

**Sculpted Gardens and Terraced Landscapes:
Commemoration, the Cleveland Cultural Gardens, and Community Identity, 1916-1986**

Mark Tebeau
Cleveland State University

On an unusually muggy June afternoon in Cleveland, 82-year old Gino Collage began the difficult task of removing graffiti from the terraced walls of the Italian Cultural Garden in Cleveland's Rockefeller Park and part of the Cleveland Cultural Gardens—a chain of twenty-four terraced landscapes with monuments to (primarily) the European cultural figures and lush foliage. As the gardens have faded into memory, vandalism has increased, including the theft of sculptures, sometimes giving the gardens the aura of an unkempt cemetery. Collage himself was closing in on finding a bust of Virgil that had been pilfered from the gardens years earlier, apparently sold to an antiquities dealer in New York. Ironically, the bust may have been less valuable than its base, a column from the Forum in Rome, which remained embedded in the gardens. Both had been gifts from Benito Mussolini in the 1930s, arriving in time for the Italian Garden's initial dedication when thousands of ethnic Clevelanders had attended opening-day ceremonies in the Cultural Gardens. One could only wonder at Collage's lonely vigil. What drew the aging veteran to the gardens several days every week? Why have the gardens become virtually invisible? Indeed, what happens to public gardens, landscape architecture, and monumental statuary over the course of their lives? And, more broadly, what can such sculpture and gardens tell us about the places—the cities and communities—in which they reside? ¹

To Viennese novelist Robert Musil the fate of the Cultural Gardens was predictable: “There is nothing in the world as invisible as monuments. Doubtless they have been erected to be seen—even to attract attention; yet at the same time something has impregnated them against attention.”² Writing shortly afterwards Lewis Mumford questioned the endeavor of monumental

commemoration itself. Arguing that monuments and memorials were not “modern,” Mumford asserts that “stone gives a false sense of continuity and a deceptive assurance of life.”³ And, yet, public memorials have continued to be built. Individuals and collectives throughout the world remain undaunted by this apparently Sisyphean process, hoping to build memorials that will survive the ravages of time and which will be “planted in the heart rather than graven in stone.”⁴

It is precisely this effort by individuals and communities to embed their values and ideals in the landscape that has made the study of monuments and commemoration such a rich vein of study. Over the past twenty years there has been a flowering of research on public sculpture and art. Connoisseurs have created inventories of public arts projects and shared the details of their creation. Arts scholars have examined public art in terms of its artistic and aesthetic contribution. Historians, especially those studying historical memory, have used monuments as a lens through which to explore larger themes, revealing changing community values, power relations, institutions, and broad historical themes, such as gender, race, and war. Most of this work focuses on discrete, well-publicized moments and monuments, in no small part because public debates offering excellent evidence for larger historical studies. Unfortunately, this approach obscures the stories of the people and places in which most memorials are built, transforming them into background stories and robbing them of their vitality and historical agency. In addition, this approach can obscure complex historical processes as well as the manner in which memorials change over time.⁵

Understanding monuments as living entities that change over time, and as being related to places, constituencies, or broad historical change offers a more nuanced portrait of public statuary.⁶ For example, studies of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington and the Civil Rights memorials offer glimpses into the benefits of this approach, articulating how a particular

memorial or memorials can take on new meaning and identity over time.⁷ Perhaps best embodied in James E. Young's studies of Holocaust memorials, this biographical approach provides a model for this study of the Cleveland Cultural Gardens.⁸ Such a biographical approach recommends itself for understanding the cultural gardens because of the unique structure of the gardens as memorials. Conceived as living organisms, the gardens' landscapes were sewn for the first time in 1916. Over the next 50 years, landscape architecture, flowers, shrubs, statues, and trees were planted, removed, or replanted. With each addition and subtractions, the gardens changed, taking a new identity. Today, they are still actively being built and rebuilt. Thus, defining the gardens by any single moment would mischaracterize their history. It also would minimize the degree to which memorials live both in the landscape and in time, developing new relations to their surrounds as they age, mature, and die.⁹

Underscoring this biographical approach are recent studies in landscape architecture that emphasizes gardens as "memory theaters." Gardens tell stories about place and identity. According to John Dixon Hunt, gardens stand in a liminal space, mediating between commemoration of the dead and the aspirations of the living. As they look backward in elegy to a lost perfection, gardens inscribe spaces with the sacredness of nature. And, yet, they are also invented traditions, expressions of collective identity and national prerogatives. Importantly, and like monuments singularly, gardens encode ideals in a variety of forms—stones, statues, fountains, inscriptions, and plantings. Importantly, though, these meanings depend on a knowledgeable audience educated in its codes, which can be "strung together into an iconographical program or narrative."¹⁰ Of course, one cannot forget gardens also provide metaphors with expansive cultural and social meaning. For instance, garden symbolism abounds when we discuss migration, history, and identity. We often speak of understanding one's roots or

putting down roots, unearthing the past, sewing the seeds of change. Nor can one forget the environmental logic that shapes garden lifecycles, which further highlights the value of a life-course approach: seed, germination, growth, fertilization, blooming, flowering, death, etc.

This study explores the relation between public sculpture and place by considering how place-based factors intersected with broad historical forces to shape the Cleveland Cultural Gardens. Following on their creation, how did the development of this public monument intersect with changes in Cleveland, both in terms of its physical environment and social history? Were the gardens able to become symbols of unity in Cleveland, the United States, and internationally? What can they tell us about broader urban processes involved in reshaping cities in the twentieth century? Alternately, how did they reflect local, national, and international political currents? How did demographic factors at play during the twentieth century matter in the construction and reconstruction of these gardens? And, finally, how do the gardens expand our understanding of art and place in America during the twentieth century?

A Fertile Natural and Human Landscape

The Cultural Gardens sit within Rockefeller Park, a filament-thin, 276-acre city park bounded by the narrow Doan Brook watershed with steep slopes, located six miles East of Cleveland's center, jutting perpendicularly from Lake Erie (toward the South)—a site that has been shaped by glaciers, industrialization, engineers, and urban planners. This story begins after the ice age, when receding glaciers sculpted the boundaries of Doan Brook, its watershed, and ravine. One of the city's many Northward flowing watersheds, Doan Brook begins its journey in the "heights" that surround the low-lying land on which much of Cleveland sits. Successive waves of development, by Shakers, urban planners, and engineers reshaped the Southern, upstream portion of the watershed, altering Doan Brook's flow patterns during the nineteenth

century. As settlement moved East, engineers and workers carving for the Brook a more definitive path in stone, gradually pushing other parts of it underground. These culverts obscure the Brook's natural history, but did not alter the watershed's influence on the Gardens' design. The gardeners confronted the ravine's steep hillsides by creating multi-leveled terraced spaces and by using flat open spaces along the brook to create communal lawns. Designers struggled to control the water flowing through the gardens, not merely deploying it in fountains, but battling to control drainage and flooding from nearby urban development, and even seeking ways to remove Doan Brook from their garden landscapes.¹¹

Doan Brook and its ravine would become part of urban planners desire to beautify Cleveland in 1896, when John Rockefeller bequeathed the lower part of the Doan Brook Watershed (its Northern portion) to the city. Designed by a protégé of Frederick Law Olmstead, Rockefeller Park was emblematic of an era of urban parks development, city beautification, and cultural uplift in cities nationwide, although its landscapes did not lend themselves nearly so well to mass use as other well-known Olmstead projects.¹² In Cleveland, these forces defined the Downtown with a Mall, designed in 1903 by Daniel Burnham, a system of parks citywide, and a cultural district to which Rockefeller Park would be connected. In fact, Rockefeller Park connects to Wade Park, which would become home to the city's major cultural district. That district, which became known as University Circle, began to form as early as the 1880s and expanded dramatically between 1910 and 1930 when Cleveland's major cultural institutions built facilities in the area.¹³ As City Beautiful ideals shaped Cleveland's landscape, they also influenced the principle leaders of the Cultural Gardens, Leo Weidenthal and Charles Wolfram. Both men served on the City Planning Commission, with Weidenthal serving during Burnham's Group Plan design.¹⁴ Not surprisingly, then, City Beautiful flourishes—including Beaux Arts

ornament and statuary—became the prevailing motif of the gardens, meshing well with the formally landscaped gardens that were most obviously influenced by Italian Renaissance garden design.¹⁵ Paradoxically, such formal landscapes would reshape the landscape of Rockefeller Park moving it away from the more naturalist impulses of Olmstead-inspired park designers toward the more didactic and ceremonial character of the nineteenth-century rural cemetery.¹⁶

Seeds: Centenaries, Literature, and Conflict

In 1916, Leo Weidenthal, then a reporter for the *Cleveland Plain-Dealer* and Shakespeare devotee, planted the first seeds of the Cultural Gardens when he inaugurated a Shakespearean Garden, celebrating the “bard” as a civilizing force. The Shakespeare Garden drew its impulse from a range of converging cultural currents. Weidenthal’s efforts were part of an extraordinary range of global commemorations of the tercentenary of Shakespeare’s death. The Shakespeare tercentenary was facilitated by an international committee, located in Stratford-on-Avon, but ultimately each individual commemorative activity grew out of local communities and their interpretations of Shakespeare’s significance. In the United States, these interpretive frames referenced popular eugenics attitudes about the ascendancy of Anglo-Saxon racial identity, an outpouring of sympathy for Britain’s entry into World War I, and the resurgence of centenary celebrations themselves as vehicles for asserting collective (especially nationalist) identity.¹⁷ On this latter point, centenary celebrations—commemorations tied to the 100-year anniversary of the births, deaths, and other moments in the lives of artistic and cultural figures—were reinvented in the last half of the nineteenth century becoming commonplace across the Western world. Typically, these commemorations focused on artistic and literary figures. They contributed to the “invention” of national traditions, patriotism, and the development of a historical consciousness in Western societies. Such commemorative events also had more banal aims, including fostering

tourism and economic development. This trend toward centenary celebrations forms the backdrop for the Shakespeare tercentenary, and would influence the cultural gardens.¹⁸

If more spectacular than other Shakespeare tercentenary celebrations, Cleveland's commemoration was nonetheless typical. Centered upon the planting of a formal garden landscape, deeply laden with symbolism, the gardens became living, almost sacred, embodiments of Shakespeare's transcendent place at the center of Anglo-Saxon culture and identity. Tying the garden project to theatrical activities, Weidenthal invited film icon Ethel Barrymore, leading Shakespearean actress Julia Marlowe, and other notables, to plant Hawthorne, Elm, and English Oak trees at the opening ceremony. The group also planted flowers, following a Victorian tradition of planting flowers from Shakespeare's writings.¹⁹ Along with the unveiling of a sculptural bust of Shakespeare, a vine taken from the "traditional tomb of Juliet in Verona, Italy" and Sycamore Maples from the Great Birnam Woods of Scotland (the setting for Macbeth) transformed the corner into an organic embodiment of playwright. This process, which included seeds or plants taken directly from Statford-on-Avon, sacralized these gardens in their locations throughout America. Promoted in the United States by the Drama League of America, the programs were meant to be more than community celebrations but educational programs tied to the uplift of children.²⁰ Toward this end, the Cleveland effort reached out to nearby Slovenian and Polish immigrant public schoolchildren, building a relation that would predict the future involvement of the Cleveland Municipal School district in the Cultural Gardens.²¹ A decade later, Leo Weidenthal fondly recalled the opening of the garden, but also seemed dissatisfied with the outcome. As he later recalled, "standing alone (the Shakespeare Garden) failed to present the entire picture of the cultural backgrounds of Cleveland's citizens."²²

Before Weidenthal could formulate plans to expand on his Shakespearean Garden, World War I interrupted life around the globe in profound ways that shaped Weidenthal's next endeavors. Among the most notable changes associated with the War were the cessation of European immigration, increased industrial production, and the beginnings of the great migration of African Americans into Northern industrial cities like Cleveland. This development, followed on the heels of anti-immigrant quotas and legislation would have a profound demographic impact on America's largest urban centers within a generation. Secondly, the unsettled peace following the war left many questions of national sovereignty and identity unanswered, but left in place the League of Nations, a framework, albeit a weak one, for international order. Finally, in cities and towns throughout America, war memorials sprung up, giving new shape to public squares, plazas, and parks. In Cleveland, the memorial to World War I was planted quite literally in Rockefeller Park along Rockefeller Parkway, also known as Lower East Boulevard, which bisected the park, running parallel to Doan Brook. A promenade for carriages and locally-made custom automobiles the boulevard became a war memorial for veterans of World War I, known as Liberty Boulevard. In 1919, the city planted 830 Oak trees, each with bronze medallions at their base bearing the name of a Clevelander who had died in the conflict, along this seven-mile stretch of road that extended into the contiguous suburb Shaker Heights. Over time, the plaques disappeared, removed by vandals, and consumed by the tree's growing roots. However, during the 1920s the oaks and plaques remained powerful reminders of the war's legacy, a legacy that deeply affected the cosmopolitan citizenry of Cleveland.

The Gardens Grow

In 1926, Weidenthal—by then the editor of the local weekly *Jewish Independent*—joined local ethnic leaders Charles Wolfram and Jennie Zwick to inaugurate the Cleveland Cultural

Gardens League. Wolfram and Zwick brought with them fully-formed progressive-era civic organizations, the Civic Progress League and American Equity League, completed with ties to the immigrant communities of Cleveland, including direct connections to many ethnic elites in the city. The Cultural Gardens League imagined an organization and a landscape that would embody and contain the pluralistic cultures of the Cleveland, then one of the world's most cosmopolitan and diverse cities, by drawing them together in common purpose.²³ That purpose, they believed, would create a bridge between the diversity of Cleveland's communities and to become a beacon beyond the city. They sought to "promote better understanding" by developing monuments to cultural heroes, as well as formally landscaped gardens. In addition, the mission statement declared that their group would promote "the cause of human brotherhood and democracy by encouraging and developing sympathetic understanding." Locating their work in Cleveland, the cultural gardeners wanted their model to reach beyond the boundaries of the membership of the League. They sought to memorialize and to "perpetuate" the contributions "made to the advancement of civilization and the course of Peace by the cultures of these several groups" and in so doing "to enrich the lives of all American citizens." The gardeners further espoused an international program, promoting "peace and brotherhood" around cultural principles and seeking physical embodiment of international diasporic cultures. Cultural Gardeners sought to transcend Cleveland as a place, with their work becoming a model for international cooperation more broadly.²⁴

In planting the gardens, the founders engaged the debates about immigration and culture that were raging in the 1920s, recommending the gardens as an alternative to prevailing cultural attitudes. Weidenthal, in particular, emphasized diversity as a key element of the gardens, proposing a "multicultural" vision of America, some 50 years before the concept would gain

wider currency. In the official history of the Gardens, Weidenthal articulated a philosophy of “one out of many,” in which he argued that “True cultures impose no barriers of race or creed. In fact, their influence is toward mutual understanding and wider sympathy.”²⁵ Weidenthal rejected the melting pot notion first articulated in 1908 by Israel Zangwill in his play of the same title, in which “all the races of Europe are melting and reforming! ... into the Crucible with you all! God is making the American.” In repudiating the melting pot, Weidenthal and his colleagues offered a corrective to the National Origins Act, which established quotas for immigrants and was based in Eugenics. At the same time, Wolfram and Weidenthal also created an alternative to ethnic working-class culture. For example, when Weidenthal celebrated Shakespeare, created a Hebrew garden, and engaged in commemorations rooted in the tradition of centenary memorials, he had a distinctive view of ethnic identity, rooted in elite culture. Though Weidenthal rejected Zangwill’s notion of a melting pot, he embraced Zangwill’s celebration (appearing in later writings) of Shakespeare as a force for creating commonalty. Moreover, when Wolfram and Weidenthal invited the city’s ethnic elite to join them as delegates and leaders of the Cultural Gardens league, they underscored this emphasis on high culture over low culture. As with the city beautiful movement, high culture became an agent of change, a way to civilize working-class immigrants and alter prevailing nativist sentiments. The Slovak Garden delegation’s statement of purpose revealed the multiple audiences that the League sought to reach with the Gardens, seeing them as a “vivid testimonial of our national maturity and education, not only to native Americans and other nationality groups, but of our offspring, to whom we desire to leave this beautiful heritage.”²⁶

The League built an organizational structure that balanced the development of brotherhood against difference, with care to accentuate and promote diversity—of perspective,

ethnic origin, and vision. Intentional or not, the federated institutional structure of the Cultural Gardens League reflected Weidenthal's "one out of many" approach. The Cultural Garden League worked with individuals from each of the city's ethnic communities and affiliated with a particular cultural organization in that community, such as a church or ethnic association. Each of the particular garden delegations sent two representatives to serve on the board. This group of delegates elected officers, who ran the League. Because of the federated organization of the Garden League, nearly every aspect of garden development—funding, maintenance, content, artists, and other aspects—were almost wholly the work of particular garden delegations. Even so, the Cultural Gardens League held authority over designs and choice of sculpture being developed by its delegates. However, judging from the League's minutes, its review was cursory, as it rejected few proposals. The City Parks Department and Planning Commission may well have had a more decisive impact on garden plans, because this organization and its landscape architects received and judged every proposal and formal architectural drawing that were submitted.²⁷ Once the Works Progress Administration began funding labor for the gardens in 1936, City Parks Department oversight increased, although each garden federation continued to work independently with the Parks department to develop and execute garden plans.²⁸

Weidenthal's plan for a "panorama" of gardens that would "stand as a symbol of democracy and brotherhood" flourished in the fertile demographic conditions of Cleveland—then one of the world's most cosmopolitan cities. In 1930, over 60 percent of the population was foreign born or had at least one foreign-born parent. In 1920, more than 30 percent of the city's population had been born outside the United States. The fifth largest city in the United States, only New York City and Boston had a higher proportion of foreign-born residents. The city had welcomed immigrants from Ireland and Germany during the 19th century but by the twentieth

century most of the immigrants were Central or Southern Europeans. Not only was Cleveland cosmopolitan, but also it was one of the world's most diverse industrial region during the late 19th into the 20th centuries. Cleveland manufactured agricultural products, textiles, shipbuilding, automobiles, steel, chemicals, machine tools, electrical equipment, and "consumer durables" that would become staples in American households. Between 1910 and 1929, most of the city's industries grew at the remarkable rate of 10 percent yearly.²⁹

Energized by the city's diversity and its economic well-being, the Gardens bloomed. In 1927, Cleveland City Council designated the section of Rockefeller Park where the Shakespeare Garden sat as "Poet's Corner" and further subdivided it into several sections, the Shakespeare Garden, a bowl-shaped Shakespeare Theater (carved into a hillside) and the Hebrew Garden. In 1930, shortly after Weidenthal and his colleagues, Charles Wolfram and Jennie Zwick, inaugurated a German Cultural Garden, the experiment was codified by the Cleveland City Council. The Council formally established Cleveland Cultural Gardens; it also authorized German, Slovak, Italian, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian Gardens. By 1934, the city had approved the addition of Hungarian, Polish, Czech, and Yugoslav Gardens. In 1938, it set aside space for Rusin, Grecian, Syrian, American (Colonial), Irish, and American Legion Peace Gardens.³⁰

Curiously, when the Cultural Gardens League carved up the hillsides of Rockefeller Park it created physical, zoned boundaries that mitigated against concord. League delegates spent hours planning ceremonies and debating programmatic elements but never considered establishing a common pathway connecting the disparate spaces. To the degree that the Cultural Gardens League organizationally embodied the plurality of the gardens, it is surprising that it did not seek to unify them as a collective within the defined park landscape. There were exceptions, of course, The Rusin and Slovak Garden delegations, for example, connected their gardens with

a path, which reflected broader social and political sympathies.³¹ Perhaps most revealing is the fact that Rockefeller Park's natural features created the grounds for a relatively unified overarching style. Doan Brook and its hillsides, Upper East Boulevard, and Liberty Boulevard (aka Lower East or Rockefeller Boulevard) shaped the design, driving the architects to utilize steps and terraces. As a result, the gardens were quite unlike expansive European landscape gardens with integrated cohesive elements, which is especially telling when judged from above—by an aerial photograph or through landscape drawings.³²

This omission was apparently first noted and remedied in the City Parks Department. Landscape architect, Harold E. Atkinson, recalled that “as the Cultural Gardens grew and developed, an increasing interest in them resulted in large numbers of visitors, and it soon became apparent that more adequate ingress would be required and that a circulatory path system linking the gardens would be provided.” To a large degree this is not surprising. Gardens delegations design spaces separately, with formally structured entrances and exits. Designs often looked inward to central water or monumental features, giving each space an individual introspective character, with little or no reference the surrounding complex of gardens. Although Harold B. Atkinson, of the Parks Department, finally created a “unification plan” in 1937, that plan was only partially successful. The “abundance of masonry” and steep hillsides mitigated against developing anything more than a “circulatory path.” The asphalt and concrete connective tissue itself also differed in composition from the patterned stone and brick walkways that characterized the gardens, revealing the degree to which unity was an afterthought.³³

The visit of Guillaume Fatio, a representative of the League of Nations who planted an American Elm Tree at the entrance to the Gardens in 1935, underscores the difficult balancing act faced by the Cultural Gardens League. According to Fatio, “Cleveland's cultural gardens are

accomplishing in their community the same thing that the League of Nations is trying to do for the world.” Elevating the Gardens’ stature, Fatio emphasized the uniqueness of the Gardens as a model for developments elsewhere. He even took plans and other materials from the Gardens back to the organization’s Geneva headquarters where, he related, they would be used as a model for beautifying the grounds, with 60 garden plots for member nations. Local newspaper coverage captured the moment by proclaiming that, through the gardens, local ethnic communities shared “the bonds and ties of a miniature League of Nations.” Covered in both the local and national press and in radio broadcasts transmitted around the world, such ceremonial events reveal the gardens growing influence. Additionally, the League of Nations’ interest in the gardens also suggests that the challenges being faced by Cleveland’s diverse communities transcended the city. How precisely could different nationalities, celebrating different cultural traditions, forge peace and comity? And, would the Gardens suffer the same fate as the League of Nations?³⁴

Multihued Blooms

As they bloomed in the 1930s, the Cultural Gardens developed a symbolic resonance tied to the peoples and places of Cleveland. Each garden delegation had wide interpretive latitude in planning and implementing its garden. Not surprisingly, the gardens deployed multiple interpretive frames, displacing ethnic conflict from elsewhere in the city into a controlled fracas among commemorative statues in Rockefeller Park. As a result, the arena for ethnic interactions shifted away from insular and competitive displays of community solidarity housed within their own communities toward more public expressive conversations. This began to lend Cleveland’s urban landscape a different flavor than other cities, where communities memorialized their identities in statuary located in different neighborhoods—often without visual references or connections to one another.³⁵ In the Cultural Gardens ethnic communities crafted spaces that

balanced a sense of ethnic identity—bounded by language, national borders, and history—with their identities as Americans and their place in Cleveland.³⁶

With the 1926 inauguration of the Hebrew Garden, Weidenthal taught the other cultural gardens delegations how to invent their own gardens through design, sculpture, and organic materials. Dedicated “to Israel’s singers, sages, and dreamers of dreams,” the garden represented the cultural accomplishment of Jews and promoted Zionism as a political and social cause. In a pattern that would repeat regularly in the late 1920s, national and international civic and political leaders would celebrate cultural figures through the use of symbolic organic materials. The ceremony featured Hebrew-language poet Chaim Bialik, who was traveling the United States promoting Zionism, planted three “Cedars of Lebanon.” Each subsequent addition to the garden brought more ceremonies, dignitaries, sculpture, and plantings. Each underscored the international intellectual frame in which these gardens resided, and promoted the gardens’ Zionist underpinnings. For example, in the next year, Chaim Weizman, then President of the World Zionist Organization and later President of Israel, dedicated three additional Cedars of Lebanon; he was accompanied on the dais by other national and international figures, as well as by prominent local Jewish leaders.³⁷

Almost universally, the gardens adopted the tradition of centenary celebrations to commemorate cultural figures whose music, literature, writings, scholarship, folklore, religion, and political activism came to embody national revival, nationalism, or were proponents of statehood. Jonas Basanavicius was a physician and folklorist who was the “patriarch of the Lithuanian national Renaissance” and first President of the Lithuanian Republic in 1918. Thomas Masaryck was a sociologist who developed a broad interpretation that shaped Czech national revival through the first half of the twentieth century; he was elected as first president of Czechoslovakia

in 1920. Jan Kollar was a Lutheran minister whose poetry was most notable for its significance in resisting Magyarization during the Hungarian dominance of Slovakia. Vodolymyr the Great was the political leader of the Ukraine in the tenth century who brought Christianity to the region, with his conversion and is a celebrated Ukrainian folk figure and Saint in both the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox churches. Petar Njegos was a Serbian prince and bishop whose epic poetry came to define Serbian national identity. Likewise the poetry of Ivan Cankar, and Taras Shevchenko defined the national revival among Slovenians and Ukrainians. In selecting these figures, the gardens delegations cleverly circumvented prohibitions on celebrating military and political figures.³⁸

The festering vestiges of international and local politics embedded in each garden's interpretation of its national identity would not have been lost on many ethnic Clevelanders, whose very "nationality" depended upon such cultural figures. In the process, they articulated the differences that had become the basis for European conflict from the 19th into 20th centuries. However, in Cleveland, the net affect may have been to contain and relocate the conflicts that ethnics had waged in churches, politics, and public spaces to the confined and relatively controlled parkspace of the gardens. Serbians, Slovenians, and Croatian, for example, battled relentlessly over the nature of the Yugoslav garden. Although they created shared a space, these groups created three committees to manage the garden, each memorializing separate figures and ceremonies. Moreover, the three groups contested over the individuals to be memorialized in the garden, eliminating a proposed Croatian statue to progressive Catholic Bishop George Strossmayer. The Slovenian Garden delegation feuded internally over who to honor. And, finally, before the Yugoslav Garden was even constructed, a Slovenian statues was stolen, an even marked by inter- and intra-community recrimination.³⁹

The gardens were funded from a variety of sources, including the local community, international sources, and the federal government. Local community funding came in many forms, including bake sales and operatic performances. Funding also came from businesses, institutions, and individuals, but especially from church-related groups, including children's clubs in which kids donated pennies toward particular projects. International governments donated statues and money. For example, the Italian Gardens League toured Italy seeking funding, eventually securing support from Mussolini, the Greek government donated sculpture to the project. Finally, and ironically, economic depression may have provided the gardens their biggest boost. By paying for the labor involved in creating the garden, though not the materials, the Works Progress Administration eventually bore a substantial portion of the cost of the gardens. As early as 1935, Cleveland began endorsing requests to the Works Progress Administration for garden construction. Over the course of the 1930s, WPA funds accounted for much of the labor and materials in building the chain. Judging from poorly-kept federal records, the WPA may have contributed as much as \$600,000 toward the construction of the Gardens, accounting for about half of the total funding expended by the city, local communities, and other sponsors from 1926 through 1950.⁴⁰

By the time that Clara Lederer wrote the Gardens' official history in 1954, the gardens had become a vibrant part of the city's social fabric, with over fifty architectural elements and nearly 20 gardens. Underscoring the significance of the gardens for defining each of the constituent communities were the remarkable numbers of people who attending celebrations. Over 60,000 Cleveland residents participated in and attended the dedication of the Hungarian Garden on a sunny July morning in 1938, watching as Cleveland's Mayor received the garden on behalf of the city. The numbers were staggering, in no small part because the census reported

that 23,833 people of direct Hungarian descent lived in Cuyahoga County at that time. Just months earlier, on a cold and rainy May morning, a crowd that some estimated to be as high as 100,000 people watched the parade that marked the dedication of the Yugoslav Cultural Garden; another 35,000 attended the opening of the American Legion Peace Garden. In 1951, over 100,000 Clevelanders visited the gardens or participated in ceremonies held in them during the preceding year. Leading cultural and political figures nationally and internationally spoke at the Gardens through the 1950s, and ceremonies reached thousands more people via more than a half dozen radio broadcasts of the ceremonies nationally and internationally.⁴¹

Designing Sacred Shrines

Thousands of visitors to the gardens found landscapes bursting with symbolism, embedded in the organic and inorganic materials, the design, art, and ornament. Quite often the use of plant materials, architectural designs, sculptures, and crafts demonstrated remarkable workmanship and artistry, although relatively few of the craftspeople, artists, and architects associated with the site achieved international (or even national) reputations in their respective fields. And, yet, taken as a whole, each of the gardens carries a monumental weight beyond its pieces, becoming shrines to nationality and cultural identity. The gardens did not become sacred spaces merely because of expressive use of plant materials or choice of symbols, but through accumulating layers of meaning. Members of the Gardens League consciously developed their gardens as shrines for national memory. For example, the Slovak Garden League imagined its garden as a “shrine” at the “center of our national gatherings and celebrations. Here will be placed the busts of our national leaders and heroes. Here also we intend to plant trees and flowers which are characteristic of our homeland, all as a symbol of our love and pride as Slovaks.” We, they reported, “intend to invite and bring our distinguished guests and visitors from Slovakia, for

the purpose of planting some tree or shrub as a memento of their visits to this land of freedom and liberty.”⁴²

In advancing their particular understanding of their communities’ identities, garden delegates deployed organic and inorganic materials laden with both symbolic meaning but also possessing literal value as a relic of national identity. Leo Weidenthal recognized the extraordinary symbolic power of gardens by referencing Eden in his introduction to the history of the Cultural Gardens, “But a higher law graven upon the heart of man is rooted in instincts formed in his earliest placements. ... In this direction is the ineffaceable memory of Paradise. Out of these promptings arise man's aspirations to culture, a culture linked forever with the First Garden where nature, not subdued but won in tenderness and sympathy supplied man's every need.” For Weidenthal and many in the Garden League, planting the gardens was sacred—at once transcendent and literal. The plants, like religious and cultural relics transformed the Cleveland landscape. When Weidenthal planted Cedar Trees from Lebanon, he literally grounded the Hebrew Garden’s statement of identity to the Jewish community’s claim to land in the Middle East.

So, too, the other cultural garden organizations connected their landscapes to physical elements of their national heritage. The Italian Garden contained architectural relics from Italy. For instance, the bust of Virgil stood on a column from the Roman forum that was made of Travertine stone “of which most Roman buildings are made,” according to a *Cleveland Plain-Dealer* report. Also there was a granite boulder from Monte Grappa in Italy that was donated by the Italian Veterans of Cleveland. The Hungarian community used Hawthorn, Yew, Cotoneasters, and Azaleas—plants that the *Plain-Dealer* reported were common to Hungarian gardens—to frame the garden’s two central lawns, brick paths, and stone benches. The eighteen-

foot ornamental iron gate that presides of the Garden's main entrance was hand copied from the traditional "Szekely Kapus" gate—typical of Eastern Hungary from where many of the region's Hungarian immigrants had migrated. Yet, the gate also contained a significant variation from the one on which it was modeled. It was made of wrought iron, in contrast to the tradition of wood gates, hand-painted and colored, that might commonly be seen guarding entrances to old world gardens. This departure drew upon the skilled labor of local Hungarian ironworkers in the Handcraft Metal Shop, just as the stone and ironwork in each of the gardens was completed by Italian, Czech, or Slovakian masons. More broadly, though, the skilled immigrant artists and craftsmen were transformative of the city's artistic landscape.⁴³

Just as the skilled craft workers, professionals, and artists active in Cleveland were transforming Cleveland's landscape, they were making the Gardens into significant artistic accomplishments in their own right. The gardens drew heavily from the professional expertise of noted landscape architects as well as on the creative talent of regional and international artists. Garden delegations worked closely with landscape architects, such as B. Ashburton Tripp, James Lister, or A. Donald Gray who trained at the country's most prestigious architecture programs. Their presence in Cleveland was due, in no small part, to the presence of wealthy clients that included the elite manufacturers, who lived along "Millionaire's Row"—reputed in the teens to be the wealthiest stretch of street in the world and a place to which international tourists flocked. Patrons, such as the iron-ore magnate Samuel Mather, funded projects meant at beautifying the city early in the twentieth century, creating a rich market for skilled craftsman, artists, and other creative professions, many of whom went on to leave a lasting mark on the city's landscape.

Drawing upon European traditions in garden design, the landscape architects collaborated with garden delegations to produce spaces that had distinctive ethnic flavors. Most of the gardens

were heavily influenced by principles of European landscape design, especially Italian Renaissance evident in the frequent use of fountains, pools, steps, and walls. Albert Davis Taylor, President of the American Society of Landscape Architects between 1935 and 1941, worked much of his life in Cleveland and is credited with bringing many such design principles to the United States.⁴⁴ Like water elements, religious designs shape many of the gardens. Burton Ashburton Tripp organized the Hebrew Garden upon an expansive brick-laid patio shaped into a Star of David, and A. Donald Gray designed the Irish Garden around a Celtic Cross, composed of turf, slate, and sandstone walks, and sedum-filled lunettes. Irish juniper, yew and white lilac, hawthorn, lavender and wisteria were planted; shamrocks, cowslips, and Shannon Roses bordered the cross. Present in nearly every garden, this celebration of Judeo-Christian tradition stands as one of the most visible unifying themes that drew gardens together, even though ethnic catholic churches were often a point of community conflict among new immigrants.⁴⁵

Garden delegations also turned to artists of local and international repute to sculpt the statuary they had selected for the garden. In so doing, the Gardens League supported the careers of regional artists and craftsmen. For example, Amos Mazzolini sculpted busts of Nobel Prize winning poet Henryk Sinkiewicz and pianist Jan Paderewski for the Polish Garden before embarking on a long career as an artist at Ohio's Antioch College, where he also opened an art foundry for teaching. Born in Cleveland to immigrant parents (Czech and German), Frank Jirouch sculpted as many as a quarter of the busts in the gardens, most notably the sculpture in the Czech Garden, including the magnificent architectural frieze depicting the history of the Czech people. Jirouch trained as a woodcarver in New York City and eventually attended the Philadelphia Academy of Fine Arts, later exhibiting at the Salon Francaise in Paris, where he lived for three years. Jirouch's architectural sculptural elements can be found in memorials

throughout the United States. The Ukrainian Garden turned to renowned cubist Alexander Archipenko, whose ingeniously carved figurative busts of Ukrainian nationalist poets, Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko, takes a subtly different approach to monumental sculpture than other works in the gardens. Interestingly, Archipenko's work for the Ukrainian only suggests his more radical interpretive works, suggesting the powerful manner in which the tradition of representative sculpture associated with nineteenth-century centenary commemorations shaped the gardens. Artists who worked in the gardens, such as sculptor Max Kalish, also engaged the city's burgeoning and renowned fine arts community by participating regularly in the Cleveland Museum of Art's influential May Show. Beginning in 1919, the May Show served as a vehicle to prominence for artists nationwide, such as Margaret Bourke-White and Louis Rorimer, but especially for those who won the juried competitions.⁴⁶

American national identity was yet another trope lurking beneath the surface of the Gardens' symbolism. For the Gardens' founders, the act of establishing and building the gardens symbolized a commitment to democratic ideals and citizenship. In this framework, the city's "nationality" communities embodied the polity of Cleveland and the nation. There would be no need, it would seem, to build a distinctly American garden. Indeed, how would an American garden fit into a scheme of nationality gardens celebrating diasporic identity in their new homeland? Who was an American? Apparently untroubled by such questions the Cultural Gardens League first invited the Cleveland Council Parent Teachers Associations to adopt a garden in 1933. The resulting American Cultural Gardens focused on patriotic expressions by schoolchildren and the celebration of satirist Mark Twain in 1935 and of United States Secretary of State John Hay in 1939 (an explicitly political figure). The presence of American patriotism in the Gardens grew increasingly strident when the Veterans of Foreign Wars began sponsoring an

American Legion Peace Garden. Having former soldiers involved would seem to conflict directly with the Garden League's emphasis on non-political and non-military figures. The Gardens' official historian, resolved this contradiction by emphasizing that Veterans were "pledged to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses, to promote peace and good will on earth and to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy. These concepts are the embodiment of the spirit and purpose of the Nationality Gardens." Even so, the addition of American Gardens undermined the symbolic relationship between the Cultural Gardens as metaphor for the United States and its constituent parts.

Contradictions between the Gardens found statements and commemorations only grew more pronounced, and tragic, at their formal opening ceremony in 1939. On the eve of World War II, representatives of 28 nations stepped to a monument of "Peace" and one-by-one, they deposited soil from their home nations, as well as from European battlefields, into a funnel that emptied into a "Crypt of Nations" at the base of the monument. "There is something terribly real about a handful of soil," wrote *Cleveland Plain-Dealer* reporter Roelif Loveland. On the one hand, the ceremonial placing of dirt made the crypt sacred, using a common technique used to remember war dead. At the same time, embodying national identity in a handful of dirt, though evocative at the level of metaphor, called forth ideas that contrasted with the Gardens founding ideology. In intermingling soil the Cultural Gardens Federation created an American Garden made up of European homeland that suggested the melting pot vision of American more than it did Weidenthal's vision of "one out of many." At the same time, the ceremony suggested another vein of thinking gaining currency at the time: the eugenicist notion that there were organic and biological foundations to identity that were tied to national origins in the most literal fashion.⁴⁷

Death

The war that had been on everyone's minds when the gardens were formally dedicated had a profound impact on the gardens, just as it had throughout the world. The German invasion of Poland in 1939 and the 1941 bombing of Pearl Harbor rendered moot political debates about how best to promote peace and brotherhood and avoid war. A new question was raised for the Gardens. How exactly does one demonstrate ethnic pride and "Americanism" at the same time? The answer quickly became evident as the League passed a resolution to "discontinue all public celebrations and demonstrations in behalf of our respective nationality gardens for the duration of the war." As members of the federation debated about what it meant to be "patriotic," they eventually loosened restrictions on holding public events in the gardens but determined that "none but the American flag be displayed on these occasions." Flag pins were distributed at garden ceremonies and the garden held a series of "four freedoms festivals."

As patriotism peaked, the Garden League's restrictions on sculpture became lax. In 1940, eighteen months before Pearl Harbor, Charles Wolfram strongly opposed an effort by the City Parks Department to place a statue to Lincoln within Rockefeller Park, contiguous to the Gardens. He wrote Parks Commissioner Samuel Newman, "We fully appreciate the importance of the Lincoln Memorial Garden but inasmuch as it expresses strictly an American Patriotic Historical sentiment with no reference to Nationality Groups it does not fit into the theme and sentiment expressed by the Cultural Gardens ... the Cultural Garden League of Cleveland ask that the Lincoln Memorial Garden be not included in the Chain of Cultural Gardens." Yet, not two years later, Wolfram wrote a fellow League delegate, "Our whole-hearted cooperation was pledged to the creation of a "Shrine to George Washington," to be dedicated on July 4th this year."⁴⁸ American identity was being forged in entirely new ways by the war. The gardens were redefined, continuing a trend that had begun in the 1930s.⁴⁹

The onset of the Cold War continued this process, transforming the gardens into places through which Clevelanders waged the battle for American democracy. In 1946, as the Cold War had begun to brew, the Cultural Gardens Federation inaugurated the first festival that involved its entire membership. Held in conjunction with Cleveland's Sesquicentennial, One World Day represented a significant new direction for the cultural gardens with a yearly common ritual. Also, the emphasis on peace, brotherhood, and diversity became subservient to the primacy of the cultural gardens as a place that represented distinctly American and sometimes militaristic values. The gardens ceased being places in which communities gathered to express distinctive values. Rather, the gardens became primarily symbolic places through which to express patriotic sentiments. For example, Ohio's Governor (and former Cleveland mayor) Frank Lausche noted "the melding of nationalities in this country presented a strong challenge to the leaders of communism. Americans of other national origins must have a devotion to this country above that to their ancestral heritage, the governor said. 'While I love the songs of Slovenia, I love America better,' he asserted." 1957's One World event ended with American folk dances, a personification of the Statue of Liberty and the audience singing "America."⁵⁰

The Cold War emptied the gardens of content, transforming them into a bare stage—one that celebrated the allegory that had been repudiated by the organization's founders. In 1954, The Cultural Gardens League's official history carried both a statement by Leo Weidenthal that emphasized diversity but a contradictory message from Anthony Celebreeze, the Mayor of Cleveland, declaring "The dream of the American melting pot has never been more clearly demonstrated than in the City of Cleveland where the Cultural Gardens stand as a memorial to the diverse nationalities and cultures of our city." A revised Cleveland Municipal School District government text declared about the gardens in 1963 that immigrants had become "truly

Americans, these people keep the best from the traditions of the Old World and blend them with those of the New World.”⁵¹

As the gardens’ intellectual integrity ebbed, its social foundation eroded, rapidly. Cleveland’s population stagnated following World War II. The city’s racial and ethnic composition changed dramatically. The black population grew by 300 percent between 1940 and 1960, while the white population shrank by 25 percent. Moreover, immigration restricted from a generation earlier altered the ethnic flavor of the city. Cleveland’s immigrant community was less than half as large as it had been in 1940; by 1960, only 1 in 10 Clevelanders were foreign born. Moreover, these folks were often elderly or refugees from Eastern Europe, whose anti-communist fervor stoked the fires of the Cold War in the Gardens, moving them further away from their founding principles. Post-war consumer culture attracted the children of immigrants to the suburbs on newly built highways that took them further and further from the gardens physically and intellectually. The now suburban children of immigrants became “white,” abandoning their ethnic heritage in favor of a more homogenized identity purchased in a shopping mall. Even Cleveland’s prominent and important ethnic heritage museums—Hungarian Museum, the Ukrainian Museum, and the Polka Hall of Fame—moved away from Cleveland. Ethnic communities stopped celebrating cultural figures in the gardens, as the Hungarian community celebrated a visit by anti-communist cleric Cardinal Mindszenty with a statue located downtown, not in the gardens. As Cleveland deindustrialized in the 1970s, the Cultural Gardens held on by a thread, led by aging ethnic communities.⁵²

As the mix of the gardens’ soil literally and figuratively changed, the Cleveland Cultural Gardens became a site of racial conflict, embodying the urban crises facing American cities in the 1960s, but also the coming economic and cultural problems associated with

deindustrialization. Like other northern cities, Cleveland underwent dramatic demographic shifts in the second half of the twentieth century and these conflicts that accompanied these changes would reconfigure the gardens culturally, socially, and physically. By 1940, African Americans from the south already comprised the largest single migrant group to Cleveland, and by 1960, Cleveland's black population more than tripled. By the 1960s, the migration of African Americans and the Civil Rights movement transformed the role that African Americans would play in Cleveland and other American cities. These shifts were especially pronounced in the communities immediately adjacent to Rockefeller Park. The immediately contiguous Glenville community was an affluent Jewish community through 1940, when the neighborhood was over sixty percent Jewish. At the same time, census maps show relatively few black families lived in any of the communities immediately adjacent to the park, although a few had begun to move into the Hough neighborhood. In Glenville, the African American population grew steadily beginning in 1940s, while the Jewish population plummeted by half. Glenville, though not the streets immediately adjacent to Rockefeller Park, had a growing African American population (40 %) in 1950. By 1962, the demographic change in the neighborhood was complete, when African Americans made up 96% of the district's population.⁵³

Precisely at this moment of change, the gardens suffered increasing vandalism—suggesting a changing investment in the gardens by nearby residents as well as those throughout the city more broadly. To be sure the gardens had always struggled to maintain their integrity against the work of vandals. Moreover, the motives of the vandalism were not, as later newspaper reports indicated, driven by racial issues. By the late 1950s, thieves had begun to target the gardens' bronze and copper sculptural elements for profit. Using torches, hammers, and chisels, they disassembled the gardens' architecture and sold them to junk dealers. In one

case in the Polish Garden in 1961, for example, the busts of Chopin and Sienkiewicz were removed. Chopin's bust had been sold to a local junk dealer for \$32, who sent it to Akron to be melted for its bronze. The police recovered the statue in three pieces before it was to be melted and located the other statue in the backyard of one of the suspects. Although recovered, restoring the pieces would have cost as much as \$2000 according to a local sculptor. If vandalism in the gardens was not a new phenomenon, it had begun to take a new and more disturbing turn.

Clevelanders were pillaging the gardens and selling them for scrap, and in the process beginning a process of deconstructing the urban landscape, of transforming the built environment into ready cash. This process was not new. In other American cities experiencing profound economic, demographic, and social changes—such as Charleston early in the 20th century or Baltimore in the 1980s—architectural and structural elements were taken from homes in exchange for cash.⁵⁴

By the late 1950s, the Cultural Gardens League (now the Cultural Gardens Federation) found itself battling community apathy, vandalism, and a new racial landscape. Of these, perhaps the most complex problem for them was how to involve African Americans in the garden. Interestingly, the records of the Cultural Gardens Federation reveal that its members had not once considered their African American neighbors as candidates for having a cultural garden, even as it continued its outreach to other ethnic communities. The challenge of incorporating African Americans into the gardens appeared abruptly, in 1961, when city councilman Leo Jackson proposed that a Negro Cultural Garden be built. Interestingly, his proposal was more directed to reclaiming park space for the surrounding black community and stopping the construction of a high-rise apartment building in the neighborhood than it was a claim on space in the Cultural Gardens. Even so, Mayor Anthony Celebrezze supported the proposals, for which community activists agitated, but the finance committee voted the measure down.⁵⁵

In 1966—the summer that the Hough riots exploded in the neighborhoods surrounding the gardens—racial tensions surfaced in the landscape of the gardens. The gardens acquired a new sensibility when the graffiti “Get Whitey” and “Black Power” appeared in black paint on over 20 sculptures, including Lincoln. The Culture Gardens Federation responded with surprising aplomb, removing the graffiti and offering a measured response. Speaking at the 21st Annual One World Day on September 11, 1966, *Plain Dealer* publisher and editor Thomas Vail said, “The unity symbolized in the gardens is America’s contribution to a world in which nations have not yet learned to live in peace and understanding.” Vail continued, “We should be reminded that the purpose of all of us must now be directed at curing the evils that have produced racial unrest.” Interestingly, Vail did not make a parallel call for the end of racial injustice, revealing the depth of the problems facing Cleveland. Nobody seems to have paid Vail much attention; the vandals or “stupid punks” were among the only people prosecuted during the Hough Riots. If their trial received plenty of media attention, they had not been the first to use the gardens as a site for racial hostility. Earlier that summer, white supremacists had covered the park buildings and benches – twice – with “anti-Negro slogans, swastikas and KKK symbols.” The gardens had become, according to Cleveland’s NAACP executive secretary George Livingston, “a battleground between Negro and white youths.”⁵⁶

Eventually, momentum developed to include African Americans in the garden, although the first efforts exposed the racial divide in Cleveland. In 1970, the American Garden dedicated a statue of Booker T. Washington memorial, under the auspices of the of the Tuskegee Alumni Association (Washington being the college’s founder). Its inscription emphasized Washington’s resolve that no man would “degrade my soul by forcing me to hate him.” But the monument was reported to have been twice dynamited by vandals. Clearly, a statue of Booker T. Washington in

the American garden was an insufficient expression of African-American cultural identity. In 1977, a separate garden was created when the Federation granted the land on the west side of Liberty Boulevard, which would be renamed Martin Luther King Drive in 1981. With little activity, though, the African American garden has stood a symbol of disunity, of the continuing problems of race in Cleveland. In 1983, a *Plain Dealer* reporter editorialized, “the Cultural Gardens, intended to be a monument to an ethnically pluralistic society, have instead become a metaphor for divisiveness and hatred, segregation and racism, unfair housing and the poor relations among people that are at the root of so many urban problems.”⁵⁷

Replanting

World War II began the process of making once vibrant and widely noticed sculpture gardens into invisible cultural artifacts, a process completed by demographic and social changes responsible for transforming American cities during the 1960s. Their moment, it seemed had past; their life had ended. Their nadir, not surprisingly, corresponded to Cleveland’s lowest points: the burning river, bankruptcy, and mass deindustrialization. And, yet, the gardens began to re-emerge with renewed purpose at the end of the 20th century. This process occurred slowly and hesitantly. In 1985, for the first time in 25 years, a new garden was added. Initially rejected by the Cultural Gardens Federation, a Chinese Garden was built apart from the chain, only being welcomed after it was constructed. During the 1990s, new leadership stabilized the gardens’ infrastructure and developed a plan to replace statues, repair fountains, and end vandalism. Though not fully successful, the gardens nonetheless benefited from over \$500,000 in investment during the first decade of the twenty-first century, as well as three new garden dedications—India, Latvian, and Serbian Gardens. In a sense, this new success, while not returning the gardens to their heyday, suggests that the cultural gardens were being replanted. For public sculpture

gardens to remain vital, they must be replanted regularly, and reconnected to the community—whether new communities or the communities that generated them. If the social landscape changes, as it has around Rockefeller Park and the Cultural Gardens, then the solution turned out to be the redefinition of the gardens themselves, the remaking of the complex. And, indeed, unlike other pieces of public art and sculpture, the physical and metaphorical structures of the Cultural Gardens allows for new plantings, additions, and alterations. This perhaps suggests a model for forward movement by the Cultural Gardens Federation, one that the organization has only embraced hesitantly.⁵⁸

ENDNOTES

¹ Interview with Gino Collage by Mark Tebeau, June 17, 2007; on the Cultural Gardens, the official history, published in 1954 is invaluable; Clara Lederer, *Their Paths Are Peace* (Cleveland, Oh.: Cleveland Cultural Gardens Federation, 1954); on Cleveland more broadly, see the Encyclopedia of Cleveland History, <<http://ech.case.edu/>> (January 1, 2007); Robert Wheeler and Carol Poh Miller, *Cleveland: The History of a City* (Bloomington, In.: University of Indiana Press, 1995); David Hammack, et. al., editors, *Identity, Conflict, & Cooperation: Central Europeans in Cleveland, 1850-1930* (Cleveland, Oh.: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1999); this essay also makes extensive use of the *Cleveland Plain-Dealer* Newspaper Morgue; the papers of the Cultural Gardens Federation (formerly the Cultural Gardens League) are housed at the Western Reserve Historical Society, Manuscript Collection 3700, hereafter cited as *Federation*.

² Robert Musil, "Monuments," in *Posthumous Papers of a Living Author* (Brooklyn, NY: Archipelago Books, 2006; English Translation, 1987, Peter Wortsman), 64-651.

³ Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities* (New York, 1938) 434; quoted in John Dixon Hunt, p. 24

⁴ Quoted in Kirk Savage, "The Life of Memorials," *Harvard Design Magazine* Number 9 (Fall 1999): 1.

⁵ For an excellent overview of the scholarly literature in the study of memory and monuments, see Kirk Savage's online essay for the National Park Service's research division, Kirk Savage, "History, Memory, and Monuments: An Overview of the Scholarly Literature on Commemoration," <http://www.nps.gov/history/history/resedu/savage.htm> (June 1, 2007); There is an expansive literature on public arts and historical approaches to them; for examples of the various types, see: Michele H. Bogart's fine essay "The Ordinary Hero Monument in Greater New York: Samuel J. Tilden's Memorial and the Politics of Place," *Journal of Urban History* Volume 28, No. 3 (March 2002), 267-299; Michele H. Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City, 1890-1930* (Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press, 1989); Penny Balkin Balch, *Public Art in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press, 1992); Harriet F. Senie, *Contemporary Public Sculpture: Tradition, Transformation, and Controversy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Harriet F. Senie and Sallie Webster, *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992). Michele H. Bogart, *Public Sculpture and the Civic Ideal in New York City, 1890-1930* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997); Michele H. Bogart, *The Politics of Urban Beauty: New York and Its Art Commission* (Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press, 2006); Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* (1997); Edward T. Linenthal, *Sacred Ground: Americans and their Battlefields* (1991); Martha Norkunas, *Monuments and Memory: History and Representation in Lowell, Massachusetts* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002); John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, Nj.: Princeton University Press, 1992); Melissa Dabakis, *Monuments Of Manliness : Visualizing Labor In American Sculpture, 1880-1935* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1998); Terence Young, *Building San Francisco's Parks, 1850-1930* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

⁶ It also provides richer insight into the communities whose endeavors led to creating such public monuments in the first place. Indeed, to imagine that a public memorial remains forever ensconced in the moment of its historical is historically reductive and may actually contribute to the death of public memorials, whose lives may depend on periodic reinterpretation and reinvention.

⁷ On the Lincoln Memorial, Scott Sandage, "A Marble House Divided: The Lincoln Memorial, the Civil Rights Movement, and the Politics of Memory, 1939-1963," *Journal of American History*, vol. 80, no. 1 (June 1993), pp. 135-167; on Civil Rights memorials, Kirk Savage, "The Life of Memorials," *Harvard Design Magazine* Number 9 (Fall 1999).

⁸ James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven, Ct.: Yale University Press, 1993).

⁹ This essay has a debt to John Bodnar's discussion of the Cultural Gardens even when my conclusions differ (not usually in substance, but in emphasis) from his; see John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, Nj.: Princeton University Press, 1992), especially 97-104.

¹⁰ For an introduction, see John Dixon Hunt, "'Come into the garden, Maud': Garen Art as a Privileged Mode of Commemoration and Identity," in Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn, editor, *Places of Commemoration: Search for Identity and Landscape Design* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), 20-21.

¹¹ On the history of Doan Brook, see Laura Gooch, *The Doan Brook Handbook* (Cleveland, Oh.: Shaker Lakes Nature Center, 2001); "Memorandum to the City Plan Commission Regarding Plans for the Yugoslav Garden," March 24, 1933, Folder 8, Correspondence, 1929-1938, Container 1, MS3700, WRHS.

¹² On parks and park planning, see David Schuyler, *The New Urban Landscape: The Redefinition of City Form in Nineteenth-Century America* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988); Roy Rosenzweig and Elizabeth Blackmar, *The Park and the People: A History of Central Park* (Cornell University Press, 1998); Galen Cranz, *The Politics of Park Design: A History of Urban Parks in America* (The MIT Press, 1982); Two examples are Central Park and Golden Gate Park; on these parks, see Roy Rosenzweig and Elizabeth Blackmar, *The Park and the People: A History of Central Park* (Cornell University Press, 1998); Terence Young, *Building San Francisco's Parks, 1850-1930* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

¹³ ECH: University Circle; Kenneth Kolson, *Big Plans: The Allure and Folly of Urban Design* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 49-64.

¹⁴ Weidenthal obituary

¹⁵ See, Phoebe Cutler, *The Public Landscape of the New Deal* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 29-30.

¹⁶ Young, pages?; On the City Beautiful movement and Progressive Era planning, see for example, Jon A. Peterson, *The Birth of City Planning in the United States, 1840-1917* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), and on Olmstead's rural cemeteries, see for example, David Schuyler, *The New Urban Landscape: The Redefinition of City Form in Nineteenth-Century America* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), 37-56.

¹⁷ Werner Habicht, "Shakespeare Celebrations in Times of War," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 441-455; Copellia Kahn, "Remembering Shakespeare Imperially: The 1916 Tercentenary," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 456-478.

¹⁸ Ronald Quinault, "The Cult of the Centenary, 1784-1914," *Historical Research* Vol. 71, No. 176 (October 1998), 3030-323.

¹⁹ See, for example, Henry Nicholson Ellacombe, *The Plant-Lore & Garden-Craft of Shakespeare* (London: W. Satchell & Co., 1884); Walt Crane, *Flowers from Shakespeare's Gardens* (London: Cassell, 1906)

²⁰ See, for example, Percival Chubb, *The Shakespeare tercentenary: Suggestions for school and college celebrations of the tercentenary of Shakespeare's death in 1616* (Washington, D.C.: National Capital Press, 1916);

²¹ Percival Chubb, "What the Shakespeare Tercentenary Celebration Might Mean for the Schools," *The English Journal* Vol. 5, No. 4 (April 1916): 237; Weidenthal, *From Dis's Waggon: A Sentimental Survey of a Poet's Corner; The Shakespeare Garden in Cleveland* (Cleveland, Ohio: The Weidenthal Company, 1926); WESTRHS,

²² Lederer, 39-43, F. Leslie Speir, *Cleveland: Our Community and Its Government* (Cleveland, Oh.: The John C. Winston Company, 1941), 107-108; Weidenthal, *From Dis's Waggon* (1926); *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, August 28, 1966; The Folger Shakespeare Library stands as perhaps the most remarkable American shrine to Shakespeare.

²³ On this point, I am indebted to John Grabowski, editor of the *Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, for insights and thoughts about the various members of the Cultural Gardens League, listed in the Cultural Gardens Collection at WRHS; on ethnic elites, see also Bodnar, *Remaking America* (1992), 94-109; Articles of Incorporation, ca. 1926, Folder 1, Container 1, MS3700, WRHS.

²⁴ WRHS, MS3700, Container 1, Folder 1, Articles of Incorporation, ca. 1926.

²⁵ Lederer, 9, 19-20; "Whatever Became of the Cultural Gardens?," *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, January 16, 1978; *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, October 11, 1942, July 11, 1951;

²⁶ Israel Zangwill, *The Melting Pot: A Drama in Four Acts* (New York: Macmillan, 1909); on the National Origins Act, see David J. Goldberg, *Discontented America: The United States in the 1920s* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 140-167; for a discussion of Zangwill and Shakespeare, see Copellia Kahn, "Remembering Shakespeare Imperially: The 1916 Tercentenary," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 456-478; for the Slovak statement see Scrapbook, Slovak Garden, Folder 2, Container 6, MS3700, WRHS.

²⁷ See, for example, December 7, 1938, "Letter from H. E. Varga to F. E. Bubna, Executive Assistant in Charge of Federal Relations," Container 1, folder 8, Correspondence, 1929-1938, MS3700; The American Colonial Garden Plan, August 17, 1937, Folder 1 Container XX, The American Colonial Gardens, MS3700; "Memorandum to the City Plan Commission Regarding Plans for the Yugoslav Garden," March 24, 1933, Folder 8, Correspondence, 1929-1938, Container 1, MS3700, WRHS; A Perspective of the Proposed Plan, The Slovak Cultural Garden, n.d., Oversize Folder, MS3700, WRHS; The Preliminary Plan, The Slovak Cultural Garden, n.d., Oversize Folder, MS3700, WRHS.

²⁸ *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, October 11, 1942, July 11, 1951; NARA, WPA State Records, Ohio Projects: Slovenian, 65-42-1952; Polish, 65-42-492; Greek, 165-42-3099; Czech, 165-42-3111 and 65-42-17175; Hungarian, 165-42-17156 and 165-42-3175; Yugoslav, 65-42-6594 and 65-42-3038; Hebrew, 65-42-3088; Lithuanian, 65-42-2255; Slovak, 165-42-3207; multiple garden projects joined by the City Parks Department, superseding earlier requests, 165-42-3207 and 465-42-2-109; replacing trees along Liberty Row, 65-42-9674; repairs, paths, channelization of Doan Brook, and other projects in Rockefeller Park, 65-42-11423.

29 Hammack, et. al., 12-44; also, Howard Green, and United States., *Population characteristics by census tracts, Cleveland, Ohio, 1930* (Cleveland Ohio: Plain Dealer Pub. Co., 1931); United States., *Sixteenth census of the United States, 1940 Housing, analytical maps, block statistics [for cities of a population of 100,000 or more]* ([Washington D.C.: , 1941); United States., *1960 Census of Population and Housing - census tracts: Cleveland, Ohio.* (Washington D.C.: 1960); United States., *1980 census of population and housing.* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Commerce Bureau of the Census ;For sale by Supt. of Docs. U.S. G.P.O., 1983).

Table 1: Cleveland Population

Year	Cleveland Population	black population		“White” Population		Native Born Whites		Foreign Born Whites		
		total	percent	total	percent	Total	percent of "white"	Total	percent of "white"	percent total
1930	900,429	71,899	8.0%	827,090	91.9%	597,603*	72.3%	229,487	27.7%	25.5%
1940	878,385	84,504	9.6%	793,417	90.3%	614,234	77.4%	179,183	22.6%	20.4%
1960	876,050	250,818	28.6%	623,020	71.1%	527,773	84.7%	95,247	15.3%	10.9%
1980	573,822	251,347	43.8%	322,475	56.2%	289,128	89.7%	33,347	10.3%	5.8%

30 WRHS, CCGF, MS3700, Cleveland Cultural Gardens—Authorization Ordinances: photocopies from, The City Record, September 3, 1930; The City Record, May 9, 1927; Speir, 108; Lederer, 22;

³¹ Such sympathies are described in Hammack, et. al., ??; A Perspective of the Proposed Plan, The Slovak Cultural Garden, n.d., Oversize Folder, MS3700, WRHS; The Preliminary Plan, The Slovak Cultural Garden, n.d., Oversize Folder, MS3700, WRHS.

³² See aerial photographs, for instance, in Cleveland Memory, Cleveland Cultural Gardens Collecton, <<http://www.clevelandmemory.org/gardens/>> (June 1, 2007).

³³ “Unification Plan for the Cultural Gardens,” A Radio Talk given over WGAR January 30, 1937, Harold E. Atkinson, Folder 8, Correspondence, 1929-1938, Container 1, MS 3700; Unification Plan for Cultural Gardens, Jos. S. Kreinberg, excerpts from City Plan Minutes of January 5, 1937, Folder 8, Correspondence, 1929-1938, Container 1, MS 3700; Harold E. Atkinson, *The Cultural Gardens of Cleveland*, 1937, City Archives of Cleveland.

34 *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, League Emissary Plants Tree Here, April 3, 1935; Cultural Gardens Draw League Eye, April 7, 1935; Tour Cleveland’s Famous Cultural Gardens, July 2, 1935.

³⁵ Traveling to Washington, New York, Chicago, St. Louis, and San Francisco reveals just how significant the gardens are. This is not to say that Cleveland is devoid of public sculpture outside the gardens. Nor is it to say that the public statuary in other places are not related. To the contrary, that statuary is certainly interconnected, at least ideologically. And, finally, this is not to say that other parks do not possess sculpture gardens. San Francisco’s Golden Gate Park has a magnificent collection of statuary, included a series of cultural gardens, situated within a smartly designed architectural landscape (near to the Museum of Modern Art.) And, yet, the statuary does not interact or possess the common idiom of the Cultural Gardens. This is true internationally, as well, although in recent years landscaped sculpture gardens have begun to

come into fashion as a way to display art. This, however, differs from the public gardens of the early twentieth century as well as the tradition of commemorative sculpture.

36 Bodnar, *Remaking America* (1992), especially, 93-109. Bodnar describes the gardens in terms of “Europe in America,” which captures a portion of the sentiment behind the gardens, but not the entirety of the subtleties. The garden delegations were also making statements about their citizenship and entering international debates, as I argue here. On ethnic conflict in Cleveland, see Hammack, et. al., *Identity, Conflict, & Cooperation*, which contains nicely wrought examples of conflict and cooperation in search of identity, as the title suggests.

37 Lederer, 55-61; Speir, 107ff; *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, October 11, 1942, July 11, 1951; in subsequent years, prominent figures were dedicated in ceremonies that reflected in multiple directions. In 1932, the Hebrew Garden simultaneously honored Sir Walter Scott, the author of *Ivanhoe*, and Rebecca Gratz, a prominent nineteenth-century Jewish reformer in Philadelphia and reputed inspiration for the character Rebecca in the novel, with a plaque and ivy drawn from her gravesite in Philadelphia. Noted in *Time* magazine in 1932, the honoring of Gratz suggests the clever and tangential ways in which Gardens would honor people in ensuing years. See <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,744493,00.html> (January 1, 2007).

38 For a description of these statues and their significance, I triangulated references in Lederer, entire, Speir, 106-113, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer* stories, and Wikipedia entries. For examples of additional essays that framed my thinking here, see for instance, Alfred Erich Senn, *Lithuania Awakening* (Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press, 1990), 35; online at <http://ark.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft3x0nb2m8/> (January 1, 2007); Mikulas Teich, “Review: The Meaning of History: Czechs and Slovaks,” *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (June 1996), 553-562; Davic Aberbach, “The Poetry of Nationalism,” *Nations and Nationalism*, Volume 9, number 2 (2003), 255-275.

39 Hammack, et. al., 64, 331-332; *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, September 16, 1937, May 16, 1938; WRHS, CCGF, MS 3700, General Minutes, 1932-1952.

40 Lederer, 22; also, for examples, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, October 9, 1936, September 14, 1937, April 8, 1938, July 11, 1938, July 16, 1938, July 6, 1938, January 23, 1939; WRHS, CCGF, MS3700, Container 1, Folder 3, Minutes, 1932-1952: 3/17/36, 4/23/36, 9/12/41; WRHS, CCGF, MS3700, Container 1, Folder 4, Minutes, 1949-1963: 4/27/50. Also, the project is documented in WPA records at the National Archives, see National Archives and Record Administration, Works Progress Administration State Records, Ohio (on microfilm), Project Numbers: Slovenian, 65-42-1952; Polish, 65-42-492; Greek, 165-42-3099; Czech, 165-42-3111 and 65-42-17175; Hungarian, 165-42-17156 and 165-42-3175; Yugoslav, 65-42-6594 and 65-42-3038; Hebrew, 65-42-3088; Lithuanian, 65-42-2255; Slovak, 165-42-3207; multiple garden projects joined by the City Parks Department, superseding earlier requests, 165-42-3207 and 465-42-2-109; replacing trees along Liberty Row, 65-42-9674; repairs, paths, channelization of Doan Brook, and other projects in Rockefeller Park, 65-42-11423.

41 WRHS, CCGF, MC 3700, Container 4, Folder 6; Census Data from year 1940. <http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/census/>; Norbert Yassanye, “Garden Dedicated by Yugoslav Group,” May 16, 1938, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*; James D. Hartshorne, “Co-Op Effort Called Way to Avoid War: Speech at Gardens Viewed as Bid for Presidential Support for Campaign,” July 31, 1939, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*; “Ten-Year Dream Comes True As Irish Dedicate Garden Plot,” October 30, 1939, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*; Margaret Suhr Reed, “26 Nationalities Celebrate

Cultural Gardens' Birthday," May 6, 1951, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*; for radio broadcasts, see for example, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, July 6, 1938.

⁴² Scrapbook, Slovak Garden, Folder 2, Container 6, MS3700, WRHS.

43 John Mihal, "Flow of Roman Culture Will Theme Garden," September 15, 1937, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*; "Arts of Hungary," *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, July 1, 1938; "Garden is Dedicated to City's Hungarians," *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, 1938; WRHS, CCGF, MS3700, Folder 2, "Let's Build it Now!"; Papp, 552. Firms, such as Rose Metal Works or Potter & Mellon, or designers such as Victor Schreckengost shaped the built landscape and material culture of the city, region, and nation with work whose distinctiveness related to their history as migrants, the children of immigrants, and/or their relation to local institutions. On Cleveland arts and artists, see for example, William H. Robinson, editor, *Transformations in Cleveland Art, 1796-1946: Community and Diversity in Early Modern America* (Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1996), discussion of Rose Iron Works draws upon interviews with Melvin Rose; Cleveland State University, Euclid Corridor Oral History Project, Interview with Melvin Rose, conducted by Colin Emma Yanoshik-Wing, November 2005, Interview 999009; Cleveland State University, Euclid Corridor Oral History Project, Interview with Melvin Rose, conducted by Mark Tebeau and David C. Barnett, April 2005, unnumbered; also, see a public history project developed by Nina Gibans, <<http://www.clevelandartandhistory.org/>> (January 1, 2007).

⁴⁴ On Taylor, see <http://ech.case.edu/ech-cgi/article.pl?id=TAD> (June 1, 2007).

45 See Lederer, entire; the Encyclopedia of Cleveland History; Speir, 114-116.

46 See Lederer, entire; Encyclopedia of Cleveland History, entries: Jirouch: <http://ech.case.edu/ech-cgi/article.pl?id=JFL>; Kalish: <http://ech.case.edu/ech-cgi/article.pl?id=KM1> (January 1, 2007); Robinson, *Transformations*; The Cleveland Museum of Art Archives, Records of the May Show.

47 "Just Plain Soil Welds People of 28 Nations," unidentified newspaper, July 31, 1939, *Cleveland Plain Dealer Newspaper Morgue*. The crypt was opened once again a decade later, in honor of the creation of the state of Israel, soil from the grave of Zionist leader Theodore Herzl (brought from Israel by Judge Drueher) was added to the soil in the crypt. On this, see WRHS, CCGF, MS 3700, General Minutes, 1932-1952, October 21, 1949. "League Emissary Plants Tree Here," April 3, 1935, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*.

⁴⁸ May 6, 1940, Letter from Charles Wolfram to Samuel Newman, Folder 9, Correspondence, 1939-1948, Container 1, MS3700, WRHS; March 21, 1942, Letter from Charles Wolfram to member of the Cultural Garden League, Folder 9, Correspondence, 1939-1948, Container 1, MS3700, WRHS.

49 WRHS, CCGF, MC 3700, Box 1, Minutes, Cultural Garden League, December 1941, March 24, 1944; James D. Hartshorne, "Co-Op Effort Called Way to Avoid War: Speech at Gardens Viewed as Bid for Presidential Support for Campaign," July 31, 1939, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*; "Czech History to be Carved on Garden Wall: Stone Tablet to Record Text Compiled by Local Committed," Sept. 26, 1938, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*.

50 WRHS, CCGF, MC 3700, Box 1, Minutes, Cultural Garden League, July 1946; "Marine General To Unveil Statue: Bust of Washington To Be Dedicated in Garden," June 30, 1943, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*; *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, August 4, 1952.; "Fusion of Six Cultures Hails One World Day," *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, 1957.

⁵¹ Lederer, 17; Frank Durham, *Government in Greater Cleveland* (Cleveland, Oh.: Howard Allen, Incorporated, 1963), 45.

⁵² United States Census; Wheeler & Miller, for a regional example of deindustrialization and its impact, see Sherry Linkon, *Steeltown U.S.A.: Work and Memory in Youngstown* (Lawrence, Ks.: University of Kansas Press, 2002); on the Ukrainian story, I pull from oral histories with Andy Fedynsky and Lena Pogrebinsky conducted by me or my students; on the Ukrainian and Hungarian museums, see their websites: <http://www.jcu.edu/language/hunghemu/hunghem2.htm> (January 1, 2007); <http://www.umacleland.org/history.htm> (January 1, 2007). The Sculpture Center in Cleveland has an inventory of over 1000 pieces of public art sculpture through the state of Ohio: <http://www.sculpturecenter.org/oosi/oo.asp> (January 1, 2007), which is a remarkable resource; in it is an image of the Mindszenty sculpture dedicated in Cleveland in 1975: <http://www.sculpturecenter.org/oosi/subjectlist.asp?PS=Hungary&SS=Mindszenty%2C+Cardinal+Joseph> (January 1, 2007).

⁵³ See, for census data and explanations, Todd Michael Michney, *Changing Neighborhoods: Race and Upward Mobility in Southeast Cleveland, 1930-1980* (University of Minnesota, Dept. of History, June 2004); Howard Whipple Green, *Census Facts and Trends by Tracts, Special 1954 Report* (Cleveland: Real Property Inventory of Metropolitan Cleveland, 1954); Howard Whipple Green, *Population, Family, and Housing Data by Blocks, Cuyahoga County, Special 1941 Report, Real Property Inventory of Metropolitan Cleveland* (Volume 1, 1941), 284-286; Howard Whipple Green, *Population, Family, and Housing Data by Blocks, Cuyahoga County, Special 1941 Report, Real Property Inventory of Metropolitan Cleveland* (Volume 2, 1941), 168-169, 174-175; William A. Behnke Associates, *Rockefeller Park: The Future of Rockefeller Park—A Positive Statement* (1981), 9.

⁵⁴ See, for example, Cleveland Public Library, Photograph Collection, Cleveland—Parks—Rockefeller—Cultural Gardens: *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, May 27, 1965; *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, January 27, 1965.

⁵⁵ “Council OK’s Garden Plan of Jackson,” *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, December 12, 1961; “Negro Culture Garden Blocked,” *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, June 26, 1962.

⁵⁶ “Undivided World Grows in Gardens, Says Vail,” *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, September 12, 1966. Note that Vail calls for an end to racial unrest, not racial injustice; “Cultural Gardens Vandals Hit,” *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, September 9, 1966.

⁵⁷ “African Envoys Dedicate Garden for Black Culture,” *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, October 24, 1977; “Cultural Gardens Reflect City’s Illnesses,” *Cleveland Plain-Dealer*, May 28, 1983; “Pride and Prejudice,” Madeline Drexler, *Cleveland Plain-Dealer Sunday Magazine*, August 11, 1985.

⁵⁸ Finally, I too have become involved in revitalizing the gardens as this project developed. At first, my involvement was merely a convenient outgrowth of the research, using the gardens as a teaching focus in a research-based, regional history and history methods course. Students became interested in the gardens through course projects, and the gardens took on new life, which we transformed into radio “sound portraits” and then a website that made the gardens more accessible, albeit on in cyberspace. Interesting, that collaborative website, which remains unfinished has begun to draw attention, with as many as 500 unique visitors per week, possibly more than the gardens themselves. See student-made “Sound portraits” on public radio; five stories, part of WCPN’s *Accents* programming—<http://www.wcpn.org/accents/feature.html>; Cultural Gardens Website—<http://www.culturalgardens.org/>.