A few months ago while driving around Cleveland, it struck me that the field of public history, if interpreted broadly, includes license plates. As we are all aware, states have been placing a slogan on their plates oftentimes celebrating an historical accomplishment within the state’s past. The rapidly approaching bicentennial of Ohio’s becoming a state in 1803, for instance, has fostered a new Ohio license plate with patriotic red, white, and blue colors, and a slogan that touts us as the “Birthplace of Aviation.” I am not sure that the state of North Carolina with its slogan, “First in Flight,” would agree, but no one can deny that the Wright brothers did live in Dayton, where they conducted many aeronautical experiments, and even constructed the planes flown at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina.

Somewhat more troublesome, though, were the Ohio license plates of fifteen years ago that proclaimed that Ohio is the “heart of it all.” Although designed to imply a continuing status, we all know that Ohio has not maintained the political and economic position that it once held in the period after the Civil War through the early twentieth century. That was a time when Ohio produced president after president, culminating in 1920 when there was an all-Ohio presidential final with Warren G. Harding for the Republicans and James Cox for the Democrats. Unfortunately, Ohio has produced few, if any, presidential candidates since 1952 when Senator Robert A. Taft ran against Dwight Eisenhower in the Republican primaries. In recent years former senator and astronaut John Glenn came the closest to garnering presidential attention, but our most well known politician today is Jim Traficant. One has to wonder where Ohio’s heart is.

As I thought about state license plates and their efforts to make residents proud of their historical heritage, it struck me that Ohio could put on its license plates that it was the “Birthplace of Public Housing.” Now I want you to know that I am not naïve enough to believe that Ohio politicians would embrace that heritage. Public housing is, after all, considered by many to be a failed social experiment today. Conservative critics condemn public housing as a hangout for druggies and welfare moms allegedly avoiding
work. For some liberal critics it is a subversive effort on the part of whites to place the poor, African American population on projects segregated from the rest of the society. Although these criticisms have some merit, they do not refute the fact that Ohio played a major role in the establishment of the first public housing projects in the United States.

As evidence of Ohio’s claim, Cleveland was the first city to submit an application for public housing to the Public Works Administration in 1933. Labor disputes delayed the work, however, and it was the second finished after Atlanta’s Techwood Gardens. Later in 1939, after Congress had passed the United States Housing Authority Act of 1937, Eleanor Roosevelt visited Youngstown, Ohio, and its Westlake Terrace project in recognition of its completion as the first USHA project. Ohio was also the first state to pass legislation establishing the local public housing authority as the body in charge of the planning and administration of public housing.¹

What were the factors that enabled Ohio to lead the nation in this area? My conclusion would be that much of Ohio’s accomplishment must be attributed to Ernest J. Bohn, an immigrant from Romania, the first Director of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority and the Chair of the Cleveland City Planning Commission from 1943 through 1967. He also worked with Youngstown in the establishment of its public housing program. It is not my contention today that Ernest J. Bohn was a “great person” who rose above the times; rather he was a singular individual who took advantage of the times to promote a cause.

Ernest J. Bohn was born in Sannicolaul-Mare, Romania, in 1901, and migrated to Cleveland, Ohio in 1911. He attended Western Reserve University from which he graduated with undergraduate honors in 1924 and as a lawyer in 1926. Private legal practice did not satisfy Bohn, who entered local politics several years later as a state representative from Cleveland’s east side. In 1929, however, he switched to Cleveland city council as a representative from a silk stocking district in the Hough area.² It was Bohn’s work as city councilman that plunged him into the fields of public housing and urban planning.

The major social condition for all in 1933 was the depression. With a major collapse of the economy and nearly 25% of laborers unemployed, there was public outcry for government action to revive the economy. The conditions facing many cities drew widespread attention because of large budget deficits and the demands for relief from unemployed marchers.
The industrialization of the late 19th and early 20th century had generated overcrowded cities with much of its housing stock old and run down, in the midst of factories, and lacking running water or a central heating system. There was widespread discontent with the rise of slums and blight and their deleterious effect on the modern city. The depression fostered worse conditions because of the inability to build new housing; moreover, the building tradesmen were themselves out of work. What better way to revive the economy than to employ carpenters, bricklayers, and other construction workers in the building of public housing? Acceptance of public housing was not so much a change in the belief system of Americans as it was the adoption of a pragmatic tool for recovery.

Certain parts of Cleveland were more strained than others. Cleveland’s East Side had attracted immigrants from southern and eastern Europe during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It had also attracted what was a small Afro-American population sprinkled throughout the East Side between the downtown and East 55th St. Many of the homes in the area were built prior to 1900. They were often deteriorated wooden buildings that lacked water or toilet facilities; others still used stoves as heating.

According to Bohn, it was his desire to serve his relatively affluent district in Hough that first led him to the examination of housing in Cleveland. His study of those conditions uncovered the disturbing fact that slum areas took a large percentage of the city budget. High crime rates, juvenile delinquency, numerous fires, overly high incidence of diseases, including tuberculosis and typhus, and other assorted dysfunctional activities in the slums cost the city enormous sums of money. In an Analysis of a Slum Area in Cleveland, a dissertation written at Catholic University, Fr. Robert Navin, a local diocesan priest, provided the data to prove that the elimination of slums could reduce the operating budget of the city government.

Bohn’s concern for Cleveland’s slums did not emanate from a pecuniary interest alone. Bohn was a practicing Catholic who had read the encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI. He drew from these writings an emphasis on the social side of the Christian message and a lifelong belief that it was his responsibility to help the poor. As suggested by Pius XI in Casti Connubii, “Christian charity towards our neighbor absolutely demands that those things which are lacking to the needy should be provided; hence it is incumbent on the rich to help the poor.” Bohn often cited this quote in his speeches and its corollary that the government had a duty to compensate for the needs of the poor, if private resources did not suffice. It was the
sense of being his brother’s or sister’s keeper that was at the heart of Bohn’s Christian formation.

Raised in the Progressive Era, Bohn also believed that social problems could be studied, data acquired, and solutions found. Thus, he acquainted himself with the rapidly growing literature on slum and blight. Over time, he would build a library of over 20,000 books, magazines, and journals eventually donated to the Case Western Reserve University Kelvin Library. Much of the early investigations into American slums had resulted in little more than tenement codes, such as those passed in New York, or building codes which attempted to make sure that the buildings were constructed properly in the first place or zoning laws. Except for this minimum effort on the part of government, no other programs, state, local or federal, were passed until the time of the great depression. 

Bohn came on the scene, though, when the depression was producing challenges of the prevailing wisdom that private enterprise could solve urban housing problems. In December 1931 Herbert Hoover sponsored a Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership at which several of the Conference Committees recommended the possibility of government expenditure on behalf of adequate housing. Edith Elmer Wood’s book, *Recent Trends in American Housing*, released during the conference, recommended that government demolish slums and construct new housing for the working class. A more moderate approach, yet one that envisaged government aid, came from Harold S. Buttenheim, editor of the *American City*, who argued for employing private corporations assisted by government loans and restricted to certain profit levels to build the houses needed. In 1932, Congress acted on Buttenheim’s suggestion and authorized Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to limited dividend companies as part of its general effort to bolster the weak economic infrastructure. This program barely had begun before the incoming Roosevelt administration transferred the loan program to the Public Works Administration.

After studying the available literature Bohn became immersed in solving Cleveland’s and Ohio’s housing problems. As a former state legislator, he used his contacts and knowledge to secure the passage of an Ohio law to permit limited dividend companies to operate with federal loans. Bohn then organized Cleveland architects and building contractors to apply for government underwriting. When it became apparent that their plans produced rents too high for low-income workers, Bohn concluded that the government would have to subsidize the low-income family if the goal
of renting decent housing were to be achieved. In these initial efforts on behalf of housing, Bohn displayed the qualities of a planner who recognized a problem, studied it thoroughly, and proceeded to find ways to implement a permanent solution, in this instance through government aid.

Bohn’s evolving position on public housing made him an anomaly as a Republican, especially in light of the changes in political outlook wrought by the great depression. His Republicanism was based on his mentor, Professor A.H. Hatten of the Western Reserve political science department, who had run as a Bullmoose Republican for a congressional seat in 1912. Hatten imbued Bohn with an appreciating of the structural reforms of the National Municipal League and local good government groups. Bohn was a consistent supporter of the city manager form adopted by Cleveland in the 1920s and of the efforts to create a regional form of government. The main value in such reforms, of course, was an end to political machines and the employment of political hacks.

Bohn’s identification with the Republican Party rested also on his belief in capitalism and his confidence in local government. Bohn was not one to wax philosophical about the values of capitalism. Rather his belief was apparent in his efforts to work out slum clearance, housing and planning reforms within the system. Bohn did not attempt to galvanize the poor, nor to form labor parties, as was done by Catharine Bauer. Rather he appealed to the movers and shakers: the commercial, industrial and financial elite, the professionals, including lawyers, architects, professors and politicians, newspaper editors, the Catholic hierarchy, and, of course, labor leaders. In spite of the fragmentation separating the society along class, racial and ethnic lines, Bohn believed that the data documenting the social problems would convince all sorts of people of the need to produce workable solutions for the overcrowded, degrading conditions of the modern industrial city. It was his hope that rational analysis could appeal to all elements of the society and thereby unite a hitherto segmented society. Thus, Bohn shared the zeal of the progressive reformer for the gathering of facts and data and the employment of experts in dealing with social problems.

As a Republican, Bohn also believed that housing reform could be accomplished on the local level. Sharing the distrust of federal power held by many Republicans, Bohn was willing to accept federal financial assistance, but only in conjunction with a locally run program. Bohn was among the first to advocate that each community should establish its own metropolitan housing authority to decide exactly how much public housing to build and
where, and also to administer it. Bohn prepared Ohio for such a development when he became the father of the first law in the nation to authorize municipalities to establish housing authorities.

Bohn deviated from mainstream Republicanism, though, in his reliance on environmentalism as an explanation for the plight of the poor. Bohn absorbed the works of Mary Simkovich, Catharine Bauer and others, as well as that of the aforementioned Robert Navin. It had been shown that regardless of who lived in slums, they inevitably generated more crime, disease and social problems than people from other areas of the city. Rather than blame the individual, Bohn blamed the conditions, and found solutions in the ideas and plans of Englishmen Ebenezer Howard and Sir Raymond Unwin. The Garden City movement, first launched by Howard with the publication of *Tomorrow: The Path to Real Reform* in 1898, had achieved an international appeal by the 1920s, especially with the work of Ernst May for the socialist government of Frankfurt am Main, Germany. American housing reformers, such as Catherine Bauer, Clarence Stein, Edith Wood and Robert D. Kohn, the first head of the PWA housing division, absorbed the garden city ideals and in turn propagandized on their behalf.

As Bohn began to involve himself in the quest to remove slums and blighted areas and to rehabilitate urban society, there was no doubt that he was not the generator of the ideas behind the public housing movement. What Bohn did contribute to the movement were his skills as a lawyer and politician. He would play a vital role in establishing the legal and professional infrastructure to support the movement and ultimately enable it to pass stronger and more supportive legislation.

The period between the passage of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act under Herbert Hoover and the Wagner Housing Act in 1937 was a time fraught with danger for public housing. In spite of a ready climate, the bills permitting federal expenditure on housing were very limited in scope, and primarily designed to help the ailing housing industry rather than to clear slums or to aid the poor. A recovery might jeopardize the housing program because Congress would withdraw its aid to public works of which the housing program was but one part. Bohn’s role during those critical years between 1932 and 1937 was to help create a more substantial foundation for public housing as opposed to the jerrybuilt support of the early New Deal. Bohn recognized that, given America’s attitude toward the poor, public housing had to acquire respectability, and he was determined to earn that respect.
One means of gaining respectability was the establishment of a profession of public housing. Although there were few paid workers in the field, Bohn began an organization for such workers called the National Association of Housing Officials (NAHO) in 1933. As NAHO’s first president, Bohn enjoyed the encouragement, assistance and underwriting of Louis Brownlow and the Spellman Foundation. Albeit small in membership, the organization served as a clearinghouse on information regarding public housing programs; it also created a training program for those seeking work in public housing, particularly as managers. The Housing Division of the PWA turned to NAHO for assistance in the establishment and operation of the first public housing management school in the nation. It also accepted NAHO’s recommendations for candidates, which included women and African Americans. As each state passed enabling legislation for the establishment of public housing authorities, more jobs became available and NAHO grew.

Bohn also saw the NAHO potential for propagandizing on behalf of public housing. He launched a NAHO-sponsored tour in the summer of 1934 of fourteen major cities. The key figures in attendance were Sir Raymond Unwin, the prominent garden city advocate from Great Britain, Alice Mallor-Samuel, also of Great Britain and an official of the British Society of Women’s Housing Estate Managers, Dr. Ernest Kahn, former newspaper editor, banker and manager of 15,000 housing units in Frankfurt, Germany and Henry Wright, the renowned planner of Radburn and Chatham Village. As they traipsed from New York City to Washington, from Cleveland to Detroit and from Milwaukee to St. Louis, they met with local housing officials. Bohn, who served as host throughout the tour, capitalized on its propaganda value by holding press conferences with local newspapers and generating news releases. He was attempting to create a groundswell of public opinion behind the drive for a permanent public housing program.

Bohn also had his newfound organization sponsor the Baltimore Housing Conference in October of 1934, which historian Mel Scott labeled as “one of the most distinguished gatherings in the history of American planning and housing endeavor.” Bohn intended that this conference would enable city planners and public housers (the nickname for those supporting public housing) to achieve agreement on what a federal housing program should look like. It also became a major lobbying effort as the delegates took advantage of the nearness of Washington to meet with congressmen and with Harold Ickes, head of the PWA. On the last day conference participants approved a report that called for federal subsidies to clear slums and to build
large-scale government housing projects. The report also recommended the creation of a permanent federal housing agency to assist local governments. This cooperative structure between local and federal governments assuaged the fears of those who disdained federal intervention, including Bernard Newman of the Philadelphia Housing Association, an ardent opponent of federal aid or programs.\textsuperscript{19}

In the years after 1934 Bohn joined Catharine Bauer and Dorothy Schoell in orchestrating a campaign to convince congressmen that public housing and slum clearance were widely accepted and publicly supported. Their good fortune in having Senator Robert Wagner as an advocate added greatly to their chances of success in the midst of an environment that was at least very skeptical if not downright hostile. Bohn secured financing to set up a Housing Legislation Information Office in Washington with Dorothy Schoell as the chief lobbyist. The office gathered information and coordinated efforts to respond to the day-by-day developments within Congress. Although a Cleveland city councilman and the director of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, Bohn made innumerable trips to Washington during those years to provide advice, to testify, to coordinate and to politic.\textsuperscript{20} One example of Bohn’s political ingenuity was the plying of city councils throughout the nation with a resolution supporting public housing and slum clearance. The passage of these resolutions by over eighty councils gave the impression to various congressmen of a groundswell of support for the Wagner bill; it was a Bohn ploy that worked.\textsuperscript{21} If it were true, as Bohn at one point contended, that all of the public housing advocates at this period of time could be squeezed into a telephone booth, then he and Catharine Bauer created the impression that they could be squeezed into a large auditorium.\textsuperscript{22}

Much of the above deals with Bohn’s influence on the federal level. Obviously, he was only one of a number of key actors on that level, but in Cleveland he was a prime mover. As a city councilman chairing a committee on slums and blight, Bohn led the fight to enable Cleveland to become one of the first cities, along with Atlanta, to have a public housing project. By 1933 Bohn had secured passage by the Ohio state legislature of the first act, outside of New York, to permit urban areas to establish a metropolitan housing authority. Cleveland quickly did so, and appointed Ernest Bohn as its first director, a position he would hold until 1968.\textsuperscript{23} Bohn then pulled together leading Cleveland architects to begin designing limited dividend proposals, but the rents were too high and the corporations were unable to raise the minimum equity investment demanded by the federal law and
Similar developments in other cities led Harold Ickes to the conclusion that “it is not possible without a subsidy to produce housing for the lower income groups.” He contended that limited dividend corporations were incapable of providing low-cost housing, and had “left the slums of America’s cities to stew in their own unhealthy juice.” Thus, Ickes chose to offer his funds to state or municipal institutions for the purpose of building public housing. Once the Housing Division of the PWA formed the Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation in October, 1933, Bohn lined up political support, as well as his professional aides, so that Cleveland could present the first proposal (its number was officially 001) to Colonel Horatio Hackett, chief of the Housing Division. Although Atlanta’s Techwood project was the first one officially finished and opened, Cleveland’s was the first received and granted. Bohn’s networking with key federal officials was a great assistance to the ability of Cleveland to write proposals. Bohn knew every nuance in federal policy development, and how to prepare an application. His reliance on the expertise of professional architects, engineers and housers strengthened the applications as well. Bohn was not a utopian idealist, but a technician capable of convincing people not only of the value of housing projects, but also of their practicality.

This paper has examined only a part of the story of Ernest Bohn and his contributions to the housing and planning movements. It seems rather clear that Bohn, a relative newcomer to these movements in the early 1930s, contributed in major ways to the development of both. He understood the need for clearly written laws that granted substantial powers to institutions empowered to make change. As a lawyer and politician, he also knew how to secure the passage of such laws both on the state and federal level. Bohn was also very sensitive to the need to gain public acceptance. His efforts to marshal supporters in a professional organization, to showcase experts, to hold national conventions and to lobby Congress were effective in creating what appeared to be a stronger public desire for government assisted housing than actually existed.

Returning to the issue of license plates, I think that we have given some credibility to Ohio’s claim as the birthplace of public housing. But we can also take pride in the fact that it worked. It gave poor, working families better and healthier housing, and reduced crime rates. Although it was segregated, it provided the first decent housing for African Americans in Cleveland, and also opportunities to work as managers. Furthermore, it also produced
some very accomplished alumni, such as the first African American mayor of Cleveland, Carl Stokes, his brother Louis Stokes, a long-term congressman from the east side and the Rev. Michael Lavelle, S.J., who emerged from Lakeside Terrace public housing to become the president of John Carroll University. I have also personally known a number of successful individuals who grew up in Cleveland’s public housing.

Indicative of the success of early public housing is the recent turn in directions of the public housing program away from high-rise apartments. The prevailing wisdom regarding such buildings among housers, such as Bohn, was that they were not made for families with children. But cities like Chicago and St. Louis built them because of the cost savings, and, of course, the segregating effect on African Americans. Under the Hope VI program, established in 1993, HUD has torn down those high-rise apartments in many cities, including the Robert Taylor complex in Chicago. HUD has returned to what was advocated in the 1930s, low-rise apartments with open spaces and the ability of parents and neighbors to keep an eye on kids, such as were built in Cleveland and Youngstown. The Hope VI program is also trying to place public housing in the midst of higher income housing. Bohn was a supporter of mixing economic levels together, and complained insistently in the 1950s when legislation limiting the income levels of public housing residents forced him to reject families that he felt brought a balance to the community. He also fought unsuccessfully to place public housing in middle-income neighborhoods as part of the urban renewal of the 1950s.

I have talked to you today about public housing, partially as a spoof of license plate slogans, but also as a reminder that what we avoid putting on our plates reveals much about us as well. Racial and economic divisions continue to limit Ohioans’ appreciation of state contributions to the beginnings of public housing and its generally positive impact on the working poor and on African Americans in its first twenty years of existence. Today those divisions continue to plague Ohio’s efforts to regain prominence on the national scene.
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