

**From City to Suburb:
The Strange Case of Cleveland's Disappearing Elite
and Their Changing Residential Landscapes: 1885-1935***

James Borchert

The current debate over the impact of urban sprawl on central cities and inner suburbs focuses largely on post World War II suburban developments. Nevertheless, the origins of the shift from city to suburb began much earlier; for the United States the late 19th and early 20th centuries helped set the pattern for urban abandonment. Historians and other historically oriented scholars have entered this debate, in part focusing on which social class or classes first led this movement out of the city. In his major survey of U. S. suburban history, Kenneth Jackson noted the significant diversity of communities that qualify as suburbs but concluded that suburban origins ultimately rest with the middle and especially the upper classes. "Social change," he argued, "usually begins at the top of society. In the United States, affluent families had the flexibility and the financial resources to move to the urban edges first." Thus what became "fashion for the rich and powerful later became popular with ordinary citizens."¹ Comparing English and U. S. suburban origins, Robert Fishman concluded that the former began "for a restricted elite of eighteenth century London merchants" but in both places became "the residence of choice for the Anglo-American middle class."² Others have argued that suburban development had multiple origins and that Jackson and others have understated suburban diversity in the years before World War II.³

This paper speaks obliquely to this debate by tracing from 1885 to the 1930s the migration of Cleveland's upper classes within the city and to the suburbs.⁴ It places this movement in the context of elite residential changes and persistence in other cities. Only in Cleveland did the upper classes leave the city quickly and early for the suburbs. Other cities, including older, eastern port cities such as Boston and Philadelphia, older interior river cities as Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, and

the Great Lakes industrial cities of Detroit, Chicago, and Milwaukee, retained the majority of their elites as late as the mid-1930s.⁵ By the 1930s Cleveland's elite disproportionately lived in the suburbs compared to the percentage of its metropolitan population that was suburban and in comparison with elites of the other cities studied. Eventually many cities followed Cleveland's pattern, but they did so over a longer period of time; some continued to house significant numbers of their upper classes even today.⁶ Finally, Cleveland's upper classes, in contrast to other cities, displayed a greater aversion to multi-family living and preferred single-family, suburban homes; conversely, elites of other cities were more likely to select multi-family living arrangements including hotels, apartments and urban social clubs than their Cleveland counterparts.

The paper begins with a discussion of the limited literature on the spatial movement of social elites within their metropolitan regions. It describes and evaluates the key sources used here, *Social Registers* and "blue books". It then presents successively, (1) the changing residential locations of Cleveland's elite; (2) the movements of upper classes in other cities; (3) a comparative analysis of elite representation in suburban settlement; and (4) the comparative analysis of elite's selection of multi-family housing. Finally, the paper advances some suggestions on the implications of these findings, from the impact of an apparent urban abandonment by Cleveland's elites, their apparently atypical residential preference to the issue of elites as suburban vanguard.

Review of the Literature

Geographers, sociologists and historians have considered spatial movements of elites within and out of cities. Most studies, however, focus on a single city; often they lack comparative frameworks, and common criteria to permit comparisons with other cities.⁷ Two comparative studies include Cleveland. Geographer Stephen Higley mapped the primary residences of the *Social Register 1988* entrants.⁸ He found that Cleveland housed only "fourteen *Social Register* households (3 %), with the remaining 97 % in the suburbs." He attributed this to "the overall urban decline" Cleveland "experienced since 1950," but provided no evidence to demonstrate when the city's elite left.⁹

Historian John Ingham's *The Iron Barons* provides the only comparative historical study that includes Cleveland and follows residential changes over time. Drawing on a sample of elite iron and

steel families in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Wheeling, Youngstown and Cleveland, Ingham traces his sample from 1874 to 1965. While Pittsburgh retained most of its elite iron and steel families (72 %), by the 1930s the other cities had lost the majority of this population to the suburbs. Of these, Cleveland fared better; in 1931, 39 % of the sample families resided in the city while only 19 % of Philadelphia's, 22 % of Wheeling's and 13 % of Youngstown's elite remained during the 1930s. Ingham's fine study has at least two limitations. First, his samples of iron and steel families are unrepresentative of each city's total elite population, and over time, as increasing numbers of these samples disappear from local records, they become more so. Secondly, he seems to over- or under-count respectively for Cleveland's and Philadelphia's populations making this data for residence patterns problematic.¹⁰

Sources: *Social Register* and "Blue Books"

The *Social Register* and the various "blue books" emerged at a time when the elite social world was in turmoil. During the last half of the 19th and the first years of the 20th century an even wealthier *nouveau riches* emerged from new industrial and financial empires swelling the ranks of the wealthy. Elites found it difficult to sort out who "belonged" in Society and who did not. These publications helped identify those who did.¹¹

From the mid 1880s to the present the Social Register Association of New York City published yearly directories for New York, adding other major eastern and mid-western cities by the early years of the 20th Century.¹² The association's agents in each city "check[ed] the credentials of local applicants," kept "track of births, marriages, divorces, scandals, and deaths, and read proofs of their respective editions."¹³ Dixon Wecter, an early historian of elite society, noted that these agents were "chiefly decayed gentlewomen or ex-society reporters" who earned a salary of \$25 per month.¹⁴

Elites were often quite mobile during a given year dividing their time between multiple locations. For example, Cleveland's socially prominent family, the Samuel and Flora Stone Mathers, resided half the year in their "grand Tudor townhouse" on Euclid Avenue and the other half at their suburban Bratenahl estate, "Shoreby".¹⁵ To respond to this, the *Social Register* provided several yearly publications including: the November issue with entries providing primary addresses and second

homes; the June *Summer Social Register*, “with country and foreign addresses of all combined,” while *The Locater* listed “the names in all the Social Registers.”¹⁶ For this analysis the November issue is used and the family’s self-selected primary residence is the one that is mapped.¹⁷

Mobility is a concern in other ways as well. Each *Social Register* reported significant numbers of households for each city in a given year whose primary, and often only address, is in another city within the U. S. or abroad. For example, the *Social Register Philadelphia 1929* includes 3,933 households with addresses in the metropolitan area; it also lists another 850 households with addresses outside of the metropolitan area, either elsewhere in Pennsylvania, other states or out of the country. When these households are added to the total, non-residents account for 18 %.¹⁸ Non-residents made up 19 % of Cleveland’s 1930 *Social Register*.¹⁹ “Non-resident” elites are not considered here, but represent a significant issue about their commitment to their city of origin.²⁰

Although most blue books were produced locally, some were national publications; the Dau Publishing Company, variously of Detroit, Buffalo and New York, published a *Society Address Book: Elite Family Directory, Club Membership* for Detroit from 1881 to 1917.²¹ The locally produced *Cleveland Blue Book: A Society Directory and List of Leading Families...* predated the *Social Register* both nationally and locally beginning publication in 1885 and continued almost yearly to the present. Less exclusive than the *Social Register*, the 1931 *Blue Book* listed 2,940 “prominent families” while the 1930 *Social Register* found only 1,134, a ratio of just under 3 to 1.²² Although the *Social Register* quickly dropped advertisements after their initial editions, blue book publishers relied on them and sales of advanced subscriptions to finance the books. *Social Register* acceptance involved a formal application process with a committee purportedly determining the acceptability of each applicant; the blue books’ selection procedures remain more obscure. Some compilers probably included families because they paid an advanced subscription price.²³ Cleveland’s first blue book provides some insight into the selection process; solicitors requested the names of others who should be included:

If, at any time, patrons feel disappointed in not finding the addresses of their friends, they may be assured that those friends persistently declined to honor the book with their names, or because, after continued endeavor, we failed to obtain personal

interviews, or to secure responses by mail or telephone.... Whenever a revised edition is called for by the ladies, the Publisher will immediately respond, knowing that future success will be comparatively easy, the importance of the work then being fully known and appreciated; individual names will be readily given and the ladies will not hesitate to mention names which they will expect to find in this book, as a few have kindly done in this issue.²⁴

Social Registers' and blue books' policies of exclusion and inclusion present major problems for researchers. They tended to include some of those whose resources and social worlds no longer qualified while leaving out those who increasingly did. The *Social Register*, especially, was notorious for its exclusion of those who were not white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant.²⁵ Blue books may have been more arbitrary in their selections; Cleveland's included some non-WASP elites unlikely to be found in the *Social Register*.²⁶ Some scholars consider blue books to be too inclusive; Higley complained that Detroit's *Social Secretary* "may include all of Detroit's upper class (as defined locally),...for the most part, it is a listing of Detroit's upper middle class."²⁷ In other ways, this difference may help sort out "real" elites from the upper-middle class permitting partial analysis of their separate movements within and out of the city. To the extent that blue books report more fully the movement of the upper-middle class, then some of the data for Cleveland suggests that this group may have been more prone to suburban migration and multi-family living than the upper class. Despite these differences, both sources tend to produce similar results on the percentages of elites who reside in the city and suburbs for the years studied.

Despite these and other problems, scholars have long used the *Social Register* and blue books as effective devices to identify elites. Sociologist E. Digby Baltzell found that the *Social Register* provided "an index of a new upper class in selected large metropolitan areas in America."²⁸ Reviewing sociologists', historians', and geographers' use of *Social Registers*, Higley concluded that "the credibility of the *Social Register* as a listing of the American upper class is unassailable....it has been used repeatedly as the authoritative designator of the American upper class."²⁹ Others have attested to the strength of blue books.³⁰ Despite their limitations, these directories provide a viable source for the upper classes and their residential patterns.³¹

Changing Residential Locations of Cleveland's Social Elite

From 1850 to the 1880s, Cleveland's upper classes maintained residential patterns like that of other cities with the majority residing on or near a centrally located "grand avenue".³² Based on the *Cleveland Social Directory* of 1885/86, 99 % of 1,805 families listed lived in the city. The largest concentration lived on Euclid Avenue (22 %) and adjacent Prospect Avenue (17 %) stretching from Public Square east and on adjoining and adjacent streets (22+ %). This neighborhood of large homes accounted for at least 61 % of Cleveland's social elite. Two smaller clusters occurred on the near west side along Franklin Avenue (5 %) in Ohio City and Jennings Avenue (2 %) in Tremont. The 21 suburbanites (1 %) lived in Collamer, Glenville, Rockport and Willoughby.³³ (Table 1 and Map).

Although Euclid Avenue "reached its peak of elegance and vitality in the 1880s and 1890s", the 1900 *Blue Book* revealed a pattern of movement from both Euclid and the city.³⁴ While Cleveland still claimed 90 % of the 1,880 *Blue Book* families, Euclid Avenue's percentage declined from 22 to 17 %. On the far east end of Euclid, within the city's boundaries, a new elite residential area began to emerge (Wade Park/University Circle - 1 %), while new suburban areas increased their proportion of social elites from 1 to 10 %. East Cleveland, adjacent to Wade Park, housed 5 %, the largest suburban concentration.³⁵ Because the western portions of Euclid were already extensively developed and increasingly encroached upon by business expansion, virtually all new home construction took place on the eastern most part of the city.³⁶

TABLE 1 Cleveland Social Elite Residential Locations - 1885-1931: Blue Books

Location	1885/86 ¹		1900 ²		1915 ³		1931 ⁴	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Cleveland	1784	99	1695	90	1631	66	539	18
Euclid Ave.	391	22	317	17	272	11	53	2
Prospect	309	17	192	10	111	4	8	-
Wade Park			12	1	125	5	281	10
Franklin Ave.	89	5	60	3	17	1	3	-
Jennings Ave.	34	2	42	2	20	1	0	-
Other City	961	53	1072	57	1086	44	194	6

CITY TO SUBURB 17

Suburbs	21	1	185	10	845	34	2401	82
E. Cleveland			98	5	280	11	146	5
Cleveland Hts.			28	1.5	224	9	1028	35
Shaker Hts.					86	3.5	685	23
Bratenahl			27	1.5 ⁵	61	2.5	74	3
South Euclid					3	-	37	1
Lakewood			11	1	162	6.5	165	6
<u>Other Suburbs</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>266</u>	<u>9</u>
TOTAL	1805	100%	1880	100%	2476	100%	2940	99%

1. Mrs. M. B. Haven, comp., *The Cleveland Social Directory or Ladies Visiting Lists... 1885/1886* (Cleveland: Mrs. M. B. Haven, 1885).

2. Helen de Kay Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book: A Social Directory and List of Leading Families... 1900* (Cleveland: Helen de Kay Townsend, 1899).

3. Helen de Kay Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book: A Social Directory of Cleveland, Ohio... 1915* (Cleveland, Helen de Kay Townsend, Publisher, 1914).

4. Helen de Kay Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book: A Social Directory of Cleveland, Ohio and Suburbs... 1931* (Cleveland, Helen de Kay Townsend, Publisher, 1931).

5. Bratenahl did not incorporate until 1903 and remained independent of Cleveland; figures here are for Glenville and Bratenahl. Cleveland annexed Glenville in 1905.

What appeared as a trickle in 1900 became, by 1915, a substantial movement of elites from the city.³⁷ (Table 1). Suburbs now claimed one-third of the 2,476 *Blue Book* families. Euclid Avenue housed only 11 % of elite families, down by half since 1885. Prospect's decline was even more precipitous, from 17 to 4 % in 30 years. Both near west side enclaves, Franklin and Jennings avenues, experienced sharp decline. Suggestive of the move to the city's periphery, Wade Park (University Circle), now claimed 5 %. Close by, suburban East Cleveland housed more elites than Euclid Avenue (11 %) with neighboring Cleveland Heights holding another 9 %. On the west side, another 6 % lived in Lakewood. (Table 1).³⁸

If the shift of elites from city to suburb from 1885 to 1915 seemed large, the next fifteen years produced a massive exodus. The 1929 *Blue Book* anticipated this shift by its new subtitle, *A Social Directory of Cleveland, Ohio and Suburbs*.³⁹ By 1931, the *Blue Book* reported only 18 % of its 2,940 families remaining in the city with 82 % living in suburbs. Euclid Avenue, once the center of Cleveland's elite life, now claimed only 1 % while suburban Cleveland Heights (35 %) and adjacent Shaker Heights (23 %) each housed more than the city. Together they became

the dominant elite residential cluster with 58 % of elite families. Not all suburbs experienced this dramatic increase in elite residents; East Cleveland's declined by nearly half from 1915, while Lakewood gained only three additional families.⁴⁰

The more selective *Social Register Cleveland 1930* reported a somewhat less precipitous decline with the city housing 29 % to the suburbs' 71 %.⁴¹ Only three years later, however, the *Social Register* gave Cleveland only 20 % of elite households while 80 % lived in suburbs. As with the *Blue Book*, Euclid Avenue's *Social Register* families claimed only 1 % of elite families, while Cleveland Heights and Shaker Heights reported similar percentages, combining at 58 %.⁴² Although John Ingham's sample of Cleveland's iron and steel elites found 39 % remaining in the city by 1931, it clearly understates the extent of city abandonment that emerges from the mapping of all *Blue Book* and *Social Register* families.⁴³ (Table 2)

TABLE 2 Cleveland Social Elite Residential Locations - 1913-1934: *Social Register*

<u>Location</u>	1913 ¹		1930 ²		1934 ³	
	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Cleveland	717	77	269	29	186	20
Euclid Ave. Area	527	56	89	10	13	1
Wade Park	107	11	147	16	98	11
Other City	83	9	33	3	75	8
Suburbs	220	23	649	71	747	80
E. Cleveland	51	5	18	2	12	1
Cleveland Hts.	92	10	320	35	323	35
Shaker Hts.	18	2	185	20	217	23
Bratenahl	20	2	45	5	45	5
Lakewood	16	2	14	2	10	1
Other Suburbs	23	2	67	7	140	15
TOTAL	937	100%	918	100%	933	100%

1. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cleveland 1913* (New York: Social Register Association, 1912).

2. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cleveland 1930* (New York: Social Register Association, 1929).

3. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cleveland 1934* (New York: Social Register Association, 1933).

Despite Higley's hypothesis that Cleveland's upper class left after 1950, the vast majority abandoned the city well before its widely publicized post-World War II decline.⁴⁴ Although the city's population declined by 2.5 % during the 1930s, it rebounded by 1950 to a peak population of over 914,808. Nevertheless, the pattern begun before 1900 and shaped during the first thirty years of the new century persisted in later years, as well. By 1988, the *Social Register* reported Cleveland with only 3 % of the metropolitan region's upper class; Shaker Heights, with the largest single concentration, had 27 % and Cleveland Heights was second with 14. Although Cuyahoga County still held 85 % of elites, neighboring counties of Lake and Geauga now housed 15 %.⁴⁵ Although the 1992 *Blue Book* reported a somewhat larger elite population for Cleveland, 6 %, the results are not significantly different. Many of Cleveland's elite resided in the University Circle or Shaker Square areas

of Cleveland, while suburban Shaker and Cleveland Heights accounted for 23 and 13 % respectively.⁴⁶

Comparative Context: Cleveland v. Eastern River and Great Lakes Industrial Cities

Although the literature is limited, Cleveland's loss of elites appears to be an extreme version of a general pattern for many cities as elites eventually chose suburban residences over city ones. What is striking here is that some cities held on to significant numbers of elites during the period under consideration. This holds true for both old eastern port cities Boston and Philadelphia as well as newer river cities Pittsburgh and Cincinnati. Walter Firey's study of Boston's elite demonstrates that while the older port city experienced loss to the suburbs much earlier than Cleveland, the movement from city to suburb took place much more slowly. As early as 1894, based on *Social Register* data, 21 % of elites lived outside of the city; by 1929, this percentage grew to half. Not until 1943, however, did Boston's share of elite families decline to one-third.⁴⁷ Similarly, Philadelphia, which was aided by the massive annexation of the remaining county land to the city in 1854, retained 53 % of its upper classes as late as 1929.⁴⁸

On the other hand, older river cities such as Pittsburgh and Cincinnati proved even more effective in holding elites within the city. The 1915 *Pittsburgh Blue Book* listed 76 % of elite households residing in the city; by 1930, the *Social Register* reported that 70 % of the area's elites remained in the city.⁴⁹ Similarly, the 1934 *Social Register Cincinnati* reported 82 % of entrants in the city.⁵⁰ (Tables 2, 3, and 4).

In comparison with other Great Lakes industrial cities, most of which emerged at the same time and under similar conditions, Cleveland appears less extreme, but still quite remarkable for the extent and speed with which elites left the city. *The Chicago Blue Book...1915* reported that 68 % of elites lived in the city; 14 years later, the 1929 *Social Register* listed 62 % with city addresses.⁵¹

Table 3 Elites / General Population in Selected Cities and their Suburban Districts:
1911/16-1920.

City	1911-1916		% 1920 Metropolitan Population	
	% Elite Population			
	Urban	Suburban	Urban	Suburban ⁷
Boston ¹	60	40	37	63
Chicago ²	68	32	83	17
Cleveland ³	66	34	86	14
Detroit ⁴	89	11	80	20
Milwaukee ⁵	95	5	83	17
Pittsburgh ⁶	76	24	37	63

1. Walter Firey, *Land Use in Central Boston* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), Table 4, page 115.

2. Chicago Directory Company, *The Chicago Blue Book... 1915* (Chicago: Chicago Directory Company, 1914).

3. Helen deKay Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book: A Social Directory... 1915* (Cleveland: Helen deKay Townsend, Publisher, 1915).

4. *Dau's Blue Book for Detroit and Suburban Towns - 1916* (New York: Dau's Blue Books, Inc., 1915).

5. The Elite Directory Co., *The Milwaukee Blue Book of Selected Names... for the Season 1911-12* (Milwaukee: The Elite Directory Company, 1911).

6. R. L. Polk and Company, *The Pittsburgh Blue Book: An Elite Directory and Family Register... 1915* (Pittsburgh: R. L. Polk and Company, 1914).

7 U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930 - Metropolitan Districts, Population and Area* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1932), Table 4, pp. 10-13.

Detroit also experienced out migration, but data from Detroit's *Blue Books* suggest a much slower movement than Cleveland's. In 1900, Detroit City housed all of the area's 2,834 elite families at a time when Cleveland had lost 10 %.⁵² By 1916, only 11 % of Detroit's 2,264 elite families had moved to suburbs; 89 % remained in the city.⁵³ Data for 1930 revealed a more pronounced shift with 37 % of the 2,736 families now living in suburbs; in contrast Cleveland lost 80 %.⁵⁴

Table 4 Elites / General Population in Selected Cities and their Suburban Districts:
1929/34-1930

City	1929 -1934 % Elite Population		% 1930 Metropolitan Population ⁹	
	Urban	Suburban	Urban	Suburban
<u>Eastern Coastal Cities</u>				
Boston ¹	50	50	34	66
Philadelphia ²	53	47	69	31
<u>River Cities</u>				
Pittsburgh ³	70	30	34	66
Cincinnati ⁴	82	17	59	41
<u>Great Lakes Industrial Cities</u>				
Chicago ⁵	62	38	77	23
Cleveland ⁶	18	82	75	25
Detroit ⁷	63	37	75	25
Milwaukee ⁸	89	11	78	22

1. Walter Firey, *Land Use in Central Boston* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), Table 4, 115.

2. Social Register Association, *Social Register Philadelphia 1929* (New York: Social Register Association, 1928).

3. Social Register Association, *Social Register Pittsburgh 1930* (New York: Social Register Association, 1929).

4. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cincinnati and Dayton 1934* (New York: Social Register Association, 1933).

5. Social Register Association, *Social Register Chicago 1929* (New York: Social Register Association, 1928).

6. Helen deKay Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book: A Social Directory... 1931* (Cleveland: Helen deKay Townsend, Publisher, 1931).

7. Ruby F. Marvin, ed., *The Social Secretary of Detroit-1930* (Detroit: Social Secretary, 1930).

8. Milwaukee Social Register and Directory Co., *The Milwaukee Social Register and Directory: 1933-34* (Milwaukee: The Milwaukee Register and Directory Co., 1933).

9. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930 - Metropolitan Districts, Population and Area* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1932), Table 4, pp. 10-13.

Milwaukee continued to house the vast majority of its upper classes; as late as 1934, 89 % of its upper-class households remained in the city.⁵⁵ Thus the Cleveland pattern of early and swift city abandonment by social elites is not mirrored in the other cities studied here including Boston and Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Cincinnati or even the Great Lakes industrial cities that more closely approximate Cleveland in timing and economic base.

Comparative Analysis of Elite Representation in Suburban Settlement

Placing Cleveland's elite movement in the context of the suburban shift in Cleveland and in other cities further demonstrates the city's unique position and helps date when this took place. Hypothetically at least three general hypotheses seem likely from the data; first, that elites would be distributed as is the larger population, secondly, that they would be disproportionately represented in the suburbs as Jackson might suggest, or thirdly, that they would be under-represented in the suburban populations. Comparing elite urban/suburban distributions from 1914-16 with the metropolitan population distribution from the 1920 census suggests that for the six cities considered here (Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee and Pittsburgh), all cities housed a high percentage of their upper classes although they vary from a low of 60 % (Boston) to a high of 95 % (Milwaukee). However, while four cities still housed a majority of their metropolitan population (83 to 86 %), Boston and Pittsburgh did not (37 % each). Thus, Boston and Pittsburgh elites were disproportionately represented in their city's population, while Cleveland's and Chicago's elites were over represented among suburban residents. (Table 3).

By 1930, the predilection of Cleveland's upper classes to leave the city emerged even more distinctly both in its own metropolitan region and in comparison with that of other cities. Although Cleveland housed 75 % of its metropolitan population, elites overwhelmingly lived in suburbs (71, 80 or 82 % depending on the source). None of the other eight cities considered here had this inverse proportion, although by 1930, Detroit, Chicago and Philadelphia elites tended to be slightly more suburban than their metropolitan populations. Boston, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati and Milwaukee still retained higher proportions of their elites than their general populations. (Table 4).

Changing Landscapes of Cleveland's Upper Classes

As with many other cities, from 1850 to 1910, Cleveland's elite largely settled on or near its "great American avenue," Euclid Avenue; at its zenith by the mid-1890s, "more than 260 residences lined the linear landscape between Ninth and Ninetieth streets," exclusive of homes on neighboring streets.⁵⁶ Euclid's biographer, Jan Cigliano, observed that the north side and parts of the south "were closer in overall presentation and plan to the country estates of Great Britain and France than to such American enclaves of wealth as those of Philadelphia's Rittenhouse Square, Boston's Back Bay, or New York's Fifth Avenue."⁵⁷ Although she incorrectly claims Euclid Avenue as a "borderland", "places where houses are so far apart that even in winter they cast shadows only on their own lots", and are distant from cities, Euclid's north side did anticipate this development with their expansive grounds and deep set back of 100 to 300 feet of rolling, treed lawns.⁵⁸

To Cigliano Euclid Avenue's residents differed in significant ways from their eastern counterparts; "in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia...the esteemed professions of medicine, religion, and literature were well represented among the established elite families." In contrast, Euclid's "were mostly businessmen and lawyers."⁵⁹ Moreover, "wealthy Clevelanders, many of them natives of rural villages, established a precedent for the Avenue's countrified development for the rest of the century."⁶⁰ Euclid Avenue, perhaps, more closely approximated the contemporary suburban landscape emerging outside the city on Cleveland's west side which was marked by "numerous handsome and costly suburban residences, set in the midst of tastefully kept grounds" than it did New York's Washington Square or Fifth Avenue.⁶¹

As Euclid Avenue and other Cleveland elite began to abandon their inner city homes for those on the periphery, urban and suburban, they continued to select single-family houses rather than multi-family alternatives. Cleveland's 1885-86 blue book listed only 24 households or individuals with addresses in apartments (17), hotels (6) or social clubs (1).⁶² By 1915, with 9 % of households in apartments, hotels or social clubs, Cleveland's upper classes were at or near their peak in their experiment with multi-family living.⁶³ By 1931, this percentage declined to 6.5 % and from 228 households or individuals in 1915

to 191. Even the location of these addresses indicates the sharp shift toward the suburbs. Few lived in apartments or hotels located downtown; virtually all lived in three buildings near university circle on the eastern edge of the city: The Wade Park Manor Hotel (77), the most exclusive; Parklane Villa (17); Fenway Hall Hotel (10) or the Moreland Court Apartments (49), at the border of Cleveland and Shaker Heights. Two suburban hotels, the Alcazar in Cleveland Heights and the Lake Shore Hotel in Lakewood, housed another 22.⁶⁴ Most striking here is the small number of apartment buildings and hotels that housed Cleveland's upper classes.

Many fewer of the more exclusive *Social Register* households selected such housing; both the 1913 and 1930 volumes reported just under 5 %. By 1934, the percentage declined to less than 3 %.⁶⁵ The disparity between the two directories may be accounted for by the fact that, as Higley noted, blue books tended to be more inclusive of the upper-middle class; in Cleveland, then, the "real" elites seem to be slightly more disdainful of multi-family alternatives than those of the upper-middle class.⁶⁶

Cleveland elites were less likely to live in apartments, hotels or social clubs than their counterparts in other cities discussed here. (Tables 5 and 6). Although it is important to note that comparative data is difficult to obtain for some cities and the numbers are small for all cities, the number of Cleveland elites housed in multi-family units declined between 1915 and 1930, while Detroit's and Pittsburgh's increased.⁶⁷ More Cincinnati elites lived in apartments or hotels than in Cleveland. Moreover, unlike Cleveland where blue book households (read upper-middle class) were more likely to live in multi-family buildings than the upper class (*Social Register*), in Pittsburgh, at least, the reverse is the case.

Table 5 Hotel, Apartment and Club Residents in Selected Cities: 1915 and 1930: Blue Books

Year	Number and Percent of Multifamily Households							
	Cleveland ¹		Pittsburgh ²		Chicago ³		Detroit ⁴	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1915	228	9.0	36	4.0	1581	7.0	286	10.4
1930	191	6.5	266	9.3			358	13.0

1. Townsend, *Cleveland Blue Book... 1915*; and Townsend, *Cleveland Blue Book... 1931*.

2. Polk Co., *Pittsburgh Blue Book... 1915*; and Polk Co., *Pittsburgh Blue Book... 1929*.

3. Chicago Directory Co., *Chicago Blue Book... 1915*.

4. *Dau's Blue Book for Detroit and Suburban Towns... 1916*; and Mervin, ed., *The Social Secretary of Detroit... 1930*.

Table 6 Hotel, Apartment and Club Residents in Selected Cities: 1930s: Social Register

Year	Number and Percent of Multifamily Households									
	Cleveland ¹		Pittsburgh ²		Chicago ³		Philadelphia ⁴		Cincinnati ⁵	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1930	43	4.7	118	10.0	130	8.0	194	5.9		
1934	25	2.7							40	5.2

1. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cleveland 1930 and 1934* (New York: Social Register Association, 1929 and 1933).

2. Social Register Association, *Social Register Pittsburgh 1930* (New York: Social Register Association, 1929).

3. Social Register Association, *Social Register Chicago 1929* (New York: Social Register Association, 1928).

4. Social Register Association, *Social Register Philadelphia 1929* (New York: Social Register Association, 1928).

5. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cincinnati 1934* (New York: Social Register Association, 1933).

Other sources suggest that elites in cities such as New York and Chicago were more likely to select apartments and hotels as residences. Manhattan's upper classes began to "retire" to apartment houses along Fifth and Park Avenues at least by 1910.⁶⁸ By 1859, the Fifth Avenue Hotel at 23rd Street attracted the well-to-do; apartment hotels for elites appeared as early as the 1870s.⁶⁹ After World War I, upper Fifth and Park Avenues became "a luxurious boulevard for apartment houses."⁷⁰ In similar fashion, Chicago elites abandoned Prairie Avenue on the near south side for the north side's Gold Coast. Although "imposing stone mansions" appeared on the Gold Coast, by the 1920s it was more noted by the "'restricted' district of tall apartments and hotels." Zorbaugh pointed to the "rapid increase in the number of apartments and hotels along the Gold Coast."⁷¹ Back Bay housed Boston's largest elite concentration; but only Marlborough street consisted of single-family dwellings during the early years. Exclusive apartment hotels dated to the 1880s and from its very beginning Back Bay had "exclusive apartment hotels throughout the quarter."⁷²

In contrast, Cleveland elite overwhelmingly selected suburban residential locations during the 1920s; the landscape they uniformly chose fit more closely with that of John Stilgoe's borderland with large homes placed centrally on broad, deep lots. Few Clevelanders selected hotels or apartments; increasingly fewer who had selected such sites remained in them. Presumably, elites found multi-family living more acceptable in other cities; why this is the case is not fully clear. Given the sources used here, one can only speculate on these differences. Certainly, Cigliano found the small town and rural origins of Cleveland's upper class accounted for this pattern although other Great Lakes cities' elites who shared these origins behaved differently as in the cases of Detroit and Chicago. Clearly, land costs affected residential choices in major cities as New York and Chicago; these conditions would seem much less important in Boston, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Detroit, yet they also were more likely to select multi-family housing than Clevelanders. The small percentages involved in these latter cities may make this akin to counting angels on the head of a pin, yet the tendency for other elites to move toward multi-family living while Clevelanders moved the other way suggests a pattern of some import.

Implications of Cleveland's Residential Patterns for the City and Urban History

In contrast to other cities, Cleveland stands out for the speed with which its upper classes abandoned the city and selected a single-family suburban landscape over other alternatives. This process, largely completed by 1930, must have adversely affected the city's tax base; it also withdrew from the city important sources of help.⁷³ Nor was the move to the suburbs simply an act of leaving the city; ultimately it resulted in rejection of the city as the political entity of choice.⁷⁴ New suburbanites strongly resisted annexation to the city. While no class analysis has been applied to annexation votes, East Cleveland and Lakewood repeatedly resisted Cleveland's efforts throughout the 1910s and 20s.⁷⁵

The move to the suburbs may have diminished elite interests in city life and culture. In her study of Chicago's cultural elite for the period from the 1880s to 1917, Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz found that business elites who became active in supporting the city's emerging cultural organizations tended to maintain their primary residence in the city; they also became major boosters for the city's cultural life.⁷⁶ The unexamined implication of her work is that those elites who migrated to Chicago's exclusive north side suburbs played lesser roles in the city. It is unclear how this translates to Cleveland.⁷⁷ Clearly, Cleveland stands out in the history of philanthropy both for the extent of giving and for the institutionalizing of these activities especially through the formation of the Cleveland Foundation and similar organizations.⁷⁸ At the very least the massive shift of upper class residences must have divided migrants' attention between the city and the suburb.

Finally, Cleveland seems to be the exception that proves the rule. Unlike most major cities where the upper classes chose in large part to remain residentially within the city limits until at least the 1940s and 1950s, Cleveland's elite swiftly left for the suburbs where they uniformly selected a low-density suburban landscape. Proportionately they were heavily over-represented in the suburbs as they were equally under-represented in the city. There is some evidence to suggest that the upper-middle class might have been the suburban leader in Cleveland. In contrast, other cities' elites tended to remain in the city disproportionate to their share of the population. This does not "disprove" the findings of scholars such as Kenneth Jackson about the origins of American suburbs resting with the upper classes. It does demonstrate, however, that in numbers and percentages, if not influence, these elites were behind the

suburb settlement curve rather than in front of it in most cities save Cleveland. This implies, if not proves, that other groups may well have been disproportionately represented in suburban settlement. It could also suggest that suburban settlement was a process more broadly shared by the working classes, ethnic and racial groups than some scholars have thus far been willing to concede.⁷⁹

NOTES

* The author wishes to thank Susan Borchert for critically reading many drafts of this paper as well as Gladys Haddad, Bill Jenkins, David Hammack, Walter Leedy, and the Academy's referee for their suggestions and comments on this paper.

1. Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 11. See also John R. Stilgoe, *Borderland: Origins of the American Suburb, 1820-1939* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

2. Robert Fishman, *Bourgeois Utopias: The Rise and Fall of Suburbia* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1987), xi. Both Fishman and Margaret Marsh see the upper-middle class as the most significant actor in this process. Margaret Marsh, *Suburban Lives* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990), xii, xvi, and 191.

3. For example, see: Richard Harris, "American Suburbs: a Sketch of a New Interpretation," *Journal of Urban History*, 15 (November, 1988), 98-103; Andrew Wiese, "Places of Our Own: Protest in Cincinnati, 1850-1970," *Journal of Urban History*, 19 (May, 1993), 30-54; and Henry Louis Taylor, Jr., "City Building, Public Policy, the Rise of the Industrial City, and Black Ghetto-Slum Formation in Cincinnati, 1850-1940," in Taylor, ed., *Race and the City: Work, Community, and Protest in Cincinnati, 1850-1970* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 175. Elsewhere I have argued that some suburbs approached central cities in terms of density, heterogeneity, diversity of economic activities including manufacturing. James Borchert, "Residential City Suburbs: The Emergence of a New Suburban Type, 1880-1930," *Journal of Urban History*, 22 (March, 1996), 283-307; and "Cities in the Suburbs: Heterogeneous Communities on the U. S. Urban Fringe, 1920-1950," *Urban History*, 23 (August, 1966), 211-27.

4. Clearly to set leadership for the suburban migration did not require a majority of a given group or class; a vanguard could easily set the pattern for others. The following suggests that, except for Cleveland, elites did not leave the city in significant proportions during this period.

5. Newark, N. J., may have also experienced very rapid elite abandonment. The sources are very contradictory, a condition not shared by the other cities; Newark's location in the New York metropolitan region and its age complicate matters further. The 1897 *The Elites of Essex County, New Jersey* listed only 17 % of entrants with Newark addresses. (Newark: H. C. Sloat, 1897?). The 1914 *New Jersey Blue Book* placed 40 % in Newark, while the 1930 *Essex County Social Register* gave only 13 % of elite households in the city. Dau Publishing Company, *Dau's New Jersey Blue Book...1914* (New York: Dau Publishing Co., 1914); and Rofflow C. Blackmer, *Essex County Social Register 1930* (Newark: Essex Co. Social Register, 1930).

6. In 1988, Washington, D. C. claimed 51 % of *Social Register* households listed for the metropolitan area while New York City housed 49 %, Baltimore and Chicago, 38 and 30 % respectively. Stephen Richard Higley, *Privilege, Power, and Place: The Geography of the American Upper Class* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1995), 84-5, 75, 87-88.

7. For example, see: Harvey Warren Zorbaugh, *Gold Coast and the Slum: A Sociological Study of Chicago's Near North Side* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 8, 46-68; Walter Firey, *Land Use in Central Boston* (New York, Greenwood Press, 1968); E. Digby Baltzell, *Philadelphia Gentlemen: The Making of a National Upper Class* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971); Alan L Backler, *A Behavioral Study of Locational Changes in Upper Class Residential Areas: The Detroit Example* (Bloomington: Indiana University Department of Geography Monographic Series, v. 5, 1974), and Kathryn Allamong Jacob, *Capital Elites: High Society in Washington, D. C., after the Civil War* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995).

8. In 1976, Malcolm Forbes bought the *Social Register* and converted it from individual volumes for each city into a single national volume. G. William Domhoff, *Who Rules America Now: A View for the '80s* (New York: Touchstone Books, 1983), 20-21.

9. Higley, *Privilege, Power, and Place*, 74. In contrast, in 1988, Higley found that "34 % of the upper-class families in the top thirty-three metro areas live in the central city," although there were wide variations with the lowest, New London, Connecticut (2 %) and the highest, New Orleans (91 %). Among large cities, St. Louis and Boston approached Cleveland with respectively only 12 and 13 % of their metropolitan areas' elite families remaining in the city. He also traced both cities' declines to the post World War II period.

10. Ingham, *Iron Barons*, 176-82, 109, 157-61, 202. Ingham seemed to count suburban Bratenah's elite residents in Cleveland's population, but added elite residents of Philadelphia's Chestnut Hill to the suburban population. Unfortunately, Baltzell's work does not provide clear statistics for Philadelphia, city/suburb divisions either.

11. For the origins of these publications, see Dixon Wecter, *The Saga of American Society: A Record of Social Aspiration, 1607-1937* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), 196-251; Higley, *Privilege, Power and Place*, 27-30; and E. Digby Baltzell, "'Who's Who in America' and 'The Social Register': Elite and Upper Class Indexes in Metropolitan America," in *Class, Status and Power: Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective*, 2nd ed.; ed. by Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (New York: Free Press, 1966), 269-74. The first *Social Register* (New York City) appeared in 1886; Newport, Rhode Island's followed the next year. Some locally produced blue books predated the *Social Register*. Of course, these directories also served the purpose of those who sought entry into society; to gain a listing represented a step in the process of social recognition.

12. While 22 cities had Social Registers at some time, only a few had emerged by the late 19th century and first decade of the 20th. Cleveland's appeared yearly from 1910 to the present, but Detroit's only covered the years from 1919 to 1927. Because the *Social Register* arrived late to several cities considered here, blue books provide coverage for the earlier years; in several cities overlapping coverage provides evidence that despite their different orientations and size of their elite pools, the two do generally converge roughly in terms of the percentages of households listed that live in either cities or suburbs. When several different blue books are available, as in the case of Pittsburgh, both were searched to determine the extent of variation; save for the Newark case cited above, the various sources largely confirm each other's distributions.

13. Wecter, *Saga of American Society*, 234.

14. Ibid. Had Edith Wharton not had Lily Bart commit suicide in *The House of Mirth*, Lily might well have become such a “decayed gentlewoman.” The small inheritance left by her old wealth family proved inadequate to stop her “fall from grace”. Edith Wharton, *The House of Mirth* (New York: New American Library, 1964, originally published in 1905). For Cleveland's *Social Register* see: “Social Register,” *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History* ed. by David D. Van Tassel and John G. Grabowski (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 936.

15. Jan Cigliano, *Showplace of America: Cleveland's Euclid Avenue, 1850-1910* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1991), 195-96.

16. Social Register Association, *Social Register, Pittsburgh, 1909* (New York: Social Register Association, 1908), 2. The research here draws exclusively on the main publication, the November *Social Register*.

17. While it might seem a straightforward process to record the primary address by political subdivision (city v. suburb) for each family, this is not quite as simple as it might seem, especially with the *Social Register*. This publication's entries for individuals and families are often jumbled together requiring very careful reading to find the correct address. Moreover, for Cleveland, some families who resided in west Cleveland chose to list their community of residence as Lakewood, although the address was clearly in Cleveland. On the other hand, some residents of Euclid Heights and other neighborhoods of Cleveland Heights listed themselves as Cleveland residents although their address clearly placed them in the suburb. These tendencies, while small in number, could provide some index to urban and suburban residents' identities that would seem to conflict with their actual locations, further complicating the apparently “easy” sorting by residence. It is worth noting that thus far this pattern has not occurred in other cities, although the discovery of the Cleveland pattern produced a “reanalysis” of street addresses elsewhere to confirm that they correspond to the community cited.

18. Social Register Association, *Social Register Philadelphia 1929* (New York: Social Register Association, 1928).

19. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cleveland 1930* (New York: Social Register Association, 1929).

20. Many of these non-resident elites may be those who have left their original metropolitan area permanently for other urban areas. Ingham notes that some Youngstown elites established permanent homes in Cleveland while some Cleveland elites left permanently for larger eastern cities. *Iron Barons*, 202; 182.

21. Dau Publishing Co., *The Detroit Society Address Book...1899-1900* (Detroit: Dau Publishing Co., 1899). Unlike the *Social Register* whose title never changed, the blue books' titles often varied.

22. Helen deKay Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book: A Social Directory of Cleveland, Ohio and Suburbs...1931* (Cleveland: Helen deKay Townsend Publisher, 1931); and Social Register Association, *Social Register Cleveland - 1930* (New York: Social Register Association, 1929). Similarly, Higley reported 437 social register households with first homes in either Cuyahoga, Lake or Geauga Counties in the 1988 *Social Register*; the 1992 *Cleveland Blue Book* reported 2,592 families. Higley, *Privilege, Power and Place*, 165-66; *The Cleveland Blue Book* (Cleveland: The Cleveland Blue Book Foundation, 1992).

23. Baltzell, "'Who's Who in America' and 'The Social Register,'" 272; Domhoff, *Who Rules America Now*, 22-23. Initially the *Social Register* was a monthly publication which "contain[ed] advertisements, until the subscription list attains 3000, after which all advertisements, excepting Real Estate will be strictly excluded; the aim being to devote the entire compact space of the register to its legitimate purposes." They eventually dropped real estate ads as well. Social Register Association, *Social Register New York 1887 Monthly Edition, February* (New York: Social Register Association, 1887), facsimile edition (New York: Social Register Association, 1986), 96.

24. Mrs. M. B. Haven, comp., *The Cleveland Social Directory or Ladies Visiting Lists, and Shopping Guide....* (Cleveland: Mrs. M. B. Haven, 1885), iii-iv. A later edition thanked "the very liberal monetary patronage which she received in subscriptions and advertising." Helen deKay Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book: A Social Directory and List of Leading Families...1900* (Cleveland: Helen deKay Townsend, Publisher, 1899), 1.

25. Baltzell, *Philadelphia Gentlemen*, 28, 20; Higley, *Privilege, Power, and Place*, 30; Hammack, *Power and Society*, 67-69; Walter Firey, *Land Use in Central Boston* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), 71-72. The *Social Register's* publisher printed literature for the American Protective Association, a nativist organization. Baltzell, *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America* (New York: Vintage Books, 1964), 113.

26. "Cleveland Blue Book," *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, 204-5. See also, Higley, *Privilege, Power and Place*, 6.

27. Higley, *Privilege, Power and Place*, 6. He concludes, however, on the importance of the symbiotic relationship between upper-middle and upper classes. "The upper-middle class is drawn to the upper-class neighborhood for reasons of status and landscape predilections similar to the upper class. The numerically superior upper middle class (approximately 18-20 % of the U. S. population) provides the critical mass to support the wide array of services required by the affluent." 127.

28. Baltzell, "'Who's Who in America' and 'The Social Register,'" 267. See also his *Philadelphia Gentlemen*, 28.

29. Higley, *Privilege, Power, and Place*, 30. Historians who have used the *Social Register* include: David C. Hammack, *Power and Society: Greater New York at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982); Ingham, *Iron Barons*; Frederic Cople Jaher, *The Urban Establishment: Upper Strata in Boston, New York, Charleston, Chicago, and Los Angeles* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982); Jacob, *Capital Elites* and Kohei Kawashima, "The Forging of a New Upper Class at Boston's Back Bay, 1850-1941" (Ph.D. dissertation, Brown University, 1992); see also Wecter, *The Saga of American Society*, 196-251.

30. Kawashima, who used both *Social Registers* and several other sources, provided a strong defense of blue books for his work on Back Bay, 385-88. Higley, *Privilege, Power and Place*, 127.

31. See also Domhoff, *Who Rules America Now?*, 44 and Backler, *A Behavioral Study of Locational Changes*, 13.

32. Jan Cigliano and Sarah Bradford Landau, eds., *The Grand American Avenue, 1850-1920* (San Francisco: Pomegranate Artbooks, 1994).

33. Haven, comp., *The Cleveland Social Directory:...1885 and '86*.

34. Cigliano, *Showplace of America*, 10.

35. Townsend, *The Cleveland Blue Book:...1900*.
36. The construction of Samuel and Flora Stone Mather's home at 2605 Euclid represented the most significant exception. It was Euclid Avenue's largest home and, by 1912, one of the last to be completed. Cigliano, *Showplace of America*, 195-99.
37. Helen deKay Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book: A Social Directory of Cleveland, Ohio...1915* (Cleveland: Helen deKay Townsend, Publisher, 1915).
38. Townsend, *Cleveland Blue Book:...1915*. The more exclusive *Social Register* for 1913, actually compiled in November, 1912, reported a smaller movement to the suburbs with Cleveland still claiming 77 %. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cleveland 1913* (New York: Social Register Association, 1912). The earlier date of publication may help account for the difference as well as the fact, reported elsewhere, that the upper-middle class may have been more likely to move to the suburbs ahead of the "real" upper class who were more fully reported in the *Social Register* while the blue books tended to include more of the upper-middle class. It was not always possible to get copies of either the *Social Register* or blue books for the precise years selected, 1885, 1900, 1915 and 1930.
39. Helen de Kay Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book:...1929* (Cleveland: Helen de Kay Townsend, 1929). Title's italics.
40. Townsend, comp., *The Cleveland Blue Book - 1931*.
41. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cleveland 1930* (New York: Social Register Association, 1929). The significant difference in these percentages again hints that the more upper-middle-class sensitive *Blue Book* revealed an earlier suburban shift by this group than the "real" social elite, more reflective of the *Social Register* population.
42. When joined with nearby in-city Wade Park's population, the eastern city-suburban cluster now housed nearly 70 % of the metropolitan areas' elite families. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cleveland - 1934* (New York: Social Register Association, 1933).
43. Ingham, *Iron Barons*, 180; see also: 177-182.
44. Carol Poh Miller and Robert Wheeler suggest Cleveland's economic decline can be traced to the early 1930s. *Cleveland: A Concise History, 1796-1990* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 156-65; and Jon C. Teaford, *Cities of the Heartland: The Rise and Fall of the Industrial Midwest* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 211-252.
45. Higley, *Privilege, Power and Place*, 165-67. This would be somewhat worse if other surrounding counties south and west (Lorain, Medina, etc.) were included.
46. *The Cleveland Blue Book: A Social Directory of Cleveland, Ohio and Suburbs...1992* (Cleveland, The Cleveland Blue Book Foundation, 1992).
47. Firey, *Land use in Central Boston*, 115. See also: Betty G. Farrell, *Elite Families: Class and Power in Nineteenth-Century Boston* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 29 and Kawashima, "Forging of a New Upper Class at Boston's Back Bay."
48. Social Register Association, *Social Register, Philadelphia, 1929* (New York: Social Register Association, 1928). Others report a smaller percentage; Ingham's sample of iron and steel barons claims only 19 % remaining in the city with "the principal living area...now shifted to the suburbs." *Iron Barons*, 161. Again, these percentages are based

on a small sample of a segment of the elite population; Ingham also counts Chestnut Hill, an outlying elite neighborhood within the city limits as suburban, thus adding to the suburban population and reducing the city's elite significantly. David Contosta found 550 entries for Chestnut Hill in the 1930 Philadelphia *Social Register*. David R. Contosta, *Suburb in the City: Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, 1850-1990* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1992), 120. Although it is difficult to determine, Baltzell's data seems to suggest that 42 % of social elites may have resided in the city. *Philadelphia Gentlemen*, 178.

49. R. L. Polk and Co., *The Pittsburgh Blue Book: An Elite Directory Edition of 1915* (Pittsburgh: R. L. Polk and Co., 1914); the following year, another elite directory reported 80 % of elites with residences in the city. The Index Company, *Prominent Families: 1916 - Pittsburgh, Suburban Districts and Adjacent Towns* (Pittsburgh: The Index Company, 1916). Social Register Association, *Social Register Pittsburgh - 1930* (New York: Social Register Association, 1929). These findings are supported by Ingham's more limited samples for Pittsburgh; he reports 72 % of his iron and steel families remained in the city. Ingham, *Iron Barons*, 109.

50. Social Register Association, *Social Register Cincinnati and Dayton - 1934* (New York: Social Register Association, 1933).

51. Chicago Directory Company, *The Chicago Blue Book...1915* (Chicago: Chicago Directory Company, 1914); and Social Register Association, *Social Register Chicago 1929* (New York: Social Register Association, 1928). Harvey Zorbaugh found that by the late 1920s "more than a third of the people in Chicago's social register," "two thousand of the six thousand persons whose names are in the social register of Chicago and its suburbs" lived on the city's Gold Coast neighborhood north of the loop and next to Lake Michigan. This represents a minimum estimate for the extent of Chicago's proportion of elite households. Although he clearly draws on the *Social Register*, Zorbaugh did not provide a citation or date for the *Social Register*. *The Gold Coast and the Slum*, 8, 47.

52. *The Detroit Society Address Book: Elite Family Directory...1899-1900* (Detroit: Dau Publishing Co., 1899).

53. *Dau's Blue Book for Detroit and Suburban Towns 1916* (New York: Dau's Blue Books, Inc., 1915).

54. Ruby F. Mervin, ed., *The Social Secretary of Detroit 1930* (Detroit: The Social Secretary, 1930). Alan Backler, who analyzed Detroit's *Social Secretaries* for every tenth year from 1925 to 1965, produced stronger evidence of urban abandonment by elites initially leading me to believe that this was a Midwest industrial phenomenon. For 1925, he reports the city housed 73 % of elite families; by 1935 it dropped to 48 %, and only a third in 1945. *A Behavioral Study of Locational Change*, Table 3, page 27. However, Backler counted only single family dwellings leaving out about 22 % of *Social Secretary* families who lived in multi-family housing, most of which was in the city. *A Behavioral Study of Locational Change*, 14.

55. Milwaukee Social Register and Directory Co., *The Milwaukee Social Register and Directory: 1933-34* (Milwaukee: Milwaukee Social Register and Directory Co., 1933).

56. Cigliano and Landau, eds., *The Grand American Avenue*; and Cigliano, *Showplace of America*, 122.

57. Cigliano, *Showplace of America*, 90. Much of the south side and adjoining streets, she notes, did fit a more urban pattern.

58. The concept of "borderland" comes from Stilgoe, *Borderland*, 11; Cigliano, *Showplace of America*, 93. Her photograph of "country estates on the north side," fig. 77, page 92 illustrates that despite the deep setback, Euclid Avenue estate lots were relatively narrow making them to appear as they could almost touch each other. Her reference to Stilgoe's borderland does fit nicely with the new landscapes many of Cleveland's elite selected when they left the city; see his chapter on Shaker Heights, Stilgoe, *Borderland*, 239-51.

59. Cigliano, *Showplace of America*, 27.

60. *Ibid.*, 93. In contrast, Ingham referred to Euclid Avenue as having "urban characteristics." Ingham, *Iron Barons*, 179. Cigliano also does not take into account the less pretentious, more urban homes of elites and near elites on neighboring streets.

61. D. J. Lake, *Atlas of Cuyahoga County* (Philadelphia: Titus, Simmons, and Titus, 1874), 118. This description is for homes along Detroit Avenue in Lakewood and west Cleveland. See also, Borchert, "Cities in the Suburbs," 211-27.

62. Haven, *Cleveland Social Directory...1885 and 1886*. By the turn of the century, just past Euclid Avenue's peak, nearly 7 % (130 households or individuals) of the city's elite claimed multi-family housing with hotels and apartments housing the vast majority. Townsend, *Cleveland Blue Book...1900*. Of these 130 households or individuals, 126 lived in apartments or hotels.

63. Townsend, *Cleveland Blue Book...1915*.

64. Townsend, *Cleveland Blue Book...1931*. The Wade Park Manor Hotel was located at E. 107th and Parklane, Parklane Villa at E. 105th and Parklane, and the Fenway Hall Hotel at E. 107th and Euclid; Moreland Court Apartments are in the Cleveland part of Shaker Square, adjacent to Shaker Heights. Further evidence for the exclusiveness of the Wade Park Manor Hotel comes from *Wade Park Manor: Cleveland's Distinctive Residential Hotel* (Cleveland: Wade Park Manor Co., 1910), and Brian E. Albrecht, "Wade Park Manor: The History, The Residents, The Stories," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 4, 1998, 8-13, 18.

65. Social Register Association, *Social Register, 1913, 1930, and 1934*. By the latter date the Wade Park Manor Hotel housed just 14 households while the Moreland Court Apartments and Alcazar Hotel claimed only 4 each. For both blue books and social registers these numbers should probably be taken as the minimum number of elite living in multi-family housing; not all addresses could be identified as multi-family units; some elites may have been overlooked because of such addresses.

66. Higley, *Privilege, Power and Place*, 6.

67. For example, no blue book exists for Chicago for the 1930s.

68. Elizabeth Hawes, *New York, New York: How the Apartment House Transformed Greater New York at the Turn of the Century* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), 71-91. See also, Paul Groth, *Living Downtown: The History of Residential Hotels in the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), especially Chapter 2, 26-55.

69. Mosette Broderick, "Fifth Avenue: New York, New York," in Cigliano and Landau, eds., *The Grand American Avenue*, 10-11, 24-27.

70. *Ibid.*, 33.

71. Zorbaugh, *Gold Coast and the Slum*, 8, 66.

72. Firey, *Land Use in Central Boston*, 275.

73. While many Euclid Avenue houses were replaced by commercial land uses that yielded higher tax returns on the same properties, it is not clear if this holds true for the larger Euclid Avenue area cluster. Moreover, the loss of wealthy residents in such large numbers to the suburbs represents a loss of real income, nonetheless.

74. Jon C. Teaford, *City and Suburb: The Political Fragmentation of Metropolitan America, 1850-1970* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), 145, 147. Ironically, by the 1930s when Cleveland's elites were overwhelmingly suburban, they, or at least their new subdivisions began to support metropolitan government. Jon Teaford notes that "seventy-two % of the voters in wealthy Shaker Heights endorsed Ohio's amendment proposal as did an equal percentage of the electorate in exclusive Gates Mills, an outlying community of country estates....in Cleveland Heights... 61 % of the suburbanites favored the amendment" authorizing "the creation of a federative metropolitan government."

75. Teaford, *City and Suburb*, 95. It is important to note that both Lakewood and East Cleveland housed diverse populations; although predominately middle class, both housed significant numbers of elites and of the working classes. Borchert, "Residential City Suburbs," and Borchert, "Cities in the Suburbs."

76. Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *Culture and the City: Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago from the 1880s to 1917* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1976), 60. For a discussion of elite abandonment of cities from WW I to the 1950s and the resulting problems, see: Jon Teaford, *The Rough Road to Renaissance: Urban Revitalization in America, 1940-1985* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 15-17.

77. Baltzell notes of Philadelphia elite that "many leading Philadelphians came out to Chestnut Hill because it was convenient to the industrial northern part of the city and because it was within the city limits, a factor appealing to those men who were interested in the city's government....Many of the city's more civic-minded leaders, therefore, prefer to live in Chestnut Hill [within the city limits] rather than on the Main Line which is outside the city limits." *Philadelphia Gentlemen*, 207.

78. Diana Tittle, *Rebuilding Cleveland: The Cleveland Foundation and Its Evolving Urban Strategy* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1992); and David Hammack, "Philanthropy," in *The Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, 785-90.

79. For example, see: Harris, "American Suburbs;" Wiese, "Places of Our Own;" and Taylor, Jr., "City Building, Public Policy, the Rise of the Industrial City".