The title of this paper is a deliberate attempt to get attention and, perhaps, to create controversy. The use of the name of the street, Euclid Avenue, which has diamond-studded connotations, in the same sentence with the term neighborhood is -- in Cleveland, at least -- almost oxymoronic. In this city neighborhoods are viewed as ethnic, blue collar bastions of common sense, frugality, and stability. They are well established, but definitely not establishment. Euclid Avenue, Millionaires' Row if you will, is the symbol of the establishment and, moreover, the epitome of excess. No, the first inclination is to dismiss the question out of hand, Euclid Avenue could not be a neighborhood, not in the Cleveland sense. However, to so readily dismiss the question would be a serious mistake for to attempt to answer it is to open several important opportunities for investigation and comment. The first is to actually define what factors have created and sustained this city's neighborhoods. Equally important is the opportunity to discover what Clevelanders have meant, over time, when they used the term neighborhood. The final opportunity is to take the title question at face value and answer it in light of what has been discovered by exploring the previous issues.

It would, of course be appropriate to start this investigation with a standard definition of neighborhoods. Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines a neighborhood as,

"A number of people forming a loosely cohesive community within a larger unit (as a city, town) and living close or fairly close together in more or less familiar association with each other within a relatively small section or district of usually somewhat indefinite boundaries and usually having some common or fairly common identifying feature (as approximate equality of economic condition, similar social status, similar national origins or religion, similar interests) and usually some degree of self-sufficiency as a group (as through local schools, churches, libraries, business establishments, cultural and recreational facilities)."

If that is the Webster definition, what then have Clevelanders considered as neighborhoods? As we will see, the traditional Cleveland neighborhood fits well into the standard definition.

Boundaries, definite or indefinite, are, perhaps, the most interesting aspect of neighborhood formation in Cleveland. They have, over the years included both natural and manmade physical borders as well as borders that are more sociological in nature. Generally, a combination of physical and sociological factors have set the limits of the city's neighborhoods. It is, today, difficult to discern many of the natural physical features that once divided the city. One, the Cuyahoga River, is, of course obvious. It has, over the years, split the community into two
cities, Cleveland and Ohio City, and later (at least in general perceptions) into different ethnic components, be they lace curtain or shanty Irish, Jew and non-Jew or black and white.

A second important surviving geographical boundary is the former shoreline of the lake which defines the "Heights." Providing space for rooms with a view and a good distance from the industrial sites of Cleveland, the Heights eventually became a neighborhood, if you will, that was defined more by economic status than other factors such as race or national origin. One could, of course, argue that these latter factors were, for many years, closely intertwined with economic status and, given this, that only those of certain backgrounds could achieve the wherewithall necessary for the rise to the Heights.

A good number of other geographic neighborhood defining features that could, at one time, be found in Cleveland are now much more difficult to discern. These, the, gullies, runs and valleys of the tributaries that fed the Cuyahoga have, in many instances, been filled in and are no longer visible. Two, Kingsbury Run on the East Side and Walworth Run on the west, are still largely intact, but are often overlooked by the casual observer. For those residing in proximity to them, their existence is much more apparent. Kingsbury Run has served as a divider between the largely Slavic southeast side and the African-American areas to the north while Walworth Run is still considered as the feature separating Ohio City from Tremont. Others have been lost or about to be lost. Mill Creek (at the falls of which, near Broadway and Warner Road, William Williams erected this area's first grist mill in 1799) formed an enormous valley that at one time divided the Polish residents of what was known as Goosetown from the Warner Road community. It also divided the suburbs of Cuyahoga Heights from Garfield Heights. Much of the valley has, in the past twenty years, been landfilled and it won't be long before these once divided neighborhoods and communities come in physical, level contact.

Many smaller gullies and ravines are now totally filled in and their disappearance has, in turn, obscured the reasons why certain neighborhoods formed where they did. Slavic Village is a notable example. This modern name refers to a district composed of a Czech neighborhood called Karlin and the city's largest Polish community, Warszawa. It is still bounded on its west by the Cuyahoga River and on its east by a series of railroad lines, including most prominently the Conrail route to Pittsburgh. Its north and south boundaries, however, have almost been obliterated. At one time the northern limit of the district was the valley of Morgan's Run and the southern boundary the ravine created by Burke's Run.

The railroad which partially defines Slavic Village is one of a number of manmade features that have come to encompass Cleveland's neighborhoods. However, the most common, and the initial manmade boundaries were the city's streets. The street layout of the city has, over time come to define districts, with a single street either serving as the nucleus of a district or as a divider from another. Since streets present little in the way of a physical impediment they serve more as psychological boundaries and are more prone to shift over time. Euclid Avenue, as we well know, was the focus of Millionaires Row. Residence on the street carried enough of a cachet -- and price tag -- to allow it to be viewed as a region distinct in
its economic level and rather cohesive in the social and ethnic background of its residents. In the Slavic Village area, East 55th street, which intersects Fleet Avenue, the district's arterial focal point, at one time served as a tenuous divider between Polish Warszawa and Czech Karlin.

The coming of the railroads to Cleveland in the 1850s created more impenetrable man-made barriers between districts and also served as the linear locus for many of the city's industries, around which would gather various groups of workers, usually rather homogeneous in race or national origin. Cleveland's railroad pattern is quite easy to understand. Some major lines entered the city from the south and west using the natural routes created by the river valley and Walworth Run. In doing so, they only served to enhance the division created by these natural features and, in the case of Walworth, probably preserve the valley from being filled in. Two major routes did not take advantage of valleys. The previously mentioned Conrail route to Pittsburgh cuts diagonally across the city from a point near the lakefront and East 33rd Street. The Lakefront route from which it departs has not done as much to divide region from region -- although it is the reason Bratenahl is separated from Glenville -- as to serve as the focus for industries around which neighborhoods have arisen. Later, the Cleveland Belt Line, which encircled the city in the early 1900s, created additional urban divisions. Suffice it to say that there were enough railroad tracks in Cleveland to allow a number of districts to be on their "wrong side."

While it may have been dangerous to cross the tracks, it is nearly impossible to easily cross the most recent of the man-made barriers, the freeway system. Cutting through traditional neighborhoods such as Tremont, the highways have been viewed as neighborhood destroyers as they decimated housing and cut internal commercial linkages that had evolved in some areas. In the thirty years since they came to be constructed in earnest, these newest man-made barriers have created new units within Cleveland. The Lakeshore freeway is a prime example. It variously divides Glenville from more northerly areas such as Bratenahl and Collinwood from Euclid. The wrong side of the tracks is now more properly the wrong side of the freeway. Gang graffetti on local underpasses testifies that the roads have been adopted by some people, at least, as major lines of demarcation.

Although natural and manmade boundaries are a fascinating issue in defining Cleveland's neighborhoods, they are merely the walls of the container. The contents are what really defines the concept of neighborhood in Cleveland. In looking at the contents, two issues must be considered. One is the distinct features that set one area apart from another. The second, and more critical, centers about the forces that created and sustained unity within these areas. Understanding these forces is something that is of great interest to historians, but of even greater import to those charged with contemporary urban planning and the rehabilitation of city neighborhoods. The Webster definition talks about common economic levels, nationality and institutions as the hallmarks of these communities within a community. Most importantly, the Webster definition notes the importance of "familiar association" as part of the concept of neighborhood. All of these have come into play in creating and sustaining Cleveland's neighborhoods throughout the city's history.
The post-Gorbachev era may not be the most propitious time to take what might be a Marxist view of neighborhoods in Cleveland, but it does seem that economic level was the first and, to date, the basic defining characteristic of the city's neighborhoods. Distinctive areas within the city began to develop as soon as the community's economy grew and allowed some citizens to prosper beyond the rudiments of frontier existence. As the settlement expanded, it split, cell-like, into separate areas. By the 1830s and 1840s Cleveland had, at least, two distinct neighborhoods. The high area on the top of the Flats had developed into the desirable commercial and residential area while the lands below became known as "under the hill." Housing boatyards, warehouses and minor manufactures, the "under the hill" district was home to those who labored on the canal and the river. It acquired a reputation as being rough-and-tumble and disreputable. Above, in what is now the northern end of the warehouse district, the city's leading citizens, including Alfred Kelley, erected their homes. Later they would move on as commercial enterprise made the area less desirable.

That such areas had or developed a distinctive ethnic composition is due, in large part, to the jobs to which individuals were restricted by their skills and/or prevailing prejudices. The Flats and, later the western slopes of the river valley would become home to the Irish who arrived in the city beginning in the late 1820s. Largely unskilled, they worked on the docks and warehouses that lined the river and they lived nearby creating neighborhoods known as Irishtown Bend, the Angle, and Whiskey Island.

In the case of the Germans, the first large non-English speaking group to arrive in the city before the Civil War, the process may have been reversed. That is, the Germans settled together for reasons of language and culture and, as semi-skilled or skilled immigrants, their neighborhoods acquired a reputation as being middle class. Lorain Avenue on the West Side, the area near St. Joseph's Church on Woodland, and other districts populated largely by Germans were viewed as neighborhoods housing skilled artisans and small entrepreneurs.

In the post Civil War era, Cleveland's economy shifted from a merchantile to an industrial base and thereby provided the community with the potential for tremendous growth. Population increased from 43,000 in 1860 to nearly 800,000 in 1920 and the city's area increased from 7.3 square miles to over 34 square miles. It was during this period that the "traditional" Cleveland neighborhoods formed -- some of which endure to this day -- and during which the economic/ethnic basis of neighborhood life was firmly established.

What was most critical to neighborhood formation in the industrial period was the siting of industries. Given transportation needs, that siting was dictated by the water and rail routes running through the city. These arteries now became the locus of industries around which new neighborhoods formed. The neighborhoods were characterized by a common economic level and rather homogeneous ethnic background, and limited in size by either geographic barriers or the maximum distance one could walk to work. Living where one could easily walk to work was the underlying reason for traditional neighborhood creation in Cleveland and an important
bond that preserved the neighborhoods. All other factors — ethnic and cultural solidarity, institutional affiliation, and even family ties — were subordinate.

A close look at Cleveland's older industrial neighborhoods quickly reveals their original economic nuclei. Lower Buckeye, inhabited first by Germans and later by Hungarians, was situated near the factories that lined the Cleveland and Pittsburgh rail line, as was Fleet-Broadway, although a bit further south on that line at the point where the Cleveland Rolling Mills (later the Newburgh Works of American Steel and Wire) were situated. The Otis Steel Plant, located on the lakefront railway line at East 55th Street, would, along with other rail-sited industries, provide a focus for a neighborhood inhabited by Germans and later, South Slavs. The Union Carbide plant on the western leg of the same rail line at West 117th Street became the seed for the Bird's Nest neighborhood of Lakewood. Standard Oil's pioneer refinery in Kingsbury Run provided jobs for the Czechs who settled in the Croton Street and later Broadway Avenue neighborhoods during the 1870s.6

Post-Civil War economic neighborhood nuclei did not need to be industrial. Bourgeois activity in wholesale and retail sales of food and other commodities in the Haymarket district attracted residents to the area who were buyers and sellers — the region became home to many Jews and Italians and later Greeks and Syrians. Little Italy, perhaps one of the city's most noticeable contemporary neighborhoods, was centered about a cemetery for which Joseph Carabelli and other pioneer settlers produced monuments and at which generations of hills residents worked as grounds keepers. Although a particular industry may have seeded a neighborhood, the resulting accumulation of residents with skills or strong backs provided incentive for further economic investment. For instance, the Cleveland Rolling Mills may have begun what is now Slavic Village, but by the early twentieth century a variety of other manufacturers had moved into the area to take advantage of transportation routes and labor.

That many of these areas came to be viewed as particular ethnic enclaves is the result of what is known as chain migration. Simply stated, when one member of a particular immigrant group found gainful employment at a particular site he would then bring family and friends to the same opportunity by sending word back to the home country. As migration from one country or region came to focus on a particular employment opportunity other neighborhood building factors came into play. For European immigrants, who dominated the movement to Cleveland during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the need for linguistic and cultural familiarity was a preeminent factor. Cleveland's neighborhoods not only provided proximity to employment, but a cultural security blanket in which churches preserved religion and provided for the continuity of national heritage and in which grocers, saloon keepers, dry goods merchants, and the other purveyors of the necessities of life not only spoke a familiar language, but dealt in familiar products. Eventually, as industry expanded and manpower needs grew, the workforce in any neighborhood became more diverse and what may have been a single economically-based settlement around an industrial core evolved into a more complex area containing a number of ethnic groups of approximately the same economic level. The Bird's Nest area in Lakewood, for instance, housed
Slovaks and Poles, the American Steel and Wire Works was bordered on one side by a Polish enclave and on the other by a Slovenian one. The mills that gave rise to Tremont's late nineteenth century growth as an industrial neighborhood attracted Poles, Ukrainians, Slovaks, and Carpatho-Russians among other groups. Although they resided in an area viewed by outsiders as a single district called Tremont they each maintained distinctive stores and institutions, if not residential patterns, within that area.

Tremont is important in that it illustrates a point often missed by the casual observer. What appears to be a single neighborhood to the outsider is, to its inhabitants, a variety of neighborhoods. Tremont, for instance, housed a multiplicity of ethnic groups, each with its own churches, clubs and stores. Even within what appears to be homogenous ethnic neighborhoods, there are still sub-neighborhoods. Warszawa, the Polish district centered on Fleet Avenue, was the home, at one time, of what might be considered three Polish groups, each defined by what Polish Roman Catholic church they belonged to as well as by their physical location within what was a rather large geographic district. In this case, a split in the major Polish church, St. Stanislaus, in 1892 eventually gave rise to a second, initially schismatic parish, Immaculate Heart of Mary. Though located within five minutes walk of each other, the two churches served two factions within the community, each of which had its own newspaper, clubs, and undoubtedly, preferred merchants. A third church, Sacred Heart of Jesus, served parishioners further to the south of the main district -- indeed those living beyond the Burke Run geographical boundary. Its district, a sub-division of Warszawa, was known as Goosetown. Loyalties and area identification varied within all neighborhoods, defined not only by religious doctrinal disputes, but by matters as diverse as public school assignment, preferred grocer, or even village of origin in the old country.

Although the research work has yet to be done, one suspects that in Cleveland, as in New York City, residential groupings at the block or building level may have been defined by village or family of origin. The best way to understand the basic level of neighborhood identification is to travel through the city and its inner-suburbs today and view the number of block parties and block associations. This brings up perhaps the most critical part of the Webster definition -- familiar association. To be successful, neighborhoods have to be small and neighbors must have the opportunity to meet with one another, whether at a church or synagogue, a local grocery store or at the neighborhood bar. To try to comprehend the complex structure of Cleveland's neighborhoods by looking at ward boundaries, social planning areas, or even physical barriers is impossible. One has to look for an area in which familiar association can take place. The distance someone could easily walk to work, the store, or to church probably limited that individual's personal neighborhood.

It can be argued that the decline of Cleveland's neighborhoods began when walking was no longer a necessity. For most Clevelanders, this occurred when cheap, relatively rapid, public transportation became available with the construction of an electric street railway network beginning in the 1890s.

Of course, there had always been a cadre of citizens who did not need
to walk their place of employment. The residents of Euclid Avenue are a
good example. They owned the horses or carriages that allowed them to live
away from their jobs. As Cleveland became more crowded and noisy after the
Civil War, movement away from the commercial heart became desirable.
Euclid Avenue grew at this period because it offered distance and large
expanses of land. Yet, despite the availability of transport, it can be
argued that the residents of Euclid Avenue did maintain a degree of
familiar association. Parties at one another's houses, match races between
sleighs down the avenue, and membership in the same churches, be they St.
Paul's or Trinity Cathedral, all indicate associational patterns. Whether
the Euclidians would have considered them familiar is another matter.

Even before the electric streetcar, some Clevelanders used horsedrawn
street railways to allow for residence away from their place of employment.
Usually clerks and skilled workers, these people, resident on Prospect or
in the city's East End, maintained neighborhoods that had a strong
institutional core of churches, clubs and stores. What is important to
note here is that public transport was used largely to travel to work.
Going to the store or to church was still a matter of walking.
Transportation was a luxury, and while it remained so, the necessities of
life could be gotten on foot. A sense of community -- in this case of a
superior economic level -- was therefore maintained.

With the advent of electric street railways, the great mass of
Clevelanders could also consider moving to new neighborhoods which were
well removed from their place of employment. Street railways were much
faster and much less expensive than carriage or horsecar. Tom Johnson's
advocacy of a 3 cent fare reflected his attempt to make transportation more
affordable for the common man or woman who may have wanted to move away
from the place of initial settlement or, during times of unsettled
employment, to easily travel to a job outside of his neighborhood. Because
of frequent layoffs and slowdowns such travel was, perhaps, not uncommon.

The availability of ready transport led to the rapid growth of new
suburbs such as Lakewood, East Cleveland, and Cleveland Heights which
attracted many of the city's middle class residents who, perhaps, were as
interested in escaping the noise and dirt of the city as they were in
moving away from the new immigrants and migrants arriving from Southern and
Eastern Europe and the American South. But at the same time, many of these
"new" immigrants were equally interested in leaving the "good old"
neighborhood. There is a major fiction incumbent in the traditional view
of Cleveland neighborhoods -- that being that those who lived there wished
to stay forever, enjoying a bastion of safety and friendship. What factual
information we have analyzed seems to point in a different direction. The
same street railways that were taking the middle class to Lakewood were
also taking Polish and Czech factory workers out of Broadway and Fleet
Avenue to the new subdivision of Corlett by 1910. Population movement was
rapid -- a sample of a twenty-five block area of the predominantly Jewish
lower Woodland district in the 1890s and early 1900s shows that only ten
percent of the residents remained at their same address over a ten year
period. The fact is that many of the city's industrial neighborhoods
were dirty, noisy and smokey. Given the economic wherewithal and
transportation, residents, be they a member of the Euclid Avenue elite, a
second-generation German-American bank clerk or a Hungarian laborer, moved
when they had the chance.

Cleveland's African-American population initially also participated in the move away from the city. By 1910 the city's relatively small black population of slightly over 8,000 was largely located in the Central area which, at that time, was not, by any means a homogeneous ghetto. The option of moving out and away was not unrealistic and a young entrepreneur, Welcome T. Blue, took advantage of this by buying and marketing real estate for a new black settlement in Mount Pleasant, a district now accessible by street railway. Within ten years, however, Cleveland's black population would swell to over 35,000 and a "ghetto would take shape" as prejudice overcame liberality and proscribed the movement of blacks to areas outside of Central.

If the neighborhoods of the walking city were undermined by street railway transport, they were almost totally destroyed by the automobile. Over time the automobile not only permitted movement to more distant suburbs, but gave rise to a culture in which the provision of goods and services need not be located within residential areas. It might also be argued that rubber-tired vehicles powered by internal combustion were partly responsible for the destruction of the economic cornerstone of neighborhoods as trucks and highways broke the industrial monopolies of rail and water-centered cities such as Cleveland. Although the Depression and World War II created a brief hiatus in the move away from Cleveland's neighborhoods, post war federal programs, which included the interstate highway network and government home loans insured the demise of the traditional Cleveland neighborhood. In its place, the city gained a new style of neighborhood and a ring of suburbs that mimicked some of the features of the old neighborhoods.

Many of these new suburbs represented distinct economic or cultural levels. For instance, Garfield Heights, Parma, and Maple Heights grew to be considered as blue collar suburbs with residents drawn from the city's southeast and near west side neighborhoods (Hunting Valley and Waites Hill are the modern analogy to Euclid Avenue). That a variety of white ethnic groups and, more recently, African Americans (in the case of Garfield and Maple hills), moved to these suburbs bears out the preeminence of economic level as the determinant factor in settlement location and association.

The contemporary neighborhoods within the city are also economically based. By the 1980s that economic base had, unfortunately in many instances, slipped well below the poverty level. Given the condition of many neighborhoods, they seemed, more than ever, to be holding areas for new migrants to the community rather than desirable places of residence. With European immigration largely restricted since the 1920s, many of those who came to Cleveland, particularly during and after World War II, were American migrants, — black, Appalachian or Puerto Rican — driven out by the poverty and prejudice of their original homes and lured to the city by the promise of jobs. What they found was a declining economy and the lessening of employment opportunities, particularly for the unskilled. Affordable housing was available only in the older inner-city areas, in neighborhoods being vacated by suburban-bound city residents. The same boundaries — railways and ravines, as well as streets, that served as
lines of demarcation — still defined the limits of these neighborhoods, but many of the other factors that had at one time held the areas together were rapidly disappearing.

By the late 1950s, the economic nuclei of many areas withered as business and industry either moved to suburban locations or out of the region. Cultural cohesion seemed the one factor that gave community to neighborhoods, but that too was undermined as local institutions, such as groceries, dry goods stores, and other minor entrepreneurial enterprises were forced out of business by large scale chain competitors, the parking lots of which signified that walking was no longer a factor in neighborhood life. All that remained were churches, clubs, and bars. Much of what had characterized Cleveland neighborhood life — smallness of scale, patronizing merchants who were neighbors, working in the same factories — had disappeared. Familiar association was, in part, gone. In the city, and in the suburbs as well, closeness and community had been undermined by the automotive homogenization of American life.

Whether Cleveland's 1990s neighborhoods, be they Hough, the Warehouse District, or Slavic Village, can be viable communities in a society that has internally combusted its way away from familiar association is not a question for historians, but a matter to be contemplated by today's urban planners. In looking at this problem they, hopefully, will review the lessons of history. The historical issue still outstanding in this discussion, however, is whether Euclid Avenue was a neighborhood.

Despite what the patrons at Dempsey's Tavern in Tremont or the customers of Lancer's Steakhouse on Carnegie might think, or even despite the strongest inclinations of this speaker to believe otherwise, Euclid Avenue — Millionaires' Row — was a neighborhood. Consider these factors in the light of what has been noted up to now.

The residents of Euclid Avenue shared a common economic and social strata. That that strata was stratospheric is of no consequence to the issue at hand.

The residents of the street had a set of institutions to which most belonged, whether churches such as Trinity Cathedral, or the schools -- Miss Mittlebersger, or University School -- to which they sent their children.

They also had a set of merchants whom they patronized whether it was the grocer, Chandler and Rudd, or Ella Grant Wilson, the florist.

There was, indeed, familiar association on the street. This is amply testified to by the many sleigh races, balls, and family marriages in which the Euclid residents participated.

Like many Cleveland neighborhoods, Euclid Avenue could be subdivided. The north side of the street housed the most socially acceptable families, the "Nabobs," while the south side housed those who sometimes did not fit into the inner circle. These people, referred to as the "Bobs" included John D. Rockefeller whose idea of a good time apparently did not meet the standards of the north side. There was, by the way, a third Euclid Avenue
community composed of the live-in servants, mainly Irish, whose work allowed the grand homes to function.

Finally, like the people of Tremont or Broadway and East 55th, the residents of Euclid moved to greener pastures as the city became dirtier and more congested. That they were able to do so more readily than others in the city is simply a function of economics.\textsuperscript{13}

So, it appears that those of us who have come to understand what constitutes a Cleveland neighborhood through intuition rather than scholarly investigation must face the fact that Euclid Avenue was a neighborhood. And, it would do us well to remember that Euclid Avenue, like Tremont, or the Angle, or Goosetown, even had a neighborhood bar -- The Union Club -- to which the descendants of those who built "America's Showplace", are wont to return, from time to time, just as the old residents of Cedar and Tremont return to Lancer's or Dempsey's, to bend an elbow and relive the memories of the good old neighborhood.
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