues be \$1 (a lump-sum of \$10 would procure life membership) and that besides electing officers, each lyceum should designate five "curators," whose assignment would be to select the lyceum's lecturers.¹¹

In Ohio, the lyceum idea flourished, and its lyceums welcomed what today would be called blue-collar workers. In contrast to some lyceums elsewhere, "Ohio [lyceums] still paid some attention to the mechanic [i.e., working] class when it came to making out the [lyceum] programs."¹²

Such Cleveland leaders as Leonard Case established the Cleveland Lyceum in March 1833. The Cleveland Lyceum prospered for ten years.¹³ Case and his allies had seeded fertile ground. According to historian David Mead, "The lyceum took root and blossomed in the frontier communities of Ohio and other parts of the West because Eastern settlers, especially those from New England, brought with them a passion for education and morality which greatly influenced the native attitude toward cultural progress."¹⁴

According to Mead, Greater Cleveland's Berea was for a time the site of a "lyceum village." The Berea project, which lyceum-creator Holbrook promoted, aimed to attract "influential friends of science and [of] the moral enterprises of

the age' ... [and would] combine 'a liberal, a practical, and an economical education' with farmwork."¹⁵ The Berea lyceum failed in 1842, but its site became the original home of what is now Baldwin-Wallace College.¹⁶

Cleveland's location was perfect for the itinerant lecturers on Ohio's lyceum routes, which followed the Lake Shore railroad east-west through Cleveland, and the north-south Cleveland, Columbus & Cincinnati railroad: "These two lines intersected at Cleveland to form a giant 'T' that sprawled across the state."¹⁷ So Cleveland was at the very junction of Ohio lyceums' programming.

The lyceum may well have encouraged the eventual expansion of public education for younger people, but formal public schooling was a side-benefit, not the central aim. "The true purpose of the lyceum ... was to enlighten the people in the community and disseminate useful information at a time when forms of communication, such as books, newspapers, and magazines, were not readily available."¹⁸

Even after the demise of the Cleveland Lyceum, Ohio lyceums generally found enough success to invite state support. In his 1852 state of the state message, Ohio's governor, Reuben Wood, a Vermont-born Democrat who had become a Cleveland lawyer, called for some state support for lyceums: "Much might, also, be done, by the General Assembly, to encourage literary taste, by small aid, from time to time, for the purchase of books, periodicals and newspapers for permanent literary associations, lyceums and clubs, in our cities and towns."¹⁹

It is unclear if the General Assembly acted on Reuben Wood's plea. But Wood's sentiments coincided with the rise of the public library, which sprouted from New England ancestors and from private Ohio library associations. Here again, the Connecticut influence was near-paramount.

Residents of New England had formed what were termed "social libraries"—"a voluntary association of individuals who had contributed money toward a common fund to be used for the purchase of books."²⁰ Social libraries "in Connecticut ... evinced a particularly vigorous growth," with more such libraries established in Connecticut (total: 26) than in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, New Hampshire, or Vermont.²¹

The idea of the public (that is, tax-supported) library provided a key piece in the puzzle of how citizens (or at least white males)—legally equal, but intellectually unequal—could govern a community without that "disorder from numbers" Emerson had said town meetings were designed to avoid.

The answer was, or could be, the public library, whose information might help resolve differences of opinion, and thus preserve the ideal of self-government. One historian, Sidney Ditzion, put it this way: "The very fact that all vital political decisions rested with the voters ... made it more urgent that we create a responsible citizenry...."

Differences of opinion, which of necessity must arise in a complex society such as ours, had to be ironed out with intelligence and knowledge, which books could help provide.”²²

The public library as an auxiliary of, or a help to, adult education: that was one of the perspectives that led Greater Cleveland to create, maintain and expand one of the nation’s outstanding networks of public libraries.

As previously noted, the New Englanders who initially peopled Greater Cleveland were extremely familiar with the connection between books and self-government and personal advancement.

And so, almost 100 years ago, a study of Greater Cleveland and its libraries revealed two important features. The first feature was the close connection between public schools and the Cleveland Public Library (and other libraries in the region). The other feature was the broad support that libraries enjoyed from taxpayers. In 1916, in a report to the Cleveland Foundation, Leonard Ayres and Adele McKinney said:

Two significant conditions characterize the place of the public library in the community life of Cleveland. The first is that the public library has always been closely connected with the public schools. The second is that the people of Cleveland support their public library more generously and use its facilities more extensively than do the citizens of other cities.²³

Moreover, Ayres and McKinney, citing federal data for 1913, reported that of 19 big American cities, “Cleveland stood first in the percentage of its total municipal expenditures devoted to the support of its public library,” and that, based on Cleveland Public Library statistics for 1914, annual circulation per capita of public library books was 4.7 in Cleveland, 3.0 in New York, 2.7 in Boston and 1.4 in Chicago.²⁴ Indeed, Cleveland’s support of its library was so notable that it drew praise from steel magnate Andrew Carnegie, the Scottish-born Pennsylvania robber baron who tried to salve his conscience by donating libraries to many American localities. In 1907, Carnegie congratulated the head of Cleveland Public Library “upon exceeding even Pittsburgh in proportion to the amount of population in library appropriation [sic], placing Cleveland first of all.”²⁵

As always, there was a history there. In 1848, people we might today term civic leaders obtained a charter for the Cleveland Library Association. “By 1858, its library had increased to 3,000 [books] ... the largest library in Cleveland at that time.”²⁶ (The association’s collection was eventually consolidated into what is now Case Western Reserve University’s library.)²⁷

Library service had also been offered the public by Cleveland’s Central High School (what later became East Technical High School).²⁸ The Cleveland Public Library itself opened in 1869.²⁹

Two people who eventually ran Cleveland Public Library made it what it is today. One was William Howard Brett, the library's director from 1884 to 1918. Among Brett's many achievements was the decision to make the Cleveland Public Library an "open shelf library, the first big American public library to do so."³⁰ In an open-shelf library, the patron—the reader—is free to browse the shelves. In a closed shelf system, the reader must ask library employees to bring him or her a book selected (unseen) from a catalog (listing) of all the books in that particular library. Brett also established what became the (indispensable) *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature*:

Brett achieved international renown for his library and himself. . . . Among the new departures which he either initiated or adopted enthusiastically were the open shelf, children's libraries, extension work in branches and schools and industrial plants, a cumulative index to periodicals, a catalogue that was a marvel, [and] departmentalization of the library.

When [Brett] became librarian, there was no up-to-date guide to periodicals; Brett developed and published one. As a result it was the Cleveland Public Library that distributed in 1896 the first quarterly issues of the *Cumulative Index to a Selected List of Periodicals* . . . ultimately . . . published, under other auspices, as *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature*.³¹

The Cleveland Public Library was a trend-setter in adult education as well, a mission further promoted by Brett's successor as head of the library, Linda Eastman. Eastman led the institution from 1918 to 1938, "the first woman in the world to head a library of that size."³²

It seems impossible to overstate Eastman's positive influence on the library's offerings of adult education. In 1922, the Cleveland Public Library added to its (K-12) school department an "extension division for adult education . . . a service division for adult education, a bureau of information on adult education, and a general field agency for contact with groups."³³ In time, the Cleveland Public Library became the "heart and co-ordinating center of adult education activities in the community."³⁴ Moreover, Cleveland Public Library's separate decision (also a national first, or close to it) to "divisionalize" its books—by subject, etc.—created a kind of municipal teaching "faculty" to help any and every citizen: "In this group of division heads is the beginning of a true community 'faculty' . . . Any Clevelander may 'matriculate' for life with this array of teacher-librarians, whose chief business it is to study the needs of the city of Cleveland with relation to the printed matter in their charge."³⁵ Put another way, the Cleveland Public Library was in the business of what later became known as "lifelong learning."

Eastman was eloquent in her description of adult education outreach by the Cleveland Public Library not just as a way to help citizens become better informed but also as a route to their economic self-betterment: "In [Cleveland]

there are five brothers, who, with the sole aid of public library books, successfully carried on the studies which enabled them all to qualify as licensed engineers.”³⁶ And Eastman’s description of the quest for and benefits of adult education was near-lyrical:

We realize that any permanent solution of the problems of labor, of technological unemployment, of social and economic change, can come only with more general, more effective, and more continuous education. . . . Perhaps the most far-reaching contribution of the library to vocational guidance and to the whole business of living in an unstable world lies in the facilities offered by it to every individual for filling in the gaps in his education; for rounding out and enriching his experience vicariously through reading; for gaining a background, and possibly, eventually, an ability to think things through to successful adjustments and the real satisfactions of life.³⁷

As part of the democratization of learning, Cleveland Public Library also developed a system of “readers’ advisers” among its staff to help Clevelanders thirsting for knowledge find just the right tonic:

We feel sure that publicity is the strategic factor at this stage of adult education in America—and in our experience holds, as well, the secret of getting readers to take advantage of opportunities offered. The ordinary reader in the library is a man lost in an uncharted country; he knows he wants something but its discovery is another story.³⁸

That was what the library aimed to be—a navigator for the seeker of knowledge in a city, led by such Progressive politicians as Tom L. Johnson and Newton D. Baker, that aimed to help its residents improve themselves.

Academic education wasn’t the only goal of the adult education movement, nor was “citizenship” education. As adult education evolved, nationally and in Greater Cleveland, it became accented by economic and political movements. That led to technical education—education for a specific craft or job—and what might be called political mobilization.

On the technical (or employment) side, Cleveland was becoming ever-bigger, ever-busier, with new arrivals of people, mainly from Europe, but also the African-American South. New arrivals brought new ideas. And new ideas often required new skills, new technology and new workers to carry them out.

On the political side, a bigger city meant that bigger businesses (and bigger political organizations) developed. But if government were allowed to grow so big as to become anonymous, then the taxpayers’ interests would not be recognized.

So there arose, not just in Ohio, but to a great extent in Ohio, what was known as the Progressive movement. Tom L. Johnson, mayor of Cleveland from 1901 to 1909, whose statue sits on Public Square, was perhaps the greatest Ohio Progressive, though hardly the only one. Another was Johnson’s lieutenant,

Newton D. Baker, later Johnson's successor as mayor of Cleveland, then secretary of war for President Woodrow Wilson, and finally a power in Democratic politics. Baker was also, in Cleveland and nationally, a dynamic proponent of adult education.

Technology had flourished in the hands of the energetic and the adventurous people of Cleveland. For instance, a Clevelander who got in on the ground floor of the telegraph business in 1850—the Microsoft of that era—was a person whose name still resounds in Cleveland: Jephtha Wade.

By getting a license from the patent-owner of the telegraph, Wade won the right to string a telegraph line from Cleveland to (then far bigger) Cincinnati.³⁹ And that was but an overture for technological investment to come. Over time, “Cleveland ... [became] a center of inventive activity in a remarkable number of important industries, including electric light and power, steel, petroleum, chemicals, and automobiles.”⁴⁰ In 1870, Cuyahoga County had been 22nd nationally in manufacturing output; by 1920, it was fourth. In 1900, Cleveland ranked No. 8 of all cities in patents granted and—counting only patents the Patent Office found significant—“*Cleveland was the fifth most technologically important city in the country.*”⁴¹ [Emphasis added.]

Telegraph technology, the focus of that 1850 investment by Jephtha Wade, helped spawn the later ingenuity of Charles Brush's work.⁴² In turn, Brush's work, and the success of those who invested with him, ultimately led to the founding of such behemoths as Linde, and eventually, Union Carbide.⁴³

Cleveland was also an “early adopter” of the telephone when it surfaced in the 1870s: The first telephone line in Ohio went live on June 25, 1877—connecting the Rhodes and Co. coal-sales office to the company's coal yard. The first Cleveland telephone exchange opened on September 15, 1879.⁴⁴

By 1920, Cleveland's largest industries were, in order; automobiles; foundry and machine tools; iron and steel; electrical machinery; and women's clothing.⁴⁵ What had helped spur Cleveland's leadership in the machine-tool market were the investments and inventions of the White family—Thomas H. White's White Sewing Machine Co. and his son Rollin H. White's White Motor (trucks) and Cletrac (tractors) companies.⁴⁶

The fuel for this industrial rise of Greater Cleveland, what might be called “human capital,” was produced by the flood of newcomers arriving in Cleveland from the Civil War until the 1920s: “The continuous flow of skilled outsiders—European or American—kept Cleveland in touch with a wide range of technical fields ... Cleveland relied upon this continuous influx of talent and combined it with native innovations to create the industrial rise of 1865–1929.”⁴⁷

But it was precisely this influx that raised challenges to the self-government ideal—the Connecticut ideal—that had helped shape Greater Cleveland in its early days. People who didn't share common ideas were unlikely to cooperate

well. They could also be pawns in the game of municipal politics, if uninformed about the ways and means that power was supposed to be used in the United States. That mix of circumstances (the rise of the new, faceless industrial company; the “mass” in mass politics due to city growth; and the blank (political, not cultural) slate of Europeans new to America, helped prompt the Progressive Era. And one of its ideals was civic self-improvement—to which adult education was one crucial approach. The Progressive Era also spawned another vector of adult education—the social settlement or social center.

That said, there is solid evidence that the concern of those already settled in, say, a Cleveland, was that newcomers not only make the right decisions, but also entrust power to the right people. As Robert Carlson observed, “Americanization,” was also essential, to many Progressives, as a topic of adult education: “Progressivism wanted to get the control of government back into the hands of the people—the right people, that is—those who understood American values, i.e., the reformers’ values. And they came to realize as they came in contact with the immigrant that their values were not his values.”⁴⁸ But Carlson also found that, while such an endeavor might be aimed (consciously or not) at maintaining the political status quo, in time, adult education did resolve itself into an “educational service station.”⁴⁹

The last thing Mayor Tom L. Johnson aimed to do was maintain that status quo. Even his political campaign techniques were adult education of a kind. According to historian Robert Bremner, Johnson was “a stirring and daring campaigner . . . many of his political appearances were made in a circus tent. He liked the informal atmosphere engendered by the big top and found the tent a convenient and portable auditorium for carrying his ideas to the people.”⁵⁰ Hoyt L. Warner, the leading historian of Ohio Progressivism, described Johnson’s technique in 1901 when Johnson campaigned in Cleveland for the Democratic candidate for governor (Ohio gubernatorial elections were then held in odd-numbered years):

Johnson [concentrated] on . . . education of the people on the tax question and the election of a Democratic slate of delegates to represent Cuyahoga County in the General Assembly. . . . Nightly, during the final two weeks, [Johnson] pitched his big tent, first used in his congressional campaigns, in different parts of the city, conducting meetings which were more in the nature of forums on taxation than political [sic] rallies.⁵¹

As it happened, Governor George K. Nash, a Columbus Republican born in Medina County’s York Township, won a second term in 1901 despite the challenge by Columbus Democrat James Kilbourne, the gubernatorial candidate that Tom Johnson supported. But the lesson-by-example Johnson taught stuck with one of his most important aides, Newton D. Baker, later a national leader in

promoting adult education: “From his Cleveland government experience [Baker] reminisced about Tom Johnson’s tent meetings which took place in every part of the city, educating people about the issues of the day on which they would have to make decisions.”⁵²

While Johnson and his allies strove to hone democracy through public meetings and the like, a parallel development of neighborhood centers or settlements arose and prospered in Greater Cleveland. So, too, did the “evening college”—such as Cleveland College, arguably a forerunner of what is today’s Cuyahoga Community College and Cleveland State University.

Though settlement houses and neighborhood social centers started first in other cities and then spread to Cleveland, the goal was the same: To provide social services in an era when government offered few, and to “Americanize” those newly arrived from Europe or “urbanize” those African-Americans newly arrived from the rural south.

By 1906, Cleveland had seven neighborhood settlements,⁵³ the first (and perhaps best known) of which was Hiram House, founded in 1896 “as an outgrowth of a Hiram College student project.”⁵⁴ The six others were Alta House (founded in 1900; its Web site says 1895); what’s now Goodrich-Gannett Neighborhood Center (founded 1897); Rainey Institute (founded 1904); the Council Educational Alliance (founded in 1899; merged in 1948 into the Jewish Community Center); and the Friendly Inn Settlement (founded in 1874, according to the Cleveland Foundation, but the *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* says 1897). Allen F. Davis chronicled the way in which, for instance, Hiram House, made an American dream come true for one young new Clevelander:

A young Russian Jew named Manuel Levine stumbled on Hiram House in Cleveland one night a few months after his arrival in America; George Bellamy, the head resident there, helped him to revive some of the hopes and dreams that had been shattered by his initial experiences in America. Levine joined a social reform club, learned English, and worked his way through night school by teaching classes in German at the settlement. With Bellamy’s aid he was admitted to Western Reserve Law School, and in 1903 Newton Baker appointed him assistant police prosecutor.⁵⁵

In both Cleveland and Toledo, historian Robert Bremner wrote, the job of settlement houses “was to instill in the cities’ new residents the ideals of thrift, cleanliness, sobriety, and self-reliance.”⁵⁶ The settlement houses in Cleveland were part of a civic-education complex; for example, the Cleveland Public Library established a “sub-branch” at Hiram House in 1898, “a periodically rotating collection of books for circulation that augmented the small circulating library collection maintained by the settlement itself.” Other sub-branches were created at Goodrich House, Alta House and the Young Mens Hebrew Association.⁵⁷

Early advocates of the settlements, or social centers, were frank in their call for re-creating the social conditions, if not the physical conditions, that had permitted self-government along the lines of the town meeting—the town meeting of Moses Cleaveland’s time. As Graham Taylor, wrote of the Chicago Commons, a social center in that city:

Our New England forefathers forged three links of association for the common interest. Their “center” church was like the flag staff of the commonwealth which kept floating high over the heads of all, their ideals of life, individual and social. Closely allied with it was the free school, the bulwark of the state and the buckler to the citizen, in being a common possession to which all had more equal right than to anything except the village green. Under-girding both and representing the whole community was the Town Meeting, where freemen met on an equality never realized before.

But our populations no sooner became diverse in race and religion and subdivided in industrial occupations and interests, than they began to lose these centers of association.⁵⁸

No surprise, then, that by the 1930s, Hiram House was so respectably “mainstreaming” newcomers that its board was peopled with members of the Greater Cleveland Establishment. According to Judith Trolander, “In 1936, half of [the] board was listed in the *Social Register*. Eight appeared in *Who’s Who in Ohio*, four appeared in both.”⁵⁹ That is, settlement house work, such as Hiram’s, had the full backing of Greater Cleveland’s leaders. That may well have betrayed a quest for social control—but it also ensured support for Hiram House’s practical operation.

Frederic Howe, one of Tom L. Johnson’s lieutenants, praised the idea of diversifying the use of public facilities, such as public school buildings, for bolstering civic life: “School buildings are open but six hours a day and for nine months in the year. Let us open them all the year round and for sixteen hours a day. Here is the natural forum for the discussion of political questions, for concerts and dramatic performances. Here the people of the neighborhood can gather.”⁶⁰ Howe himself had assisted in “a regular [Tom Johnson] tent campaign in the days immediately preceding [a 1908 Cleveland traction] referendum.” Howe sometimes provided a lantern slide presentation “describing the financial condition of the [streetcar] company in some detail.”⁶¹

Experiences such as these evidently helped inform Newton D. Baker’s perspective on the need for adult education. He had seen Tom L. Johnson, with varying degrees of success, mobilize public opinion through what amounted to the roving classroom of a pitched tent. Baker, too, had seen the results of settlement house work in Greater Cleveland—and Cleveland Public Library’s extraordinary outreach.

And surely Baker's service in Woodrow Wilson's Cabinet added to Baker's commitment to adult education. While Baker was still mayor, Wilson—early in his presidential administration—signed the Smith-Lever Act, which created agricultural extension services, in effect a nationwide and specialized form of adult education. Theodore Roosevelt's Country Life Commission had called for “[projecting] the work beyond the schools for youth into continuation schools for adults.”⁶² Wilson himself, signing Smith-Lever on May 8, 1914, said it was more than an agriculture-extension measure; Wilson called the measure “one of the most significant and far-reaching measures for the education of adults ever adopted by the government.”⁶³

So not only did Baker's presidential patron embrace adult education, but Baker also became aware of mass education among the men drafted into the Army when he was secretary of war:

From his Cleveland government experience [Baker] reminisced about Tom Johnson's tent meetings which took place in every part of the city, educating people about the issues of the day on which they would have to make decisions. From his war experience Baker lauded a variety of camp educational and recreation programs, especially the amazing American Expeditionary Force University. The latter became a symbol to him of the general population's thirst for education.⁶⁴

As a result, Baker, once back in Cleveland after World War I, was a sparkplug in the creation of Cleveland College:

The outcome was the incorporation, on July 29, 1925, of Cleveland College, in affiliation with Western Reserve University and Case School of Applied Science. Situated downtown, several miles away from its two parent institutions, Cleveland College offered late afternoon and evening classes to working adults and morning classes to recent high school graduates who either could not afford to attend residential colleges or did not quite meet their admissions requirements. Baker served on this Board of Trustees until his death.⁶⁵

This exemplified a key tenet of Baker's civic creed: “‘If the people were to be self-determining, they had to have opportunities for education. . . . In a democracy, every step forward is that of educating an effective majority of the entire electorate to change their minds.’”⁶⁶

Before Cleveland College opened, Cleveland didn't have a municipal or quasi-municipal institution of higher education. In contrast, in 1925, when Baker and others created Cleveland College, there were 11 municipal colleges or universities already established long before in the United States—including Ohio's Akron, Cincinnati, and Toledo universities, and what's now Detroit's Wayne State.⁶⁷

By 1930, “Cleveland College . . . enrolled over seven thousand students in 559 classes [from] every social and occupational class in Cleveland. A full-time

day college and Division of Informal Adult Education were later added the latter offering] short courses on parent education and health and general education courses on art, literature, and music.”⁶⁸

Today, thousands of Greater Clevelanders trek to classes to prepare for a General Educational Development diploma; or to earn degrees from Greater Cleveland’s community colleges and public universities; or to take practical classes in a technology or pastime, offered by the Cleveland Municipal School District or Greater Cleveland’s neighborhood centers.

That army of seekers is following trails blazed more than 200 years ago by men and women who wanted Greater Cleveland to be a self-governing community peopled by citizens who knew their own minds—and how to speak them.

ENDNOTES

1 Kevin Mattson, "The Challenges of Democracy: James Harvey Robinson, the New History, and Adult Education for Citizenship," *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 2 (2003): 48–79, 50.

2 Elbert Jay Benton, *Cultural Story of an American City: Cleveland, Part I: During the Log Cabin Phases, 1796–1825* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1943), 44.

3 Lois Kimball Mathews Roseberry, *The Expansion of New England: The Spread of New England Settlement and Institutions to the Mississippi River, 1620–1865* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962), 185.

4 *Ibid.*, 192.

5 *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, s.v., "Cleveland, Moses."

6 Connecticut Secretary of the State, *State of Connecticut Register and Manual* (1947), 448.

7 For minutes of a June 2010 Canterbury town meeting, see <http://canterbury-ct.org/documents/Town%20Meeting%20Minutes%206-20-10.doc>

8 Emerson lectured publicly in Cleveland eleven times from 1850 to 1867 under the auspices of the Cleveland Library Association; see, David Mead, *Yankee Eloquence in the Middle West: The Ohio Lyceum, 1850–1870* (East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1951).

9 Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Historical Discourse at Concord," in *Miscellanies. Concord edition, Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, 11 (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1904), 46–47.

10 Carl Bode, *The American Lyceum: Town Meeting of the Mind* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), 11, 12.

11 *Ibid.*, 12, 13.

12 *Ibid.*, 168–69.

13 *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, s.v., "Cleveland Lyceum."

14 Mead, *op. cit.*, 1.

15 Harold W. Stubblefield and Patrick Keane, *Adult Education in the American Experience, from the Colonial Period to the Present*, Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994), 87 [internal citation omitted].

16 *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, s.v., "Baldwin-Wallace College."

17 *Ibid.*, 17, 183.

18 *Ibid.*, 47.

19 “Annual Message of the Governor of Ohio . . . Jan. 5, 1852,” in Ohio. Documents, including Messages and Other Communications, Made to the ... General Assembly of the State of Ohio 16, pt. 1 (1851–1852), 5–29: 13.

20 Jesse H. Shera, *Foundations of the Public Library: The Origins of the Public Library Movement in New England, 1629–1855*. Reprint of 1949 University of Chicago Press ed. s.l. (Shoe String Press, 1965), 57.

21 Ibid., 54–55.

22 Sidney Ditzion, *Arsenals of a Democratic Culture: A Social History of the American Public Library Movement in New England and the Middle States from 1850 to 1900* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1947), 65.

23 Leonard P. Ayres and Adele McKinney, *The Public Library and the Public Schools. Cleveland Education Survey*, 21 (Cleveland: Survey Committee of the Cleveland Foundation, 1916), 17.

24 Ibid, 14, 15–16.

25 C. H. Cramer, *The School of Library Science at Case Western Reserve University: Seventy-five Years, 1904–1979* (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, 1979), 17.

26 *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, s.v., “Cleveland Library Assn.”

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid., s.v., “Central High School” and “Cleveland Public Library.”

29 Ibid., s.v., “Cleveland Public Library.”

30 Charles Zueblin, *American Municipal Progress*, rev. ed. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1916), 230. (“The first large city library to provide books on the open shelf plan was that of Cleveland, which introduced this system in 1890.”)

31 Cramer, op. cit., 7–8.

32 *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, s.v., “Eastman, Linda Anne.” See also, Alice Edwards Wright, “Linda A. Eastman: Pioneer in Librarianship,” Kent State University M.A. thesis, 1952—“first woman to hold the head librarianship of so large an organization.”

33 William S. Learned, *The American Public Library and the Diffusion of Knowledge* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1924), 162.

34 Marilla Waite Freeman, “The Organization of a Public Library to Meet Adult Education Needs,” in *The Role of the Library in Adult Education: Papers Presented before the Library Institute at the University of Chicago, August 2–13, 1937*, 156–80, ed. Louis R. Wilson, The University of Chicago Studies in Library Science (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), 157.

35 Learned, op. cit., 28.

36 Linda Eastman, "The Library as an Informal School," *Journal of Adult Education* 1 (1929): 290–92, 290.

37 Linda Eastman, "The Part of the City Library in the Vocational Guidance of Adults," *American Library Association Bulletin* 26 (1932): 10–16, 16.

38 Lucia H. Sanderson, "Adult Education in the Cleveland Public Library," *American Library Association Bulletin* 31 (1937): 203–8, 204.

39 Russell H. Anderson, "Jeptha H. Wade and the Cleveland and Cincinnati Telegraph Company," *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* 58 (1949): 801–93.

40 Naomi R. Lamoreaux, Margaret Levenstein, and Kenneth L. Sokoloff, "Financing Invention during the Second Industrial Revolution: Cleveland, Ohio, 1870–1920," in *Financing Innovation in the United States, 1870 to the Present*, ed. Naomi R. Lamoreaux and Kenneth L. Sokoloff (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007), 39–84.

41 *Ibid.*, 42, citing, Michael S. Fogarty, Gasper S. Garofolo, and David C. Hammack, *Cleveland from Startup to the Present: Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the 19th and Early 20th Centuries* (Cleveland: Center for Regional Economic Issues, Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, [2002]).

42 *Ibid.*, 46; Brush (1849–1929), born in Euclid Township, was "one of America's most distinguished inventors." *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, s.v., "Brush, Charles Francis."

43 *Ibid.*, 49–50.

44 *The Telephone in Ohio* (Cleveland: Ohio Bell Telephone Co., n.d.), 2

45 Lamoreaux, *op. cit.*, (Table 1.1), 43.

46 For a study of the Whites and White Motor, see Rosemary Solovey Hritsko, "The White Motor Story," University of Akron Ph.D. dissertation, 1988.

47 Darwin H. Stapleton, "The City Industrious: How Technology Transformed Cleveland," in *The Birth of Modern Cleveland, 1875–1930*, ed. Thomas F. Campbell and Edward M. Miggins (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society; London: Associated University Presses, 1988), 71–95.

48 Robert A. Carlson, "Americanization as an Early Twentieth-Century Adult Education Movement," *History of Education Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (1970), 440–64: 442.

49 *Ibid.*, 459.

50 Robert H. Bremner, "Tom L. Johnson," *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* 59 (1950), 1–13: 9.

51 Hoyt L. Warner, *Progressivism in Ohio, 1897–1917* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press for the Ohio Historical Society, 1964), 96.

52 Rae Wahl Rohfeld, “Newton D. Baker and the Adult Education Movement,” *Ohio History* 95 (1986), 119–32: 119.

53 John J. Grabowski, “A Social Settlement in a Neighborhood in Transition: Hiram House, Cleveland, Ohio, 1896–1926,” Case Western Reserve University Ph.D. dissertation, 1977: 192.

54 *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, s.v., “Hiram House”; s.v., “Settlement Houses”; and Web sites for Alta House Social Settlement and Cleveland Foundation.

55 Allen F. Davis, *Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement, 1890–1914* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 88 [internal citation omitted].

56 Robert Bremner, “The Civic Revival in Ohio: Humanizing Cleveland and Toledo,” *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 13 (1954), 179–90.

57 Grabowski, op. cit., 64.

58 Graham Taylor, *Chicago Commons: A Social Center for Civic Co-operation* (Chicago, Grand Avenue and Morgan Street, December 1904), 1–2.

59 Judith Ann Trolander, *Settlement Houses and the Great Depression* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975), 52.

60 Frederic C. Howe, “The American City of To-morrow,” *Hampton’s Magazine* 26 (May 1911), 573–584: 582.

61 Robert Arthur Huff, “Frederic C. Howe, Progressive,” University of Rochester Ph.D. dissertation, 1967: 88–89.

62 *United States. Country Life Commission. Report of the Country Life Commission: Special Message from the President of the United States [Feb. 9, 1909] transmitting the Report of the Country Life Commission* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1909): 54.

63 Wayne D. Rasmussen, *Taking the University to the People* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1989), 48.

64 Rae Wahl Rohfeld, “Newton D. Baker and the Adult Education Movement,” *Ohio History* 95 (1986), 119–32: 119.

65 *Ibid.*, 123.

66 *Ibid.*, 130.

67 John P. Dyer, *Ivory Towers in the Marketplace: The Evening College in American Education* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1956), 35.

68 Stubblefield, op. cit., 201.

EDUCATION

PRIMARY & SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN GREATER CLEVELAND

SCOTT STEPHENS

SCHOOLS IN A CHANGING WORLD

There's an old joke in education that when Rip Van Winkle finally awoke from decades of slumber, the only thing he recognized was the typical American high school. The point: while the world around them has shifted dramatically, most schools have changed very little in the last 150 years. More often than not, a teacher still stands at the front of the classroom and lectures to students seated in rows of desks. The majority of lessons still originate from textbooks. Most all schools are closed during the summer, a nod to a long-gone agrarian calendar that enabled students to work on their family farms. High school remains a four-year affair, regardless of the progress a student makes. For many college-bound students who have completed their modest requirements, the senior year is largely wasted time

Like Rip, many Americans are beginning to wake up to the fact that much of their public school system exists in a time warp. Sure, sophisticated calculators have replaced the abacus. But the basic way we deliver education is remarkably unchanged. That might not be a problem, had the rest of the world not changed so quickly and dramatically.

When young people in Greater Clevelander dropped out of school 50 years ago, they may have ended their hope of ever attending college. But they could still get a decent-paying union job at a steel mill or an automobile plant. They could move to the suburbs and buy a house. They could purchase a new car or take a vacation to Florida. And they could save enough money to send their own children to college.

Today, that world has disappeared like the smoke that once poured out of the manufacturing plants. The mills and auto plants have either moved or shut down, or are operating with dramatically smaller workforces. The percentage of

workers who belong to a union is at its lowest point since just before the Great Depression. Service industry jobs, such as work in restaurants and retail stores, tend to pay poorly, offer few benefits, and rarely last a lifetime. The higher-paying breadwinner jobs that remain are in fields like health care and technology. Competition for them is fierce, and some kind of post-high school training, ranging from certification to post-graduate degrees, is usually required. The dramatic loss of population in parts of Ohio and other states has even lessened the demand for professionals such as lawyers, accountants, and teachers.

Students in Greater Cleveland no longer compete with their classmates for positions at large companies that operate around the globe. Rather, they compete with young people from places like China, India, and Korea, and students in those countries are outscoring American students on most international mathematics and science exams. In fact, a 2005 study ranked U.S. 15-year-olds 24th out of 29 industrialized nations on practical math applications.

That's a concern to business leaders like Intel Chairman Craig Barrett, whose company sponsors the national Science Talent Search, a 70-year-old competition for high school seniors, known as the "junior Nobel."

Barrett says the problem isn't American students, but rather an unfocused curriculum and a high percentage of math and science teachers not trained in the subjects they teach. Unlike most developed nations, the United States has no national curriculum. Instead, each state has its own set of standards, its own set of textbooks, and its own set of tests.

"Kids are capable of so much more than we give them credit for," says Barrett. "But you don't get there by comparing Columbus to Cleveland. In my mind, that misses the point by about a million miles."

A COMMON SYSTEM OF SCHOOLS

Our current concept of public schools hasn't really been around that long. The most robust education system for settlers in Cleveland in the 1820s and 1830s was religious schools, many of them Catholic. But the country was going through some dramatic changes. Reform movements, such as abolitionism, women's rights, the temperance movement, and prison reform, were blossoming. Society was struggling to find a unifying way to deal with change and diversity in a growing country.

Reformers, such as Horace Mann in Massachusetts and Samuel Lewis, Ohio's first superintendent of public instruction, led movements to establish common schools for all, publicly supported and publicly controlled.

Even so, most of the early schools in and around Cleveland served only white, elementary-age children. Living in a mostly rural economy, most Ohioans saw little reason for schooling beyond the basics of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

But as the city grew, so did its school system. By 1842, there were 15 schools in Cleveland serving about 1,200 students. On July 13, 1846, Cleveland proudly opened Central High School, the first public high school west of the Alleghenies. The idea of public schools for all citizens was also gaining traction at a state level. In 1851, a lawmaker from Canton named Harmon Stidger proposed language in the state constitution calling for a “thorough and efficient system of common schools.” That language remains to this day and has been the subject of years of court fights over the state’s responsibility to adequately fund public education.

As factories expanded during the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, Greater Cleveland was emerging as a significant population center. After the Civil War, Superintendent Andrew Rickoff divided the school system into 12 grades in three divisions (primary, grammar, and high school) and eliminated separate schools for boys and girls. Rickoff was an innovator. In an effort to attract immigrant German children from their private schools, Rickoff formed a bilingual program. Such efforts appeared to work. During his 15-year tenure, the school system grew from 9,643 students to 26,990.

By the end of World War II, Cleveland was one of the nation’s largest cities and its school system one of the country’s best. The district was known for its vocational programs as well as its Major Works program, a series of high-level classes for the brightest students that became a national model. In the baby-boom years after the war, the district was building many new schools. As an emerging middle class sought newer homes and quieter surroundings, suburban school systems also grew.

By the 1960s, Cleveland’s enrollment had swelled to 150,000 students. Much of the growth was fueled by the massive post-war migration of African Americans from the South to industrial jobs in the North. But some social activists complained that Cleveland was actually operating two school systems—one for white children, and one for African-American children. In 1973, the NAACP sued, accusing the district of running an intentionally segregated school system that kept black children in poor facilities with less-qualified teachers. The district argued that segregation in the schools was the result of residential housing patterns that were beyond their control. But in 1978, Federal Judge Frank Battisti ruled in favor the plaintiffs. The judge found that the district used busing and student assignments to deliberately consign black students in inferior schools, violating their 14th Amendment right to equal protection under the law.

Battisti’s order to integrate the schools—especially using the controversial practice of cross-town busing—is often blamed for the flight of stable, middle-class families from the city, resulting in the district’s slide into academic mediocrity and fiscal woes. The reality is more complicated. At the time of Battisti’s order, Cleveland was a city on the decline. Factories were closing, and jobs were moving to the Sun Belt or overseas. From 1980 to 1990, the number of residents

on welfare rose more than 200 percent. During that same time, crime, teenage pregnancies, youth delinquencies, and drug use skyrocketed. Federal court records also cast doubt that the case resulted in “white flight”—the exodus of middle-class white families to the suburbs. Of the 12,967 student transfers out of the district that occurred during the court-ordered busing period of 1978–80, only 6,705 were white students. Many of those transfers were moves out of state, suggesting they were not motivated by school desegregation.

By the time the desegregation case ended in 1998, the district was in the throes of fiscal and academic woes and under the control of the state education department. Federal Judge George White placed the district under the control of then-Mayor Michael White. Cleveland was the first Ohio school district under mayoral control, a practice that was also being tried in other struggling big-city districts, such as Chicago, Boston, and Baltimore.

Around that time, the standards movement, which put a premium on data and accountability, was gaining ground in Ohio and across the nation. Standardized tests benchmarked what students were learning and enabled districts to be compared against one another. They also underscored how much high-poverty districts, such as Cleveland, were struggling. Test scores tracked closely with the average household income and the educational level of parents in the district. Predictably, affluent suburban districts posted high test scores. Poor urban and rural district regularly had the lowest scores.

Meanwhile, Cleveland’s shrinking population, along with new options for students, such as charter schools, is expected to reduce the district’s enrollment to fewer than 36,000 by the 2018–19 school year. That sharp decline, along with a disappearing tax base, has raised questions about the district’s long-term sustainability.

Those questions aren’t unique to Cleveland. The landmark No Child Left Behind, the sweeping federal policy then-President George W. Bush signed into law in 2002, required schools to have all students proficient in reading and math by 2014. But, for all its good intentions, the law didn’t address what was happening outside the school. No one was requiring all students to have a roof over their head or an adequate meal every evening. No law mandated that their parents had jobs or health care. More and more was being demanded of teachers and school officials, but the world beyond the school was growing more and more complex.

SCHOOL FUNDING: THE \$1 BILLION PINT OF ORANGE JUICE

People who talk about school finance often talk about the \$1 billion pint of orange juice. The story goes something like this: Back in the 1990s, California lawmakers, looking to make a lasting mark on the state’s education system, came up with the idea of giving a carton of orange juice each day to every child in the

public schools. Who could oppose such an idea: it's good for nutrition, high in fiber, and loaded with vitamins.

Then someone did the math. The state had six million youngsters in kindergarten through twelfth grade. Each pint of orange juice cost about \$1. There were 180 days in the academic year. So the price for providing a pint of juice for each child every morning: \$1 billion.

The point of the story is that in school finance, scale matters. Seemingly small expenditures can swell at a frightening pace.

Ohio has no orange juice mandate. With about 1.8 million public school students, it is not as large as California. Even so, education remains the largest public expenditure. Per year, the budget of the Cleveland public schools has exceeded that of the city.

Figuring out fair and efficient ways to pay for education has been a vexing problem in many states. No state has struggled with the issue more than Ohio. Beginning in 1991, eleven years of litigation resulted in four Ohio Supreme Court decisions that found the state's school-funding system unconstitutional, because it relied too heavily on local property taxes.

The case, *DeRolph v. State of Ohio*, was named for schoolboy Nathan DeRolph. Nathan attended school in Perry County, a rural county east of Columbus that included five small scattered rural districts. The county, mostly rolling farmland and abandoned strip mines, embodied the flaws in the way Ohio funded its schools. The buildings were crumbling. Science labs lacked microscopes. Textbooks were tattered and old.

One school, Thornville Elementary, was built seven years before Albert Einstein developed the theory of relativity. The inside walls of the building were exposed brick. In 1998, the third-floor hallway of the school started to collapse, because bat feces had collected on an attic floor and corroded the hallway ceiling.

The school was part of the Northern Local School District, which ranked near the bottom in most economic measures, including household income and value of taxable property. Those measures are important, because local property taxes make up a large part of how Ohio funds its schools.

Many believe such a reliance on local property taxes creates huge disparities among communities. Districts with lots of factories, retail stores, and expensive homes in their boundaries have high tax bases. Towns with little industry and low housing values have low tax bases. As a result, the quality of education children receive often depends on where they live.

"Look at the kind of land we have," says Finn Laursen, former superintendent of the Firelands Local School District in rural Lorain County. "In a district like ours, the property value is much lower than in suburbia or in the city. Funding becomes a challenge, and that leads to difficulty in paying things like competitive salaries for teachers."

The DeRolph decisions pushed the state to contribute a greater share of money to schools. The case also sparked a massive program to rebuild and replace schools like Thornville Elementary. Today, most of the schools in Perry County are modern and well equipped. But inequities remain.

A year after the court issued its fourth and final ruling in 2002, Northern Local was spending \$5,650 per pupil, with about \$1,500 of it coming from local property taxes. By contrast, the suburb of Beachwood was spending \$16,450 per pupil, with about \$13,000 coming from local property taxes. That's a difference of nearly \$11,000 per child.

That kind of disparity was a major issue in the 2006 governor's race. Former U.S. Congressman Ted Strickland campaigned on the promise that he would fix school funding in Ohio. After taking office, Strickland pushed a plan that called for dramatic changes in the way the state funded schools.

For years, Ohio funded education by essentially calculating how much money the budget could afford for schools and then dividing it among the state's students. That method was known as residual budgeting.

Strickland proposed turning that equation on its head. He said the state should first identify the programs necessary to educate children—full-day kindergarten, smaller class sizes, more Advanced Placement classes, and the like—and then fund them. It's a method known as evidence-based funding.

The governor's plan, which was adopted as part of the state budget, also calls for the state to gradually assume a greater share of funding responsibility. The goal is to lessen the reliance on local property taxes.

Unfortunately, launch of the plan coincided with an economic downturn. That caused Strickland and legislators to delay or scrap some parts of the plan. Still, the measure was widely viewed as a step forward in Ohio's long-running battle to make its school-funding system constitutional.

"After 10 years, someone finally understood what the court said," says former Ohio Supreme Court Justice Andy Douglas, who signed all four majority opinions calling for a funding overhaul. "I'm glad I lived long enough to see us vindicated, to a degree."

The most significant change in school funding in Ohio and across the nation is at a federal level. Historically, federal funds have made up no more than 6% or 7% of a school district budget. Most of that was in the form of Title 1 money—the federal money designed to give poor children extra help.

But in 2009, Congress approved a massive economic stimulus package aimed at preserving and creating jobs for teachers and other school personnel. The windfall was a lifeline for many districts that were facing layoffs and program cuts because of shrinking budgets.

President Barack Obama followed that up by offering states competitive Race to the Top grants. The extra money, which was designed to fund innovation,

was contingent on states conforming to the president's agenda, which included reforms like charter schools and tying teacher pay to student performance. By mid-2010, only two states, Delaware and Tennessee, had been awarded grants. Ohio and other states resubmitted applications and were still hopeful they would share in the money.

IMAGINING A WHOLE NEW EDUCATION SYSTEM

It's been more than 25 years since the Carnegie Report declared a state of emergency in our nation's schools and a warning that the U.S. was losing its competitive edge around the world as a result. In the interim, much has been tried, in the name of reform. But it's difficult to point to single large urban school system in which meaningful reform has taken root.

For decades, schools have sought to replicate what they call "best practices"—find out what works, study it, and implement it. In theory, the concept makes sense. But finding out what works is only part of the problem. It's just as crucial to find out why it works, and if it is truly the ingredient needed for success.

Imagine that you are trying to put together a successful professional football team. In studying Super Bowl winners, you find that they all had one thing in common: they were coached by men over the age of 30. You might be tempted to identify that fact as a best practice of winning football programs. There's only one problem, of course. Year in and year out, the league's worst teams also were coached by men over the age of 30.

Some reformers say it's time to look beyond best practices and to start from scratch. They encourage educators to re-imagine schools. Writer Frederick Hess of the American Enterprise Institute calls the idea "greenfield schooling." The goal, he says, is to create school systems capable of evolving with the students and society they serve.

While there is widespread agreement that all children can learn, there is also a consensus that children learn at different speeds and in different ways. To provide those opportunities within the framework of shrinking budgets, we might have to change the way we deliver education.

Take Fairfax County, Virginia, for example. Administrators in that district, the nation's 12th largest, discovered they could offer French at a cost of \$11 per student, using the popular Rosetta Stone language program. Offering traditional French instruction cost the district \$400 per student.

It might seem like a small example. But put enough of them together and you have suddenly changed the way education is delivered. Let's look at several examples:

1. RETHINKING HIGH SCHOOL

By the time spring rolls around, many high school seniors have been accepted to college, have a job lined up, plan to travel overseas, or are simply bored with school. Senior-itis—the tendency for seniors to slack off in their final year of high school—is a uniquely American malady.

Some researchers believe that's a waste of time and money and will eventually hurt the nation's ability to compete globally. They propose overhauling high school into something that would look very different from the traditional freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior divisions.

One of the most dramatic plans was proposed by Marc Tucker of the National Council on Economic Education. Tucker says we ought to essentially do away with the last two years of high school, as least as we now know them. He proposes giving 10th-graders a test that would allow most of them to leave high school and enter community college directly. Those who scored the highest would still take some advanced high school coursework to prepare for admission to selective colleges and universities. The money saved from eliminating the last two years of high school would be spent on providing high-quality early childhood education to all 4-year-olds and all low-income 3-year-olds.

Ohio and other states are already experimenting with some of those ideas. Most of Ohio's largest cities have "early college" programs, in which students spend half of their day in high school, and half at a local community college. By the time they graduate from high school, many of those students have completed a year or more of college—for free.

A variety of specialty high schools are also emerging as a powerful force in education. Most of them link a traditional high school education with a specific career program, such as health, architecture, or business. Others offer alternative learning environments, such as single-gender academies or performance arts. Still others specialize in attracting older students who have dropped out of school. These schools, often called dropout-recovery programs, help young people earn the necessary credits and pass the required state tests to get a high school diploma. Much of the work is done on a computer, rather than in a traditional classroom, and most of the students are required to also hold down a part-time job.

One of the most unusual such programs is the Dayton-based charter school operation called ISUS, Inc. The program, which stands for Improved Solutions for Urban Systems, offers training in skilled trades, such as carpentry, electrical work, and manufacturing. ISUS students have built or rehabilitated more than 50 homes in blighted neighborhoods. In the process, many have earned high school diplomas, gained certification, found jobs, and gotten accepted into college.

Before enrolling, nine out of 10 had dropped out of high school, and 80 percent were in the criminal justice system.

2. GIVING FAMILIES A CHOICE

It used to be that a family's choice of where to send a child to school was fairly limited. Some families favored religious schools, either for the quality of instruction, safety, and discipline, or for the moral and religious instruction that was included. A few families sent their children to private schools, where the level of instruction was generally rigorous. The default choice, of course, was the nearby public school. By law, those schools had to attempt to educate everyone who came through the door, regardless of their economic status, disabilities, or behavioral challenges.

That all changed in 1992. That was when the first charter school was established in Minnesota. Charter schools are unique, because they are publicly funded, but privately operated. Not part of a school district, they operate as a stand-alone venture. The state money that would normally go to a school district for a child's education instead follows that child to a charter school.

The idea of charter schools was to provide an environment free of bureaucratic red tape, where innovation could flourish. It has proved to be an extraordinarily popular idea: there are more than 5,000 charter schools in 39 states and the District of Columbia, serving 1.5 million students. That includes more than 300 in Ohio, where they are called community schools.

The success of charter schools has been difficult to gauge, in part because their very existence is often a subject of controversy. In Ohio, the involvement of for-profit companies in running charter schools has drawn criticism. Critics say those companies make a profit at the public expense and drain much-needed resources from traditional school districts. Nationally, most studies show that charter school students perform about the same as their peers in regular public schools. In Ohio, even charter school advocates that admit charter schools have not made the academic gains they had hoped.

But most people agree that a small but growing number of high-performing charter schools have been beneficial. They have provided good educations to their students, and have forced regular public schools to change, if they hope to stay in the marketplace. They have often demonstrated, by closing achievement gaps among students of different races and ethnic origins, that all children can learn, when they are given the opportunity.

Another controversy in the school-choice movement is the issue of school vouchers. Vouchers give parents the chance to send their child to a private or religious school with a publicly-funded scholarship. In 2002, a voucher program in Cleveland drew national attention when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled

it constitutional. Supporters of vouchers hailed the ruling as an opportunity for poor families to send their children to better schools—an opportunity affluent families have always had. Those who challenged the program had argued that the practice of using public money for education at religious schools violated the separation of church and state. Later, the school-voucher program was expanded throughout Ohio.

One of the more interesting choices parents now have for their children doesn't involve sending them to a bricks and mortar building. Cyber schools, also called virtual schools, provide instruction online through a computer the school delivers to the child's home. The computer-based instruction, usually delivered on an electronic intranet system, is augmented by field trips, teleconferences, and other enrichments. A large number of cyber school students are from families who have home-schooled their children and welcome the additional instruction and curriculum virtual schools can provide. Ohio's largest cyber school, the Columbus-based Electronic Classroom of Tomorrow, has thousands of students living all across Ohio. ECOT was the first electronic school in the nation to graduate students from high school. The school's annual commencement marks the first time many of its students meet one another face to face.

Some worry about the lack of social interaction and personal contact with teachers in virtual schools. But advocates say the schools offer a valid learning opportunity for many students who, for a variety of reasons, don't flourish in traditional school environments.

"Kids are not going to show up because we build them a brand-new building," said ECOT founder Bill Lager. "But every kid in Ohio is a password away from taking part in a robust digital academy."

3. BUILDING THE 21ST-CENTURY TEACHER

Few people look back at their school days and remember a favorite school board member or middle-level administrator. But most of us can name at least one teacher who had a positive impact on our lives.

Research is clear that the quality of the teacher in the classroom is the single most important ingredient in education. In fact, research shows that students who have three ineffective teachers in a row will score as much as 50 percentage points lower on standardized tests than students who have three effective teachers in a row.

"That's the difference between being ready to go to an Ivy League college and not finishing school," says Stanford University professor Linda Darling-Hammond, an authority on teacher training.

But what makes a teacher "effective" or "ineffective"? What is the best way to evaluate and pay teachers? Can we make struggling teachers better?

Those are some of the questions dominating today's education conversation. The questions are difficult, and the answers can be polarizing.

The toughest question is whether teachers should—or can—be judged on the performance of their students. Most teachers strongly resist being evaluated on test scores alone. Let's say the majority of a teacher's class are newly arrived immigrants who speak little English. The teachers might make tremendous progress with those students, but the progress won't likely be apparent in the class's standardized test scores. Likewise, a teacher in a wealthy community, whose students are the children of doctors and lawyers, may do very little to challenge his or her class. Even so, the test scores of such a class are likely to be well above the state norm. And how can you judge art or music teachers on the test scores of their students?

Most people in education believe some compromise will emerge. The most intriguing so far has been the "value-added" analysis, which measures the academic growth of a student over a period of time. The analysis also takes into account factors such as the economic status of the child's family. Although not perfect, it comes closer to determining whether teachers are succeeding.

Another subject of debate is the role of teachers unions and the contracts they negotiate. There was a time when a teacher could be fired for putting on too much weight, or for his or her sexual orientation or political beliefs. Teacher unions emerged and negotiated an agreed-upon set of work rules that included a salary structure based on longevity and graduate degrees. Many now argue that the way contracts protect and pay teachers no longer makes sense. Charter schools, which are largely non-union, have often viewed teacher tenure and seniority as impediments to change and academic success.

But the answer is far from a simple one. If seniority is scrapped, what system will be used to replace it? And if union contracts are an impediment, why are schools in right-to-work states, like Mississippi and Louisiana, consistently the lowest performers, and schools in strong union states, like Connecticut and Massachusetts, consistently among the top performers?

One of the most successful programs in the nation for evaluating and improving teaching is in the Toledo Public Schools. Nearly 20 years ago, the Toledo Federation of Teachers proposed to the district a system in which veteran teachers would mentor new and struggling teachers and then recommend them for continued employment or dismissal. Over the years, thousands of teachers have been made stronger, and hundreds of ineffective teachers have been removed from the district's classrooms.

"We want to find out if someone is good enough to teach here, and I want to find out if they're good enough to be in my union," says Dal Lawrence, the former president of the teachers union, who proposed the plan.

The preparation and training of teachers is another hot issue. About 90 percent of the nation's 3 million teachers come out of traditional teacher-preparation programs at colleges and universities. In a four-year study of teaching schools, former Teachers College President Arthur Levine found that students intending to become teachers scored lower, on the whole, on college-entrance exams than their college-bound peers. He also found that education professors, on the average, were weaker than their peers, receiving tenure less frequently and getting paid less. He found the preparation programs hopelessly out of touch with what was happening in the real world of education.

That sort of criticism has fueled interest in programs like Teach for America, which puts the best and the brightest college graduates—most of them non-education majors—into hard-to-fill classroom jobs in big cities and rural areas. Teach for America requires a two-year commitment, but rewards the participant with a master's degree. At its best, the program replicates efforts in other nations that encourage the top-performing college graduates to teach. Unfortunately, a low percentage of Teach for America participants have remained in teaching, raising questions about whether it is a large-scale solution to improving the quality of teaching.

LOCAL CONTROL VERSUS CONSOLIDATION

Ohio delivers education through a crazy-quilt patchwork of 614 sovereign school districts. Although the offices for these districts are often only a mile or two apart, each district has, by law, its own superintendent, its own treasurer, and its own school board. Virtually all operate their own food-service systems, their own bus fleets, and their own athletic departments. In Cuyahoga County alone, there are 31 public school districts and scores of independent, publicly financed charter schools. Some lawmakers and policy makers have asked whether this is the most efficient and sensible way to deliver public education.

"Maybe we need to think out of the box and get more serious about streamlining," says former Ohio Senate Minority Leader Greg DiDonato of New Philadelphia. "We cannot afford this system."

DiDonato is not suggesting that individual rural districts—some of them with fewer than 300 students and only one school building—disappear. But he does believe that two or three small districts can share the same school board, administration, and services. In rural Tuscarawas County, where DiDonato lives, there are eight school districts.

"I've looked in my own county and said, 'We have eight administrations, eight transportation systems, and eight food service systems. There has to be a better way,'" he says.

As resources shrink, districts are taking a more regional approach to delivering education. Many districts in Greater Cleveland, for example, band together to purchase items like gasoline and heating fuel. Services like special education and teacher training are often provided on a regional basis.

But changing the basic structure of the system is not easy. In Ohio, bitter feelings linger from a consolidation push that began in the 1930s, when the state had more than 1,900 school districts, and ended in the 1980s. Since 1985, only a handful of small, cash-strapped school districts have consolidated.

Part of the problem is that consolidation seems to run counter to the mantra of American public education: local control. For small towns and rural communities, the school is often the center of entertainment, culture, employment, and civic pride. Folks look forward to rooting for their school's football team on Friday nights. Parents don't like the idea of putting their child on a bus to attend a school far from home.

But in some states, local control has been taken to absurd lengths. New Jersey had 22 districts that were so small they had no buses, no cafeterias, no football team—and no schools. Those districts, called “non-operating,” paid tuition to send their students to neighboring districts. A quirk in the state law there created the districts-without-schools, which had taxing authority, a board of education, and a business administrator. Sometimes, administrators outnumber students. In one case, a municipal golf course made up the entire school district, and the caretaker's children were the only students!

Another peculiarity of the American system is the lack of one curriculum. All 50 states and the District of Columbia have their own set of standards and assessments, all at different levels of rigor. Most developed nations have a common set of educational standards, and the lack of such standards in the U.S. is often blamed for our students falling behind their international peers in science and mathematics.

In 2010, governors, business leaders, and education leaders in 14 states, including Ohio, came up with what could be the first set of national standards in language arts and mathematics. While most states have said they liked the idea, none has officially adopted the new standards as their own. Still, advocates are hopeful it is the first step to offering a uniformly strong curriculum to all children.

“Zip codes might be great for sorting mail, but they should not determine the quality of a child's education or success in the future workplace,” says former West Virginia Governor Bob Wise.

Finally, more and more people are thinking about education as a cradle-to-grave endeavor. Historically, colleges and universities, K–12 systems, and preschools have operated independently. Policymakers hope that, by working together in what are known as P-16 councils, those three networks can produce

better-educated and successful graduates. In Greater Cleveland, the Cuyahoga County Educational Services Center last year convened stakeholders from education, business, and economic development, with the hope of forming a P-16 council here. The idea is to work together in the interest of all area school-age youngsters: 220,000 in public schools, 50,000 in Catholic schools, and 15,000 in charter schools.

“It’s all about how we, as a region, can get better and stronger,” says William Wendling, director of public-private partnerships for the Education Services Center.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Many international tests show U.S. students falling behind students in other developed nations in science and mathematics. Is our curriculum in science and mathematics rigorous enough? How can it be improved?
2. The Cleveland Metropolitan School District struggled for years with integrating its schools, so that black children and white children were not segregated. Why is that an important goal? Does desegregation help students deal better with people after they leave school and encounter people different than themselves?
3. Many school systems are faced with less money. What can be done to deal with budget shortfalls, and who should make sacrifices?
4. Ohio has 614 school districts. Is that too many? Should some of those districts be consolidated?
5. Some have proposed eliminating the last two years of high school and sending students who are ready on to college-level studies. Is that a good idea? Do you think the senior year of high school is a waste?
6. There’s a running debate on how teachers should be evaluated and compensated. Do you think teacher evaluation and pay should be tied to how their students perform? How do you evaluate the quality of a teacher?

INTERNET REFERENCES

American Federation of Teachers: www.aft.org
Battelle for Kids: www.battelleforkids.org
Catalyst Ohio Magazine: www.catalyst-ohio.org
Education Writers Association: www.ewa.org
Education Sector: www.educationsector.org
Education Week: www.edweek.org
Thomas B. Fordham Institute: www.edexcellence.net
KidsOhio.org: www.kidsohio.org
KnowledgeWorks Foundation: www.kwfdn.org
Ohio 8: www.wendlingpr.com/ohio8
Ohio Department of Education: www.ode.state.oh.us
Ohio School Boards Association: www.osba-ohio.org
U.S. Department of Education: www.ed.gov

TRANSPORTATION

IN GREATER CLEVELAND

JAMES A. TOMAN

TECHNOLOGY CREATES A MODERN TRANSPORTATION ERA

For thousands of years, humankind depended on muscle power, animal or human, to move people and goods from one land location to another. That would finally change in the 18th century with the invention of the steam engine. It revolutionized the way in which work was accomplished, and it ushered in the “Modern Age.”

The first successful use of steam power for transportation was the work of John Fitch. In 1787 his steamboat traveled along the Delaware River in Philadelphia. It was Robert Fulton, in 1807, however, whose steamboat *Clermont* successfully plied the Hudson River between New York City and Albany, that ultimately marked the arrival of the age of the steamboat.

While the challenge of using steam to propel shipping along the waterways had been met, it wasn't until 1825 that its application to land travel arrived. This took the form of a steam locomotive, invented by George Stephenson in England. It was four years later, in 1829, that his *Rocket* locomotive raveled between Liverpool and Manchester averaging 30 miles per hour. The *Rocket* proved that steam railroads were the wave of the future. The first steam train serving Cleveland came in 1850. It connected the city to Chicago and New York City.

The use of steam locomotives for city transportation, however, was really not feasible. The noise, smoke, and soot that accompanied them made them unsuitable for an urban environment. As a result, the city version of the stagecoach, the horse-drawn omnibus, continued a while longer in cities like Cleveland as the main means of transit.

The omnibus was faced with its own set of problems. The omnibus mainly had to travel along unpaved streets, which after rain or snow, often became impassable for the clumsy vehicles. Thus, the idea of putting the omnibus on rails built in the streets offered real advantages. These street railways, as they were

known, were pulled by teams of horses, and proved considerably more reliable than the omnibuses. Cleveland's first two horsecar lines, one operating along Woodland Avenue and the other along Euclid and Prospect avenues, opened within days of each other in 1859.

In 1860 the population of Cleveland reached 43,417, an increase of over 250% from the previous census in 1850. The increase in numbers also meant that people were spread over a larger area of the city, making transportation increasingly important.

This trend made the investment in street railways ever more attractive. Entrepreneurs interested in laying rails in city streets needed to apply to the City of Cleveland for a franchise. By 1875 nine separate companies were operating street railways in the city.

Street railway leaders, however, were not content to continue operating with horse-drawn cars, and so the search continued for a suitable replacement power source.

In 1879 Cleveland inventor Charles Brush had installed electric lighting along Public Square. Its reliability as a lighting source suggested that it might also be the answer to powering the street railways. Two other Clevelanders, Edward Bentley and Charles Knight, gave the idea its first successful trial. On July 26, 1884, a mile of electrified line on Central Avenue was tested. Cleveland became the first city in the nation to have an electricity-powered streetcar line. The Bentley-Knight system, utilizing a trough buried between the rails, encountered problems, especially when rainwater would flood the power conduit. It was discontinued after a month of operation.

Another system was then under development in Richmond, Virginia, the work of Frank J. Sprague. His system brought electric power to the streetcar via an overhead wire. A trolley pole on the car's roof took in the power and transferred it to the car's electric motors. It was the Sprague system that proved most effective and was adopted in most cities across the country. Cleveland opened its first Sprague installation on Euclid Avenue, from East 118th Street to East 55th Street, in December 1888. Electrification from East 55th Street to Public Square was completed in July 1889.

Even as electricity brought about the triumph of the streetcar in public transportation, in Germany Karl Benz began building the first automobiles, powered by internal combustion engines. The automobile would soon challenge the dominance of the streetcar, and within 50 years it would become the dominant force in urban planning.

CREATING A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

While electrification represented significant technological progress for public transit, it also meant that additional capital would be needed to build electrical power plants, substations, and the overhead distribution network. Recognizing the advantages of economies in scale, the street railway operators saw an answer in mergers between the separate companies.

By 1893, the various independent lines came under the control of just two companies, the Cleveland Electric Railway Company and the Cleveland City Railway Company. In 1903 Cleveland City Railway Company merged into the Cleveland Electric Railway Company. The consolidation, however, did not bring peace to the local public transit scene.

By 1900 Cleveland's population had jumped to 381,768. It was the seventh largest city in the nation. Automobile ownership that year was estimated at 150. This meant that public transit was of vital importance to almost every Clevelander, and naturally there were different concepts about how public transit should be operated and managed.

The Cleveland Electric Railway Company was a private company. It viewed its investment in public transit as a sound way to generate dividends for its stockholder. Ridership in 1903 passed the 100,000,000 mark, and with fares set at a nickel, the company was showing a solid profit.

The railway company's vision about public transit, however, contrasted sharply with that of Cleveland Mayor Tom Loftin Johnson, who led the city from 1901 to 1909. Johnson, a Progressive in public policy thinking, believed that public transit was a service which should be operated by the city at the lowest possible cost to passengers.

At the time Ohio law did not authorize cities to own public transit operations, so in the interim, Johnson and his allies created the Municipal Traction Company. Organized as a holding company, its aim was to lease Cleveland Electric Railway's lines and operate them in trust until such time as city ownership became possible. True to his Progressive ideals, Johnson advocated a three-cent fare instead of the five-cents which was then being charged.

Naturally, his point of view alarmed Horace Andrews and John Stanley, the leaders of the Cleveland Electric Railway Company, who were not interested in ceding control of their properties or finding their profits squeezed. But Johnson's allies had the upper hand. The city could choose not to renew the franchises under which various lines were then being operated. Facing that threat, Cleveland Electric Railway reluctantly agreed to lease its lines to a newly created Municipal Traction Company.

The battle, however, was not over. With reduced income, the Municipal Traction Company was unable to meet its workers' wage demands. To save

money routes were revised, much to the riders' displeasure. A strike followed, but when that had been settled, disgruntled employees conveniently chose not to collect fares from the passengers. Ultimately Municipal Traction Company could not pay its debts, and in 1908 the local streetcar lines went into receivership.

The case was held in the federal district courtroom of Judge Robert W. Tayler. He determined that the street railways belonged to the private company, renamed as Cleveland Railway Company. He also held that the railways operated over streets belonging to the public. His solution was to set up a 25-year franchise for the Cleveland Railway Company, but to make it subject to oversight by a Cleveland traction commissioner. The commissioner was authorized to determine routes and schedules for the company, but the company was to be entitled to an annual 6% return from its operations. The new organizational scheme thus recognized the interests of both private and public factions. It went into effect on March 2, 1910.

The privately-owned Cleveland Railway Company operated the city transportation system until 1942, when the City of Cleveland established the Cleveland Transit System and purchased the Railway's assets.

BUILDING A UNION RAILROAD STATION—ANOTHER BATTLE

Just as the streetcar industry was critical for transportation within the city, the steam railroad played that same role for transit and commerce between cities. Cleveland was in need of a new passenger railroad depot.

While the traction issue had been settled by a court, the site for a new Cleveland railroad station was to be decided by the voters. It was a contest between a lakefront site at the northern end of the mall and one on Public Square, the former favored by the city's establishment and the latter by two entrepreneurs on the rise—Oris Paxton and Mantis James Van Sweringen.

In 1903, behind the leadership of Mayor Tom Johnson, a Group Plan Commission unveiled a plan which would clear 101 downtown acres. Its centerpiece was a 500-foot wide central mall, stretching from Rockwell Avenue north to the bluff overlooking the lakefront railroad tracks. New government buildings would be built along the mall perimeter, giving Cleveland an impressive new civic center, befitting the city's ever increasing status. Most of the buildings proposed in the Group Plan were built. Plans for a new railroad station, however, languished.

At the time Cleveland had several railroad stations, each serving different railroad companies, but the main Union Depot, at the foot of West Ninth Street, was the busiest. It served both the Pennsylvania and New York Central railroads.

It had been built in 1865, and it was in deplorable shape and filthy from decades of pollution from the steam locomotives that served it. The first site to greet most visitors to the city, it was a civic embarrassment.

The city fathers were intent on completing the Group Plan with its location at the northern end of the Mall. That location, however, did not please the railroads that entered Cleveland from the south: the Erie, Nickel Plate, Baltimore and Ohio, and Wheeling and Lake Erie railroads. Nor did a lakefront location benefit the Van Sweringen plans for creating an express route for their rapid transit line from Shaker Heights into downtown.

Ultimately, the decision about the location of a new station was left to the voters. On January 6, 1919, they went to the polls and by a 3:2 margin selected Public Square as the site for the development. In doing so the voters set into motion the Cleveland Union Terminal project, which over the next 15 years would significantly alter the city's skyline and create for Cleveland its most famous landmark. Simultaneously, however, their decision left the long-time civic vision to complete the Mall Plan unfinished. Over the 100-plus years since the Group Plan was first presented, Clevelanders have been vocal in demanding that the basic Mall layout not be compromised. That issue has bedeviled plans over the years, and it remains a challenge to the present time.

VOTERS, POLITICIANS, AND A SUBWAY

Sometimes voters decide, and sometimes elected officials get the final word. Three times Cleveland developed plans for a downtown subway, but none of these ever came to fruition, each for different reasons.

The first plan for a downtown subway was the result of the dramatic increase in passengers on the surface lines of the Cleveland Railway Company. Between 1910 and 1920, annual passenger totals climbed from just over 225,000,000 to nearly 451,000,000. Downtown Cleveland had become the place to shop, not just for inhabitants of the city, but for the entire northeastern Ohio region. Streetcar traffic and the increasing number of automobiles, which numbered over 40,000 by 1920, were choking the downtown street network.

The Detroit-Superior Bridge (now the Veterans Memorial Bridge) opened in November 1917. It had been designed with two decks, the top one for pedestrians, bicycles, and automobiles, and the lower deck for streetcars. The separate right of way for the streetcars was intended to speed their way across the Cuyahoga River, and suggested to city planners additional transportation advantages that could come from a subway.

In 1916 Cleveland City Council considered the advantage of extending the bridge subway to Public Square, and it began talks with the Cleveland Railway Company about that and other routes for a downtown subway. The plan would

remove streetcars from the surface streets in the most congested parts of downtown. Besides the west side entry via an extended bridge subway, the east side line would enter subway tunnels just outside the downtown business district. All the lines would have their main station in loops built beneath Public Square. To carry out the plan, Cleveland City Council authorized a bond issue for \$15 million to appear on the April 27, 1920, ballot. Voters soundly rejected both the plan and the funding. Analysis of the election results indicated that Clevelanders had felt that the issue should have been on a countywide ballot because it would benefit the entire area; Clevelanders should not have to pay for it alone. The voters had their say.

In 1925 The Greater Cleveland Transportation Committee issued a report on traffic improvements for the city. It concluded that a subway from University Circle, along Euclid Avenue, to Public Square would “make Cleveland a vastly more attractive city in which to live, work, move about, and shop.” The committee, however, was uncertain how implementing such a plan could be financed. It therefore suggested that any decision be deferred until a practical funding plan could be worked out.

The Committee was more enthusiastic about possibilities for a lakefront freeway, and suggested that special lanes for buses there could provide “rapid transit” service to the Collinwood and Glenville neighborhoods of the city. (This kind of thinking was well ahead of the times; “Bus Rapid Transit” did not become a national transit option until the 1970s.) The first stretch of what would become known as the Memorial Shoreway, between East Ninth and East 55th streets did not open until 1938. It was the start of the city’s freeway system.

The years of the Great Depression effectively put on hold plans for further transportation improvements. But with Cleveland Transit System’s (CTS) municipal takeover of the Cleveland Railway Company in 1942 and with the reviving economy, plans were soon announced to modernize the existing system. In 1944 it published its proposal.

The plan called for modern streetcars operating over the outer portions of existing routes, then joining traffic-segregated rapid transit rights of way, before dropping into a downtown subway loop. It was a plan similar to those then operating in Boston and Philadelphia (and which continue to the present time in those cities). The downtown subway loop would have been built beneath Huron Road, East 13th Street, Superior Avenue, and West Third Street to Cleveland Union Terminal. It would have connected the uptown shopping district (Halle’s and Sterling’s, Bonwit Teller) with the stores clustered near Public Square (Bailey’s, Higbee’s, and May’s).

In 1945 the City of Cleveland hired a Chicago consultant, DeLeuw, Cather and Company, to review the modernization plans. Its report held that the city only needed a single rapid transit line, rather than several, but it supported the

idea of a downtown subway. Plans for the rapid transit line went forward, and today's Red Line, the portion from Windermere to West 117th Street (later extended to West 143rd Street and later to Cleveland Hopkins International airport) was the result. It opened in 1955. The subway portion of the plan, for which a \$35 million bond issue had been approved by voters in November 1953, was in the planning stages.

Highway improvements were also getting increased attention. In 1940 county voters approved a bond issue to finance the next stages in highway improvements. Automobile registration in the county had skyrocketed to 350,000, a more than eight-fold increase in just 20 years. Motorists faced daily gridlock on the existing street network. Limited access freeways were seen as the answer, and work began on the Willow Freeway (today's I-77).

In 1944 a comprehensive plan for future freeway development was published. It called for "outerbelt" freeways, serving the perimeter of Cuyahoga County, as well as radial freeways with downtown as their axis. Substantial progress of translating this system of limited-access roads, however, did not occur until after 1956 when Congress passed the Federal-Aid Highway Act to establish the Interstate system. The first portion of a revised highway plan, generally designed along the lines of the 1944 version, was the Innerbelt Freeway. Its first segment opened to traffic in 1959.

The plan for the downtown subway became the focus of heated debate. While its advocates cited the need for a rapid transit system with more than one downtown station, the plan was vigorously opposed by Cuyahoga County Engineer Albert Porter. He contended that population was shifting to the suburbs, public transit ridership was falling (by 1959, from its peak in 1946, 250 million riders since its peak in 1946), and that downtown was losing its pre-eminence as a destination. Ultimately, his arguments prevailed, and in December 1959, the county commissioners decided not to issue the subway bonds.

At the same time, taking advantage of the federal support for building the Interstate system of Highways, local planners moved forward. Beginning in 1956 with the downtown Innerbelt, the road-building project eventually resulted in 116 miles of super-highway within Cuyahoga County.

Beginning in 1960 Cleveland Transit System officials proposed a series of six new rapid transit lines that would radiate from downtown to all corners of the county. It was their belief such an investment was the only way to mitigate the pull of decentralization. None of these was ever built.

The automobile had become the highest priority in transportation planning, and it would remain in that position right up to the present time.

REGIONALIZATION BEGINS TO TAKE HOLD

In 1950, the City of Cleveland reached its all-time peak in population, with 914,808 city dwellers. Cuyahoga County's population also continued to grow, reaching 1,389,582; the city's population accounted for 66% of the county total.

But then things began to change. At first the loss of city population was modest. Between 1950 and 1960, Cleveland lost just over 4% of its residents. By 1970 the out migration to the suburbs had accelerated, the city losing another 14% of its citizens, and for the first time more people were living in the suburbs than in the central city. Cuyahoga County's population had climbed to 1,720,835.

During the 1970s the trend became even more severe. Cleveland lost another 177,057 residents during that decade, and for the first time the county also saw its numbers shrink. Besides the loss in numbers from Cleveland itself, the suburbs had also begun to lost numbers. Altogether, the county's population fell by 222,435 to a total of 1,498,400.

Not only had the population begun to move ever farther from the mother city, but Cleveland's strength as an industrial and manufacturing was also being eroded, as plants and jobs moved to the southern states and out of the country as well. These demographic changes translated into a dollar drain, and the city could no longer afford to operate elements of its infrastructure. The response was recognition that the burden of supporting urban life had to be spread more broadly.

One of the first steps towards regionalization came in 1968 with the establishment of the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency (NOACA). The agency was charged with establishing priorities for future transportation and water quality projects.

Soon came a series of other transfers, responsibility being shifted from the city to county and/or regional bodies. In 1968 the commercial waterfront became the responsibility of the newly established Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority. In 1970 the Metroparks assumed control of the Cleveland Zoo. The Cleveland sewer system was turned over to the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer district in 1972. In 1975, the Cleveland Transit System, deeply in debt and bleeding ridership, was turned over to the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority. And then in 1978 the State of Ohio established the Cleveland Lakefront State Park to manage the city's lakefront park properties.

In the course of a decade the City of Cleveland was able to shed financial responsibility for all of these assets, and turn them over to a countywide authority for their future operation. It was a real start towards regionalization, but that effort seemed to stop at the county's borders.

In transportation, for example, the new Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority was authorized to serve the broader northeast Ohio region, but doing

so would require adjacent counties seeking the service to support it financially. None of the neighboring counties chose to do so.

The 1980 census revealed a drastic drop in the city's population, to 573,822. For the first time Cuyahoga County also showed a loss, with some 220,000 fewer residents than just one decade earlier. The steps taken towards regionalization during the 1970s were proving to be only a temporary solution. A broader support network was needed.

It took some time to develop a plan that would advance the regionalization effort. In 2004 the Greater Cleveland Partnership (formerly the Greater Cleveland Growth Association and itself a product of merger among area advocacy and development groups) launched a three-year plan to "mobilize private-sector leadership, expertise and resources to create jobs and leverage investment to improve the economic vitality of the region."

One component of the plan resulted in the major chambers of commerce in the region joining to form Team NEO, a business-development agent for 16 northeast Ohio counties. Another was the formation of the Cleveland Plus Marketing Alliance to coordinate a general marketing strategy and program for the region.

These programs helped not only to promote the region to the rest of the country, but they also served to raise the consciousness of the local population (about 4,000,000 in the 16-county area) of the importance of working together to advance the region. One manifestation of this local consciousness was the approval by Cuyahoga County voters in November 2009 of a new charter for more effective county government.

The resulting vision from these efforts is essentially threefold: 1) sustainable economic development, 2) population stabilization, and 3) quality of life across the region. These are the 21st-century challenges that now face Northeast Ohio, and a broad consensus has been achieved about them.

NOACA, the agency responsible for local transportation planning, in its *Connections 2030: A Framework for the 2030 Transportation System*, reflects this consensus. In particular, NOACA has identified revitalization of the region's urban core as a primary focus. It has also produced a goal to "Establish a more balanced transportation system which enhances modal choices by prioritizing goods movement, transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel instead of just single occupancy vehicle movement and highways."

The first half of the 20th century emphasized improvements in the public transit system. The second half of the century was focused on the automobile. Public policy at the start of the 21st century endorses yet a third vision.

NEW CHALLENGES FOR TRANSPORTATION IN GREATER CLEVELAND

Many ideas have been advanced to achieve the goals to achieve the three fold goals for revitalizing Northeast Ohio. As with most ideas of this kind, there are both advocates and critics, not mention a plethora of obstacles that must be faced and surmounted to bring these plans to life. East of them tackle the challenge from a different perspective.

HIGHWAY PLANNING

Three highway projects are on the planning frontline in 2010. Two represent a reconstruction of existing highways and the other a return to a long dormant idea.

The most costly of these projects involves the rebuilding of the Innerbelt Freeway, a task made necessary by the deterioration which the fifty-year-old downtown bypass route is experiencing. The project calls for a second bridge to be built across the Cuyahoga Valley. When that project is completed the existing bridge will be completely rebuilt. The project also involves the re-engineering of the lakefront “Dead Man’s” curve, as well as reducing the number of on/off ramps between the curve and the bridge.

As is typically true of most Cleveland projects, this one has experienced considerable public criticism, centering around bridge design and the impact on downtown venues from fewer access points.

The second highway project involves rebuilding the West Shoreway (also designated as Ohio Route 2). The reconfiguration would cover the highway from Baltic Avenue on the west side to downtown.

The plan envisions changing the limited-access, 50-mph freeway into a tree-lined boulevard with a 35-mph speed limit. It would add three entrance/exit points along the route, thus making Edgewater Park and adjacent properties more accessible to the west side neighborhoods that flank the highway. Such an improvement is seen as enhancing the prospects for the continued revitalization of the Detroit-Shoreway neighborhood. The project is seen as contributing to the goal of improved quality of life for city dwellers.

The third project carries the name Opportunity Boulevard. It is a 2.75-mile boulevard running from the eastern terminus of Interstate 490 at East 55th Street east to East 105th Street at the edge of the city’s University Circle medical, educational, and cultural hub. NOACA has given the project a high priority.

The current plan represents a significant reconfiguration of the long-abandoned Clark Freeway which would also have travelled east from East 55th Street,

but its path would have carried it through Shaker Heights, significantly disrupting both residential and park settings. It was vetoed by the residents of that suburb.

The new routing would have minimal impact upon residential neighborhoods, running through mostly abandoned industrial sites and along the rapid transit right of way that traverses the area. The highway is seen as a significant economic development tool, opening up some 350 empty acres to new industrial construction and the attendant jobs that these would generate. The plan also addresses quality of life issues, making the University Circle attractions more directly accessible from the area's existing interstate highway system.

THE PORT OF CLEVELAND

Cleveland's very existence is due to its geographic location at the confluence of the Cuyahoga River and Lake Erie. Cleveland was founded in an era when water transportation was the primary means for moving freight. The Port of Cleveland has continued to be an important part of the region's commercial network.

As the regional priorities have changed, however, a growing consensus has emerged that the location of the port, on downtown lakefront land, may not be the most promising future use of that area.

A proposal for relocating the port facilities farther east to a newly created dike area near East 55th Street has gained considerable support from area planners. The relocation would address several needs. First, the port needs a new dike to contain material that continued dredging of the Cuyahoga River generates. The land created by this new dike could serve the port's relocation.

The proposal also takes into account that most of the downtown waterfront has been essentially closed to residential development due to the docks, warehouses, and railroad spurs necessary for port activity. Relocating the port eastward would open that land to redevelopment that would likely lead to repopulating the downtown area of the city. The lakefront holds considerable residential appeal.

Moving the port carries an estimated pricetag of \$500 million. The new dike alone would cost well above \$100 million. These costs pose a major challenge to the viability of the project.

PASSENGER RAILROAD SERVICE

Passenger rail service for Clevelanders is limited. Amtrak trains connect Cleveland with Chicago to the west and to Boston, New York, and Washington to the east. Due to the promise of federal stimulus funding, state policy makers are now considering adding rail service to Columbus, Dayton, and Cincinnati.

While the project has generally received positive support from the public, it has its share of critics. These center around the fact that the 3-C line, as it has been nicknamed, would share tracks with freight traffic, thus significantly limited the train's speed and making the time for trips between the cities considerably longer than for automobiles or buses. The critics wonder if the increased comfort that the rail service would provide would offset the time restrictions and result in a ridership that could justify the expenditure of some \$400 million to bring the project to fruition.

The Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority has also studied the development of a commuter rail network. In its *Transit 2025* document, it offers the possibility of developing rail connections between Cleveland and Painesville, Aurora, Akron, Lorain, Elyria. A rail link beyond Lorain to Sandusky has more recently been given a closer look.

AIRPORT DECISIONS

Cuyahoga County has three airports: Cleveland Hopkins International Airport, and the smaller Burke Lakefront Airport and Cuyahoga County Airport. The question has been rather continuously raised about whether both of the smaller airports are really needed. Burke Airport was built in 1947 on the site of a lakefront garbage burning site. Cuyahoga County Airport opened in 1950 in suburban Richmond Heights.

The two smaller airports serve to siphon smaller private and corporate aircraft from Hopkins, thus relieving congestion there. In light of the fact that neither smaller airport has achieved the promised benefit that was forecast for them, should operations be consolidated at one of them.

If Burke were to be closed, 450 acres of valuable lakefront land would be opened for commercial and residential redevelopment. Its central location, however, in comparison to Cuyahoga's location 11 miles east of downtown, makes Burke a more appealing to the business traveler.

While planners suggest changes in the current status of the two smaller airports, officials continue efforts to improve the infrastructure and operational features of both facilities. A decision about the future does not appear imminent.

PONDERING PAST AND PRESENT POLICY

PAST PONDERABLES

1. The first of the six downtown department stores closed in late 1961. If the downtown circulator subway (rejected by the commissioners in 1959) had been built, would it have allowed downtown to remain a vibrant

shopping district, or might it have slowed the decline, or was the eventual death of the Euclid Avenue shopping zone inevitable?

2. Would the proposed development of a more extensive rapid transit system, connecting inner and outer ring suburbs to downtown, succeeded in offsetting the pull of outmigration from the city; might it have mitigated the appeal for the suburban office parks that sprang up in the suburbs?
3. Construction of the Interstate highway system in the county made cross-county travel much easier for motorists. The highways, however, required a right of way that resulted in the demolition of hundreds of homes in Cleveland and which often severed neighborhoods. To what extent was the highway construction program the cause for accelerating the loss of city population and of increasing urban blight?

PRESENT PONDERABLES

1. Have such organizations as NOACA, Team NEO, and Cleveland Plus correctly identified the priorities which are most critical to the revitalization of Cleveland and of Northeast Ohio? Are there other priorities that should be added to the list or which should replace the current emphases?
2. Are the projects being proposed as addressing the region's most compelling needs well chosen to meet the established priorities? Are these likely to achieve the goals toward which they are pointed?
3. What data can be summoned to either support or criticize plans for a) highway changes; or b) commuter or intercity railroad development, or c) port relocation, or d) airport consolidation?

INTERNET REFERENCES

Burke Lakefront Airport: www.burkeairport.com

Cuyahoga County Engineer: www.cuyctyengineers.org

Cleveland Hopkins International Airport: www.clevelandairport.com

Cleveland Plus Marketing Alliance: www.clevelandplus.com

Encyclopedia of Cleveland History: www.ech.cwru.edu

Greater Cleveland Partnership: www.gcpartnership.com

Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority: www.riderta.com

Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency: www.noaca.org

Ohio Department of Transportation: www.dot.state.oh.us

The Plain Dealer (online edition): www.cleveland.com; also cleveland.com/datacentral

Team NEO: www.clevelandplusbusiness.com/data-library

ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT

DISSECTING THE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITY PARTICIPATION IN THE NEW ECONOMY

RANDELL McSHEPARD

Not so many years ago, Cleveland was a magnetic city known for its economic vitality and opportunity. At the start of the 20th century, Cleveland was well-positioned at the forefront of the industrial revolution with the founding of companies such as Standard Oil, TRW, Inc., and Eaton Corporation. These robust organizations laid the foundation for decades of prosperity. The region's vibrancy was augmented by convenient waterways, including Lake Erie and several rivers that allowed for the shipping of iron ore and other raw materials and products that strengthened the region's manufacturing capacity. This economic boom led to the creation of thousands of jobs, which in turn attracted thousands of residents seeking employment opportunities. Many of these new residents hailed from European countries such as Hungary, Germany, Italy, Poland, and Ireland. The tremendous growth of jobs and corresponding increase in overall population led Cleveland to a peak population of 915,000 residents in 1950. For the first 50 to 60 years of the last century, opportunities for jobs and a good quality of life were abundant for citizens residing in the area.

In addition to attracting immigrants from European countries, Cleveland's fast-paced growth and prosperity also initiated migration patterns from southern states. From the 1940s through the 1960s, thousands of African Americans seeking employment and a better quality of life (not to mention civil rights) migrated to Cleveland from Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi and other southern states. What they found were plentiful jobs, good schools, a rich arts and culture environment and active faith-based institutions. These southern transplants hungry for opportunity settled largely into Cleveland's East Side neighborhoods and quickly began to experience a new lifestyle replete with all of the accoutrements that urban America had to offer.

Many of these African-Americans landed jobs in the manufacturing sector, including working for automakers, steel mills, stamping plants, and in other assembly line positions. Although a good number of them had less than a high school education, these “blue collar” workers became the first generation in their families to reach middle class status. Manufacturing positions paid competitive wages and often led to labor union affiliations. Manufacturing also provided steady employment with long-term staying power. Other important benefits, such as medical coverage, pension plans and, in some cases, bonus pay-outs, laid the groundwork for comfortable lifestyles and financially sound retirement years. As a by-product of reaching this level of status, African-Americans who for so long had been denied opportunity, also became empowered to further pursue and attain the American dream. Their view of the American dream, just like that of their white counterparts, was varied and multi-faceted: purchasing homes in safe and integrated neighborhoods, sending their children to quality school districts (and colleges and universities) and engaging in entrepreneurial endeavors. Their success in pursuing these ambitions and accomplishments created wealth, stable neighborhoods, families and hope for the promise of future generations.

As African-Americans became more educated and prosperous, they began to migrate from the central city where they had been concentrated for many years to inner-ring suburban communities. They also began to take leadership positions within major corporations, civic and community organizations, and local governments. In 1968, Cleveland became the first major city in America to elect an African-American mayor. In the sports world, the first African-American to play in the American League of Major League Baseball played for the Cleveland Indians, and the first African-American general manager in Major League Baseball led the same franchise. All of these developments confirmed, for celebrities and common folks alike, that the City of Cleveland was a national model of opportunity, upward mobility, and empowerment for African-Americans.

In the decades that followed, however, the living and social conditions for African-Americans began to plummet. Higher percentages of African-Americans failed to complete high school, compared to their white counterparts. The quality of the public schools began to be called into question. A hastily organized desegregation plan in the late 1970s led to tumultuous times in the Cleveland Municipal School District, including the exodus of large numbers of white students from the district and the sharp division among many African American students within the district, which resulted from neighbors and former classmates being split among east and west side rival schools. Crime rates in neighborhoods began to increase, and the tight bonds that had held communities together started to unravel. The plentiful manufacturing jobs that at one time served as the magnet and anchor for African-Americans began to disappear, due to the decline of U.S. automakers who were faced with foreign competition, a decreasing demand for

steel in America and a growth in outsourcing entire industries, such as textiles and light manufacturing to Mexico and China. These developments began the “emptying out” of manufacturing businesses in Cleveland, leaving behind vacant buildings, ailing infrastructure and high unemployment. Workers with the economic wherewithal started leaving the central city for greener pastures—literally and figuratively—as urban sprawl began to take minorities with financial means further away from the urban core.

Coinciding with this exodus of jobs and educated, financially stable minority families from the central city was the wholesale criminalization of the African-American male. Incarceration rates among young African-American men started to rise alarmingly in the 1970s and exploded in the 1980s and 1990s, with the advent of the nation’s legal crackdown on crack cocaine. Over a period of two decades, thousands of able-bodied African-American men were taken away from their families and their neighborhoods and sent to penal institutions. This incarceration boom contributed to an explosion in the number of single parent households, which ultimately changed the life experiences for the last two generations of African-Americans who have had to grow up in homes and communities where responsible fathers were rarely seen. This explosion of single parent households, by all accounts, has resulted in decreased family income and diminished opportunities. Decreased family income, in turn, has contributed to a deterioration in community resources and the downward spiral of neighborhood businesses and supportive service agencies. Upon returning home from prison, men found themselves ostracized and shut out of jobs. This lack of opportunity to re-enter the workforce led many to conclude that they had no other option than to re-establish the criminal activities that had led them to prison. This vicious cycle of incarceration and unemployment created despondent children who have largely continued the cycle of poverty by following the examples set by African-American men going to prison and discounting the importance of education. This combination of high rates of incarceration and low levels of educational attainment, more than anything, has been the most significant detriment for African Americans in Cleveland—and other urban areas—over the past few decades. Unemployed, undereducated males have proved to be a death sentence for many minority neighborhoods. As the nation has rapidly shifted toward a knowledge economy and greater global competition, education has increasingly been touted as the “last best chance” for African-Americans, and the communities that they call home, to survive.

EDUCATION

The Washington Post reported in a 2007 article that nearly half of African-Americans born to middle-income parents in the late 1960s plunged into poverty

or near-poverty as adults. The article went on to say that 45 percent of black children whose parents were solidly middle-class in 1968—a stratum with a median income of \$55,600 in inflation-adjusted dollars—grew up to be among the nation's lowest fifth of the nation's earners, with a median family income of \$23,100. Only 16 percent of whites experienced similar downward mobility.

How could this be? The simple answer is the demise of the manufacturing sector and the challenges of the public education system in Cleveland. In the 1960s, many more men were working and therefore able to support families because of the abundance of manufacturing jobs. By 2005, roughly 65 percent of all males living in poverty were African-American. Nearly one-third of African-American men living in area cities never completed high school. The overall high school graduation rate for the Cleveland Metropolitan School District in 2008–09 was only 54%. Such a low rate of completion in this era that trades on knowledge is cause for concern. However, alarm bells should be ringing over the fact that 19 to 26% of African-American young men are completing high school. Lack of educational attainment poses a significant barrier to economic empowerment, not only for these disenfranchised citizens but the entire region.

The following grim findings underscore the dangers of large minority communities such as Cleveland not taking advantage of what education has to offer:

- In 2003, workers who did not complete high school earned less than \$21,000 a year on average, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Minority working families in Ohio are about twice as likely to become low-income or poor.
- In most counties of Northeast Ohio, 2000 Census figures reveal that the percentage of African-American men living below the poverty line is 2 to 3 times higher than the overall poverty rate among all males.
- Joblessness among African-American men who live in central cities and never finished high school is oppressive. Northeastern University's Center for Labor Market Studies found that 44 percent did not work in 2002. Losses in the manufacturing sector have no doubt contributed significantly to the rise in unemployment among African-American high school dropouts.

Given that the loss of low-skilled manufacturing jobs has been a major contributor to decreasing levels of employment among African-American workers, Clevelanders must re-invent the pipeline to ensure that low-to-moderately skilled individuals can become and remain gainfully employed. This is not a moral

lament, but an economic imperative for our region's economic health. To do this, a revamping of educational offerings and opportunities will be paramount.

The Cleveland Metropolitan School District is in the process of launching a major transformation plan. This plan is expected to increase the number of Cleveland students who successfully graduate and leave school well-prepared for positions of relevance in the 21st-century workforce. Those positions, to a great extent, will hinge on the continued expansion of the health-care industry, which now accounts for the highest number of jobs not only in Cleveland but the entire State of Ohio. The Cleveland Metropolitan School District has reacted to this industry trend by creating new schools that prepare their students for medical-related employment opportunities, including the Cleveland School of Science and Medicine and the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) schools. Other high quality schools, such as the Cleveland School of the Arts, Early College, the School of Architecture and Design and Max Hayes, are also preparing students for other 21st-century jobs in areas such as technology, alternative energy, arts, architecture, and advanced manufacturing. It is absolutely imperative that these kinds of specialized schools continue to grow and expand if African-American citizens are to be empowered to take control of their own destiny. So far, these innovative, industry-focused approaches to education have centered on the high school years, but they need to be integrated into the K–8 feeder schools that prepare students for their high school years. The Cleveland School District and several neighboring districts are all carefully evaluating programs that align education reform efforts with the needs of the 21st-century workforce and are pursuing a core strategy of replicating successful and proven models throughout their respective districts.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Minority and small businesses within core cities such as Cleveland are critical to helping initiate urban revitalization. Because the very survival of communities depends on thriving businesses that provide employment for residents and contribute taxes for government services, state and federal policies should support and complement efforts to connect minority businesses to investments designed to stimulate urban economies. Minority businesses employ a higher number of minority employees, as compared to majority businesses. This, in turn, increases the likelihood that dollars will recirculate in minority communities. Recirculation of dollars can determine the overall quality of life for a neighborhood or city and should never be underestimated.

The National Center for Policy Analysis has estimated that some 25 million Americans participate in a “hidden economy,” often made-up of self-employed people who employ workers off the books, perform unlicensed services

or exchange unregulated goods. Although some of this activity is illegal, the vast majority of these off-the-books workers produce goods or services that are legal. Whether they be unregulated catering services, unlicensed barber shops, uncertified auto mechanics or unregistered construction and/or landscaping businesses, these services often offer the only opportunities for employment and wealth creation for urban core residents. This is especially true for disenfranchised populations such as convicted felons, who are disproportionately African American, male and poor, and who find that they are not wanted in most mainstream jobs. The aforementioned explosion of health-care jobs, by example, will not serve the needs of this demographic group, as most medical institutions have policies that prohibit the hiring of ex-felons. Therefore, entrepreneurship must be a vital component of any plan or strategy to empower minority residents to earn a living and contribute their share to the region as tax paying citizens. The “heavy lifting” associated with making such opportunities come to fruition will clearly rest with those entities that regulate, certify and provide licenses. Special outreach programs that assist minority entrepreneurs with everything from education about certification and licensing programs to obtaining financial assistance with fees and necessary training could go a long way. Access to bid opportunities and business contracts would also ensure that these enterprises can compete and ultimately thrive.

According to Small Business Resources, African-Americans are 50 percent more likely to start their own businesses than white workers. A Junior Achievement poll of students 13 to 18 found that 86 percent of black teenagers want to be entrepreneurs, compared to 69 percent of white teens surveyed. This not only further makes the case for the need to empower minorities to start and grow their own businesses, but also suggests that more grant and loan dollars should be designated for minority businesses. Such an investment would be a sound approach and would support the reality that the propensity for many minorities (especially those who are disenfranchised) is to explore entrepreneurship.

Clearly, Northeast Ohio would benefit by nurturing and cultivating this entrepreneurial spirit among African-Americans who are trying to create their own American Dream. Melvin Gravely II, of the Institute for Entrepreneurial Thinking, summed up the opportunity as follows:

We have been spending resources to impact the economics of minorities primarily using a social model. Our next big opportunity is to invest in economic inclusion through the proactive development of minority businesses. Success in this critical mission means the same type of investment used in other important areas of our communities. It means a comprehensive strategy that captures the trends of the market, invites the ideas and passions of the individual and leverages existing assets.

Northeast Ohio leaders need to recognize that true growth and development in America stems from hard work, ingenuity, opportunity, and entrepreneurship. We, as a region, need to offer each and every individual, especially African-American men, the chance to develop and prosper.

EMPOWERMENT

An analysis of economic empowerment requires some focus on the meaning of the word empowerment. In the article, "Empowerment: What Is It?" (*Journal of Extension*, www.joe.org), the term is defined as a multi-dimensional social process that helps people gain control over their own lives. It is a process that fosters power in people for use in their own lives, their communities and in their society by acting on issues they define as important. The article goes on to state that the core of the concept of empowerment is the idea of power. The possibility of empowerment depends heavily on the premise that power can change. If it can, then empowerment is possible. If it can't, empowerment is impossible. Additionally, the concept of empowerment depends upon the notion that power can expand. The article goes on to state the following about power:

Power is often related to our ability to make others do what we want, regardless of their own wishes or interests (Weber, 1946). Traditional social science emphasizes power as influence and control, often treating power as a commodity or structure divorced from human action (Lips, 1991). Conceived this way, power can be viewed as unchanging or unchangeable. Weber (1946) gives us a key word beyond this limitation by recognizing that power exists within the context of a relationship between people or things. Power does not exist in isolation nor is it inherent in individuals. By implication, since power is created in relationships, power and power relationships can change. Empowerment as a process of change, then, becomes a meaningful concept. (Page and Czuba, 2)

There are many forms of power that affect the quality of life for citizens in neighborhoods, cities, and even nations. These forms include political power, economic power and community/civic power. Each of these are detailed below in the context of Cleveland's future, bearing in mind that power relationships can change and ultimately lead to empowerment.

POLITICAL POWER

Elected officials play a major role in setting the course for the region's economic success. They set the parameters for tax structure, city services, human services, land use, and safety, just to name a few. If political leaders are bold, proactive and inclusive in their approach to their work, they can help empower constituents, especially marginalized or less-connected constituents, to realize

opportunities that lead to jobs and shared prosperity. If these same leaders have a more limited view of how their priorities might include minorities and other disenfranchised populations, the community and many of its citizens will not reach optimal levels of success. The power of voting citizens is the one element that can counter the abuse of political power and power relationships.

ECONOMIC POWER

Economic development, business attraction, business growth, per capita income and gross regional product are all terms that measure or contribute to a region's economic health. As a region grows and attracts businesses, it becomes more competitive and helps to generate tax dollars as well as philanthropic dollars that contribute to the quality of life for its citizens. If these same areas falter, the region can experience negative trends that slow or impede growth. Therefore, it is in any region's best interest to generate economic power. However, that economic power cannot be amassed in a fashion that benefits a few. It cannot only apply to large corporations or wealthy individuals. Again, the power needs to be shared so that, as the region gains economic power, it can "lift all boats."

COMMUNITY/CIVIC POWER

The ability of citizens to organize, mobilize, and strategize on the important issues facing their community is a good determinant of the community's collective level of progress and impact. Key decision-making cannot be limited to corporate leaders and elected officials who control the political and economic power. It must also include community and civic leaders who are "closest to the ground" on the issues affecting the city and the region. Community residents are, by and large, most affected by political and/or economic decisions on an ongoing basis, which results in outcomes such as tax increases, job loss and urban sprawl. Therefore, the ability of the Cleveland community to share power with the masses will be a key ingredient to success. The power of the community to speak in one voice and to challenge the status quo will ensure that decision-making is balanced and representative of community needs. In doing so, decisions will be more likely to lead to job creation, business attraction and improved city and county government services.

Providing economic empowerment for Cleveland's residents will require changes in how power is organized and shared. That process cannot and will not happen until all representatives have a seat at the table, with social and economic equity at the core of all power-sharing and empowerment efforts.

NORTHEAST OHIO'S FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES

Northeast Ohio is rich with opportunities that can address and fortify its financial position. These include opportunities associated with neighborhood development, education, workforce development, immigration, and arts and culture. A few concrete recommendations for several of these categories are listed below:

- Schools in distressed communities that have significant minority populations should have a longer school year and extended instruction time throughout the year to help close the achievement gap. Providing enriched and accelerated programs for African-American students (particularly boys) will require additional resources, but, given the correlation between low educational attainment and high levels of unemployment, poverty, and incarceration, the additional investment should pay off in improved employability and opportunities for empowerment.
- Schools need to elevate the quality of instruction among teachers who work in schools with significant numbers of minority males. All such teachers should have access to professional development that introduces them to cultural awareness and sensitivities associated with this population. Unique teaching approaches need to be developed to assist this population in moving from dead last in academic performance to more respectable levels of achievement. Special incentives should also be developed to attract more African-American male teachers to serve this student demographic.
- African-American entrepreneurs need access to assistance that goes well beyond the usual anecdotal information offered in workshop or seminar format. Business intermediary groups, economic professionals, and local financial institutions should conduct an analysis of this issue to better understand why and how minority businesses struggle. After the analysis is complete, those groups should commit to devising and implementing a plan that supports and lends resources to help minority entrepreneurs succeed.
- Acknowledge the impact of race in employment. Traditional training programs have typically failed to take into account the important influence of race and ethnicity. Although white workers in rural Appalachian areas and black workers in poor urban neighborhoods may have similar levels of unemployment that stem from similar marketplace shifts, their

workforce development needs may be different because their cultural backgrounds, community values and life experiences are different.

- Incorporate state-level Alternative to Prison (ATP) programs that offer proactive options to first-time offenders and those who commit lesser crimes. The alternatives should include year-round school, boot camps, “skill training” camps, probations (contingent on working towards educational goals) and community service. These programs could be financed with dollars saved from a declining incarceration rate, which ideally would be reduced by 10 percent to 15 percent over a three-year period. This approach would lessen the number of individuals who enter the penal system and thereby mitigate one of the most pressing challenges facing African-American males today. This approach would also lessen the tax burden of the entire region.
- Focus training efforts on employment in the trades to fill the projected shortage of construction workers. Efforts to redevelop aging cities and to expand “green building” and urban agriculture practices and technologies should create job opportunities that could be targeted toward disenfranchised urban workers. Projects such as the medical mart and the new casino should provide many opportunities in this regard. Cleveland’s focus on being a leader in sustainability should also help to develop new “sustainable-oriented” businesses, including solar and wind energy.
- Analyze each neighborhood block by block and make the necessary tough choices about where investment dollars are warranted and where they would likely be wasted. Identify assets within neighborhoods that can be built on and channel resources toward developing a unique sense of place and catalyzing work opportunities in support of those anchoring assets.
- Provide incentives to banks and the Small Business Administration to invest in small to medium-sized neighborhood businesses. In addition to providing access to capital and supplying technical assistance, help local businesses understand how they can position themselves for growth and prosperity in 21st-century neighborhoods.
- Teach the history of Cleveland and economics to area school students. Provide supportive resources that empower them to get engaged in projects and programs that lead to community service, civic engagement, and entrepreneurship. Focus these programs on minority students with a goal of empowering them to take risks as well as control their own

destiny. Helpful programs could include business mini-grants, college readiness training, and civic engagement coordination.

- Leverage the rich arts and culture environment in Northeast Ohio by connecting minority residents with employment opportunities in arts-related positions. Expose minority residents to arts through classes such as music, painting, drawing, poetry, and dance, and help them understand the long-term opportunities that may stem from training and experience in the arts. Offer arts scholarships, internships and work study programs at local arts institutions.
- Aggressively market the Cleveland region as a hub of activity and opportunity for immigrants. Develop a welcome center and offer immigrant incentives such as discounted housing, opportunities for the “clustering of homes” (geared toward families moving to the region), and technical assistance, ESL classes, and scholarship dollars for higher education. Get immigrants involved in the growth and prosperity of the region, and build in expectations for reciprocity, such as philanthropy, volunteerism, and a long-term civic and residential commitment to the region.

“Empower” is defined in two very interesting ways: 1) give or delegate power or authority to; and 2) give qualities or abilities to. Based on these definitions and as previously referenced, it is imperative that minorities be afforded the critical tools defined in the word empower or empowerment. These tools include delegating and/or sharing power, extending authority to unusual partners and providing opportunities and skills to those who have the potential but lack the networks and prospects for success.

We need all of our citizens empowered and working toward returning Cleveland and Northeast Ohio to the vibrancy of its past. We need all citizens to be educated, equipped with relevant skill sets and armed with confidence. They also all need to feel that they are a part of the solution and integrated into the fabric of the community in which they reside. As discussed throughout this chapter, it is going to require concentrated effort to reach out and empower minority citizens, particularly African-American men, to succeed in today’s changing work environment. There are many challenges. Yet, connecting minorities to opportunity has the potential and is the key to transform the region. As such, those with political, economic, and civic power must do all that they can to include minorities in the growth and prosperity plans for the region. Every citizen should be empowered to make Northeast Ohio a quality place to live, play, work, worship, and raise a family.

REFERENCES

- Fletcher, Michael A. (2007, November 13). "Middle-Class Dream Eludes African American Families." *The Washington Post*. Available: www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/12/AR2007111201711.html.
- Gravely, Melvin J., II. (2005, September). "Why Minority Entrepreneurship . . . Is Imperative to Economic Inclusion." *The Entrepreneurial Thinker*. Available: www.entrethinking.com/pdf/Entre%20Thinker%20Newsletter%20September%202005.pdf.
- McShepard, Randell and Mark C. Batson. (2009, January). *Hope for Urban America*. PolicyBridge. Available: www.policy-bridge.org/hope.pdf.
- McShepard, Randell, Timothy Goler, and Mark C. Batson. (2007, May). *The Rap on Culture*. PolicyBridge. Available: www.policy-bridge.org/PolicyBridge_final_report%20on%20Culture%205-11-07.pdf.
- . (2005, December). *Untapped Potential: African-American Males in Northeast Ohio*. PolicyBridge. Available: www.policy-bridge.org/Untapped_Potential.pdf.
- Page, Nanette and Cheryl E. Czuba. (1999, October). "Empowerment: What Is It?" *Journal of Extension* 37:5. Available: www.joe.org/joe/1999october/comm1.php.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

John J. Grabowski holds a joint position as the Krieger-Mueller Historian and Vice President for Collections at the Western Reserve Historical Society and the Krieger-Mueller Associate Professor of Applied History at Case Western Reserve University. He has been with the Society in various positions in its library and museum since 1969. In addition to teaching at CWRU he serves as the editor of *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* and *The Dictionary of Cleveland Biography*, both of which are available online (ech.cwru.edu). He has also taught at Cleveland State University, Kent State University, and Cuyahoga Community College. During the 1996–1997 and 2004–2005 academic years, he served as a senior Fulbright lecturer at Bilkent University in Ankara, Turkey. Dr. Grabowski received his B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in history from Case Western Reserve University. He is a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Brent Larkin joined *The Plain Dealer* in 1981 and in 1991 became the director of the newspaper's opinion pages. In October 2002, Mr. Larkin was inducted into the Cleveland Press Club's Hall of Fame. He retired from *The Plain Dealer* in May of 2009, but still writes a weekly column for the newspaper's "Sunday Forum" section.

Chris Seper is the president and a co-founder of MedCity News. While serving as *The Plain Dealer's* awarding-winning technology reporter, he became the first member of the staff to blog. Later he became the paper's first online medical editor, responsible for creating destination sections for consumer health and healthcare business, and advising the paper's online editor on topics including social media. Mr. Seper's byline has appeared in *The Plain Dealer* and *Philadelphia Inquirer*, as well as *The Washington Post* and *Christian Science Monitor* while working as a journalist in Cambodia. He holds a master's degree in political science and a bachelor's degree in journalism and political science from Eastern Illinois University.

Scott Stephens has been an award-winning journalist for 30 years. He is currently a senior writer with *Catalyst-Ohio*, a quarterly, nonprofit news magazine that documents, analyzes, and supports school-improvement efforts in Ohio's urban school districts, with special emphasis on Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Columbus. Previously, he worked at *The Plain Dealer* for 18 years, the last 15 covering education. He has written extensively about issues such as testing, charter schools,

school vouchers, desegregation, and school funding. Before coming to Cleveland, Mr. Stephens worked for newspapers in Pennsylvania, Florida, and Ohio, and served as a stringer for United Press International in Mexico City, D.F. To many Clevelanders, he was best known as *The Plain Dealer's* beer critic, establishing the paper's first beer column. Mr. Stephens was also a long-time leader and activist in the Newspaper Guild-CWA, and served for six years as regional vice president on the board of North America's largest media workers union.

Joe Frolik is currently the chief editorial writer of *The Plain Dealer* Editorial Board. Before joining the editorial board in 2001, he was *The Plain Dealer's* national correspondent for 12 years—that's four presidential election cycles, in political-junkie terms. He wrote about personalities, strategies, and issues, and also coordinated *The Plain Dealer's* opinion polling from 1996 through the 2000 election. Away from politics, he has covered earthquakes, hurricanes, space shots, and Kenyon College's swimming dynasty. On the editorial page, he has written extensively about local and national government and politics, and about economic development. He was the lead writer in the opinion section's "Quiet Crisis" series on Northeast Ohio's struggle to reinvent its economy. His Saturday political notebook column debuted in January 2008.

Steven Litt, a native of New York, has been the art and architecture critic of *The Plain Dealer* in Cleveland since 1991. He lives in Shaker Heights with his family.

Diane Solov is Program Manager of Better Health Greater Cleveland, a multi-stakeholder alliance dedicated to improving the quality of health care for people in Northeast Ohio with chronic illness. Based at Case Western Reserve University's Center for Health Care Research and Policy at MetroHealth Medical Center, Ms. Solov manages the day-to-day operations of all aspects of the program. She came to MetroHealth in March 2007, following a career in journalism, winning numerous awards and recognition for her work. She spent her last 15 years as a journalist at *The Plain Dealer*, Cleveland's daily newspaper, as a medical editor and, previously, as a medical reporter. For nearly a decade, Diane Solov often broke and edited stories about Northeast Ohio's expansive healthcare market and national healthcare issues that affected them and their patients. She earned a B.A. in anthropology from the University of Missouri and completed coursework in the M.A. program at its renowned School of Journalism. She was a 2010 Fellow of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Ladder to Leadership program.

James A. Toman has authored or co-authored 18 books on various Cleveland topics, particularly those relating to the downtown district and to public

transportation. An inveterate collector of Cleveland streetcar photographs, he has also photographed most of the streetcar, light rail, and subways systems in North America. He holds a doctorate in education/clinical counseling, and retired in 2006, after 43 years in the teaching field. His last educational post was as dean of the Social Sciences/Human Services Division at Lorain County Community College.

A native of Youngstown, Thomas Suddes joined *The Plain Dealer* in 1982; the next year, he transferred to the newspaper's Columbus bureau, where for 17 years he covered the Ohio General Assembly and the state budget. While at the Statehouse, Mr. Suddes was elected president of the century-old Ohio Legislative Correspondents Association. His *Plain Dealer* column on Ohio government and politics, which appears on Sundays, began in the 1980s. Late in 2000, Mr. Suddes left the newspaper's staff for graduate study at Ohio University's E. W. Scripps School of Journalism; he graduated in 2009 with a Ph.D. in mass communication. He returned to *The Plain Dealer* in 2007, as a part-time editorial writer, covering state affairs.

Randell McShepard is a native Clevelander and proud graduate of the Cleveland Municipal School District. He received Bachelor of Arts degrees in Psychology and Communications from Baldwin-Wallace College and a Master's of Science in Urban Studies from Cleveland State University. In January 2001, Mr. Randell joined RPM International, Inc., a worldwide Fortune 1000 chemical coatings company, as Director of Community Affairs. In October 2007, he was promoted to Vice President of Public Affairs, in which post he is responsible for external and government affairs, corporate philanthropy, and corporate purchasing initiatives. Prior to joining RPM, Mr. McShepard spent 15 years in senior management positions in the nonprofit sector, where he managed multi-million dollar budgets and created programs focused on workforce development, economic development, and community service. He has worked as an independent consultant for over 45 organizations, more than half of which were community development corporations.