A Tradition of Involvement

The Cleveland Foundation’s interest in public education can be traced back to 1915, when it commissioned a comprehensive investigation of the performance of the Cleveland schools, which were then struggling to cope with the needs of a rapidly growing immigrant population from southern and eastern Europe.

The school study had sprung from banker Frederick Goff’s intention of having his new foundation conduct “a great social and economic survey of Cleveland, to uncover the causes of poverty and crime and point out the cure.” With this public announcement, coming within six weeks of The Cleveland Foundation’s creation in January 1914, Goff revealed his considerable expectations for the role such a trust could play in the life of its community. Three-quarters of a century later, the Foundation would still be struggling with how best to fulfill the mission Goff had envisioned for it when the concept of a charitable trust held for the benefit of an entire city had still been little more than words on paper.

Goff’s ambitious plans were as much rooted in pragmatism as in idealism, however. The newborn foundation had, as yet, no funds, although Goff shared with reporters his belief in 1914 that within 10 years Clevelanders would endow it with $100 million in bequests. The survey, which Goff and his business associates were prepared to underwrite, would be a way for the penniless foundation to make an immediate contribution—by increasing public awareness of the problems facing a community in the throes of rapid urbanization.1 It would also be an indispensable blueprint to guide the Foundation’s grantmaking at that future date when income was available for distribution.
The research project, which Goff expected would take two years to conduct, was to be modeled after a study of living and working conditions in Pittsburgh's steel district. The study was conducted in 1907 with funding from the Russell Sage Foundation, a newly formed national philanthropy dedicated to "the improvement of... living conditions in the United States" through social science. But, according to Goff, who had taken pains to familiarize himself with the methodology recommended by the Sage Foundation's director of surveys and exhibits, the Cleveland effort would be more comprehensive than the 100 or so other municipal studies the Pittsburgh study had since inspired.

"The rapid increase in foreign population has brought its attendant problems," Goff told a Cleveland Press reporter. "... Tenement houses, playgrounds, the segregated district [where houses of prostitution were tolerated but confined], the problem of delinquent children, infant mortality and every cause which leads to distress among the inhabitants of Cleveland will come under [examination] with a view to ascertaining whether or not the present-day machinery of social and industrial life is adequate to deal with the needs. ... In brief, what can be done to make Cleveland a better place to live in and hence to do business in?"

Concurrent with Goff's announcement of the Foundation's ambitious undertaking, a five-member Survey Committee was chosen to oversee the research by the same authorities empowered to appoint the Distribution Committee. Chaired by a local manufacturer who sat on the board of Cleveland Trust, the Survey Committee soon grew with the addition of a paid director, Allen T. Burns, whom Goff had recruited from Pittsburgh, where he had been executive secretary of a civic commission formed to carry out the recommendations of the Sage survey. As events would have it, however, Burns was never called on to conduct the comprehensive municipal survey Goff had originally contemplated. Once the founder's plans for the new community trust were publicized, the Foundation began to be approached from all quarters with requests that it conduct studies of a multitude of social evils—some as limited in scope as dangerous railroad crossings, others as complex as the causes of socialist fervor among newly arrived immigrants.

From this menu of problems the Foundation would select, over the course of its first decade in existence, eight topics that it deemed sufficiently weighty to engage the spirited public debate it believed was required to prompt reform. Each carried out by a team of national ex-
perts, these independent and largely unrelated surveys would cost more than $200,000. Goff, his friends and Cleveland Trust itself underwrote this then princely sum with apparent good cheer (the latter viewing the contribution as a legitimate advertising expense for its trust department). Though several of the surveys yielded only modest fruit, the three largest would lead to much-needed (if only temporarily salutary) overhauls of Cleveland’s systems of public education, of recreation and administration of justice. Indeed, two of the surveys could have changed, dramatically and favorably, the course of Cleveland’s economic development. Unfortunately, both would come to naught.

The first, a study of the Cleveland lakefront aimed at turning it into a recreational resource similar to those in Chicago and Toronto, was proposed by the Foundation’s first full-time director, Raymond Moley. However, the project was shelved when Moley accepted a job elsewhere. The second was a survey of higher education; its principal recommendation, that Western Reserve College and Case School of Applied Science be merged into a municipal university to rival those in New York, Boston and Chicago, went unheeded. It would be left to a succeeding generation of Cleveland Foundation leaders to undertake the lakefront’s redevelopment and help strengthen the finally merged Case Western Reserve University.

In retrospect, the most enduring contribution of the survey years was to establish a precedent for a local philanthropy to act as a civic agenda-setter and problem-solver. Because this tradition would inspire the creators of the similarly enterprising Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation in the sixties, who cited the survey work as justification for their undertaking, the first 10 years of the Foundation’s life bear examination in some detail. (They have additional interest as perhaps the most colorful period in The Cleveland Foundation’s history.)

The topic of The Cleveland Foundation’s first survey was “poor relief,” as the city’s embryonic welfare system was called. The investigation had been suggested by Belle Sherwin, the daughter of the founder of the Sherwin-Williams paint company and one of the city’s most prominent volunteers. Miss Sherwin, a graduate of Wellesley College and a former girls’ school teacher, was no Lady Bountiful. A trustee of the Federation for Charity and Philanthropy, she was a tireless civic planner who helped design a parallel organization, the Cleveland Welfare Council, to coordinate the work of the city’s social service agencies. In April 1914 Miss
Sherwin had been asked to become its founding president. During the council's first 18 months she called dozens of meetings, many of them concerned with the increasing demands being placed on the city's private and public relief agencies by a severe recession that year. Faced in the fall of 1914 with the imminent prospect of the entire system running out of funds, Miss Sherwin asked Allen Burns, a member-at-large of the Welfare Council, if The Cleveland Foundation would consider conducting a speedy study of how to strengthen the city's relief effort.

The Foundation decided to shelve temporarily Goff's plans for a much broader survey. (The project may have looked less appealing in light of the previously mentioned federal investigation of the untoward influence of private philanthropy.) Instead, Burns made arrangements to bring to Cleveland Sherman C. Kingsley, director of the Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund of Chicago, and Amelia Sears, welfare director for Cook County. Among the most notable features of their subsequent report, issued on December 1, 1914, was a plan for the complete reorganization of the city's relief department in preparation for its assumption of all the burden of assisting the poor. This recommendation, which went unheeded, preceded by almost 20 years the New Deal measures that transferred responsibility for public welfare from the private sector to the state.

A significant by-product of the first survey was the establishment of a close working relationship between the Foundation and the city's social service coordinators. This bond was tightened when Sherman Kingsley became the first executive secretary of the new Welfare Federation of Cleveland, formed in 1917 from the merger of the Welfare Council and the Federation for Charity and Philanthropy. The appointment of Federation trustee Belle Sherwin to the Foundation's first Distribution Committee the same year would add another channel of communication between the two organizations. When in the forties and fifties the understaffed Foundation began to rely on the Federation's evaluation of the merits of the agencies and programs that were requesting funding, the ties would become constricting. Yet in the beginning the Foundation's collaboration with the Federation proved synergistic.

In January 1915, for example, the Survey Committee formally decided to abandon its plans for a comprehensive municipal survey in favor of investigating one topic of societal interest at a time. Looking for guidance on what the Survey Committee should do now that its relief study
had been completed, Burns turned to Miss Sherwin and her Welfare Council. Subjects under consideration, according to reports in the local paper, were occupational diseases, the "social evil" (a euphemism for prostitution) and city housing policies that permitted "one of the most notorious rookeries in the United States . . . to exist in downtown Cleveland—a huge building erected not so many years ago, where hundreds of families are living in dank, poorly lighted rooms [with] . . . inadequate . . . sanitary arrangements." However, according to the Welfare Council's 1914–15 annual report, "the Executive Committee was agreed that the educational needs and opportunities of the city . . . should be considered first."

Then as now, the Cleveland public schools were overseen by a seven-member board elected by popular vote, and political considerations often reigned over educational ones—a dynamic that had hamstrung action on the problems of an increasingly overcrowded and antiquated system. Despite the proposed survey's price tag of $50,000, Goff agreed that "the schools are the very thing we ought to tackle. Nobody else dares do it."

To direct the project, Goff and Burns hired the director of education of the Russell Sage Foundation, Dr. Leonard P. Ayres. A former school superintendent with a penchant for statistics, Ayres had made a national name at Sage with his research on spelling. (In analyzing 2,000 letters of all kinds, Ayres had discovered that 50 words carried 50 percent of the communication burden and that 2,000 words comprised the letter writers' entire vocabulary. "If 2,000 words is all we need," he had concluded, "why learn to spell 2,001?" His assessment had influenced the writing of a generation of spelling primers.)

Ayres brought a similar perspective to the Foundation's survey, which was announced on April 13, 1915, at a luncheon meeting of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce—a forum no doubt chosen because Ayres had determined that the survey ought to focus on promoting social and industrial efficiency. Did the schools adequately train pupils to perform in an increasingly mechanized world? "The trade worker today is a specialized man," Ayres pointed out at the luncheon. He elaborated:

The coat I wear was the product of 39 separate mechanical operations. My shoes required more than 100 different operations in their manufacture; in producing them, more than 45 different machines were used. Just as the manufacturer
today analyzes his coal and his steel so as to find out how to use them to best advantage, so we must analyze the occupations and processes of industry so we may develop effective courses of instruction in training workmen.

Ayres and his research staff began presenting their findings to the public that fall. At a series of regular Monday meetings open to anyone with the price of 60 cents for lunch, Ayres laid out a comprehensive plan for modernizing the Cleveland public school system, every component of which received front-page coverage in the newspapers. To set the stage for his recommendations, at his second presentation on November 15, Ayres issued a blanket indictment of the schools' performance. Out of the total student population, Ayres reported, only one-third were progressing satisfactorily, while the remaining youths were either slow in their progress or among the 2,500 pupils who dropped out of school each year because they were overage.

In subsequent meetings more than 100 recommended changes were introduced, including specialized instruction for the gifted, the handicapped, the foreign-born and the incorrigible; vocational education expanded beyond a course in woodworking; the teaching of such previously ignored subjects as civics and general science; a free textbook policy; consolidation of separately housed technical, commercial and academic programs for high school students into single buildings; enforcement of daily and compulsory attendance; the provision of health care, hot lunches and library services for all students; more rigorous teachers' certification; and establishment of a policy-making-only function for the school board.

Ayres had accepted the survey assignment on the condition that the Foundation secure the cooperation of the school board and the superintendent. School officials received in advance drafts of each survey report to review for factual errors. The superintendent's good will toward the project soon disintegrated into expressions of hostility or feigned indifference under the pressure of all the negative publicity. By the time a summary of the survey's 25 separate hardbound reports was published in January 1917, the board had hired, with Ayers's assistance, a new administrator, Frank E. Spaulding.

The former head of the Minneapolis public schools, Spaulding shared Ayres's passion for social efficiency, which no doubt helps to account for
the fact that fully three-quarters of the survey's recommendations were ultimately implemented, the Foundation determined in a follow-up investigation six years later. During that time, 9 of 11 board seats up for election had been filled by candidates pledged to noninterference in administrative matters, and five school-bond issues totaling $30 million had been approved. Both phenomena were measures of the heightened public interest in education the survey had helped to generate. Another was the brisk market for the individual hardbound reports; in the intervening six years 100,000 volumes had been sold. Orders came from educators in every corner of the county and even from overseas, and for several decades afterward, the Cleveland public schools were widely considered a model system, though problems with truancy, high dropout rates and the nonperformance of disadvantaged students persisted.

Encouraged by the overwhelming acceptance of Ayres's work, the Survey Committee decided in late 1916 to undertake a related study focusing on recreation. Scheduled to be completed in the fall of 1917, the survey was inspired in part by a concern for the unwholesome influence of pool rooms and the streets on young people who had nowhere else to play, in part by recognition of the consequences of the trend toward a shortened, eight-hour workday. The committee asked employee Burns to direct the research, with technical assistance to be provided by Rowland Haynes, New York City's recreation secretary.

As had been the case with the education survey, the project was launched in the name of the new American ideal. "What we want to do is to apply the same principles of efficiency to leisure time as they are applied to working hours," Haynes told Cleveland reporters on December 14, the day the project was announced. He continued:

The tendency everywhere is for a shorter workday. That's going to produce problems of how the extra leisure should be spent. We want to point the way.

There will be unlimited questions raised and, I hope, answered. . . . How far is the saloon the poor man's club and what would replace it if the state should vote dry? Should the city have a municipal theater? How much of your young people's lives are going to the scrapheap, and how can we stop the waste?

Research was divided into two parts: an investigation of existing public, private and profit-oriented recreational agencies and an analysis of the leisure-time needs of school children, juvenile delinquents and
adults. Only three of the contemplated six reports had been published when work ground to a halt. America had finally declared war on Germany.

Yet it was a bitter row between Goff and Burns that put the Foundation out of the survey business for the duration of the global conflict. Their dispute had its origins in an attack a prominent Methodist minister had made from the pulpit on Cleveland’s mayor. On October 28, 1917, the Reverend M. H. Lichliter of Epworth Memorial Church had stood before his parishioners and accused Mayor Harry L. Davis of winking at the development of a new “segregated” district more obnoxious than the red-light zone, which had been put out of business by the previous mayor. The story broke in the Press the following Tuesday under the banner headline: “Pastor Offers Davis Proof of New Vice Zone.” The proof was Allen Burns’s assertion that a nest of 27 brothels had been discovered by field researchers working for the recreation survey. Embroiled in a close race for reelection, Davis denounced Lichliter’s charge as a “colossal falsehood,” and the two men exchanged salvos in the papers for several days to come.

In the meantime, incensed that the Foundation’s survey director would publicize its findings unofficially and prematurely, Goff angrily denounced Burns in the newspapers. Burns took umbrage at the public dressing-down, believing that he had had ample justification for what he had done. As it turned out, Mayor Davis had been using as a campaign tool a letter written by a second Cleveland minister that had been published in the newspapers. It praised the mayor for keeping prostitution and gambling under better control than had ever been the case before. Burns, who was a member of the council of churches to which the letter writer belonged, had informed the minister of the survey investigators’ findings to the contrary and had asked the man to correct the public record. When the minister refused, Burns had gone to Lichliter, a member of both the council of churches and a civic committee acting as an advisor to the recreation survey. Lichliter had decided that he would set the record straight.

But Goff would have none of it. After all, Davis was a fellow Republican and the mayor’s campaign chairman was a director of Cleveland Trust. Burns, feeling cruelly misjudged, resigned as director of the Survey Committee. Shortly afterward, the Survey Committee suspended
operations, citing the pressure on its members of more urgent war business as the official reason for abandoning its work.

The Foundation's first Distribution Committee would resume the recreation survey after the end of the war. Steel manufacturer Thomas G. Fitzsimons, dry-goods wholesaler Malcolm L. McBride, machine-tool manufacturer Ambrose Swasey, real estate owner James D. Williamson and Belle Sherwin had been appointed to the committee in the spring of 1918, when it had become clear that the Foundation would shortly realize income from its first trusts. But the members did not meet in earnest until January 5, 1919, when approximately $25,000 had been accumulated. With sizeable funds finally at its discretion, the committee decided that its first act should be to finish planning for a community-wide recreation program, a move that had been requested by the Welfare Federation's Sherman Kingsley, who was concerned by the fact that his organization and several others were being called upon to develop separate and unrelated plans to meet the recreational needs of returning soldiers. The Distribution Committee also voted to begin a search for a man of "broad social understanding" to become the Foundation's permanent director.

That spring, Raymond Moley, an ambitious 33-year-old professor of political science at Western Reserve University, was casting about for gainful summer employment. A colleague reminded him of the discontinued recreation survey, and Moley approached Belle Sherwin to suggest that the Foundation hire him to complete it. Moley, whom the mayor had put in charge of organizing citizenship classes for Cleveland's foreign-born during the war, had met Miss Sherwin in her capacity as the leader of women's activities for the Mayor's Advisory War Committee. Miss Sherwin, who had been impressed with a speech Moley delivered, "Effects of the War on Political Thought, Organization and Action," gladly recommended him to the Distribution Committee. In May 1919 he was hired.

Revealing the political acumen that would serve him well both as the leading member of the "brain trust" that later guided FDR into the White House and as Roosevelt's first assistant secretary of state, Moley immediately set up an appointment with Goff, whom the Distribution Committee had not consulted before reactivating the recreation survey.
“Four members of the . . . Committee, including Miss Sherwin and one of the appointees of the Cleveland Trust Company, [had] supported Burns after the outbreak,” Moley would later explain. “They resented Goff’s interference with the survey which was properly the exclusive concern of the Committee. . . . But [Goff’s] cooperation was [now] most essential as the resources of the Foundation were so limited that dependence must be placed upon him to find the money for the [recreation] survey.” His meeting with the banker, Moley recounted, “did much to dissipate old differences.”

Moley finished work on the recreation survey in late 1919. Among other things, it called upon the Cleveland Board of Education to increase expenditures on recreational programming and to operate the city’s playgrounds, thus consolidating responsibility in one body. (Both measures were adopted for a time.) Other recommendations resulted in the creation of city-sponsored sports leagues, a separate tax to support the Cleveland Public Library and a new coordinating body to “sell to the people of the city wholesome spare time activities,” as Moley later put it. That the initial reaction of the mayor to these proposals would be cool was surprising only to those with short memories. “I understand the survey cost $35,000,” said Harry L. Davis, who had been reelected in 1917, but was apparently still fuming from his encounter with Moley’s predecessor. “This money could have been more profitably employed in paying the salaries of additional police.”

Despite the mayor’s reservations, the recommended coordinating body, with Rowland Haynes as director, was established the following year under the auspices of the Welfare Federation. The Cleveland Recreation Council immediately began pushing for the passage of a special tax levy to allow the Metropolitan Park Board to purchase parkland in outlying districts. With 50 influential citizens whom the council had led on a guided tour to Bear Mountain Park in New York orchestrating the cheerleading, the levy passed; and the park board set about assembling what would become known as the “Emerald Necklace,” a chain of greensward and connecting parkways that today encircles Cleveland with 19,000 acres of enviable open space.

Well before Moley had completed the recreation survey, he had begun thinking about his next career move. Weighing an offer of an associate professorship from the University of Minnesota against the position of Foundation director that he knew was available, he decided to go after
the latter as the more important job. He set up a meeting with Belle Sherwin, in which he hinted at his interest in the Foundation position. Miss Sherwin said that she would consult with the other Committee members and see what they thought,” Moley remembered. “This was characteristically Belle Sherwinesque. For such was her prestige in the field of social welfare and such was the dominance of her personality that, while pretending to consult her colleagues on the Committee, she was really making up their minds for them.”

What Moley failed to factor into his assessment was Goff’s preference, which was to hire Leonard Ayres as director. Although Belle Sherwin had made it known that Moley was available, the Distribution Committee decided to follow Goff’s wishes and offered the position to Ayres. Having just returned from service as the War Department’s chief statistical officer, Colonel Ayres declined to leave the Russell Sage Foundation (although a year later he would accept Goff’s offer of a vice presidency at Cleveland Trust and a subsequent invitation to become the Foundation’s secretary.) That left only one candidate, Moley, whom the committee invited to present his ideas for the Foundation’s next survey at a meeting on July 24, 1919.

Two months earlier, on May 1, a demonstration by trade unionists and members of Cleveland Socialist party in downtown Cleveland against the recent jailing of Socialist leader Eugene Debs had led to a riot, leaving two persons dead. Fearful that the “red scare” sweeping the city could lead to more deaths, “Prof. Moley spoke at length regarding the need of making a careful examination of the unrest among certain classes of people especially in the large cities.” After Moley left, the Distribution Committee, satisfied that he was indeed a man of “broad social understanding,” named him director, fixing his salary for a one-year term to begin September 1st at $5,000.

On October 10, 1919, with the Foundation settled into its first official headquarters downtown at 1202 Swetland Building, Moley more fully explained his proposed survey of “‘Direct Action’ Socialists” to the Distribution Committee. He wanted to hire an investigator with foreign-language skills to interview “a considerable number of immigrant workers . . . and, through sympathetic questioning, learn something about their attitude toward their adopted country.” Even though the technique of case studies was then in its infancy, Moley believed that it would produce “a picture, however limited, of the immigrants’ prob-
lems of adjustment and thus, by communicating such information to the city power structure in industry, government and social life . . . promote a better relationship all along the line."

Winning approval for the concept and his projected budget of $2,600, Moley hired a Hungarian-born newspaperman named Joseph Remenyi to search out disaffected immigrants in back-alley lodgings, coffeehouses and cafes across the city. Venturing forth evenings and Sundays when the immigrant workers were free, Remenyi would transcribe his interviews from memory the following day. (To ensure that his subjects would talk freely, he made no notes.) Remenyi's work in gathering a body of usable interviews continued well into 1920.

In the meantime, the Foundation had been unofficially asked by the Welfare Federation to conduct a survey of "the Treatment of the Offender in Cleveland," Moley reported to the Distribution Committee on March 2, 1920. The city was then in the midst of a "crime wave," as the newspapers described a series of spectacular unsolved murders—many of them committed in broad daylight by holdup men—whose toll was on its way into the high 20s. The violence was symptomatic of a deeper disorder: the breakdown of a centuries-old Anglo-Saxon system for the administration of justice that was straining to meet the needs of industrial, urban America. Federation secretary Sherman Kingsley, appearing at the March Foundation meeting in person, gravely certified that "conditions in the courts, the police and the correctional institutions were in great need of study, that the Delinquency Committee of the Welfare Federation had not succeeded in helping matters because of the lack of facilities for investigation and that the probation system was particularly in need of adjustment," according to the minutes.

The Distribution Committee agreed to consider the Welfare Federation's request for a study, but at meetings throughout the spring and summer Moley begged the committee's indulgence for once again postponing a promised progress report on the matter. In the interim he considered the possibility of a survey studying the role played by the city's foreign-language press in the socialization of immigrants, which he ultimately discarded as too limited in appeal. He also gave a speech on Remenyi's preliminary findings on immigrants at a mid-June luncheon meeting of the City Club of Cleveland. ("The way to combat radicalism is not through instrumentalties of repression," Moley argued, reporting that the 400 case studies Remenyi had conducted
showed that the leading causes of the immigrants' alienation were under-use of their Old World skills by employers and domestic unhappiness.)

Then something incredible happened. In November 1920, the chief justice of Cleveland's municipal court was indicted for the murder of a man with whom he had been drinking. The incident prompted Moley finally to pursue an investigation of "whether faults in the method of pursuing and punishing criminals had anything to do with the prevalence of crime," as a Foundation brochure on the resulting criminal justice survey described its focus. He arranged for the Cleveland Bar Association to make an official request that the Foundation undertake the survey. Upon receipt of a letter to that effect, Moley sought and won Goff's blessing, contingent on the director's also persuading the mayor to request the Foundation's involvement.

On December 6, 1920, Moley reported to the Distribution Committee that the Welfare Federation, the Chamber of Commerce and the League of Women Voters had joined with the bar association and the mayor in urging the Foundation to act. He then presented a memorandum detailing his thoughts on the scope of the survey, his recommendations for potential directors and the reasons why he felt it was needed. His argument dramatically concluded:

One of the striking features of Mr. Remenyi's study was the fact that the immigrant feels more distrust of our courts and the administration of laws than any other public or private institution. When we consider that the population of Cleveland is so overwhelmingly of foreign birth this distrust is not without very serious implications. The immigrant who finds the instrumentalities of justice available only to the fortunate and the cunning is not very likely to ignore the agitator who would lead him to revolution.

Despite Moley's newfound sense of urgency, the Distribution Committee withheld its approval of the survey, authorizing Moley only to conduct a search for a possible director. Two weeks later, back from trips to New York, Boston and Chicago, where he had consulted with leading criminologists, Moley had narrowed his list of preferred candidates to one man: Roscoe Pound, dean of the Harvard Law School. The committee authorized Moley to return to Boston to interview Pound. On January 4, 1921, he reported back that Pound was very interested in the problem of law administration in large cities, but he could not spare the time to manage the survey alone. Would the Foundation accept
Pound as nominal director and his colleague, Harvard law professor Felix Frankfurter, as on-site manager of the survey? Actually, Frankfurter had pronounced himself too busy to make more than fortnightly trips to Cleveland, but because the arrangement was the only way to acquire the Harvard imprimatur for the Foundation's undertaking, Moley argued for accepting it. In the end the Distribution Committee approved a resolution that Pound and Frankfurter be authorized to undertake the proposed survey "at a cost not to exceed $25,000 and to complete the work by July 1, 1921." A midsummer deadline would allow time for the findings to be disseminated before the election of judges in the fall.

Moley announced the survey (which would end up costing Goff and the bank more than double the budgeted amount) the day after the Distribution Committee meeting. "We have hesitated to undertake the survey," he told reporters, "because such efforts are usually foredoomed to failure, but we believe the spirit of the city has been aroused and that we will have the approval of the people in this work." Even though Moley had accurately predicted the response of the editorialists, he did not anticipate the vociferous objections certain attorneys and businessmen would voice regarding his selection of Felix Frankfurter. They regarded the future Supreme Court justice—he would become that body's first Jewish member—as a dangerous radical because of his pro-labor sympathies, made clear during his service as a member of President Wilson's War Labor Policies Board. Leading the behind-the-scenes attack on Frankfurter was the Foundation's own attorney, James R. Garfield, the son of the 20th president of the United States.

Moley suspected that religious prejudice also motivated some of the protest, an issue he answered at length in a letter to an old friend, prominent Cleveland attorney Harold T. Clark. Moley urged Clark, who had served with him during the war on the mayor's Americanization committee, to "use your influence with those to whom the selection of Frankfurter was not at the outset pleasing in bringing them into the good work of making this survey a success." Clark, who would go on to play an even more pivotal role in the Foundation's life in the sixties, agreed to serve on the survey's advisory committee. By mid-January more than 40 other civic leaders had also joined, and their collective backing was more than sufficient to silence all naysayers.

By mid-February, Pound, Frankfurter and Moley had agreed upon six areas of concern and the national experts who would handle each inquiry.
For the study of court organization and administration, they landed Reginald Heber Smith, a Boston attorney (and future president of the American Bar Association) who had written the eye-opening *Justice and the Poor* for the Carnegie Corporation in 1919; the survey of police would be handled by Raymond B. Fosdick, the author of respected books on American and European law enforcement. (Fosdick went on to become president of the Rockefeller Foundation). Their choices of authors for the reports on prosecution, penal and correctional treatment, psychiatry and medical relations and legal education had solid, if somewhat less dazzling, credentials. Learning after work was under way that his collaborators had all encountered the press as a contributor to the problems under study, Frankfurter suggested adding as a seventh topic an examination of newspaper coverage of crime, a proposal to which the Distribution Committee gave its assent in April 1921. The following fall *The New Republic*, which had been impressed with the inclusion of investigations of the press and especially of the legal profession, at whose feet the magazine laid primary responsibility for the failures of America’s criminal justice system, would praise the survey as “broadly and courageously planned.”

The work, of course, did not proceed as smoothly as it might have. Costs had soared, and the July 1, 1921, deadline came and went without the arrival of all the manuscripts. In an attempt to save his planned announcement of the survey findings in September, Moley wrote Frankfurter to urge him to lean on his collaborators. Frankfurter responded heatedly on July 15:

Writing reports of this kind is wholly different from turning out standard parts of a Ford machine.

... What the Dean and I insist upon is the scientific quality of the result. We are not writing to catch the stimulated, sensational desires of a hurrying afternoon crowd, seizing its daily headlines. Unless you and your Committee get the fundamentally different purpose of the Survey from the ordinary fleeting, catch-penny crusade, you will get nowhere. That is why I am shocked at your statement that the Report “cannot go over into December because by that time, public interest will be entirely gone.” ... I know all about “putting over,” and the “psychological moment” and the rest. But the deep reason why so much that is “put over” doesn’t stay put is that we are trying to catch the hasty, passing, emotional interest instead of recognizing that we are enlisting in a long-term campaign, the very starting point of which is the persistent
of qualification, loafing on the job, undignified conduct, failure to punish perjury and overconcern with reelection as common judicial sins.

Smith had scarcely left the podium on September 14, 1921, at the public meeting to announce his findings, when the counterattack began. The presiding judge of the appellate court denounced the work as "a roast . . . not constructive criticism." "The survey's . . . unjust," pronounced the chief clerk of Cleveland municipal court. Smoldering over the "criminal waste of money," Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court Judge Homer G. Powell went so far as to threaten to jail the Distribution Committee for contempt. The committee promptly huddled with Foundation attorney James Garfield, who advised the members to tell "Judge Powell that he could send the sheriff anytime he wanted to receive us."

A more serious threat to the survey's credibility emerged later, when Leonard Ayres spoke about it to members of the City Club in February 1922. Rising from his seat after the address, Cleveland juvenile court judge George S. Addams lambasted the sections covering his court and detention home, calling the report "full of the grossest errors and mis-statements" and claiming that investigators had never stepped inside his chambers. Ayres responded that Pound and Frankfurter had had previous knowledge of the judge's criticisms from his review of the report's draft—not-picking that they had weighed and discounted. Nonetheless, "the fact is that [Addams] did get the sympathy of a large part of the crowd and some impression was left with them that the Judge had been badly treated . . . ," Moley wrote Frankfurter on March 1, 1922. Moley explained:

This, of course, gave the News the chance they have been looking for since they have learned that the survey of the newspapers is to be published and they proceeded to give the whole thing a big front-page story in the Sunday paper. . . . Ayres and I prepared a letter to [Addams] in which we called upon him to state specifically once more the errors and that we would be glad to consider them in putting the report through to its final publication. In reply . . . the Judge broke forth again last Saturday with an enormous letter addressed to Mr. Goff.

The News printed the letter in its entirety. Concluding that Addams's written charges required a definitive reply, the Distribution Committee asked Moley to prepare a written response in consultation with Frankfurter and the appropriate field investigators.
But Frankfurter wanted no surrogate to handle his defense. He answered Addams's allegations point by point in a letter to the committee, maintaining that the judge "mistakes good will for ill will, charges incompetence where there is no incompetence, and fastens on a few details to the exclusion of all else in a fairly comprehensive study." The committee ordered 200 copies of the Addams-Frankfurter correspondence printed and made them available to "those having a special interest in the standards and procedures of the Cleveland Foundation."

With the last challenge to the survey's integrity surmounted, Moley now concentrated on publicizing its findings, making dozens of speeches in and out of town and writing numerous summaries to publicize the reports. An aroused public interest had already prompted improvements in Cleveland's criminal justice system, which Moley could trumpet. Two offices that had been criticized by the survey for their lax operations, the city workhouse and the prosecutor's office, had a new superintendent and an almost totally new legal staff, respectively. Gone, too, in cases involving serious crimes, was a mandatory police court appearance before the grand jury hearing—a technicality that had added, according to the survey, weeks and sometimes months to the scheduling of trials. A central probation office had been created within the county common pleas court to replace the unstandardized practice of bench parole, and the state legislature would soon enact a law giving the formerly leaderless court a chief justice to supervise all administrative matters. At municipal court, a candidate who had run with the backing of the bar association had been elected chief justice. (In the years following the survey's call for the nonpartisan election of judges, the bar's endorsement would assume greater importance than party affiliation.) Moley even attributed the election of a former Cleveland police chief as mayor to the influence of the survey. "The survey having come out within the last two months has thrown the administration of justice sharply in the foreground," he wrote Frankfurter two days after the mayoral election in November 1921, "and the people, poor things, thought that by electing a policeman they would solve their difficulties."

Another important development was the creation, at the Foundation's instigation, of a watchdog agency by a coalition of 13 civic and business groups in January 1922. Within three months the Cleveland Association for Criminal Justice had posted two full-time observers at municipal and
Con condolences flooded in to Cleveland Trust, including an expression of sympathy from John D. Rockefeller, who telegrammed: "I knew him only to honor and most highly respect him." The Distribution Committee passed a memorial resolution pledges to carry forward his plans with "unremitting zeal." However, bereft of the founder's vision and encouragement, if not his financial support, the Distribution Committee would let an opportunity to change the course of Cleveland history for the better slip through its grasp.

The summer before his death, Goff had sent the Foundation a check for $7,000 accompanied by the message that he hoped the Distribution Committee would not refrain from planning new enterprises because of a lack of funds. That September Moley had briefly presented his thoughts to the committee about the issue to which the Foundation might next direct its attention: Cleveland's lakefront. To further illuminate the nature of the problem, Moley had brought to the next committee meeting governmental navigation charts of Cleveland's and Chicago's shorelines, which made clear that "the latter city was far ahead... in making its lakefront available for use by the public for park and lake drive purposes."

In January 1923, one month before Moley announced his resignation and two months before Goff died, the committee had instructed the director to prepare a report explaining exactly what his proposed study of the lakefront would entail.

Nine months passed before Moley submitted his written report. (In the interim the director had spent several months attempting to persuade the committee to publish the Remenyi report, which had been shelved while the crime survey was being conducted. The Distribution Committee ultimately declined to publish, questioning both the work's scientific basis—a nonissue—and its timeliness, which had indeed passed.) At his final meeting with the Distribution Committee on September 19, 1923, Moley presented a lengthy memorandum recommending that the Foundation undertake a campaign to redevelop the city's 17-mile-long shoreline, only 2.5 miles of which were open to the public. Cleveland, Moley believed,

in addition to the remarkable record it had made in building civic and social institutions, needed a physical setting appropriate to its distinction. This it lacked because its greatest physical asset had been neglected, its frontage on Lake Erie. While Toronto, Milwaukee and Chicago had made their lakefront beautiful and at the same time useful to the people of the city, Cleveland had
permitted commercial enterprise to litter the shore of the lake with unsightly docks, buildings, and railroad tracks. The cost of such tremendous development . . . should mainly be a charge upon the public purse. But the inspiration to bring it about and the planning and some of the cost might be something to occupy the Foundation for years to come.

The Distribution Committee concurred that the project should be pursued. But, in the 11 months that elapsed before the Distribution Committee hired a new director, no further mention was made of the study, and more than 50 years would expire before the Foundation considered the issue again.

Rather, the Distribution Committee occupied itself with the routine administration of the modest income from the Foundation’s four trust funds (although the recipients had largely been predetermined by the donors). Then, in late February 1924, committee chairman Malcolm McBride received an intriguing appeal in the mail. Signed by the president of the Case School of Applied Science and the president-elect of Western Reserve University, it was a request that The Cleveland Foundation undertake a study of the feasibility of merging the two rival institutions. Their joining forces to create a great municipal university had been periodically suggested since the 1880s, when the liberal arts college had moved from nearby Hudson, Ohio, to Cleveland’s University Circle, adjacent to the site where the Case engineering school would be founded. Yet nothing had ever come of the discussions, including a formal request made in 1914 by Cleveland Mayor Newton D. Baker of Fred Goff that an examination of the possibility be included in the new Foundation’s contemplated municipal survey.

With a new, young president to be inaugurated at Western Reserve in fall 1924, the time again seemed auspicious to the trustees of both stubbornly independent institutions to talk of federation, for each school realized that it had not kept pace with the city’s ever-increasing needs for broader and more sophisticated educational offerings. The Distribution Committee agreed. In April it authorized the expenditure of $10,000 for the proposed study to be conducted that summer by Dr. George F. Zook, chief of the division of higher education of the U.S. Bureau of Education, under the supervision of none other than vacationing professor Raymond Moley. The Foundation officially announced the survey, which ultimately cost $20,000, in late May. The president of Case “is very anxious that the publicity should not stress the fact that
this is to be a study looking toward... amalgamation... but rather that it should be along the lines that Cleveland needs a great university,” McBride advised Moley in writing beforehand. “... [This] would cause less feeling among his trustees. Some of them are getting along in years, and... are very jealous of the prestige of Western Reserve University, and I think you know the whole situation without my saying anything more about it.”

That fall Zook came back with the not unexpected recommendation that Case and Western Reserve be merged into an “expanded” university to be built on a new campus easily accessible to all parts of the city. He estimated that the project, which would strengthen the two institutions’ existing programs in the liberal arts and engineering and provide Clevelanders with new schools of education, business and journalism, night classes and an expanded graduate school, would cost $16 million. The day after the release of Zook’s final report, the developers of the Cleveland suburb of Shaker Heights, O. P. and M. J. Van Sweringen, offered to give the proposed university a 300-acre tract in Shaker Heights near the future homes of a Jesuit college, a private school for boys and another for girls. The offer of a site at the new “University Circle” the Van Sweringens were building was, however, good for only 90 days and had long since lapsed when, in the spring of 1925, the trustees of Case approved Zook’s proposal on the conditions that the combine would be called the University of Cleveland and that details of its management could be worked out to their satisfaction—namely, that Case be allowed to maintain control of its own internal affairs. (As Case’s president had forewarned Zook in a letter sent before the survey was completed, “If [it]... should recommend that the president of the new university be the president of each of the constituent parts, it would place Case... under the same control as though it became a part of Western Reserve... and this is one of the things which we have been very much opposed to in the past and I think would be opposed to in the future. If we are to develop engineering education to the highest degree, it seems to me that it must be wholly under the direction of those who understand it and sympathize with it.”)

In July 1925 the trustees of the liberal arts college responded to Case’s statement of conditions with their own statement that the name of the federated university must remain Western Reserve. Their refusal to compromise ended serious negotiations and dashed the city’s hopes for “a
great light on a hill [as Zook had envisioned the University of Cleveland], drawing all men and women under its beneficent influence.”

The higher education survey would be The Cleveland Foundation’s last. In the late twenties the Foundation entered a period of relative invisibility and reticence, partly in reaction to fallout from its thoroughgoing investigation of Cleveland’s justice system. Although the survey had been greeted with interest and praise on three continents, the controversy it provoked in its own hometown had considerably dampened the Foundation’s ardor for further fact-finding missions.