

Planning Washington Highlands

I. Werner Hegemann – Life

As a younger son of a manufacturer, Werner Hegemann was born on June 15, 1881, in Mannheim, a growing industrial town on the river Rhine, known for its baroque city center. Due to the divorce of his parents, Hegemann was educated at schools all over Germany, taking his final exams in 1901. The death of his father in 1900 left him a young man of independent means under the tutelage of his uncle Otto March until he came of age. March, a renowned Berlin architect, vested him with an interest in art history and architecture.

A term of general studies in Berlin and military services rendered Hegemann free for studies in Paris and Philadelphia before he finally enrolled for political economics. In 1904 he married the young teacher Alice Hesse and they had a daughter, living in the bustling town of bohemian Munich where Hegemann studied with Lujo Brentano and finished his Ph.D. thesis in 1908, dealing with classical finance economy.

The same year, the family returned to Philadelphia for a year of further studies. Hegemann took an interest in Philadelphia's housing conditions, studied its newly established Housing Inspection, visited and reported on New York's municipal planning exhibition of 1909, organized by the Municipal Art Society and the Committee on Congestion of New York. There and then, his visiting uncle Otto March and Hegemann sparked an idea. Berlin had held a first competition for a general plan and its plans were to be shown publicly next year. What about turning this exposition into a first full blown German city planning exhibition? In the summer of 1909 Hegemann applied for the „Boston 1915 Exposition“ to be held in November and became a member of its Exhibit Committee. „Boston 1915“ was a city's philanthropic undertaking to develop Boston into an ideal community by 1915, its exposition showing the efforts of every social group to better the city.

At the end of 1909 Hegemann was called home to be made general secretary of the International City Planning Exhibition of 1910 in Berlin, March having succeeded with his plans. The vast exhibition contained the Berlin plans, German and international architecture and city planning, attracting a vast national and international public. It was repeated in Dusseldorf and shown partly in London in the same year. Hegemann, who acted as its spokesman and guide successfully, was finally commissioned with the exhibition's official presentation. He made it a condition to study personally all the European towns which were to be discussed and composed two volumes on Civic Art, establishing a new discipline.

In 1913 Hegemann returned to the US, now alone, since traveling had ruined his marriage. He was to give city planning lectures in several cities on invitation of the People's Institute of New York. Starting from New York, he delivered lectures in about twenty cities. Hegemann made thorough tours of the towns and discussed their problems and chances, emphasizing the City Functional, thereby taking a crucial part in shifting the focus of planning, which was mostly concerned about the City Beautiful. When his tour ended in California, he bought himself a small motorcar, touring the west coast up to Seattle. Later on the municipalities of Oakland and Berkeley engaged him to do a comprehensive planning report which was published

in 1915. Hegemann delivered a broad analysis, stressing the potential of the East Bay cities and confirming his view of planning as a corporate undertaking.

For his way home Hegemann chose the pacific route, visiting australian towns and sightseeing in asian countries. With the outbreak of the First World War his german ship was brought up in the coastal zones of Africa, its passengers interned in Mozambique. After several months of hunger and diseases Hegemann succeeded to flee as a stowaway on a norwegian sailor. Received friendly by its crew, the ship brought him back to the US where he stranded at Gulfport and finally made his way back to New York to work as a city planning consultant.

Setting up his own firm with the landscape architect Elbert Peets from Harvard, the partners specialized in suburban development and private gardens. Joseph Hudnut, later Dean of Columbia's and Harvard's School of Architecture, was a part-time staff member. Meanwhile Hegemann met his second wife Ida Belle, nee Guthe. Born in Ann Arbor, she was the daughter of a german-born physicist and seems to have lived happily in Germany during the Weimar years. Married in 1920, they were to have four children.

Desillusioned by the aims of planning and the decline of business, the partners dedicated themselves to a collection of fine examples of civic art. By 1922 they authored a vast documentation of american civic art, called „American Vitruvius“, presenting over 1.000 illustrations. Peets had contributed sketches from his european stipend tour, Hegemann had collected american model building. Thereby they contributed vastly to the self-discovery of a discipline in the making. Though the book was not regarded favourably up to its rediscoveries in 1972 and 1989 due to the authors' opposition against the traditional Harvard School it acquired an unprecedented reputation when Theodora Kimball recommended it in 1923 for every planner's library. By the end of 1921 Hegemann and his wife left the US for extended travels in Italy, where their first child, a daughter was born in Naples. Meanwhile Hegemann dabbled at literature, digesting the discussions on politics with his american friends and coming up with a severe critique of german political thought.

Back in Berlin, he was made editor of a well-known architectural review. To reintroduce himself, Hegemann edited a german version of his book on american civic art in 1924. Now it was designed to contradict the european avantgarde and their idols Frank Lloyd Wright, Louis Sullivan and Lewis Mumford. His opposition was debated hotly among the modernist architects and by years of provoking critiques – editing the monthly review up to 1933 –, Hegemann and his review became unique. The stylistic range and international focus of the architecture reviewed were unequalled among the contemporary reviews as was the literacy of Hegemann's articles.

At the same time, Hegemann engaged in political criticism. He voiced his opposition against traditional german political thinking in weighty literary volumes. He passed judgement against idolatry in order to educate republicans for a post-war Germany, and named his first book „Fridericus“, debunking a national hero to encourage democracy. He made a lot of enemies, the historians being especially hostile to his views but was approved of by other authors and colleagues. He wrote on „Napoleon“ in 1927 and „Christus“ in 1928, english editions published from 1929 on, and became

a widely known author, but not a rich one. When he merged his architectural and political criticism in 1930 in a book on Berlin to explain the errors, mistakes and offences made in building the city, this was to be the book he usually is known for, even today.

Traveling on another lecture tour in south-american cities for the better part of 1931, Hegemann returned to enforce his former criticism of the national socialists. Having made right-wing enemies since 1924, he attracted even more attention by a series of newspaper-articles comparing the nazis to their acclaimed heroes from history. His publisher pressed him to leave Germany in the early days of Adolf Hitler's regime. By February of 1933, Hegemann left for Switzerland and made his family follow him by March, rightly, since Hegemann's books were burned publicly in May 1933 with those of countless other undesired authors. The family's home, a house built after his own design, was confiscated in 1934; Hegemann expatriated in 1935.

When the family had spent a summer in Switzerland, Hegemann desperately seeking work, Alvin Johnson invited Hegemann to teach at the New School of Social Research in New York City. Having already spent his money on the University in Exile, Johnson contrived to come up with a small salary to keep the Hegemann family who arrived at New York City in November of 1933. Hegemann gave courses on planning and lectured on the New York Regional Plan. Finally in 1935 Joseph Hudnut succeeded in attaining the help of the Emergency Committee for Displaced German Scholars. Even managing to find sponsors for the second half of Hegemann's salary, Hudnut was able to appoint Hegemann Associate in Architecture, to teach planning within Columbia's new curriculum. Meanwhile Hegemann worked frantically. He tried to resume political criticism in order to support Roosevelt's New Deal and published a book on „City Planning Housing“ in 1936, arguing for the expropriation of slum lords in Lincoln's and the Abolitionists' tradition. When he died prematurely of pneumonia on April 12, 1936, the two subsequent volumes were edited by his friends. His wife, Ida Belle Hegemann, left with four minor children, took up teaching again and his children and grandchildren became Americans.

II. Hegemann and the United States

During 1909, the year spent in the US after his doctorate, Hegemann studied Philadelphia's housing inspection and its social work as well as the activities of New York's Committee on Congestion, Municipal Art Society and the Single Taxers. All those groups and the men involved impressed him with their ideas of reform and the progressivism of the social gospel. With his visiting uncle, the Berlin architect Otto March, a plan was formed: to turn the show of Berlin's first competition plans into a first comprehensive city planning exhibition to propose reform in Germany. Therefore Hegemann became one of the exhibit managers of the „Boston-1915 Exposition“ of 1909. A municipal and philanthropic undertaking to develop Boston into an ideal community by 1915, propelled by its City Club, it was concerned with „efficiency“, meaning to coordinate the efforts of its every social group. Hegemann became infected by these ideas and returned to Berlin to be made general secretary of the „Staedtebauausstellung“ (Exhibition of Civic Art) 1910.

Though its vast presentation of american works had not been his merit, Hegemann made them popular. He wrote a noted report on the Chicago Plan, afterwards organized several exhibits in a separate „Parkausstellung“ to make a tour of additional cities, prompting reform ideas. The aesthetics of Frederic L. Olmsted's landscapes and the organized spaces of Daniel Burnham's Chicago Parks became an admired item, supporting the layout of „Volksparks“ in german cities. Moreover, Hegemann personally organized a grand display of Jules Guerin's paintings of Burnham's Chicago-Plan for the Dusseldorf-part of the exhibition. The splendour of future Chicago corroborated the prewar concept of grandeur for the city center of civic pride, restaging downtown's economy within greek temples.

But in his voluminous work on the exhibition Hegemann began to blend ideas: he discovered a progressive tradition of social and city planning in Germany to be revived by modern experts. Though not an architect by education, he became familiar with the best works of building and planning during extended european travels he undertook to study his object.

When Frederic C. Howe, Director of the People's Institute, asked around for a german expert to lecture in american cities, hoping for a promotion of municipal socialism and efficiency attributed to german towns, it was Hegemann who was recommended to him. Hegemann, somewhat disillusioned after a failed campaign for better housing in Berlin, arrived in 1913 with a declared interest in dampening this enthusiasm but was dissuaded by Edward M. Bassett.

Finally Hegemann surprised his hosts with a thorough critical viewing of their towns, responding to regional needs and chances. During his tour of about twenty cities he blended the best of both conflicting concepts, of efficiency and splendour, into one and advised his audiences to view planning as a corporate undertaking. His thorough study for the municipalities of Oakland and Berkeley suggested a strict hierarchy of items and objects to optimize after careful consideration to effect a better city, ranging from replanning the harbour to homely rose-gardens.

From 1916 on Hegemann worked as city planning consultant, soon opening his own firm with his partner Elbert Peets, a landscape architect from Harvard. Due to the First World War, the firm seems to have prospered most in counties with german-

american population. Only several of the firm's projects are known. A lengthy consultancy with Walter J. Kohler for a model industrial city at Kohler WI did not succeed. Their work at its best can be seen in Washington Highlands, Milwaukee, 1916-1919, marked today as a historical site. Wyomissing Park, a large site planning at Reading PA, 1917-1921, was only partly executed. A suburban development at Madison WI, called Lake Forest, 1917-1923, was a failure since the ground-water level prevented further building and the developers went bankrupt. But large private gardens have been landscaped by Hegemann & Peets as well, presumably more than reported.

When business became slow during the war and depression years, the partners looked for compensation. Desillusioned by the failing of the social gospel, planning by now absorbed by establishing zoning ordinances, they assembled a thesaurus, the „American Vitruvius“ of 1922. Peets contributed drawings from his european stipend tour, integrating a perspective favoured by both authors: the views and vistas pleasing to the flaneur in the big city. Hegemann collected and presented types and models of american building. Opposing the traditional Harvard School, the authors once again upheld the idea of inner city beauty, nonetheless stressing the american additions to the planning agenda: civic centers, campus, suburban development and parks. Theodora Kimball recommended the book for every planner's library in 1923. Back in Europe, Hegemann was asked to edit the english catalogue of the International Cities and Town Planning Exhibition, held 1923 in Gothenburg, Sweden. Thus enabled to resume contacts with former friends and colleagues, he criticized their work nonetheless, proving himself the independent critic of his Berlin years of 1924-1933. The thesaurus' german version of 1924, now called „American Architecture and Civic Art“, was designed to counteract the european modernists and their idols like Frank Lloyd Wright, Louis Sullivan and Lewis Mumford. Hegemann tried to establish a more realistic image of american building, a view highly disputed by german architects. But it stood its ground despite the following quarrels on Modernism. Hegemann firmly implanted the planning agenda with the scyscraper of moderate height, coordinated suburban planning and urban transport as means of modern city planning not to mention parks and playgrounds.

His Berlin years were dedicated to architectural and political criticism. Hegemann set to provoke the idealistic traditions of german political thought – even voicing his objections by a fictitious american character, modeled after Boston friends.

In 1931 Hegemann was invited for another lecturing tour in South America. In 15 lectures he acted true to his principles. Firmly contradicting modernist solutions like Le Corbusier's vision for Buenos Aires, he confined his advice to demonstrating the probable outcome of existing zoning and building ordinances, underlining the potentials of vernacular building and its widely accepted types.

When Hegemann returned to the US in 1933 he met and worked with Henry Wright at Columbia University. Because of his broader concept of planning he fitted well into the new curriculum of planning. A students' project with Hegemann exemplifies modernised suburban planning: a sociological survey, comprehensive execution plans, graded house-sizes, community buildings – now in international style, the new style having shifted its meaning to a symbol of democracy.

Meanwhile in „City Planning Housing“, in 1936 Hegemann called for a revaluation of american tradition: to revalorize the american vernacular and its regional and historical styles, ideas he shared with his friend of long standing, the art historian Sidney Fiske Kimball. He set himself in Lincoln's and the Abolitionists' tradition to demand the expropriation of slum lords. Impressed with the political developments at home, with impoverishment and unemployment, Hegemann aimed at supporting the New Deal. In contrast to most emigrés, Hegemann was radicalised not cautioned. Being not a socialist, but an ardent liberal, however with his credo of enabling the workmen to support himself, he tended to outrun his colleagues on the left, thereby clearly overcharging them. Nonetheless, the third volume of „City Planning Housing“, another thesaurus edited after Hegemann's premature death, by his friends in 1938, translated his ideas into a sequel and contemporary version of his „American Vitruvius“.

III. Lectures in American Planning

Hegemann returned to Philadelphia in 1908, where he had been a student at the Wharton School of Business in 1904. He had listened to Simon Patten and been impressed with his ideas of cooperative economic action. Hegemann became interested in housing, exploring it as a precondition on individual betterment. He visited settlement houses and volunteered as a housing inspector with Philadelphia's first housing inspection for several days. Problems of congestion and bad housing conditions were easily recognizable to him, being a severe problem in the ever growing german capital's urban region. But to see by himself, as he said in 1913, „blocks where people are crowded on every acre in small houses and rear houses along horrible allies, the back yards filled with privy vaults and cesspools“, came like a shock to him.

Therefore, he was equally impressed with the ongoing debates on remedies, ranging from the settlement's friendly rent collectors, the chance to gain profits to turn into moral as well as economic arguments for reform, up to the social surveys and the professionalization of social work.

From there on Hegemann went on to New York, to see the Municipal Exhibition, most probably invited by Benjamin C. Marsh, whom he had met at the Wharton School. He now came to see another range of the city's condition. Though the Municipal Art Society proudly presented their piecemeal projects like planting and lighting, the exhibition's main topic was the economic condition of the city. Stressing the necessities of tax reform, these activists were seen as radicals who did not make friends with slogans like „Taxation Is Democracy's Most Effective Method of Securing Social Justice“.

Marsh, by now secretary of the Committee on Congestion of New York, had published his „Introduction to City Planning“ as a „manual for actionists“ in the same year. His friend, the architect George B. Ford, a well known city planner of the years to come, had written a chapter on planning. Thereby, Hegemann was introduced into the midth of the reformers' debates, as he had been at home where planners and reformers had been personal friends of his uncle.

Hegemann by now became fascinated by the metropolis' economic condition. When writing a report for a german planning review he reported on numbers, datas and statistics, on population density and building density, on prices and production, concentrating 12 percent of its factories and 13 percent of its workers on 1,3 percent of Manhattan's ground. But by reporting numbers Hegemann reveals a social zeal, knowing very well these discrepancies to depend on the immigrants' willingness to accept underpaid work and disease-infesting housing conditions. But being a liberal, he sets his hopes on efficiency and zoning ordinances, finally accepted by land owners for the protection of real estate values.

Inbetween, Hegemann met with his visiting uncle, the Berlin architect Otto March, for when back, March immediately set in motion preparations for a Berlin exhibition, winning over reformers and officials to promote establishing a general building plan for the capital by showing off the profession's work. To apply for Boston's exposition therefore was to Hegemann to look for a crash course to prepare for the german exhibition.

To meet with the Boston-1915 movement meant to take another angle again. The philanthropic undertaking, backed mostly by Boston's City Club, was founded to make Boston a better city by 1915. Its head was Edward A. Filene, a self-made man and owner of a department store. His ideas were propelled by the muckrakers, Lincoln Steffens even having visited Boston on his invitation, and connected to the political ideas of better governance, most probably backing the Boston Brahmin James L. Storrow to be elected as the city's mayor against the Boss Fitzgerald in 1910.

The movement's exposition, held in November of 1909, „mirrored a city“, as one visitor put it. Though showing the big projects of the City Beautiful from Burnham's Chicago Plan, Philadelphia's Parkways to Washington's MacMillan Commission, its aim was wider. The exposition wanted to make its visitors, the city's inhabitants, familiar with every singular movement for betterment, to encourage them to participate and to unite in city betterment. Therefore the unions, the professions, the churches, the boy scouts, the women's leagues, children's health care and others presented their work, and visitors were successfully attracted by spectacular events and moderate prices.

As Hegemann went home, he might not exactly have studied how to present planning, but all the more how to advertise, how to guide an audience, and how to win over the public to aims of public welfare. He was to apply it quite successfully at Berlin, introducing american planning to the public, even founding a public campaign for better housing, backed by politicians, authors and scientists but failing to convince the authorities.

When Frederic C. Howe was looking for a planning expert to give lectures on city planning in american cities on behalf of the People's Institute in 1913, Hegemann was recommended to him. Howe, who had studied german cities like Marsh, was a single taxer and wanted german municipal socialism advertised. But Hegemann had been campaigning for planning in Berlin, meaning to secure playgrounds and suburban settlement, but had foundered on the officials' procrastination. He arrived at New York in the spring of 1913, quite disappointed and quite willing to demolish the american perception of german efficiency. It was the New York lawyer Edward Bassett, himself campaigning for New York's zoning ordinance, who convinced him to refrain. Like Howe, Bassett wanted the cities' eagerness to be spurred by a model and Hegemann gave in.

He went about his task quite diplomatically and was introduced in an interview in the „New York Times“ as a „very modest man, supremely anxious not to give offence“. Hegemann argued carefully, ever in favour of foresight being better than rebuilding. He strongly recommended business districts with exceptional skyscrapers and to secure suburban housing by urban transport. Avoiding the import of european means of planning, he rather solicited his audience to prepare for and cooperate in planning.

On his tour of about twenty cities Hegemann surprised his hosts with thorough studies of their towns. „Instead of devoting his time to the inspection of boulevards, parks, squares and fine buildings, Dr. Hegemann goes into the alleys and looks into backgrounds and other surroundings in the districts where people of modest means

live“, a Baltimore newspaper noted. In doing so, Hegemann echoed Marsh who had claimed a city never to be more beautiful than its most unhealthy tenement houses. Hegemann shifted his audiences' attention from beauty to efficiency.

Again, as in his european studies of previous years, Hegemann made the most of his tours by learning about the city's conditions. He had himself lead around by city engineers and officials, by architects and business men, informing him on problems and projects.

Even in 1916, one of his hosts declared: „He came out to Berkeley that same day, but instead of looking at our treeless residence streets, insisted on going down to the water-front, walking the length of the municipal wharf, examining our outfall sewers, talking with manufacturers about shipping facilities, and West Berkeley residents regarding rents and housing conditions. Here was no mere city beautifier. Here was a planner, not only of cities good to look at, but of cities good to live in.“

Once Hegemann even refused to discuss a civic center if the basic needs of housing and transportation were not attended to before. However, he tried to dissuade his audiences to imitate european city scapes. Recommending the development of the center city as a business district, accentuated by a distinct skyline, and to secure suburban housing by urban transportation and by separating functional and easily accessible industrial sites, he aimed at land-use regulations. Moreover, he encouraged the citizens to oppose the „railway dictatorship“, discerning their rights of way to determine the city's growth and to undermine the set-up of regulations. Generally, he invited the city's groups and lobbys as well as the administration to cooperate in planning the planning.

Ending his tour in California, Hegemann bought a small automobile and set out to travel along the coast. Riding a motorcar was quite adventurous at that time. Getting lost was easy since neither roads nor towns bore signs, streets were not paved and the motorist had to negotiate by landmarks, looking out for rare gas stations. Though Hegemann seems to have liked coming and going independently, he was not won over by individual transport. He is told to have parked his car one day at a roadside only to put notice in the newspaper as to whoever wanted it, just to go and fetch it. And he loved telling this anecdote in the later years adding, that when he came to see for the results, he found three more cars parked there!

He was one of the first planners to voice doubts on the goods of ongoing motorisation. Hegemann warned the motorcar to divide the people, making the wealthier independent of the city's center by offering commuting to suburbs but to force back the others into congested areas of downtown because public transport would be no more rewarding to its investors. He was only too right, since in 1922 a development at Madison his firm was commissioned with failed not at least because of this conflict. In 1916, Hegemann suggested to build highways as toll-roads, re-investing the profits in urban transportation.

Studying cities crosswise the country from New York to California had sharpened Hegemann's insights. Moreover, he had been invited to the 5th National Conference on City Planning in Chicago to meet and discuss with experts from all over the country. When he was commissioned with a written report for the municipalities of Oakland and Berkeley towards the end of his tour, his study covers an unequalled

range of problems, verifying broadened knowledge and deepened understanding. Hegemann established a strict hierarchy of factors determining a city: the harbor; the railroads (freight, passengers, long distance, suburban and urban); the streets (main traffic streets, business streets, residential streets); the parks and playgrounds; finally civic art and civic centers. The „structural rank of the different elements in a city-plan“, as he termed it, was to result in efficiency. Remarkably, efficiency held various meanings. Economic efficiency needed foresight, sparing reorganization and reconstruction, minimizing the capital spent. Business efficiency meant optimizing effort and labor, the idea related to Taylorism. Since the outcome necessarily meant separating industries, business and residence, organising the bustling of production and selling best as possible, it promised efficient recreation and beauty at the same time. Elsewhere, Hegemann mentioned that to provide for a well-organised harbor with industrial sites would supply the best protection for residence districts. Hegemann aimed at separating and optimizing, proposing and defending his aims by rational arguments and logic. But his object was bettering the citizen's life. So, behind the „structural rank“ a care for homely rose gardens, a relish for a beautiful landscape, and wishes for happy homes and proud citizens lay hidden too. Therefore Hegemann proposed to cover the new industrial harbor with a large waterfront-park and designed an intimate town center with a piazza and a sunken garden. Since his report was received with praise even as far as in Great Britain, there is little surprise to find it was considered to engage Hegemann as a lecturer at the University of California. Though strongly supported by his friend and colleague, the Californian architect Charles H. Cheney, it came to nothing. Therefore Hegemann made for home. He chose the Pacific route, to travel the Asian coasts and to go to Australia. He left the US in the spring of 1914 and headed for Europe in July. His German steamer was brought up on the African coast, its passengers to be interned at a small village of the Portuguese colony in Mozambique. After several months where food was scarce and malaria took its grip, Hegemann „managed to stow away with one of my book trunks on a Norwegian sailing ship“, as he said in 1917. Received friendly by the ship's captain and crew, he busied himself with his manuscripts throughout the journey and left at Gulfport, MI, hoping to find work with the building of new harbours in the southern states.

VI. Hegemann in Milwaukee

In Gulfport, Mississippi, Hegemann reentered the US in 1915 as the Norwegian sailing vessel carrying him as a stowaway from the african shores let him off. He traveled in the southern states, visiting Galveston, Texas, which had been swept away by a storm tide recently, obviously looking for work.

Finally he made back to New York to set up himself as a city planning consultant. It seems he could refer to connections made before. Temporarily he resided at Greenwich House, a meeting place of housing reformers like the well-known Mary K. Simkhovitch whom Hegemann met again in 1934. The People's Institute issued another brochure announcing Hegemann's lectures on the advancements by city planning, but meeting with meager response.

Another stranded German tried to help on. Moritz J. Bonn, a political economist from Berlin, had been Carl Schurz Professor at the University of Milwaukee in 1915. He brought Hegemann to the attention of Harvard's Professor of Social Ethics, James Ford. Since Ford's brother was George B. Ford, the american planner who had visited and commented very favourably on the Berlin exhibition in 1910, professional and personal relations seemed to do the trick.

James Ford obviously liked Hegemann's idea to teach planning within social sciences and was convinced of his professional competence. He offered Hegemann a lecturership, even winning over the Bostonian Philip Cabot, another friend from former times, to back up finances, but met with difficulties. The Dean of Harvard's Landscape Architecture, James Sturgis Pray, seems to have been all against planning taught as a social science, even in addition. Pray wanted to maintain the monopoly of landscape architecture, seeing it as aesthetic and artistic profession quite apart from social engineering. Anyway, the President's disapproval was not to be overcome. A. Lawrence Lowell declined, voicing his reluctance to lower Harvard's standards to adapt to foreign teachers, experiences the university had had before. Lowell did not disagree with Hegemann because of his being a German, just having defended another German scholar and his freedom of opinion.

But when the offer was finally declined in February of 1916, Hegemann was quite disappointed. He had wanted to teach planning since 1913, but by now felt even more discouraged. Moreover he was disheartened because he had listened to Woodrow Wilson's famous speech on „Preparedness“, aiming at America's entrance on the raging European War. Hegemann foresaw oncoming isolation, feeling depressed by the contrast between planning the future and destruction taking place in the present. As he said in a speech of 1916, it felt strange to discuss possible savings of „perhaps of several million dollars by wisely planning for the future, while at the same time, in the old countries, our brothers destroy billions and billions which we, all of us, will never, never be able to reconstruct. But I suppose we have to keep at our modest job, which may be worth while, in spite of all.“

With loyalty conflicts, Milwaukee might have felt a good place to be for Hegemann. Three of four of its citizens had a foreignborn parent, the predominant foreign stock being german, to be seen in the german names, theatre, newspapers, clubs, institutions and school lessons. At the beginning of the Great War pro-german sympathies boomed. Bazaars were held to collect money for war victims, the upper classes, of

german origins too, demonstrating german sympathies while the superpatriots eyed them suspiciously. By the middle of 1916, feelings began to change. Wilson was re-elected in November, 1916, boycotts and damnation started and the sale of war bonds was forced by mobbing. As the US entered the war, patriotism won. People changed their last names, firms and institutions were renamed, even the „Sauerkraut“ was called „liberty cabbage“.

All the while, Milwaukee's industries boomed. Iron, steel and heavy machinery grew by orders due to preparedness, the Ford Motor Co. opened up a new factory in 1916. Even the big breweries expanded by the take-over of southern markets from imported beer until Prohibition was introduced in 1920, and by 1921, the Great Depression set in.

Labourers and progressives of Milwaukee in 1910 had elected the first socialist city administration. The socialist officials engaged in reforms in public health, franchises, land-use, housing and harbor, working for a more regulated use of private property in the interest of the public good. Two years in office only, their ideas, generally termed „sewer socialism“, prevailed nevertheless and, when in 1916 former city attorney Daniel W. Hoan was elected mayor of Milwaukee, gained impetus.

By 1911, the City Club of Milwaukee had been founded, dedicated to „civic betterment“, to bring the wave of civic reform sweeping the East Coast to the midwestern city. Four years later, the City Club could count on 20 civic committees, working closely with the city's administration. Milwaukee's City Planning Commission, established in 1911, planned to introduce land-use regulations to protect residence areas from intrusion by business and industry, but failed in 1913. By 1915, they had Edward M. Bassett drafting a zoning ordinance, which was finally adopted in 1920, Milwaukee the twelfth city in the US having embraced these means of comprehensive planning. The City Club's Planning Committee campaigned for municipal embellishment, for parks and playgrounds and discussed chances of land-use regulations. The city's precursor of the City Planning Commission, the Metropolitan Park Commission, had already debated on river beautification, pleaded for river parkways by 1910 and planned to establish a county park board to induce comprehensive planning.

Therefore, the City Club was one to respond to the People's Institute's brochure on Hegemann. It might have been Bassett who called Hegemann to their attention or confirmed their interest, but anyway his profile matched their needs. When the City Planning Committee discussed the engagement of the german planner in January of 1916, it became obvious that public opinion of city planning had changed since his tour of 1913 and knowledge broadened.

The City Club Committee on City Planning already planned whom he was to meet – reformers, architects, businessmen –, that he was to stay for three weeks and his report was to be published „in a simple inexpensive publication“ to make it widely known. Though they did not propose to Hegemann what to do, their strategy reflects the increased interest in the shape and the future of their hometown as well as a general idea of optimizing by planning.

Finally Hegemann's visit and report were supported by the Wisconsin Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, the Milwaukee Real Estate Association, the Westminster League and the South Side Civic Association. The sponsors represent

a broader idea of means of planning, of its practical work to be done by cooperation of different groups and by promoting and pressure.

The report as printed in the latter half of 1916, corresponded to these needs. Hegemann imparted knowledge to his audience, he did not advise. He claimed the end of carelessness and fortuity and asked to consider consequences, especially when incorporating planning.

Hegemann explained the „modern starshaped city“ in contrast to the „old concentric city“, recalled an american tradition of planning, pleaded for urban transport und better housing. As ever, to him betterment was to turn out as beautification as well as efficiency in work, health and finances. And as before, he had done a thorough study of Milwaukee by car and by walking, accompanied by the men he was to meet. Therefore it is no surprise that his suggestion considered today the most important was to secure parks and to protect residential districts by interchanging the industrial spread on the coast with land reserved for parks. By developing „extensive cheap factory sites well served by rail and water“, Hegemann wanted to establish a modern harbor to promote Milwaukee's dominant position as a market and trade center, increasing the city's income. But at the same time Hegemann meant regulation to preserve the natural beauty of the lake front and its „beautiful bluffs“, where factories were cut off from traffic but interfering with a planned park system and conservation of natural sites.

Preparing his report provided Hegemann with contacts and served as an entry-ticket to Milwaukee's professional groups und high society.

He was consulted by Walter J. Kohler, president of the Kohler Co. in Sheboygan. Kohler had been on a trip to Europe in 1912 and had been impressed with model industrial villages, especially with Germany's. Returning home, he started thinking about building his own to house his workmen and to attract immigrants. Seeing Hegemann presenting the „Margaretenhohe“ in his report, the famous industrial village of Krupp at Essen, exemplifying unified housing design as well as suburban settlements, Kohler engaged him.

Hegemann was enthusiastic. As he reported, the Company's grounds were „full of the most delightful gifts of nature, rolling land, fine trees, a most surprisingly winding stream, high ravines, wide, perfectly framed views; in short an ideal location for a garden city“ and he started sketching his ideas. Kohler insisted on engaging a landscape architect too and Hegemann contacted his later partner, Elbert Peets, who had just taken his degree from Harvard. Their cooperation was a precursor for their joint firm, established later in 1916.

On Kohler's demand Hegemann even conducted researches in Chicago, exploring the use of concrete, talking to the famous landscape architect Jens Jessen. A listing of buildings, written by Hegemann and continued by Kohler himself, shows their shared ambition to build a real garden city, completed by shops, a school and a club house. But finally this engagement came to nothing since Hegemann and Kohler could not agree on the distribution of costs. Kohler wanted his prices paid but Hegemann would to see him as a benefactor, investing in a piece of art for the common good. At last they disagreed on amounts on invoices and did not part as friends. In the early 1920s, Kohler had the Olmsted Bros. plan Kohler and West I was executed in

1924.

Nonetheless, to fall out with Kohler seems to have done no harm to Hegemann's acceptance in Milwaukee. He made friends, among them the lawyer Erich C. Stern, who occasionally visited him when going to Europe in the later years. As he mentioned to have debated hotly with one of them „as usual“, the political questions of the Great War presenting a subject the German-Americans were most likely to give each other a piece of their minds.

Correspondingly, the firm of Hegemann & Peets was signed on to design several private gardens. Their work was not documented, but since Hegemann had asked Erich C. Stern to tell him about the gardens of the Uihleins and Fred Pabsts the firm must have designed in the later 1910s. In 1926, a former client from Michigan came to see Hegemann in Berlin. He inspired him to give a report on working conditions in the US for the architectural review he edited. Designing a large estate on the border of Lake Michigan, Hegemann & Peets set about to heighten the contrast between formal gardening and wild woods. They increased the slope of the bluffs by modern sluicing methods, providing a steep walk down to the lakeside among rocks and trees, setting the manor on the highest point to overlook a formal terraced garden placed on the landside. The essential feature of the partners' work, emphasizing and increasing natural contrasts by combining formal and informal landscaping, will be recognized easily.

It was to guide Hegemann even before, when the heirs of the Pabst Farm considered to have the former farmlands developed.

V. Washington Highlands

If you happen to arrive at Washington Highlands from Washington Boulevard you will recognize its main feature at first sight. A „lofty elevation of high hill land“ will present itself, abundant with trees and greenery, a straight boulevard leading you on into the grounds, following the slope into a small roundabout, then leading uphill to stop dead, revealing vantage points „where to the East fully half of the City Hall tower presents itself surprisingly over the roofs of the teeming city, while to West the eyes wander over cultivated lands and forest far into Waukesha County“. At least this was what Washington Highlands' planner Werner Hegemann meant you to see when designing his layout, contrasting the adjoining city scape to the east and at the (then) farmlands of Waukesha County to the west, while at your feet, uniting the best of each, a profuseness of gardens, residential homes and curving streets disclosed themselves.

With Hegemann this is bound to mean more. The first view into the neighborhood was to create an air of wideness and largesse, to show the wealth of greens contrasting to narrow, barren city streets. When widening the view again on top of the hill to enclose town and country, the onlooker was meant to realize the neighborhood to be a community in itself while at the same time being part of a greater community. Turning back on the grounds, you will catch glimpses of the different houses among greenery and stately trees, bound together by curving streets. The residential homes reveal their individual designs, united by a unified setting. Walking back down you will realize to have crossed a bridge over a meandering creek, the creek set apart by adjacent parkland, providing pleasure walks for the community's social life, for its members to greet and meet each other.

Hegemann's object was to create a community of residences connected to the city, not only radiating exclusivity, but to be supported by a strong sense of unity and by pride of its shape. The means to create this impression were taken from classical landscaping, modern ideas of planning and social reform as well, merged in his idea of planning.

The subdivision's area was known as the Pabst Farm. Frederick Pabst, born in Germany, immigrated in 1848 and served with a shipping company on the Great Lakes. In 1862 he entered into the brewing company he was to develop into the leading producer of lager-beer by 1893 (only by 1902 to be surpassed by the Schlitz Co.). On his farm he grew hops and horses until his death in 1904. After several years of probate the heirs decided to sell the grounds.

The realtors must have been interested in buying since their firm already had invested in these parts of the Milwaukee outskirts. Though Hi-Mount, Grand Circle, Maplewood Place and Pabst Acres were disconnected, they will have presented residential areas already upgraded by comprehensive development and Hegemann called them „high-class residential tracts“. Though protected by restrictions, nevertheless Hegemann reduced those to an „ordinary and somewhat primitive set of restrictions used in tracts previously laid out in Milwaukee“ to advertise the forthcoming subdivision. By 1914, Washington Boulevard had been constructed, a wide, landscaped parkway to connect the Washington Park of 1892 by Frederick Law Olmsted & Co. to Milwaukee's business district and to its west side boulevard system, initiating

construction of fine residential architecture in a then obviously fashionable part on Milwaukee's side of the border to Wauwatosa. Whereas Washington Highlands' 133 acres were part of Wauwatosa WI, most probably promising to pay less taxes when moving there, an attractive feature of suburban dwellings.

To the firm, the developments presented vested capital to be guarded. Therefore, when a large adjacent territory came on offer it was to be secured to continue high-grade development in order to turn initial investments into a longterm success. By this time, former agricultural lands only presented chances of big-scale development without individual property owners to deal with, without structures, streets or facilities to move or condemn. Moreover, the increasing number of automobiles – by 1913 every eighth american owned his own – allowed for discovering the city's outskirts and its scenic beauty. Before, the fringe areas had been touched by street car service only, but by now becoming easily accessible, development had turned into a business proposition.

Clients became interested because of the ongoing change of the city's balances. When industry was booming, factories and facilities drew near the city's center, thereby changing old houses, converting them into tenements and flats while downtown districts were changed by retail and banking. Securing residential areas became one of the great moving forces of american planning. But residence settlements on the city's outer districts disturbed the balance further. When people moved to the outskirts, transport and retail had to follow. But finally the streetcars would not follow, since the high building densities making a streetcar line profitable would never be reached. If people moved out of streetcar coverage, roads and highways had to be built, the subdivisions being for the upper classes.

The „Grand Circle“, a small layout Hegemann did too for the realtors' firm, was „an effort to insert a pleasant variation into an existing grid“, as he wrote in 1922. He had grouped 15 lots like the pieces of a cake, creating a round block among large lots at corners of incoming streets. Its main feature was the center garage court, served by a lane from the round-about. Even the adjacent blocks were served by a middle lane, quite obviously allowing to park the car at the premises but hiding it. This was upper-class development, public transport not even mentioned, providing every convenience for automobiles and probably even chauffeurs.

Compared to these, Washington Highlands was more progressive. The sales-brochure issued by the realtors shows the „direct boulevard connection“ to Milwaukee's business district, aiming at buyers working the city, commuting by individual transport. Therefore the probable addition of a garage was a general feature in Washington Highlands; „a garage entrance close to the street level without having to do much expensive cutting“ even becoming a marketing argument, advertising the street plan. But beyond that the subdivision's value was defined by being served by a streetcar line at its northern border. The sales-brochure did not aim at 'minor' clients by showing the streetcar connection by an extra map, but its drawing of an entrance street explained the availability by showing a streetcar, pedestrians and an automobile, the street's moderate, pleasant houses another hint at modest sizes and prices. When Frederick Pabst had opened up Pabst Avenue in 1891, running through his farm, and granted a right-of-way to transit companies building the streetcar line,

the farmland on its northern side had been platted soon after. Its grid pattern was to enhance Washington Highlands' effects further.

By all this we might deduce that Hegemann suggested to design a layout aiming not only at the upper-middle classes. Eventually, the realtors might have heard about slackening sales of subdivisions served by individual transport only or even have experienced them themselves. Moreover, one of Hegemann's paragons of subdivision would not prosper until a long advertised tunnel provided street car access too, shortening commuting time down to 20 minutes. Though it might be hard to decide whether wartimes or lack of prosperity held sales down, it certainly was an item. After all, even Hegemann became a victim of these changes in later years when the last of his firm's subdivisions would not be executed since the realtors went bankrupt for relying too heavily on individual transport only.

When Hegemann had set out to make his life in the United States in 1915 he only had his rich knowledge of planning but no formal education as an architect whatsoever. He had been engaged by Milwaukee civic groups to do a report on planning successfully, but when consulting with Walter J. Kohler he had met with difficulties and had been criticized for his job performance.

Hegemann had to make good for his greatest drawback as a planner: he could not draw. Therefore, in Elbert Peets, he had found a congenial landscape architect who was quite talented, whether in sketching or drawing. Peets (1886-1968), who took his master in Harvard in 1915, seems to have been somewhat dissatisfied with Harvard's obsession with informality for he favoured formal elements. He was fond of clipped hedges and trees, and he repeated the merging of formal and informal axis' when designing Greendale WI in 1936, one of the New Deal's greenbelt towns. For the Washington Highlands sales-brochure it was him who drew the illustrations, showing off an architecture enhancing the undulations by walls and stairs, decorating the border and the streets with hedges and trees cut exactly to form. Like Hegemann, he loved views, producing continuous interesting vistas and discovering distant views, connecting places to other sites by visual means, symbolizing underlying deeper meaning. When Kohler had insisted on consulting a landscape architect too, contacts had been made and finally Hegemann and Peets set up their joint firm during 1916, residing at Milwaukee up to 1921.

Though working for the planning report had promoted Hegemann, not social contacts but his special training enabled him to fulfill the commission for a layout of the former Pabst farm successfully. (Since he submitted his first study for the subdivision in June of 1916, still by himself, he will be treated as the design's author though Peets' share concerning practical ideas and artistic details should not be underestimated.) By 1913 Hegemann had become an expert on German building reform meaning building types as well as city planning. He had made a lifelong friend in Raymond Unwin, architect of England's most famous garden cities, had seen his work and studied other European examples. Furthermore, Hegemann had made the most of his lecture tour of 1913 and had himself guided through American subdivisions by their developers as Edward H. Bouton in Roland Park, Baltimore and Duncan McDuffie in St. Francis Wood, Los Angeles.

Thereby Hegemann knew about the best, calling them „the famous subdivisions of

this country“. Roland Park, built already in 1891, was laid out to follow the lay of the land, save its trees and knew deed restrictions. Also, Hegeman must have visited Forest Hill Gardens, 1909 in New York City, which was organized by the Russell Sage Foundation to provide quality lower-income housing by careful planning. And he had heard J.C. Nichols, who developed Kansas City’s most famous Kansas Country Club, give a lecture at the National Conference on City Planning in 1913. With Duncan McDuffie Hegemann had made friends in 1913, impressing him with his thorough studies before voicing an opinion.

He had those in mind when talking of the new type of subdivision, the „super-subdivision“ to be introduced to Milwaukee by Washington Highlands. Hegemann defined it by several characteristics distinguishing it from precursors by „the larger area and amount of capital“, by a „system of restrictions“, highly developed and placed upon the entire area, by restricting the percentage of the lot area to be built upon, the remainder to be kept as a garden, by providing private parks for the homeowners, maintained by an owners’ association, by the seclusion achieved by exclusion of traffic and a distinctly designed borderline, by harmony in architecture and landscaping, subjected to the association’s approval to guarantee unified appearance as well as harmonious future development. In aiming at this „new type“, the realtors called themselves „Planners and Developers of High Grade Subdivisions“. Hegemann is said to have walked the grounds he worked on excessively, and, on another site, is reported even to have taken a walking tour on skis in midwinter – only to be followed by an amused crowd of children who had never seen someone cross-country-skiing. He knew the grounds very well, he liked being outdoors, and he shared the fondness of views and vistas with his partner Elbert Peets. By exploring the grounds, Hegemann will have discovered the farm’s hill to connect the view to the city center of Milwaukee, a feature he set upon enhancing. He will have walked the floodplains of the Schoonmaker creek cutting across the grounds, by then remembering the requirement to develop watercourses into qualifying features of landscaping, when he had been a member of the jury for Dusseldorf’s first general plan. To set off the untouched lands as a stretch of original landscape in a unified design he will have identified natural and mature vegetation as „the stately groves of trees“, to be preserved to render a distinct appearance, last but not least identifying the big elms he even was to name a road for.

The predominant feature of this subdivision is Hegemann’s consequent refusal of the grid. The territory, being untouched by building, allowed to design an independent street-layout to differ from the surrounding grids. While the great models usually had romanticized the grid, Hegemann abolished it. The planners elsewhere often had simply loosened the grid, curving the streets but basically adhering to the pattern of right-angled crossings, whereas Hegemann even refrained from right-angled lot-lines. To do away with the obligation of even-sized flattened lots, cut by right-angled property lines, allowed to make the most of a fetching stretch of land.

Hegemann first plan already combined a short straight axis with a great curving boulevard. Rejecting „conventionality or caprice“, he sought for „a careful adaptation to the charming undulations of a beautiful piece of Wisconsin landscape“. The axis continued Washington Boulevard into the grounds, no mere „conventional straight

street“, but „designed as a perspective stage setting“, connecting to Milwaukee’s largest park but not encouraging traffic. The great curving boulevard with its adjoining lots paid homage to informality, underlining the desired contrast to the city grid. The contrast was heightened by the informal cross-axis of parks on the creek, paralleled by another curving road. In blending the aesthetics of the formal and the informal lay the mastership of Hegemann and Peets. This outstanding mastership enabled them to blend embellishment and economic needs.

Now with Hegemann designing the layout of streets meant to follow the contours of the land very closely. Without the need of straightening, the main streets were not to be defined by practical crossings just as the single lanes were not designed for traffic, but for defining block-sizes. Again avoiding the right angle, they combine the lots while the block’s borders are given by the contour lines. The outstanding half-round of the grand boulevard provided a pleasant access to the hill, followed by an inner half-moon parkway, addressing the prominent lots and guiding the visitor uphill easily. Moreover, the contour made for bends in the roads, either to provide a smooth grade or to preserve natural features like the elms – later lost to the elm disease. When a newspaper article of the 1970s told of a homeowner of early days who seemed to remember she had proposed to name Two Tree Lane for the elms, this might indicate Hegemann’s success in making people identify with their new home. Providing a smooth grade made for the distinct bulbous bend in Washington Circle South descending to a lower elevation through ravines. The unusual bend originated the local rumour of Hegemann’s having designed the plan to depict a „Kaiser’s helmet“, most probably springing from decidedly anti-german feelings when the US entered the european war. In August of 1917 the mayor of Oakland had accused Hegemann publicly to be a german spy, handing over all his information on East Bay harbors into the Kaiser’s hands to prepare for a german landing. (The „Oakland Tribune“ protested against these accusations, pointing out that the mayour never had engaged in progressive reforms.) But the distinct shape of this boulevard seems to have turned the rumour into local gossip adding to the local lore.

Most importantly following the contour lines lends a distinct shape to the streets’ appearances, distinguishing them not only from straight and barren city streets but from each other. Hegemann rightly denied „the streets of Washington Highlands to be wantonly curved for the mere sake of being different“ nor „following meaninglessly topographical irregularities“. Even the smaller scale of curvature of the western streets makes for continously changing vistas as they lead from higher to lower elevations in accord with sloping topography, and with tighter density of residences the streetscapes appear no less interesting.

To make such use of contour lines did not serve aesthetic purposes only. It meant avoiding costly cutting and filling. This obvious economizing was furthered by Hegemann’s decision to have Washington Circle laid out in a split-grade level. Again, to cut costs he chose an artistic means which fit the plan into the desired park-like setting and became the intended residence park. To execute the curving street in a split-grade level turned out as an ideal way to preserve the raising grounds. The split-grade sets off the informal design of irregular lot sizes to their greatest advantage. It made for an on-grade access to homes on both sides, accentuating the

difference by varied setbacks, allowing for a wide lawn on flat land and a closer setting of the house on hilly land, granting a distinct atmosphere of privacy to its later homes. The creek crossing several private lots made a construction of footbridges necessary, once again turning irregularities into special assets. They lend a „story-book character“ to those homes, as the architects undertaking the registration for the National Register of Historic Places attested them.

The greens of the central reservations and islands of the boulevards were to drown the traffic and the dust, to be planted with grasses, flowers and bushes, again underlining the contrast to city streets. Built after the model of the parkways, they were boulevards with separated sidewalks, not necessarily laid out parallel to the lanes, styled to cruise and to walk the dog. These characteristics Hegemann lent to the eastern crescent of the Upper Parkway and to parts of the upper western streets, thereby distinguishing the most prominent lots.

Levelling the lots had seemed equally out of question to Hegemann. On the contrary, the architecture and landscaping of undulating grounds was meant to play upon the extraordinary topography. As can be seen in the drawings, done in detail by Peets, the planners envisaged the private homes to be built on terraces, showing off high retaining walls and steep open stairs, overgrown by vines and ivy, alluding to old Italian gardens.

To strengthen this allusion to old Italian gardens Hegemann introduced his formal axis and its classical means of landscaping. As a straight street it cut across the round-about, continuing the axis of Washington Boulevard connecting to Washington Park. It gave directions towards the business center of Milwaukee where owners were supposed to work. But it is not to encourage taking short-cuts. Stopping dead at the high point of the hill, it preserves the former apple orchard as a small park and special asset of the view-commanding lots.

The axis drops ten feet after entering the premises, rises twenty feet to bridge the creek, then rises another hundred feet to the vantage point of Apple Croft. To heighten the sense of largesse the planners executed the central axis to strengthen the perspective effect of distance by an optical illusion, forged by a diminution of the axis' width. The avenue is broader when entering the estate and is narrowed from a 100 to 56 feet in the run to deepen the impression and to heighten the hill. The perspective effect is heightened by reducing the setbacks from 40 to 30 feet on the west end, and moreover, by continuous lines of hedges bordering the street. „The proportions of the Avenue and its planting are patterned upon a plan dear to the great old masters of old Italian garden craft“. Thereby the planners democratized old arts, formerly due only to sovereigns. In 1931 Hegemann even related to have chosen a special construction for the bridge crossing the creek to save this undisturbed view. The object of these means being the civic symbolism, its design was due also to artistic considerations. For Hegemann and Peets creativity meant not to be bent to contemporary fashions and 'Zeitgeist', but to choose artistic means deliberately. But Hegemann cut across his formal styling with another informal element. Since mere informality seemed meaningless to him and bare formalism drab, he aimed at the contrast. Instead of hiding the Pabst Farm's creek underground to gain building sites, spending enormous amounts on canalization and fillings, the creek was not to

be straightened, hidden or buried, but to be built up as a special feature. Again, minimizing costs meant to make the most of the design. Adjoining the private parks to the creek, it was made into a meadow – serving as a floodplain at the same time –, playing on the impression of an unspoiled country-side. To develop the floodplains into the subdivision's parklands provided for longer pleasure walks than setting aside a central, compact park. To shorten the walker's way to the common greens, two pedestrian routes were introduced for a short cut to the parks. The parks were to be social places, to meet and greet the neighbors, the willows providing shades for a chat. These walks do allow a feel of nature but the lookout from the bridge above even feeds dreams of bigger parks.

Giving a sense of shelter and protection was strengthened by practical means. The straight entrance street is typically misleading, for it was never meant for cross-traffic. Only six out of eighteen oncoming street are continued into the estate, none of them straight, none leading through, discouraging any automobilist looking for a short cut, without doubt having created nameless misgivings with visitors searching for their host's residence. The few distinct entrance ways enhanced the shielded character, the gateways flanked by decorated entrance post, the borders marked by clipped hedges and trees or small terraced gardens. The main entrance gate was to be built of „hedges and lindens, both clipped in the stately style of famous old world gardens“.

The bordering lots are smaller, designed for smaller but higher houses. Hegemann originally might have even thought of terraced or rowhouses, meaning the lesser incomes to share the opportunities of high grade developments. Finally, the restrictions saw for double and four-flat houses on the outer border, depending on being well adapted to their site and the neighboring homes. Thereby Hegemann and Peets had succeeded in creating a graded environment, reserving a central area to large and dominant lots and residences, surrounding it by more modest lots for more moderate prices and multiple-family homes, meant to have families of minor incomes participate in planning progress.

Therefore, the notable accomplishment of Hegemann is to have blended several aims, artistic, social, and financial aims, into one design. Enabled by his special training, sponsored by Milwaukee's society, promoted by the developers, this development was a unique blending of german and american ideas, secured by its progressive deed restrictions and its owners' association. It provided the ground for a very special architecture, awarded with the National Register plaque for good reasons.

VI. From Garden Cities to Residential Parks: Ideas and Influences

City planning has had various origins in different countries when emerging as a public as well as a professional movement at the onset of the last century.

In the United States the blinding whiteness and classical grandeur of the World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 in Chicago instigated its many visitors with the dream of a city of one design when confronted with a dramatic increase of the size of American cities and its haphazard growth. Its Beaux-arts-style, designed by artists educated in Europe nursed the City Beautiful, the big rebuilding of the city center with Greek temples and Dorian columns. At its height Daniel Burnham's Chicago Plan was published, whose rearrangement of functional elements of the city plan like industries and transportation tended to be overlooked. These ideas were furthered by Washington's McMillan Commission, established to revive the plans of Pierre L'Enfant, reintroducing radiating streets and axis to supply prominent lots for the big memorials which were built until the 30s.

All the while the piecemeal projects of municipal art societies and civic clubs all over the country had contributed to the city's embellishment by outdoor art and landscaping, planting and lighting, confirming city betterment to be possible by local efforts. Social reformers fought against the congestion of downtown and its overcrowded tenement districts, collecting factual information and statistical data, finally introducing a first Tenement Law in 1901. Moreover, the enthusiasm for outdoor life had civic groups campaigning for parks, and with their first successes, extending their plans to park systems to provide for recreation in the big cities, thereby crossing city borders to call for regional cooperation. All these and other various groups came to meet at the first National Conference on City Planning in 1909, starting continued debates on the development of planning and its agenda.

In Germany, booming industrialisation and a fast growing population posed a challenge. For the first time, the number of people living in a city outgrew the number living in the country. The cities' building ordinances could not cope with the increasing growth, the people gathered in crowded tenements. Though the city architects managed the street layouts and building regulations they were heavily criticized by planners for fashionable layouts and defunct social care. Industrial companies had started to build model settlements to house their workmen, set up like country villages assembling small houses around a marketplace. The ideal of rural housing united reformers to fight for better housing conditions for the working classes. They supported the founding of cooperatives to build homes, ground and buildings owned by all, rented out for moderate non-profit prices.

Concerned with reforming building types, their criticism met with the architects', based on aesthetic and social aims. Germany's fast growing capital saw its own problems by being divided into 20 competing municipalities. Therefore, the Berlin architects hoped to unite the different forces of reform when calling for the instalment of a first comprehensive general plan. The competition even mentioned Washington and the park systems and, when its plans were shown within the Berlin exhibition of 1910, a new profession made a successful appearance.

Therefore, in the broad scope of city planning the garden city had only been one of countless items. The idea of the garden city originally held high hopes of a utopian

quality. But when scaled down and put to the test in the following years, from the national casts of planning quite different types of garden city were to appear.

Ebenezer Howard's „Garden Cities of Tomorrow“ (1902) dreamed of self-contained cities, located on former farmland, with a population of about 32.000 and its own housing, employment and amenities. Howard being more of a social visionary than a town planner, his was a kind of third way between capitalism and socialism, related to utopian ideas. He meant the people to leave the congested city area, suffering from high rents, low wages, polluted air and barren surroundings. The garden cities were to be built by a limited-dividend company, to be linked by municipal railroads and highways, but not to be built for commuting into the parent city. Howard wanted to provide for nature, pure air and water, low rents, sufficient wages and social activities – in short, a better way of living.

The first garden city was set up by 1903, Letchworth in Hertfordshire in the United Kingdom. Howard persuaded a printing and bookbinding company to build a factory some 30 miles from London. Its architects were Unwin and Parker, linking the garden city with its predecessor, industrial settlements like Bournville and Port Sunlight, and also with its successor, the garden suburb and its (british) prototype Hampstead. Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker, architects with different backgrounds, one starting as an engineer, the other as interior designer, raised to fathering town planning in Great Britain, from defining its design and architecture to organising and executing the legal framework.

Unwin and Parker had planned an industrial settlement with terraces of cottages, grouped around communal greens, connecting them by pedestrian routes and preserved natural features like trees and a brook. Letchworth had been more challenging for integrating the industries. The town was bigger, therefore called for more formal elements like radial avenues and traffic circles, completed by informal housing layouts.

But Hampstead was entirely different. From the beginning it was meant to be a community for commuters and lay in easy distance to an underground station. Therefore a great variety of housing types was offered, which became famous for Unwin's style. He grouped the houses around the ends of cul-de-sacs to minimize traffic, and combined irregular curving streets with formal elements, including pedestrian routes to the playing fields and walkways through the woods. But Unwin's grouped houses generated a long line of misunderstandings. Most planners read them for the picturesque, while to Unwin they were a rational mean to shift the balance between public and private space in favour of the latter.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the „garden city“ sprang from a totally different origin. The architect of the first planned settlements was Frederick Law Olmsted, the famous landscape architect well-known for his parks. The widespread park movement of the latter days of the 19th century promoted the desire to live in park-like surroundings. Since only the upper classes were able to maintain these wants, this meant an altogether different setting. Olmsted set about his task in Riverside by 1868 differently, landscaping a park in a informal way, made to mount the individual manors and villas like jewels.

Riverside lay on the banks of the Des Moines River, 9 miles from Chicago. At first

a parkway was built to connect it to the city. A 1000 acres of subdivided land preserved the floodplain and river banks. Olmsted developed the well-built inner roads as scenic as possible, which meant following the curve of the land, but to ease the grade of the slopes to fit his plans. Though he avoided the straight lines and right angle intersections, the underlying pattern still remains the gridiron, now reformed to a winding pattern of romance and informality, signaling privacy. By generous planting and vast public grounds the park-like character of the layout was completed. A model for private subdivisions from then on, their number increased because of city growth and the closing down of farmlands at the city's outskirts when food production became less profitable. Nonetheless, the garden suburb did not become a common apparition until the second decade of the new century.

In Germany, these ideas took quite a different turn. Private subdivision being the exception, the booming years after the french-german war knew an early *hausse*. Even before, since the craze of summerhouses started, realtors offered locations but never took sides with planners to offer comprehensive planning in subdividing. In Berlin, entrepreneurs had promised model villages for the new riches. Placed on vast grounds at the western outskirts, they were to provide villas in a different setting, apart from the high density of the town and its industrial nuisances. But due to the short *hausse* at the stock exchange, these speculators went bankrupt, their legacy soon to be built over by the common four-storey tenement houses exporting overcrowding to the outskirts. (During his studies Hegemann discovered these entrepreneurs and declared them precursors of housing reformers – which they were not, meaning business strictly. For that reason he was susceptible to deed restrictions, the only guarantee against later increases of density. When in 1922 he bought a lot in Nikolassee, a western suburb of Berlin, to built his own home on, restaurants, hospitals and all branches of business „producing noise, smells, dusts or soot“ were banned by the deed restriction.)

While there were no planning real estate entrepreneurs, in Germany their role fell to the building societies and cooperatives. But according to the limited financial powers of their members, no large-scale projects came up. It was not until after the Great War when housing shortage was at its peak, a special tax was introduced, the revenues to be granted as loans to the big cooperatives, that these were enabled to start the large-scale settlements german modernist architects became famous for.

Meanwhile reforming the building types united artists, architects, economists, social and union workers. In Berlin, several projects were set in motion before 1914, only one of a larger scale, but strictly speaking executed as an industrial settlement, not to be finished before 1917. „Garden city“ by then meant a planned layout at the city's outskirts, providing 2-4 room flats or rowhouses for the labouring classes.

The Berlin city planning exhibition of 1910 reflected the quest for blending better housing quality with the financial requirements of housing in the big city. The reformers engaged against inner city high building density, always on the lookout for groupings of tenements without drab alleys and dull, dark backyards. Models showed large rows of houses grouped around common greens or set along private lanes, ever influenced by the ideal of rural villages and their marketplaces. Though Unwin and Parker also had shown examples from english garden cities, another impulse

prevailed. (Hegemann and Unwin met again when the Berlin exhibits had to be hung at London's Town Planning Conference: only 48 hours left for the task, they seem to have made friends for life.)

At the exhibition, Robert Kuczynski, a political economist like Hegemann and friend, and the architect Walter Lehweß proved that a kind of 'superblock' housed the same number of tenants within two-storeys as the usual block if divided differently. Their block was surrounded by a two-storey tenement rowhouse, enclosing a variety of single-family row-houses, each with its individual garden meant for growing vegetables, to be accessed by small lanes and a small common green in its center. This model had left all utopian ideas behind. Calculated for realisation on high-priced city grounds, it meant to house the smallest incomes, providing the families with the small garden to better their nutrition and to educate them by gardening. The model helped to establish a single-family rowhouse type which had to be crammed on hardly affordable lots, types and models cut short of further development by the oncoming war.

Having a further look at this example might help to understand why and how Hegemann tried to make the most of both developments when working in the US. Among the city planning exhibition's visitors had been several groups and societies to study housing, one of them the building co-operative „Ideal“. The Ideal's members consisted of craftsmen, handymen and workers mostly. Closely associated with the unions and the socialdemocratic party, in the German Empire of Wilhelm II. they were excluded from public subsidies. Though ever short of money, the co-operative decided to dare the new model. The members were supported by famous architects and reformers such as Hermann Muthesius and Rudolf Eberstadt and, by 1912, Hegemann was voted to become one of Ideal's members of the board to help execute their new building project.

The cooperative succeeded in securing the grounds of a former gravel pit, the only building land remaining untouched, but the filling stretched expanses nearly to the limit. The first part of construction consisted of 86 dwellings including 50 one-family-rowhouses, combined with flanking three- and two-storey-houses, whose tenants were to have small separate lots as a garden. The size of the allotment did not allow for generous common greens or aesthetic groupings, moreover the cooperative met with difficulties when applying for different rights of way.

This was housing for small means and Hegemann partook in project planning and building site supervision, for the first time meeting with practical problems of construction the cooperative had problems to deal with. Moreover, Hegemann supported the organisation and execution of an intricate model of financing. He even talked friends and relatives into sponsorship. Hegemann never was a socialist, more of an ardent liberal, this project corresponding to his credo to enable the workingmen to support themselves.

The first stage of construction was happily completed by the beginning of 1913, constituting an immediate success for the cooperative. The waiting lists were long, houses and flats rented out soon. The property and premises owned by the cooperative, the tenants had to buy a share while the rents were calculated on maintenance and actual expanses. The solid architecture remains and two of the lanes were named

in honour of sponsors.

When Hegemann left for the United States in the spring of 1913 he had to have realised that these means would not do to provide better housing for urban masses, costs and efforts being too high to be executed on any larger scale. Therefore he embraced the opportunities of private suburban development, trying to mingle the best of both models. He was inclined to favour common ownership at least of the parklands to secure their maintenance, he welcomed deed restrictions as a means to exclude a later increase of building and population density. But he wanted to grade lot and housing sizes to include families of smaller income, spreading the benefit of good planning.

Meanwhile, the success of the American type of subdivision was dependant on more than their romantic designs. Generally, with growing industries and immigration, the growing of its population changed the city's shape. Zoning began because of excluding the laundries from San Francisco's residence areas and barring the shopping avenues of New York City from upcoming back-door sweat-shops. Restrictions of property became acceptable simply to protect its financial value, not its pleasant appearances.

For example, the immediate success of the five sections of subdivided land known as the Kansas City Country Club depended on innercity change. When the packing industries opened up, old downtown houses underwent conversion to rooming houses for industrial wage-earner families while the downtown retail district expanded.

Therefore Jesse C. Nichols' developments at the southeast of the city district were sought after. Grouped around a golf-course, by a connecting parkway within easy access from the commercial districts if you had an automobile, these environs were highly desirable for Kansas City's elite. Grand houses built on large estates were protected against increasing building of future times by deed restrictions. By 1917 finally 1.500 acres were developed and offered by Nichols' real estate firm, the layout of formerly five areas done kind of arbitrarily. The streets again adhered basically to the grid, only slightly curving or transversing, to show off the big estates. To make up for a missing grand scheme of planning, Nichols' Company began to place outdoor sculpture at intersections to increase the distinctiveness of the residential sections. (When Nichols even built an area for shopping by car, the Country Club Plaza of 1922, the demand for it resulted from the city's change but changed the city further.)

When Hegemann returned to the US in 1915, there really was no market for city planning consultancy. The plans and ideas of rebuilding the city center were absorbed increasingly by the establishment of zoning ordinances, work done mostly by lawyers. Zoning seemingly became the only means of planning.

On the other hand, private land development now prospered. By 1914, real estate developers became interested in planners. The general weakening of the urban real estate market and heightened competition among the realtors redirected their interest. With the beginning of World War I immigration slowed down, bonds and loans promised to be more financially rewarding than investing in real estate. Therefore, real estate entrepreneurs had to offer quality. Good planning had turned into a financial argument, as Hegemann had heard J.C. Nichols argue at the 8th National

City Planning Conference in 1916.

Based on land-use regulations and deed restrictions, by now the realtors' subdivisions offered security of investment, and by the growing number of automobiles, financially attractive scenic outskirts of a city region were to be developed, land subdivision no more restricted by immediate access to streetcars or mainlines. The scenic parts untouched by building activities were to be found on former farmlands, a joint feature of the better known subdivisions where either heirs had sold out, discontinuing the original business while the food production promised lesser profits than developing the land.

When one of America's foremost planners, John Nolen in 1916 argued the real estate developers being the progressive planners, he called up the very same examples Hegemann himself had listed: Jesse C. Nichols' Kansas Country Club, Edward Bouton's Roland Park at Baltimore, Duncan McDuffie's St. Francis Wood at San Francisco. Nolen meant the merging of regulations and restrictions, guaranteeing residential uses only and low building density, which, with artistic planning, provided charming surroundings as well as conspicuous exclusivity.

Therefore Hegemann marked out the proposed land development of the Pabst Farm exactly when terming it a „super-subdivision“. To him it was defined by the big area and the amount of capital spent, by the system of restrictions binding the complete subdivision, by restricted building density, by a share of parkland reserved to lot owners, by the enclosure preventing traffic, and last but not least by the harmonious appearance of topography, buildings and gardens, achieved by modern planning.

It might be said to have begun with Roland Park, Baltimore MD. (Hegemann had himself guided through the residential area by its general manager Edward H. Bouton in 1913 when visiting Baltimore.) Begun in 1891 on 100 acres, an English business syndicate invested about 20 mio. \$ to extend planned development to 800 acres. Roland Park's director Edward H. Bouton became the enterprise's driving force up to 1935. Plat 1 was designed by George E. Kessler, a former staff-member of Olmsted's. He developed the plat in the romantic tradition, the relatively flat land not calling for imaginative planning, thereby creating a typical upper-class development with traditional design.

But the Club House, built in 1898 and sponsored by the Roland Park Co, served to strengthen the idea of a residential community. Even as early as 1896, a shopping center was erected to provide for the resident's day-to-day needs. Both were to be a latter day marketing feature. Moreover, the water tower when built as an Italianate octagonal tower became a local landmark. Thereby, Roland Park encouraged the acceptance of compulsive planning by the recognition of the contrast to previous haphazard growth along the lines of rigid application of grid patterns in street and lot layouts.

Designing Plat 2 after 1897, F.L. Olmsted Jr. was presented with a difficult terrain and set about to follow the natural contours of the land. He designed different areas, preserving and heightening the picturesque effect of hills and valleys, thereby creating sites for fashionable houses in Tudor or Arts&Crafts, built by well known architects like Charles A. Platt. Accepted for the value of unique site planning and its precondition, the deed restriction by then became firmly established. The inclusion

of land-use restriction in each property deed still being quite new, moreover each owner had to agree to abide by regulations established by the Roland Park Co. including architectural control. Regulations were intended to run into perpetuity, so finally turning out as a legal mean to secure real estate investment.

Further plats were designed in the coming years, one including a parkway, another one surrounding a meadow, protected as a shared open space. Modern building methods were employed and to built avenues, even the sluicing methods of western hydraulic mining applied to wash down hills and fill ravines. Yet Roland Park's success depended mostly on Bouton. He achieved to establish electric streetcar service, connecting Roland Park to Baltimore's city hall, 24 hours a day. The commuting time of 25 min. allowed for year-round residence in contrast to summer or holiday stays, thereby securing a whole new group of potential customers.

Thus Roland Park introduced the acceptance of restrictions on real estate property in exchange for extensive site planning and architectural control, even a first feeling of a residential community identified by visible social features.

Suburban planning progressed fastly. In 1910 the Russell Sage Foundation set up Forest Hill Gardens, aiming at providing housing of quality for modest means, at the same time proving adequate commercial profits a feasible possibility. The setting therefore bore some more resemblance to the garden city, which was to be the prototype for its outer shape.

142 acres in Long Island, by nine miles within easy commuting distance of Manhattan, were landscaped by the Olmsted Bros. The architect Grosvenor Atterbury now set out to resemble his architecture to those of the british models, designing grouped houses after Unwin. But moreover, Forest Hill Gardens was to provide for all daily activities within walking distance including a community center offering activities. Though without employers no garden city according to Howard, it was meant as a self-sustained suburb. But it failed the foundation's initial aims, not even making profits but by high prices of land and construction bound to turn out as an upper-middle-class residence area. Nevertheless Forest Hill Gardens' fame became confirmed with the sociologist Clarence Perry's studies for the Regional Plan, who declared its size of 5.000 inhabitants the ideal size of suburban settlement.

Planned settlements spread fastly, Bridgeport CT and Walpole MA being early works of the eminent planer John Nolen who in the 20's became identified with the planned towns of Kingsport TE, Mariemont OH and Venice FL. While in Bridgeport due to industrial growth Nolen consulted on a general plan, later on contributing to the immediate building of about 900 family homes for arms workers, Walpole was in need of incorporating the varying requirements of three different communities comprising the industrial region. There Nolen advised on a comprehensive plan and its sites for community buildings, meanwhile designing a garden village housing industrial workers, outlining detailed street sizes and types, meant to ease Walpole's need for coordination.

Thereby the means of site planning were assembled, adjusted, improved and refined. Since examples there are many, but Nolen himself had spoken of realtors as progressive planners it might be more useful to review a model Nolen had mentioned too: St. Francis Wood.

St. Francis Wood seems to have impressed Hegemann deeply. Duncan McDuffie, head of the realtor firm, boasted even in 1932 about Hegemann, „the great German city planner“, to have called it „the most distinguished residential suburb not alone in California, but in America“. McDuffie and Hegemann had made friends when Hegemann came out to Berkeley and had surprised not McDuffie alone, by conducting studies all over the city before commenting. To McDuffie, Hegemann „was no mere city beautifier. Here was a planner, not only of cities good to look at, but of cities good to live in.“

McDuffie had been enchanted with the lay of the lands seemingly at first sight: the 175 acres had been part of a ranch, heavily planted with trees by a former owner. San Francisco opening up to the western parts after the great fire of 1906, access was barred by several peaks of about 900 feet, sheltering the city from fog and winds. A tunnel projected by the City Engineer, was not begun before 1914. The complicated topography comprised wooded lands, wildflowers demonstrating good soil, and when McDuffie saw a boulevard unrolling to the beach, he imagined lots securing views at the Pacific, sun and best garden soil. He engaged the Olmsted Bros. for architectural landscaping and John Galen Howard as architect.

Nevertheless, sales did not rise until the long propagated Twin Peaks tunnel for streetcars was opened up in 1918, reducing commuting time to 20 min. When McDuffie remembered slackening sales of the wartimes, he recalled the temptation to turn away from his original ideas, to cheapen the street improvement, to reduce the size of lots and to let down on restrictions and architectural supervision. Thereby the features distinguishing this subdivision are indicated. Moreover, regarding the lists of improvements in a mid-1910 sales brochure, we are able to identify all those utilities and amenities which have become that ‘normal’ we do not even think about them any more.

The streets are laid out with concrete basic and asphaltic surface for „secured footing and traction“, the sidewalks to be separated, laid with bricks, curbs heavily armoured, gasoliers, hydrants and parking spaces will be provided for. At the same time, the streets will be „highly cultivated to change the barrenness of characteristic city streets for the beauty of a private garden“. City conveniences are guaranteed: gas, water, electricity, sewer and telephone will be laid out in the sidewalk area; all electric wires laid in conduite, thus „no hideous poles and overhead wires“ will disturb the view.

Parks and parkways, several playgrounds and a Children’s Common were designed by the Olmsteds, the latter procuring a special summerhouse to protect children and nannies against rain and to provide shade. The architect to design „architectural embellishments“, Howard was meant to spread a unified design all over the subdivided land, a plan realised more conclusively than Nichols’ beginnings had indicated. The gateways, loggias, pergolas and pools cited an italian renaissance garden. Howard enhanced the effect by decorating the grounds with vases, pillars and balustrades – he even was to design the street lamps – and by now, a distinct border was effected by the special entrance gates Howard designed. They bore the name of the subdivision, mounted in a special lettertype, which was to be the residential park’s identifier.

But without doubt McDuffie's boldest stroke was founding the St. Francis Homes Association. In this organisation, every buyer was to be given a share to own and manage all of the community property. Moreover the association was entrusted with the interpretation and enforcement of the deed restrictions. (Obviously this appealed most to Hegemann, recalling the instruments of securing a settlement's future development by cooperative ownership, its appearances only to be changed by a majority vote of all its members.) Thereby introducing an element of democracy in the organisation and maintenance of a residential park, it enhanced the inhabitant's sense of building their own community and strengthened their willingness to adhere to impositions.

The restrictions banned stables, the spite fence, shacks, the flat and apartment houses, laundries, groceries and saloons; they guaranteed wide lots and freedom from future crowding, therefore the existing building density, and the gardens and designs. Consequently, McDuffie argued with stable, even increasing prices, protecting the investments. The sales-brochure advertised the view to the horizon, looking upon the ocean, the opportunities of experiencing the grandeur of pacific sunsets every day with the simple argument „In every city in the United States view-commanding residence property is price-commanding property.“ The brochure predicted increase-ments in value of about 100 %, deduced from examples of other restricted residence areas. By now, Nichols' statement was applicable not only to the realtor but also to the buyer.

All over, St. Francis' layout presents a loosened grid, one part laid out formally with an axis to ease up by curvilinear streets due to the contours of the land. Incorporating landscaped topography and park-like settings, it provided grand parks and boulevards, ideal settings for Howard's neoclassical ornaments. Most impressive remains the contrast to the city's grid and density, incorporating villa size lots, setting a stage for the unfolding of contemporary fashions of architecture, where today Arts&Crafts, Chicago School and Beaux-arts styles can still be seen.

By now, Hegemann in Washington Highlands merely seems to have done as all did. Anyway he was up to his times but he might have done more.

In any case he encountered favourable conditions meeting with realtors ready to raise to the challenge of modern subdividing. Willing to invest a larger amount of capital as usual, the firm had been willing too to incorporate those means of protection as had served to increase prices elsewhere. However, the system of restrictions guaranteing the future development of the residence park was drawn up and a Washington Highlands Home Owner Association was founded. Binding the complete subdivision by obligatory regulations, the execution of these rules was handed over to the community's association. (It has been said that Hegemann would not have agreed with the restriction's part on allowing for afro-americans as servants solely. But being an economist, he certainly knew of the financial reasons for a despicable rule of today and however judging it, would have had to keep mum about it.)

Otherwise, with the design of the subdivision the realtors meant Hegemann to have a free hand. Development on a minor scale excluded the grand schemes, the share of parkland forcibly smaller. Whereas the first plans included a school building, probably indicating the subdivision had been meant to become a nucleus of a greater

planned site, the area finally comprised of residential homes only, except for the existing seminary grounds on its north-eastern corner. The size did not allow nor call for a separate shopping-center.

When good planning had turned into a financial argument, it was Hegemann's special achievement to turn this argument upside down. He made financial arguments into good planning.

Since he had to make do without a club house or a shopping center he designated parklands for a compensation. By landscaping the trough of the creek into Central and South Park he did not only aggrandize them by their appealing names, but made up for the missing meeting place. To furnish the oblong shapes of the creek's greens with walkways meant to avoid those pedestrian ways Hegemann often mocked as „pretzelways“, curling around small, stampsized parks. Now these parks provided relatively long pleasure walks in short walking distance of every home, ideal settings to walk the dog, to meet and talk to your neighbors. And to walk up the strait lane or the pleasant crescent to the hill point made up for the missing community center in another way since up there the view on town and country was to connect the residential area to its municipality, strengthening a self-assertion as well. (But the so called Apple Croft originally seems to have been meant as a private park used like London's commons by neighbors only who had a key. Therefore it might be rightly objected, the design did not care very much for children, at least not as much as McDuffie did, though the sales-brochure announced that, in their parks, „a mother residing in Washington Highlands, will have the assurance of a reliable guardsman watching her children“.)

One of Hegemann's operating principles was to cut costs. Since that meant to avoid cutting and filling mainly – road construction a necessary factor, planting and maintenance being less costly –, the principle transformed, the idea being not only to accept and make do with but to show off the topography's irregularities.

Thus Hegemann refused more consequently the underlying pattern of the grid to divide the lands. While the Olmsted Bros. in St. Francis Wood and elsewhere had romantized the grid, changing the crossing's angles and curving the streets, they basically adhered to the quadrangular block. Hegemann abolished it. Knowing the grounds very well, he chose the main contour line to have it followed by the grand boulevard, even its eastern dent defined by two contour lines. All the winding roads are laid out to meet both requests, to preserve the topography but to divide into blocks and lots usefully. Therefore, the exception of „Betsy Ross Place“, parting block 14 and 12 into right-cornered blocks, cut straight where a diagonal road according to the contour lines would have produced impracticable lot sizes. (But when „Betsy Ross Place“ was sold out quite early, clients seem to have taken their time to get used to deviating appearances, preferring the lots and blocks they were used to.) The planner's intention might best be seen in the alterations between his first subdivision plan of June 1, 1916 and the lot-line plan of the sales-brochure. Hegemann had bent the western half of his inner crescent, the „Upper Parkway“, to meet with „Upper Parkway South“. This run was near to identical with the contour line, providing a flat lane, while the later chosen curve had to mount towards the hill over 30 feet. Than, the „Central Park“ was larger and there, Hegemann had

inserted a building which probably was to be a kind of club house. By the plan's later version, we do see the reasons for the redesign. The crescents laid out parallel, increased the lot number from Hegemann's 19 in block 9 to 23 lots. But more important, it allowed for a second block 11 with 10 extra lots, which, bordering the park without a separating road, were of extra financial value.

The example shows the planner's difficult course, to adhere to his ideas of design but to adjust to the manager's estimates. Without doubt, Hegemann had dreamt of a generous subdividing, securing lots of special largeness to the potential buyer. Only at the western and northern fringes, his layout had seen to smaller lots, facing the adjacent streets, but still too big for duplexes or rowhouses to be really attractive to the lesser incomes. By the time the managing firm had revised the layout, lot numbers had increased by a fourth, from 289 to 373. Where Hegemann had drawn in 11 or 12 lots – the two blocks of the southeastern corner – the firm had inserted 24 and 21 lots, redoubling the numbers, while an additional service drive now made cars, delivery men and servants invisible.

It might hint on Hegemann's want of experience. But more importantly it might prove Nolen's statement of the realtors being progressive planners. Quite obviously, the managers knew their clients very well. They had to calculate not only the prices the buyers could afford and to cut down lot sizes according to the clients' pecuniary power, but to consider which equipment would be wanted to match prices for a favourable judgment on the buyer's side. (Which, at the same time, might have happened to mean the contrary: two lots of the later plan comprised of 4 each of Hegemann's former plan, obviously meeting the buyers' desire of large grounds in block 6.) Therefore, lots adjacent to the park or lots to be served by an extra lane were more valuable than a planner's vision.

Therefore, we should not give in to an artist's purism and condemn the entrepreneur as a disdainful capitalist without rethinking. The realtors had to trim the planners' ideals to reality and they made them work – even if it meant to cut out community buildings and to cut down on largesse and social ideas. All the more, thinking of McDuffie's complaints of near to non-existent sales during the wartimes, because they had to compensate for general obstacles also. In that sense, putting the progressive planning to the test and making it work, they turned out as progressive planners (though that might not have been what Nolen had in mind when praising them).

However, Hegemann had already made use of saving and adapting. He had graded the street widths according to their importance – the flow of traffic still being of minor significance – in accentuating the lay of the lots. Most of the roads laid out with separated side walks, but with single lanes, the larger ones were reserved to the central ways. The show-piece, the half-moon of „Washington Circle“ as well as parts of three more boulevards he designed in the fashion of the parkways, a central reservation to be planted to drown the traffic, to built up ways for cruising and walking without steep raises. Constructing the circle in a split-grade level matched again preserving and saving, showing off the characteristics of the subdivision's special topography.

To resign himself to cheap means of landscaping and design had turned out stressing his design ideas instead of damaging them. Since levelling the lots or burying the

creek was out of question, the small natural stream had to cross at least 6 of the lots. There, small footbridges were built – some more planned for the parks, Peets rendering them for the picturesque in the sales brochure – to cross the waters, the irregularities put on display for distinction. Where lots had to be filled to commence building, the designers had relied on the owners' interests to act the same – as is to be seen in the sales-brochure's illustrations of the architecture they imagined – choosing a design which by walls, stairs and terraces would transform the peculiarities into show-pieces.

To reduce the share of public space by reducing streetland served several ends. Of course, to cut down street widths meant to enlarge the lots. But to change the streets' layout from the grid to the curvilinear reduced the street length, even up to a third of the frontlines compared to the grid. Economizing by reducing the street lengths was topped by cutting down the numbers of streets though serving other ends. To discontinue the oncoming roads meant to discourage traffic, the automobilist moreover wanting to avoid the winding lanes for fear of losing his direction.

Meanwhile the unbroken fringeline of the estate served as a border, sustained by the slight removal of ingoing streets at crossings on the southern side or a shifting of a branching to midblock. Thereby, seven entries to the residence park were created, enhancing a feeling of inner and outer community. Heightened further to resemble them to gates of entry, they were decorated by pillars of modest size, but special decoration. The basket of fruits Peets had drawn to crown the pillars, cited the roman pine-cone, the emblem of sovereignty, signaling its owner's power over his territory. The diminution to the basket with fruits, sign of wealth, fertility and abundance, had turned it into the picturesque and into a fashionable style of its time, but nevertheless subtly insisting on the owners' rights.

Thus, the straight axis reveals itself as just one more feature to insert a symbol of sovereignty into the design, to be achieved by moderate means too, nonetheless misleading. It was misleading in a practical way, since not built to ease through-traffic but being a dead end. And it was misleading in a figurative sense, built to connect the community to the surrounding city by the view from the hill, demonstrating its embedding and dependance. Whereas copying its perspective illusion, aggrandising the width and importance of the terrain, meant democratizing an aesthetic and dominant means formerly belonging to rulers and sovereigns from the old world for new owners to participate in its scenic beauty and political meaning.

All in all, Hegemann might not have done a lot more than combining the essential features he had encountered when visiting other progressive subdivision developments. But he achieved to join all these elements on a relatively small scale, not though, but by being confined to architectural means and landscaping, in a unified distinctive setting, accentuating a peculiar topography and enhancing its scenic beauty by an intensified combination of formal and informal ways of design.