



# Kent Academic Repository

Haney, David H. (2013) *Admiration and Apprehension of the American Metropolis: European Responses to the Plan of Chicago*. In: Eisenschmidt, Alexander and Mekinda, Jonathan, eds. *Chicagoisms : the city as catalyst for architectural speculation*. University of Chicago Press.

## Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/64209/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

## The version of record is available from

## This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

## DOI for this version

## Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

## Additional information

## Versions of research works

### Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

### Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

## Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact [ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

## European Responses to the *Plan of Chicago* and the Chicago Park Systems: Admirations and Apprehensions of the American Metropolis

David H. Haney

*The Plan of Chicago* was published in 1909 as a luxuriously illustrated volume intended not merely as a factual presentation of practical planning concepts for the city, but more importantly to serve as propaganda piece designed to arouse public support for the promised civic improvements.<sup>1</sup> The prominent Chicago architect Daniel H. Burnham and his colleagues in the elite Commercial Club were the authors of the *Plan*, which they saw as an overall solution to problems of traffic congestion, unhealthy environmental conditions, and haphazard development. Burnham's first major planning project had been the World's Columbian Exposition of 1893, where he oversaw a vast array of logistical and design problems necessary to create the dazzling spectacle soon dubbed the "White City."<sup>2</sup> The architecture of the Exposition was symbolized by the neo-classical "Court of Honor" with its gleaming white electrically-lit facades, which stood in strong contrast to the chaos and grime of the surrounding city. This success led to a number of other urban planning commissions for Burnham, most notably the restoration and renewal of the eighteenth-century plan by Charles L'Enfant for Washington DC.<sup>3</sup> Burnham's planning style was characterized by neoclassical architecture arranged along grand axes and monumental spaces, recalling the planning principles of the French Baroque, but adapted to modern American needs. Burnham was not the sole author of the *Plan of Chicago*, but was undoubtedly the leading protagonist behind it. The other members of the Commercial Club were highly successful business men (as the name of the club suggests), who loudly proclaimed their commitment to the "public good." However as critics pointed out at the time, they were also in a position to profit from the great increases in urban land values that would result from the proposed improvements.<sup>4</sup>

Yet the *Plan* was not the first systematic proposal for planning within the city of Chicago. Four decades earlier in 1869, three administrative bodies had been founded by the State Legislature: the Lincoln Park, South Park, and West Park Commissions.<sup>5</sup> By the time of the publication of the *Plan*, the development of Chicago's parks was in full flower. Perhaps the most innovative among the new parks were those designed by the Olmsted brothers for the South Park Commission, located within some of the densest, poorest neighborhoods of the city. While the *Plan* was also committed to the establishment of more public park areas, especially along the lakeshore, the work of the park commissions would have continued even if it had never been drafted. *The Plan of Chicago* may be characterized by the focus upon large-scale traffic circulation schemes and the erection of monumental buildings, while work of the park commissions is marked by a concern for local neighborhoods and individual recreational needs.

Unsurprisingly, news of the *Plan* soon reached professional circles in Western Europe through publications and exhibitions. Burnham even travelled across the Atlantic to promote the idea personally. To many Europeans, America represented the best and the worst of modern industrial metropolitan society, for which Chicago as the fastest growing city in the US was the perfect symbol. During this period reformers on both sides of the Atlantic were appalled by living conditions caused by dangerous increases in traffic levels, overbuilding, and lack of fresh air and sunshine. Many critics blamed these adverse developments on uncontrolled

commercialism, capitalism, and industrialization. The birth of metropolitan mass-culture was both welcomed and feared. On the one hand, the potentially grand scale of construction and planning made possible by industrial organization was celebrated, while on the other, the danger of depersonalization brought about by mass-production and mass-consumption caused deep concern. Burnham was famous for his statement that only "big" plans would stir the imagination; the *Plan* was a strategy for harnessing the potential of the colossal metropolis in an organized and even aesthetically pleasing manner. The artist Jules Guerin's striking color perspectives emphasized the vast scale of the *Plan* through depictions of grand axial streets stretching out into the distant prairie, a vision which could not fail to instill a sense of awe. On the other hand, these images of Chicago as a symbol of American mass-culture and commercial success could also arouse a sense of apprehension among some Europeans. The members of the Commercial Club were indeed the heads of great commercial interests, and although their intentions may have been noble, they nevertheless were ultimately serving the same American capitalist interests that had resulted in chaotic urban conditions in the first place.

Another issue that the *Plan* raised was the relation of the modern metropolis to history and national culture. Burnham clearly wanted to bring the civilizing influence of European high culture to Chicago through the adaptation of Baroque and neoclassical planning and architecture to modern American needs. In the narrative description of the published *Plan of Chicago*, Paris was held up as the ideal city for emulation. The level of imitation was especially obvious in Guerin's illustration of a new Chicago opera house, nearly a literal copy of the original in Paris. This would have seemed perfectly logical in the American context, where European settlers had naturally brought over their own cultural traditions from the beginning. However, Burnham and company's *Plan* expanded the extent and size of avenues and civic spaces far beyond what would have been possible within the walls of the old city of Paris. On the other hand, because European metropolises such as Paris, Berlin, and London had also witnessed radical growth and change during the nineteenth century, planners there were also searching for large-scale solutions to the problems of the modern metropolis. On a superficial level, it is true that Chicagoans wanted European culture, and that Europeans wanted to learn from American pragmatism. Yet Europeans were also struggling to preserve and define their cultural identities within their own radically transformed cities. Thus, the difference between the modern American metropolis and the European one was not as great as some European critics wanted to suggest.

In the meantime, the popular press in Chicago was convinced that not only was their city capable of successfully emulating European models, but moreover that the *Plan* had actually transcended them. From the [Chicago] *Daily News* in 1910 we read: "Jealous Paris Fears Chicago Beauty Plan: D. H. Burnham says French capital dreads American city will snatch its laurels."<sup>6</sup> And the following year the *Chicago Record-Herald* proclaimed: "Model of Kaiser for New Berlin is 'Chicago Plan:' German Emperor has Commission Adopt Burnham Ideas for His Capital."<sup>7</sup> Despite the bombast of such headlines, they do point to the pride with which many Chicagoans viewed the *Plan*, and in fact, professionals in Europe were carefully considering its pros and cons. Whatever the criticisms of European professionals may have been, Burnham definitely received positive recognition among many of them. Already in 1907 he had been invited to join the prestigious Institut International d'Art Public in Brussels in recognition of his work in Washington DC and elsewhere.<sup>8</sup>

To some extent the influence of "Chicago" abroad reflected Burnham's own influence as a public personality.

One of the most important events in the newly emerging field of city planning during the period was the 1910 International Town Planning Conference held by the Royal Institute of British Architects in London. The *Plan of Chicago* was prominently exhibited there through models, drawings, and even the enormous painted views by Jules Guerin. The proceedings of the conference, including audience reactions to Burnham's own talk, were published in a thick volume, itself a fascinating document of the period.<sup>9</sup> Judging from these proceedings, some Englishmen greeted Burnham and the *Plan* with great enthusiasm as harbingers of modernization, while others viewed them with great suspicion as representatives of American commercial interests. English architects and planners had already divided into these two camps well before the publication of the *Plan*, and to some degree they were acting predictably. On the other hand, their conflicting views pointed to fundamental differences: between those advocating large-scale planning in service of the collective needs of the metropolis, and those who believed that small-scale neighborhood planning was necessary to protect against the alienation of mass-culture. These two positions could be conveniently represented by those in favor of wide streets and monumental buildings, versus those promoting small-scale picturesque planning and the English garden city movement.<sup>10</sup> The former railed against the insularity of their countrymen, and the latter held themselves to be the protectors of English individualism.

Naturally, Burnham's own talk at the London conference generated much discussion.<sup>11</sup> Rather than elaborating upon the Chicago Plan itself, or even on specific design points within his planning strategies, Burnham instead turned to the broader theme of "democracy," and the type of organization needed to bring large-scale schemes to realization. Burnham went to great lengths to defend American democracy as a system whereby a few civic minded individuals could serve the needs of the mass public. He explained that, "the town-planning men in every city are the ablest in the community," in reference to the leaders of the largest businesses and enterprises.<sup>12</sup> Another important factor in American democracy was "publicity," which for Burnham meant that, "With us any degree of secrecy in governmental politics is impossible."<sup>13</sup> American political leaders could thus not foist a grand scheme upon the public against its will, as despots had been able to do in the past, or so he believed.

Burnham clearly tailored his comments to some degree to his British audience (although perhaps with a degree of condescension). He assured his London colleagues that:

There is not a man in the room who could not make a good plan for the development of London's thoroughfares, but it will take all of you working shoulder to shoulder to get any one of them carried out. And yet I do not think this impossible<sup>14</sup>

Burnham concluded his talk by discussing the need for better use of resources and lauding the advent of electric power, for it would mean the demise of the pollution caused by horse traffic and coal smoke. On this occasion he emphasized organization on a great scale, under the control of specialists and civic-minded philanthropists, for the main focus of his talk did not concern a specific design aesthetic as such.

In discussions that immediately followed, audience comments on Burnham's talk were generally positive with some exceptions. The planner and university professor Stanley Adshead, was unequivocally supportive:

Mr. Burnham opened his paper with a very fine philosophical foundation on the sociology of America. He showed us that the new conditions of America, combined with its numerous nationalities, have resulted in the production of something entirely original<sup>15</sup>

For Adshead, America and Chicago were genuinely new products, with their own legitimate culture; they need not imitate European cultural models. Indeed, Adshead saw only a progressive modernizing tendency in Burnham's work:

A great city must be built on a great scale; it must have wide streets, wide sidewalks, and big buildings simply composed; it must concentrate its interest at points, and must not spread it about with reckless waste. I do not look disparagingly ahead on every side I see evidence of the need for improvement, and the advent of the Ritz Hotel and Selfridge's Store marks a change<sup>16</sup>

Selfridge's department store in central London was indeed a "big building" designed by Burnham himself for the American retailer Gordon Selfridge. The store was a symbol of the kind of American commercialism that Chicago was known for, clearly not a problem for Adshead, who believed in bigness and centralization. His comment about "reckless waste" was directed against garden city advocates like the socialist architect Raymond Unwin who were arguing for decentralization.

Predictably, the founder of the English garden city movement, Ebenezer Howard, made no reference to Chicago at all following Burnham's talk. Others, on the other hand, were openly critical. One participant noted that another speaker had correctly identified that:

...the tendency of to-day was, in towns ... to substitute the benevolent despotism of the great landlords [with] an organized democracy. That would appear to be what Mr. Burnham wants, and, to my thinking, it is one of the very worst things that could possibly happen to the people<sup>17</sup>

For this speaker, "the tyrant is the vast majority of the people," meaning perhaps that the masses could not be trusted to know what they actually needed.<sup>18</sup> Another speaker critically observed that a few elite men could in fact make decisions without consulting the majority, which he also believed to be happening in America. Between them, these two English critics identified what they perceived to be the twin flaws of American culture: on the one hand, a democracy of the masses could not be trusted because ill-informed, and on the other, business elites could not be trusted because they were acting in their own favor in the name of the masses. How exactly these situations were to be avoided in their own culture they did not explain.

In the English professional press at the time, other criticisms were more practical: "Grandiose as it appears on paper...considerable doubt may be pardoned to an Englishman as to how it would work in practice."<sup>19</sup> The review of the exhibition published in the official proceedings also expressed a lack of conviction: "In considering the proposals as a whole, however, we cannot help feeling a doubt as to whether the effects indicated in the drawings are ever likely to be attained in

actuality."<sup>20</sup> English skepticism was no doubt based on over two centuries of unrealized urban proposals for London, beginning with Christopher Wren's plan for the city following the Great Fire of 1666. As the English landscape architect Thomas Mawson pointed out, the English frame of mind was not receptive to the kind of large-scale planning schemes found on the Continent, preferring instead a kind of "rough and tumble" method of town making.<sup>21</sup> In any case, the *Plan* may have had supporters at the 1910 London conference, but it cannot be said to have had any real subsequent influence in Britain.

Another series of grand schemes on display at the 1910 exhibition in London presented the "Competition for a Plan for the Development of Greater Berlin," which had just been judged in March of that year before the London exhibition had opened in October.<sup>22</sup> (This was the urban plan alluded to in the Chicago newspaper headline above.) The catalyst for the 1910 RIBA conference was in fact a 1909 German Garden City Association study tour to England, widely hailed as a success in both countries.<sup>23</sup> While the garden city idea had taken firm root in Germany, planners and architects there were divided along similar lines to those in England. Significantly, the competition for greater Berlin was conceived by advocates of monumental planning. One of the three original organizers of the Berlin competition, Albert Hofmann, made reference to the "White City" of the Columbian Exposition as a commendable precedent.<sup>24</sup> Hofmann also admirably recalled the bold remark of American sculptor Augustus Saint-Gaudens that the planning of the Columbian Exposition had brought together the greatest collection of artists since the Renaissance. Hofmann recognized that Berlin was indeed a different city from other European capitals, as it had experienced the most rapid growth of any on the Continent in the late nineteenth century, earning it the popular nickname "Chicago on the Spree." While there were significant eighteenth-century urban spaces in Berlin such as the grand avenue Unter den Linden, on the whole it had become a nineteenth-century city dominated by speculative development. The plan for Berlin was intended to restore a sense of European monumentality, while also solving technical problems such as traffic flow. Designers entering the Berlin planning competition faced similar problems to those of Burnham and his team.

Among the Berlin competition winners, fourth place was awarded to the team of architect Bruno Schmitz, planner Otto Blum, and engineers Havestadt & Contag.<sup>25</sup> This scheme received great praise in the professional press, and among the winners it was thought by many to most closely resemble the *Plan of Chicago*. One of the focal points of the scheme was a proposed "Forum of Labor" located on an island in the Spree River, reminiscent of the governmental "Civic Center" depicted in *The Plan of Chicago*.<sup>26</sup> This scheme of Schmitz and partners also incorporated the expected broad avenues and monumental public spaces, designed to symbolically represent the relatively new imperial status of Berlin as a capital. However, another element in the Schmitz scheme was a series of free-standing high-rise blocks, which one critic, Albert Brinckmann, decried for being "American," associated as they were with Chicago commercialism.<sup>27</sup> To such critics, this kind of gesture was not suitable for imperial Berlin. Nevertheless, Brinckmann found the Schmitz scheme sufficiently monumental to elevate it from the fate of being too American on the whole, "even though your design is reminiscent of projects such as the development plan for Chicago."<sup>28</sup> As was the case in England, Chicago as a symbolic entity evoked different and sometimes contradictory responses even within the same circles.

Perhaps the most important single European professional in this era to promote the *Plan*, and indeed American planning ideas in general, was the

economist and planner Werner Hegemann.<sup>29</sup> He had spent a number of years in the USA, principally in Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia, and thus was an authority on the subject of American planning. He was the primary organizer of the Berlin City Planning Exhibition held in the spring of 1910, as well as of a similar follow-up exhibition that was opened in Düsseldorf that summer. For the latter exhibition, Hegemann succeeded in persuading Burnham to ship the large-scale Guerin paintings of the *Plan* across the Atlantic. Because of this, they could be displayed later in London. Hegemann correctly believed that the stunning Guerin paintings would be a sensation at the exhibition, winning the public over to the cause of urban planning. Afterwards, he published an extensive two-volume catalogue of the 1910 exhibitions that he had organized, as well as a small booklet dedicated specifically to the *Plan*.<sup>30</sup>

In his brochure on Chicago, Hegemann did not discuss the organizational and political structures behind the realization of the plan, but focused on its formal and aesthetic qualities. He announced in the opening:

All of Chicago – not just a limited exhibition area – is to be treated as a magnificent overall design, and be created anew as the most beautiful city on the continent, perhaps in the world<sup>31</sup>

For Hegemann the significance of the Chicago Plan was its comprehensiveness, not just as a matter of practical problem solving, but also on the artistic level; although he did not state it as such, he clearly thought of it as a kind of *Gesamtkunstwerk*. He expressed his belief that, "It [the *Plan*] represents an attempt for once, to see the entire city organism first and foremost from the standpoint of the architecturally oriented city planner."<sup>32</sup> Here he implied that the "architecturally oriented" planner would have an aesthetically more sensitive perspective than the technically oriented engineer, who was often in charge of laying out streets at this time. For Hegemann, the shift towards the architectural was essential to progress in the field of planning. He was particularly impressed by the open spaces in the *Plan*, not simply the wide, open streets. He noted that the "monumental representation of the city would primarily occur at the street intersections," with the civic centre at the most important intersection providing the focal point of the whole.<sup>33</sup> He did not fear the sense of monotony that some of his English colleagues did, for he believed that the *Plan* was also well-considered at the level of detail, providing the right amount of spatial variety and complexity. And unlike many of his German colleagues, he felt that the *Plan* presented a legitimate model for his countrymen to follow; in addition, he was perhaps the only German planner to seriously consider Chicago's park systems.

Among Western Europeans the most extensive discussion of American public parks took place in Germany, although the subject was also studied by landscape architects in England, France, and elsewhere. During this period the emerging fields of urban planning and landscape architecture often overlapped, as was the case with public parks. At the level of detailed design, however, it was primarily landscape architects who led the way. Although Europeans had also made great progress in the field of park design and green space planning, many there continued to recognize the park systems of American cities as being at the forefront of the field. The two US cities that received the most praise for their parks were Boston and Chicago. The Metropolitan Park System of Boston, consisting of large landscape

reserves surrounding the city was seen as being an example of urban green space planning on a metropolitan or regional scale. By contrast even though the parks of Chicago were part of a large overall system, they were generally praised for their individual character and contribution to neighborhood life. However, the *Plan* in fact called for the establishment of an outer park system, although this aspect received less attention abroad.

In 1905, four years before the publication of the *Plan*, the Parisian landscape architect J. C. N. Forestier penned a small brochure, *Large Cities and Park Systems (Grandes Villes et Systèmes de Parcs)*, with the problem of the planning of Paris in the background.<sup>34</sup> Forestier included a statistical table comparing the ratio of park area to population among 16 major international cities.<sup>35</sup> Not insignificantly, all the examples that he gave were American except for three: Vienna, London, and Paris – in that order, with Paris having the lowest ratio on the entire list. Paris was in a different situation from most other European capitals, for as Forestier noted, the fact that the ring of fortifications surrounding it still had not been demolished caused considerable planning problems. Despite his obvious admiration for American urban park systems, there appears to have been some irritation underlying his comment that "some Americans" thought that Paris was a "finished city."<sup>36</sup> While it isn't clear whether Forestier was referring directly to Burnham and his colleagues, his observation was certainly applicable. In *The Plan of Chicago*, the model city of Paris is primarily the nineteenth-century city of Haussmann and his boulevards, not the congested early twentieth-century Paris of Forestier's time. Following on this comment, Forestier elaborated:

The city that ceases is the city that is beginning to die; in order to live, it must develop. Now Paris is still living, and with more vigor than ever<sup>37</sup>

Forestier further noted that the growth of Paris was primarily taking place in the suburbs beyond the old fortification walls. Therefore, green space planning for Paris needed to consider the entire metropolitan region, not just the urban core. Ironically perhaps, while Burnham was extolling the charms of historic Paris as the model for modern Chicago, Forestier was trying to explain that Paris itself was suffering from uncontrolled metropolitan growth. Forestier, however, did not make any derisive comments about Chicago, instead he praised its inner city parks as being of great benefit to the population on a daily basis.

In 1911, six years after the publication of Forestier's study, Werner Hegemann published a more extensive study with the self-evident title, *A Park Book: American Park Facilities*.<sup>38</sup> Once again, the parks of Boston and Chicago were the primary examples presented. In contrast to his earlier brochure on the *Plan*, here Hegemann focused solely on green spaces throughout Chicago, including the existing parks within the three Commission districts, as well as the new lakefront parks proposed by Burnham and his colleagues. Hegemann was particularly interested in a type of small park for active recreation specifically developed for Chicago by the Olmsted firm in Boston.<sup>39</sup> Hegemann referred to these as "play parks" ("*Spielparcs*"), reflecting the fact that these had been designed for active recreational use, not just for passive contemplation of scenery. These Chicago neighborhood parks were smaller than the older landscape parks, and Hegemann emphasized that every space within them was designed for a specific recreational function.<sup>40</sup> More unique to Chicago were the "field houses" specifically conceived for this park type, with the purpose of providing indoor recreational space during the long Chicago winters. In



his study, Hegemann featured exterior photos of these buildings along with outdoor gymnasiums and swimming pools. For Hegemann, these parks provided supportive environments for the phenomenon of cultural mixing in America, as symbolized by the organized public festivals staged on their grounds:

Chicago is one of the largest immigrant population centers in the world, and here all conceivable peoples are brought together in a spirit of communal happiness; one cannot imagine anything more reassuring than these great fraternal festivals, where each people strives to show off its most beautiful assets<sup>41</sup>

To illustrate his remarks, he included photos of activities such as children engaged in a great circle dance and young women performing in kilts and silk stockings, the latter captioned: "Scotts in their native costume."<sup>42</sup> These small parks were constructed in some of the poorest, densest areas of the city, a point not lost on Hegemann, who did not see this as evidence of elitist paternalism, but of effective social policy.

Hegemann's *Park Book* concluded with a small section featuring the garden and park designs of the Hamburg firm of Jacob Ochs, who financed the publication. All of the illustrated designs and writing in this section bear the mark of Leberecht Migge, the leading landscape architect in the Ochs firm. Migge was a close colleague of Hegemann and was deeply influenced by his thinking. In 1913, Migge published his own book on landscape theory and design titled, *Garden Culture of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*.<sup>43</sup> American parks played an important role in Migge's book, again primarily those in Boston and Chicago.<sup>44</sup> His study was more analytical than Hegemann's in a design sense, as he tried to explain more specifically how American models might be adapted to German culture. Migge was also highly enthusiastic about the rational layouts of the small Chicago parks designed by the Olmsted brothers. Migge interpreted the repetitive forms and spatial organizations of these parks in the context of the German Werkbund discussion of "types" as essential spatial units. He believed that through a system of spatial types, park designs could be rationally assembled almost like a kit of parts. Migge was probably thinking of these small Chicago parks when he wrote that it would be up to Germans, "to contribute music institutes, public schools and open air museums, as supplements to the sport halls and public libraries of the Americans, as possible intellectual additions to these green gymnasiums."<sup>45</sup> He further commented on the need for Germans to improve the American park models in an architectural sense:

...if we term the sober and unimaginative park architecture of the Americans simply *rational*, then may our later social park period be called upon to promise the highest values: it should be *monumental*<sup>46</sup>

While Migge admired the practicality of Chicago and its park designs, he also believed that Germany possessed a higher level of culture as a European country. Here again, the sense of European superiority is revealed, although Migge's own park designs bore more formal similarity to these small, rational recreational parks, than the grand monumental park schemes proposed for the Chicago lakefront.

Conclusion

Given that European discussions of the *Plan of Chicago* and the city's parks were largely based on published material, and that many European professionals had never even been to the USA, let alone Chicago, it is unsurprising that many criticisms were ultimately superficial. The European sense of cultural superiority asserted by Migge and others was to some degree disingenuous. Berlin, for example, despite being the imperial capital since 1872, was largely an industrial city with masses of workers crowded into substandard housing. The German Kaiser and leading German architects would have naturally wanted to conceal this fact by creating new monumental spaces and buildings. Thus the German assertion of the need for monumentality during this period was also a reflection of cultural insecurity within their own society. In France, meanwhile, Forestier was complaining that Americans thought of the city of Paris as a finished work of art, when in fact it was a vast, rapidly growing metropolis extending well beyond the old fortifications. Burnham's own optimism and his somewhat condescending remarks to his London colleagues was based on another cliché, that because the American city was relatively new it could be more easily redesigned than its European counterparts. To some degree this was true, but the implementation of the *Plan* proved to be quite difficult. For example, Michigan Avenue was widened and extended as projected, but only after protracted legal battles with individual landowners.<sup>47</sup> Proposals for the construction of a great Chicago Civic Center and the transformation of Congress Street into a monumental east-west thoroughfare were in fact never carried out.<sup>48</sup>

Another aspect of the European reception of Chicago during this period is the generally more straightforward discussion of Chicago parks, focused on the smaller scale of these parks and their success as social amenities. Although not specifically framed as such, these park studies implicitly advanced the cause of small-scale planning, which could be contrasted to the large-scale concerns of the *Plan*. Today, the debate between advocates of large-scale versus small-scale planning has been transformed by sustainability agendas, but it has not really abated. Although the search for individual European identities in architectural discourse has long ceased to be an issue, and "Americanism" is no longer synonymous with mass-commercialism, capitalist metropolises around the world continue to inspire both awe and derision. In any case, *The Plan of Chicago* continues to stand out as one of the first attempts to give the capitalist metropolis a global identity, and thus remains a milestone in international histories of economic forces and urban form.

---

<sup>1</sup> Daniel H. Burnham and Edward H. Bennett, *The Plan of Chicago*, Chicago: The Commercial Club, 1909. See also the online version accessed via the *Encyclopedia of Chicago*, at <http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/10417.html> ; the standard comprehensive study: Carl Smith. *The Plan of Chicago: Daniel Burnham and the Remaking of the American City*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Smith, *Plan*, pp. 19-22.

<sup>3</sup> Smith, *Plan*, p. 22-23.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, *Plan*, p. 115.

<sup>5</sup> For the most comprehensive study of the Chicago park systems see: Julia Sniderman Bachrach, *The City in a Garden: A Photographic History of Chicago's Parks*, Placitas, N.M.: Center for American Places, 2001.

<sup>6</sup> Papers of Daniel H. Burnham, Ryerson and Burnham Archives of the Art Institute of Chicago, Call number: 1943.1, Box 62, Folder 36, Series VIII, *Chicago Daily News*, Oct. 26, 1910.

<sup>7</sup> Papers of Daniel H. Burnham, Ryerson and Burnham Archives of the Art Institute of Chicago, Call number: 1943.1, Box FF62.36, *The Chicago Record-Herald*, January 14, 1911.

<sup>8</sup> Papers of Daniel H. Burnham, Ryerson and Burnham Archives of the Art Institute of Chicago, Call Number 1943.1, Series XVI, 604, and Series XVII 118, 170.

- 
- <sup>9</sup> William Whyte, ed., *The Transactions of the Royal Institute of British Architects Town Planning Conference, London 10-15 October 1910*, [Reprint] London: New York: Routledge, 2011.
- <sup>10</sup> See Whyte, *Transactions*, Introduction.
- <sup>11</sup> Lecture by Daniel H. Burnham, "A CITY OF THE FUTURE UNDER A DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT" in: Whyte, *Transactions*, pp. 368-378.
- <sup>12</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, p. 370.
- <sup>13</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, pp. 368-369.
- <sup>14</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, pp. 371.
- <sup>15</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, pp. 392-393
- <sup>16</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, p. 502.
- <sup>17</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, p. 394.
- <sup>18</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, p. 394.
- <sup>19</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, p. [vii]; NB: there are no page numbers in Whyte's introduction.
- <sup>20</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, p. 738.
- <sup>21</sup> Thomas Mawson, *Civic Art*, London: Batson, 1911; Janet Waymark, *Thomas Mawson: Life, Gardens, and Landscapes*, London: Frances Lincoln, 2009.
- <sup>22</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, p. [vii].
- <sup>23</sup> Whyte, *Transactions*, p. [iv]; No author, *Aus Englischen Gartenstädten*. , Berlin: Deutsche Gartenstadt-Gesellschaft, Renaissance-Verlag, 1910.
- <sup>24</sup> Wolfgang Sonne, *Representing the State: Capital City Planning in the Early Twentieth Century*, Munich: Prestel, 2003. p. 104.
- <sup>25</sup> Sonne, *Representing*, p. 117.
- <sup>26</sup> Sonne, *Representing*, p. 119.
- <sup>27</sup> Sonne, *Representing*, p. 120.
- <sup>28</sup> Sonne, *Representing*, p. 120.
- <sup>29</sup> Christiane Crasemann Collin., *Werner Hegemann and the Search for Universal Urbanism*, New York: W. W. Norton, 2005.
- <sup>30</sup> Werner Hegemann, *Der Städtebau*, Berlin: Wasmuth, vol. 1, 1911, vol. 2, 1913; Werner Hegemann, *Der neue Bebauungsplan für Chicago*, Berlin: Wasmuth, 1910.
- <sup>31</sup> Hegemann, *Bebauungsplan*, p. 5.
- <sup>32</sup> Hegemann, *Bebauungsplan*, p. 25.
- <sup>33</sup> Hegemann, *Bebauungsplan*, p. 14.
- <sup>34</sup> J. C. N. Forestier, *Grandes Villes et Systèmes de Parcs*, Paris: Hachette, 1906.
- <sup>35</sup> Forestier, p. 44.
- <sup>36</sup> Forestier, p. 49.
- <sup>37</sup> Forestier, p. 49.
- <sup>38</sup> Werner Hegemann, *Ein Parkbuch: Amerikanische Parkanlagen*, Berlin: Wasmuth, 1911.
- <sup>39</sup> William Tippens, "The Olmsted Brothers in the Midwest: Naturalism, Formalism, and The City Beautiful Movement," in: William H. Tishler, ed., *Midwestern Landscape Architecture*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000, pp. 159-173.
- <sup>40</sup> Hegemann, *Parkbuch*, p. 9.
- <sup>41</sup> Hegemann, *Parkbuch*, p. 10.
- <sup>42</sup> Hegemann, *Parkbuch*, plates between pp. 8-9.
- <sup>43</sup> David H. Haney, trans., ed.: Leberecht Migge, *Garden Culture of the Twentieth Century*. Washington DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2013. Original ed.: Leberecht Migge, *Gartenkultur des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Jena: Diederichs, 1913. See also: David H. Haney. *When Modern was Green: Life and Work of Landscape Architect Leberecht Migge*. Abingdon (UK): Routledge, 2010; another important study of Chicago parks by a German landscape architect during the period: Hugo Koch, *Gartenkunst im Städtebau*, Berlin: Wasmuth, 1914.
- <sup>44</sup> For example, plate 4 in the appendix in Migge's *Gartenkultur* is of an unidentified plan of one of the small Olmsted parks, in fact Davis Square in the Back of Yards district.
- <sup>45</sup> Migge, *Gartenkultur*, p. 27.
- <sup>46</sup> Migge, *Gartenkultur*, p. 28.
- <sup>47</sup> Smith, *Plan*, pp. 134-135.
- <sup>48</sup> Smith, *Plan*, p. 138.