

Branches from the Baron: Cincinnati's Carnegie Libraries

Eira Tansey

As the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County expanded at the beginning of the twentieth century, the library's trustees turned to Andrew Carnegie to build new branch libraries. The construction of Cincinnati's Carnegie branches extended access to dedicated library facilities outside of the downtown basin, because the branches were primarily built in the emerging hilltop neighborhoods. The library trustees were largely responsible for location decisions. Community associations saw the construction of a neighborhood branch as a desirable status symbol, and regularly attempted to influence the trustees' decisions in their favor.

Over the course of fifteen years, Carnegie grants were used to build nine branches, seven of which are still in operation as of 2016. The construction of the Carnegie libraries was long and often difficult, involving setbacks with site location, cost overruns, political controversy, and most dramatic of all, the suspension of a grant for several branches in 1916. The Carnegie libraries formed a key part of a robust county-based metropolitan library system by extending not just the provision of books, but also the creation of new public spaces into the area's neighborhoods. The branches occupied important places in the life of Cincinnati neighborhoods, and provided new spaces in which voluntary associations could meet.

Much of the literature on Carnegie libraries does not examine the factors related to location decisions, even though these decisions affect user accessibility. Recent scholarship on Carnegie libraries has primarily focused on the social context of who supported, used, and rejected Carnegie libraries, the architecture of Carnegie libraries, and how these libraries promoted reading consistent with white middle-class values. Built between 1886 and 1919, with funds from the wealthy steel magnate, Andrew Carnegie, Carnegie libraries were an integral part

of the public library movement in the United States. Thousands of Carnegie libraries were built across America because any community could solicit Carnegie's funds for a library, provided it supplied a site and annually committed 10% of the original donation for maintenance. The Midwest especially benefited from Carnegie's funds, receiving the most buildings of any other region. Cincinnati's construction of Carnegie branches stands in contrast to the small towns that built a single Carnegie library, since it already had some level of distributed library services in place.¹

Insert Tansery Image 1: Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919). LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Prior to the Carnegie branches, Cincinnati and surrounding Hamilton County did not have a well-developed branch library system. Library services were available throughout the city and county via deposit stations, deliveries, and "branches" that were often located in modest facilities or buildings that served a different primary purpose. There appeared to be no branches housed in a purpose-built library building prior to Cincinnati's Carnegie libraries. Cincinnati's Carnegie library era began in 1902, when the trustees first contacted Carnegie, and ended in 1917, with their last communication with Carnegie.

As Cincinnati grew outward from the central business district, new communities boomed on Cincinnati's hilltops, and adequate library services were needed farther from the main library building that was located downtown. At the time, the library was formally known as the "Public Library of the School District of Cincinnati," as the library did not have a formal relationship with the city of Cincinnati. It had been affiliated with the school district since the 1850s, and had previously drawn funding support from a levy that more broadly supported the school district. Library borrowing privileges were extended to all of Hamilton County (which contains Cincinnati, along with smaller towns and villages) following passage of an 1898 act by the state

legislature. After this act was passed, the library trustees sought to expand services around the county via deposit stations, and later with urban branches. Cincinnati was one of the first public library systems to extend services to county residents. In 1900, the library's trustees passed a resolution to accept management of village libraries upon request. As a result, a number of the deposit stations and modest branches that had been established in the distant areas of the county, far from the city's core, applied to be managed by the Public Library of Cincinnati.²

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 2: Cincinnati Main Public Library, c.1875. PUBLIC LIBRARY OF CINCINNATI AND HAMILTON COUNTY

Cincinnati Main Public Library, c. 1904. PUBLIC LIBRARY OF CINCINNATI AND HAMILTON COUNTY

The library's board of trustees was composed of businessmen, lawyers, and other prominent citizens. The library trustees, in cooperation with the head librarian at the time, N. D. C. Hodges, largely shouldered the effort to obtain Carnegie's money. Composed of seven trustees, the board was a stable group of men with little turnover during the Carnegie period. The Cincinnati Board of Education, the Union Board of High Schools, and the University of Cincinnati each appointed two members. The Judges of the Court of Common Pleas appointed the seventh member. Hodges and trustee W. T. Porter were active in the American Library Association (ALA). Porter served as chairman of the trustees section from 1905 through 1920, and served as trustee for the endowment and Carnegie funds for the ALA. Hodges was elected first vice president of ALA in 1908 and became president of the association in 1909.³

As the trustees had few additional sources of income to build a number of suitable purpose-built library branches, they turned to Andrew Carnegie for assistance. In their first letter and subsequent correspondence, they displayed their beliefs--common to Carnegie library

applicants--that their city was a unique place, deserving the enlightenment and broadened service that Carnegie libraries could provide. In their correspondence and meeting minutes on branch libraries, the trustees tended to emphasize architecture, appearance, location, and prestige. Their correspondence with Carnegie frequently reflected civic boosterism and the conviction that Cincinnati could ill afford to exist much longer without a major library system.⁴

The Public Library of Cincinnati trustees initially solicited Carnegie's funds to build a large main library as well as branches. Early correspondence with Carnegie mentioned the need for branches, but also spoke to their great anxiety about the state of the main library. The main downtown location, originally built as an opera house, was too small for its rapidly expanding use. The trustees' overtures for an expanded main library were a contrast to the shifting priorities of Andrew Carnegie, as well as the Public Library of Cincinnati's head librarian. When Andrew Carnegie began funding libraries, many of his early grants helped build large, elaborate main buildings. These included large central libraries in Detroit, St. Louis, Columbus, and Seattle. By the time Cincinnati library officials began their relationship with Carnegie, he had shifted to funding small branch libraries, a position he increasingly embraced in later years. Cincinnati head librarian, N.D.C. Hodges, echoed this same sentiment; writing a report to the trustees in 1901, he asserted that while the main library needed a new building, branch libraries were the key to expanding the reach and influence of the Cincinnati library. Reinforcing his point, Hodges compared Cincinnati and Hamilton County to Cleveland, which had smaller population yet a higher circulation. He identified the reason as being Cleveland's use of "four excellent branches." Hodges also praised Cleveland's practice of locating branches within two miles of the main location. During the Carnegie library-building period, many cities embraced an ideal of a

one-mile distance between branches. Without Hodges's advocacy, the trustees might have continued to assume an expanded main library would serve the needs of the city.⁵

Having failed to receive a response to their initial request from Andrew Carnegie, the trustees wrote again in March 1902. The bond issue for construction of a new main library had failed and would not be reconsidered for another two years. The trustees reiterated their interest in finding a way to build both a branch system and a new main library. Carnegie replied to the trustees a month later with an offer of \$180,000 for the construction of six branch libraries. He closed the letter with the two conditions that characterized all Carnegie libraries: Cincinnati had to furnish the sites and the city had to pledge an annual 10% (\$18,000) maintenance fund for the branches.⁶

State financial regulations challenged the trustees shortly after they accepted Carnegie's \$180,000 gift. Several months after securing an act allowing the library to issue bonds in order to purchase building sites, the Ohio Supreme Court ruled the measure was in violation of the Ohio Constitution. Since the court found that the library did not have the authority to issue bonds, library funds were instead used to purchase sites for the branches. A site for the first branch, located in Walnut Hills, was finally secured in 1904. The site was purchased from the estate of Maria Longworth Nichols Storer, one of Cincinnati's most famous and wealthy women, as well as the founder of the famous Rookwood Pottery.⁷

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 4: Maria Longworth Storer (1849-1932). CINCINNATI MUSEUM CENTER

The trustees' decision to construct the first Carnegie branch in Walnut Hills demonstrates how the economic and civic importance of a neighborhood influenced the trustees' location decisions. Shortly after the trustees first contacted Carnegie, the library trustees considered

Walnut Hills a likely early recipient for a branch. Given its important status as a commercial and transportation district at the time Hodges began to advocate for pursuing a branch model, he specifically mentioned the need for expanded library services in the area,. Expectations for this branch ran high; the neighborhood had many affluent residents, civic groups were eager for a branch, and Walnut Hills was one of the most important commercial districts outside of the downtown core. More than 100,000 people traveled through the area daily due to the confluence of streetcar lines. The architect for Cincinnati's first Carnegie branch was James McLaughlin, a prolific local architect who designed the Cincinnati Art Museum and the remodeling of the main library. The trustees also planned to spend more money on this branch than the others, determining it "to be the most important of its Branch Library Buildings, and as Walnut Hills is the most populous part of our city on the Hills."⁸

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 5: Walnut Hills Branch, Public Library, c. 1906

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF CINCINNATI AND HAMILTON COUNTY

It was also an area with a rich history of educational institutions. Lane Theological Seminary, where Lyman Beecher was president, his daughter Harriet met her husband Calvin Stowe, and anti-slavery sentiment flourished, was founded in Walnut Hills. The seminary not only designated Walnut Hills as a site for intellectual activity, but also ensured that the neighborhood was racially mixed from its earliest days, since it leased parts of the property to black families. As Walnut Hills developed, numerous other schools were established in the area. The oldest neighborhood public school, later known as Frederick Douglass school, was a highly regarded destination for the education of black children during Cincinnati's Carnegie period.⁹

The opening ceremony of the Walnut Hills branch on April 9, 1906, made national headlines when Mayor Edward Dempsey, in attendance to accept the library on the city's behalf,

failed to acknowledge Andrew Carnegie in his remarks. According to the mayor's later remarks on the occasion, the omission was intentional, as he had, "no deep admiration for a man who has made his millions out of the sweat and blood of the toiling classes, but who attempts to atone for the oppression by giving away buildings, and thus advertising himself as a philanthropist." Dempsey took his criticism even further by stating, "I am inclined to regret that the great City of Cincinnati did not build and pay for the branch libraries, instead of receiving them as charity from a man who could have no real sympathy with a city of which he knew nothing, and in which he had no interests."¹⁰

INSERT TANSEY IMAE 6: Cincinnati Mayor (1906-1907) Edward Dempsey (1858-1929) CINCINNATI MUSEUM CENTER

None of the correspondence with Carnegie indicated any desire from city officials to take an active role in pursuing a library system for Cincinnati at the time. However, Mayor Dempsey's attitude towards Carnegie libraries was hardly unique. Many individuals in or connected to the labor movement were deeply suspicious of Carnegie's motives in funding libraries. The juxtaposition of Carnegie's much-ballyhooed "Gospel of Wealth," with the violent breaking of the Homestead, Pennsylvania strike only reinforced the suspicion of Carnegie's motives by those in the labor movement. In 1905, the trustees' minutes recorded a mention of "labor troubles" related to construction of the Walnut Hills branch, but no further explanation was given.¹¹

Cities such as Detroit, Indianapolis, New York, Wheeling, and Cleveland faced labor opposition during the construction of Carnegie libraries. Smaller cities with large working-class populations also faced labor opposition to building Carnegie libraries. Even the relative absence of labor concerns from the trustees' correspondence should not be taken as a sign that labor

wariness was absent from Cincinnati, but that the trustees did not regularly interact with the concerns of Cincinnati's labor community. This likely reflects the business and managerial outlooks of the trustees, since Cincinnati indeed had a vibrant labor activist base. As recently as 1893, one-third of the Cincinnati electorate was associated with Cincinnati's Labor Council, and Cincinnati's labor community made alliances with elected local leaders who supported expanding public education. On occasion, representatives from the labor community appeared at trustee meetings to request the use of unionized labor in library construction, but it is unclear how the trustees addressed these concerns.¹²

Other towns in Ohio experienced labor resistance to Carnegie libraries. In Mansfield, a newspaper reported, "the labor element want[ed] Andrew Carnegie to amend his \$35,000 library offer and change the building into a public hospital." In Coshocton, a subscription library slated for replacement by a Carnegie library met with so much opposition from labor that the local trades council offered to purchase the library and run it. Carnegie prevailed and the town received a check for \$15,000 a few months later. In Youngstown, any "favorable" discussion of socialism was not allowed in the Carnegie library, reportedly on orders from the librarian, who had been personally responsible for obtaining the Carnegie grant.¹³

As the construction phase began, cost issues frequently challenged the trustees' ability to stretch Carnegie's gift as far as possible. This was a common problem for Carnegie libraries. Other Ohio cities experienced similar problems; Marion and Defiance solicited Carnegie for extra money in order to complete buildings. The Cincinnati trustees contacted Andrew Carnegie and his secretary, James Bertram, in late 1905 with a request for a supplement to the original grant. They noted the possibility of building a seventh branch, in addition to Carnegie's gift for six branches, by remodeling an old house on Dayton Street in the West End. Carnegie did not

furnish the additional money. Following the opening of the Walnut Hills branch in 1906, an additional five new Carnegie libraries opened between 1907 and 1909 (see Appendix I).¹⁴

Physical and human geography significantly influenced the trustees' decisions concerning locations of Cincinnati's Carnegie branches. Changing demographics, transportation options, and neighborhood political rivalries formed an urban landscape that shaped where the trustees decided to build libraries. Most of the branches were located only a few miles from one another. This was common in cities with Carnegie branches, which were often "closely spaced" as a reflection of pre-automobile neighborhood development. The geography of the city's hillside and riverside neighborhoods also affected construction decisions. The East End branch was located close to the Ohio River. Due to concerns about potential basement flooding, the lecture room was built on the same first level as the reading room. Price Hill's librarian was sensitive to local mobility, noting in her reports that those who lived on the streetcar line or who owned a car often visited the main library instead of the branch, but children who lived at the base of the hill did not mind the walk up to the library. Ironically, the Price Hill branch was located adjacent to Dempsey Park, named in honor of Mayor Edward Dempsey. Despite the ruckus he had caused during the opening of the Walnut Hills branch, the mayor had secured land for the park by working in cooperation with the library and the city's safety and public service departments.¹⁵

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 7: East End Branch, Public Library, c. 1906.

CINCINNATI MUSEUM CENTER

Historically, Cincinnati's urban core was contained within a six-square mile area between Mill Valley and the banks of the Ohio River, known as the basin. Steep hills on the western, eastern, and northern sides of the city constrained its early development and expansion,

leading to high levels of congestion in the basin, comparable only to the overcrowding conditions found in New York. As city transportation networks developed, higher income white Cincinnatians moved out to the hilltop communities. Many of these early hilltop communities included the same neighborhoods that would receive Carnegie branches. By the time Cincinnati's Carnegie building period ended, the city had become much more racially segregated as whites overwhelmingly left the basin.¹⁶

Many facets of Cincinnati's educational and social life remained segregated, if not by law, then by custom. Shortly after the Walnut Hills branch opened, a separate library for African Americans opened inside Douglass school, located close to the Walnut Hills branch. This branch had only 2,000 volumes, but its opening was justified by the "existence [of] the large settlement of colored people in the immediate neighborhood, which could not be cared for adequately at the larger branch." It is quite possible this was a euphemism to justify segregated services, since it is unclear why the local black population's needs couldn't be met at the Walnut Hills Carnegie branch. At the beginning of Cincinnati's branch library expansion, schools were legally integrated, but many of the former "branch schools" that accepted black students from across the city had closed. The only remaining branch school with a mission to educate black students was Douglass School in Walnut Hills. The black community was very supportive of the school and a new school was built in 1911 with a considerable number of features, including a large auditorium. The public library was approached to support the library services of the new school around the time of its opening. The school remained an educational anchor for the city's African American community for much of the early twentieth century.¹⁷

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 8: Frederick Douglass School, Walnut Hills, Cincinnati, Ohio, c. 1902. CINCINNATI MUSEUM CENTER.

As word spread that Carnegie's largesse was making its way to Cincinnati, neighborhood groups made overtures to the library to secure their own branch. The location of libraries and their surroundings were sometimes fraught by rivalries. Local identities were contested when the neighboring communities of Mount Auburn and Corryville competed against one another to build a library. When Corryville was selected as the site for the next branch, a celebration dinner was hosted and Mount Auburn leaders were invited. The Mount Auburn library advocate gave the congratulatory remarks, which reflected the German heritage of Cincinnati and especially Corryville. Comparing advocating to trustees to get a branch library with trying to win a favorable marriage proposal, he remarked, "I knew I was 'up against it.' Nevertheless, I went before them and tried my best to convince them that I was the best of the catch." When it came to a vote, "Some voted 'Yea' but more voted 'Nein,' and she married the fellow on Daniels and Vine."¹⁸

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 9: Corryville Branch, Public Library, c. 1906. PUBLIC LIBRARY OF CINCINNATI AND HAMILTON COUNTY

Securing locations for the branches often provoked tenancy or property issues involving those residing on or nearby the future library site. In 1904, the board secured property for the future East End branch location after the city had condemned it. Several months later, after purchasing the site for the future North Cincinnati (Corryville) branch, the board informed the tenants that they would have to vacate the premises within ten days. The trustees and library staff were often anxious about the physical environment surrounding the libraries. Soon after the Walnut Hills branch opened, the city purchased a lot next to the library property. This property included an "objectionable frame dwelling," which was removed in order to create a more prominent corner lot for the branch. At meetings, trustees extensively discussed matters such as

how to inscribe properly the plaques above the entryways to the branches, and “relieving the flat appearance of the Price Hill branch.”¹⁹

As branches opened, the library system professionalized. The newly built branches had more resources and services to offer and therefore required more professional staff to maintain the branch. Library staff had to be graduates of library school, or go through the Public Library of Cincinnati’s examination schedule and training. Many of the first Carnegie branch librarians had already worked for the main library, and often transferred between branches. Staffing at the branches was almost exclusively female, except for the janitor and pages. Librarians at these branches were involved with patrons’ lives and neighborhood politics, and were able to position the branches as important community spaces. Their reports on the activities of the branch often demonstrated the highly localized concerns of the users from the surrounding neighborhoods.²⁰

The construction and opening of a branch was seen as a step forward in community development. Neighborhood groups, especially businessmen’s clubs, regularly lobbied the trustees at twice-monthly meetings to consider their community for a Carnegie branch. Delegations representing middle and upper-class communities appeared far more frequently than working-class groups to advocate for their interests. Local community improvement associations or women’s clubs often provided flowers and landscaping for the new library’s grounds. The first Cumminsville librarian, in reflecting on that branch’s opening, noted that neighbors planted ivy to improve the appearance of the surrounding buildings.²¹

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 10: Cummingsville Branch, Public Library, c. 1906.

CINCINNATI MUSEUM CENTER

Even as the first group of branches opened, the trustees continued to ask Andrew Carnegie to furnish money to build a new main location. Citing the lack of local library

philanthropy, the trustees also felt that Cincinnatians took the institution for granted. Their requests to replace the main library were consistently rejected, though Carnegie continued to fund new branches for the city. Anxiety over what to do with the main library remained a constant theme in the Public Library of Cincinnati's annual reports, and the trustees soon began to observe that rather than alleviating the burden on the main library, the branches actually increased pressure on the library system. This resulted in increased use of the library system and a greater burden on staff and existing resources.²²

The gift of Carnegie monies did not come with significant oversight or accountability. This is demonstrated by confusing documentation related to two branches. The first situation concerned a house on Dayton Street that was remodeled into a branch. In the trustees' accounting and reporting to the Carnegie Corporation, they did not consistently distinguish between Carnegie funds and other funds used elsewhere within the system. Although it was not explicitly a "Carnegie branch" the way the other nine branches built specifically from Carnegie funds were, it was often mentioned in correspondence to Carnegie and Bertram. In addition, contradictory statements found in the annual and financial reports of the library raise several questions and no clear answers regarding the Dayton Street branch's funding. Records indicate that the funding for remodeling the house on Dayton Street into a branch came primarily from a bequest from Mary P. and Eliza O. Ropes. However, in several library treasurer's reports under the heading of "Carnegie Funds" the Dayton Street branch appears under various line item descriptions. This may be due to the trustees' decision to use a small amount of Carnegie funds on the reconstruction, but they changed their minds and decided to continue with the construction using funds other than Carnegie's money. Later statements from the trustees that the Dayton Street branch was "not [a] Carnegie" and "upon which no part of the donations was

used” also add to the confusion. The second situation concerned a Carnegie branch in Norwood, an independent city within the city boundaries of Cincinnati. In contrast to the library trustee-led efforts of Cincinnati, Norwood’s mayor and women’s clubs led the early advocacy for bringing a Carnegie library to their city. Norwood’s quest to obtain a Carnegie library was not part of the Cincinnati Carnegie library building effort, however the intention was to transfer ownership of the library to the library system after completion. Shortly after the branch opened in 1907, it was transferred to the Cincinnati library system. While the library maintained six Carnegies after Norwood came into its ownership, it took responsibility for the full construction of only five Carnegie branches from the first grant.²³

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 11: Norwood Branch, Public Library, c. 1906.

Cincinnati Museum Center

In May 1908, the trustees requested \$105,000 from Carnegie for an additional round of construction. In February 1909, Carnegie agreed to a second grant of \$100,000 for three additional branches. In March 1914, construction began on Cincinnati's last Carnegie, the West End branch. The costs for this branch went over budget. The difference was covered with a \$6,000 appropriation from the city council, while the Carnegie Corporation added \$6,000 to the original \$100,000 gift, obligating the trustees to maintain the three branches from the second gift and its increase at an annual cost of \$10,600.²⁴

Shortly after the Carnegie branches opened, they became important neighborhood anchors, functioning as community centers and attracting a diverse group of users. With their public rooms and auditoriums, Carnegie libraries served as meeting places for community groups, testing sites for exams, extension service sites to schools, firehouses and other audiences, and settings for a wide variety of classes. Groups meeting at the branches reflected the religious,

civic, business, or educational nature of the area. Library staff promoted the branches as alternatives to alleged urban vices and less wholesome activities. Core user groups from surrounding communities included children, mothers, and businessmen. The trustees explicitly positioned the branches as community centers, noting in an annual report, "...the branch library [is] the social as well as the book center of the community." Librarians worked directly with teachers to encourage children to visit the library. Before a new branch opened, library staff visited neighborhood schools to sign up children for library cards in advance. The librarians in Cincinnati's Carnegie branches reached out to various schools, conducted story hours, and hosted groups and events for children.²⁵

These community ties often carried political implications. The Hyde Park Business Men's Club had long lobbied the trustees for a library, and expected preferential treatment as a result. The club was one of the largest stakeholders in the branch, publishing library news in its club bulletin. The branch librarian communicated her political concerns about accommodating this group shortly after the branch's opening. In a branch report, she noted that a special exception to smoking tobacco in the auditorium should be made for the Business Men's Club, with the wry remark that "smoking is as essential to the working of some men's brains as some propelling force is to an engine." Given the limited authority of branch librarians at this time, it is likely that this would have been a particularly challenging situation. Other tensions between the community and library staff reflected local religious practices. Several issues came up during the early years of the Price Hill branch concerning the Catholic identity of the surrounding neighborhoods. Book deliveries to a convent were temporarily interrupted with the arrival of a new mother superior. A year later, the librarian suspected that parishioners were told that the library supported anti-

Catholic influences. After a few years, the children's librarian claimed that the branch was experiencing competition for its child patrons from a Catholic school library.²⁶

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 12: Price Hill Branch, Public Library, c.1906.

CINCINNATI MUSEUM CENTER

Cincinnati's library staff and trustees reflected a national approach to the library's function in society. As the public library movement accelerated, early leaders characterized the library not only as a place of learning, but also as a "social stabilizer." During this period, library trustees were typically from the upper class and used libraries as a vehicle for defining elite culture, while middle-class library staff viewed libraries as instruments of Progressive Era values that contributed to individual and community self-improvement. Librarians at this time were preoccupied with "good" reading, and actively tried to shape patrons' reading habits and choices. Anxiety over fiction and other light reading had been a topic in the profession for many years. The Price Hill librarians often wrote about the reading habits of patrons, and expressed their distaste in branch reports. A couple of years later, the neighborhood's reading tastes had apparently changed, driven by the growth of the area: "The fact that this impetus is toward better reading, is but an indication that the new people coming in are of the reading class, and that the older patrons are turning to the better books, likewise." This mirrored trends within public librarianship during a time that highly valued the library as a force for cultural assimilation to white middle-class reading preferences, while tending to ignore reader interests, ethnic reading materials, and controversial materials. Reading was a wholesome activity, in contrast to other distractions. A couple of years after the North Cincinnati branch opened, there was a downturn in attendance over the winter, which the librarians attributed partially to the "demoralizing effect of the five-cent theatres and dance halls upon the young people of the neighborhood."²⁷

Anxieties manifested over library users in general were just as strongly directed to the branches' youngest patrons, even as Carnegie libraries provided some of the only public accommodations that welcomed children outside of schools. Carnegie libraries introduced the concept of children's reading rooms on a large scale. Children's library conduct was a perennial concern to librarians, as Carnegie branches frequently served as the first exposure children had to a public library. Following the opening of a branch, large numbers of children visited the new library. The Walnut Hills librarians reported that in the weeks following the opening of the branch, there were so many children who visited after school that many "seemed unwilling to go home even for meals." Although it was less mediated than a school classroom, librarians ascribed certain codes of conduct and symbolism to children's use of the branches. This was apparent in librarians' control over children's reading habits, behavior, and use of the library building. Librarians at the Hyde Park branch felt compelled to address "age appropriate" reading. They noted, "the young boys and especially the girls have been reading fiction far beyond their age." The librarians asserted their perceived authority to enforce good reading habits, claiming to use "tact and scheming to lead them back to literature suited to their age." Branches organized activities both to appeal to children, but also to regulate their behavior. The Price Hill librarian organized the Price Hill Boys Club and reported the club had "a strong influence toward good conduct in the branch." At the West End branch, an influx of boisterous boys descended on the library shortly after opening: "the gang seized upon the library as a splendid place to spend six nights out of every week. We realized at once that a club was the only possible solution."²⁸

Library architecture at this time was used to communicate certain values and segregate different groups of readers. Shortly after the Cumminsville branch opened, the annual report remarked that the branch's reading rooms were "most satisfactory" as they were "well screened

from the noise of the Circulation and Children's Rooms in the front.” While the introduction of children’s reading rooms was a major step in recognizing their unique reading needs, it also attempted to mitigate their perceived unruliness, particularly among working-class children. The librarian at the West End branch frequently commented on the effects of the library on the working-class neighborhood. She noted that the local children referred to her as “the liberry lady.” In her communications, she reassured them by stressing that “the atmosphere of simplicity and good taste of the West End Branch has its effect on those who come in.” However, the library staff also struggled with attempting to impose the value of order. She contrasted the local enthusiasm the neighborhood children had for the opening with the struggles of the branch staff to enforce middle-class values in a working-class neighborhood. She remarked, “[o]ur energies were divided between rescuing books from grimy hands, and rescuing small brothers and sisters from the anxious offices of cleanly-minded young persons bent on enjoying all the benefits of the library, including soap and warm water.”²⁹

Cincinnati librarians had a historical precedent for their concern over “grimy hands.” Soon after William Poole became Cincinnati’s head librarian in 1869 (and later went on to serve as ALA president), he emphasized that only patrons with clean hands be allowed use of library materials. The “unwashed masses” posed a problem for library staff, not only offending on an olfactory level, but also by contaminating the library as a hallowed place of learning and decorum. Many Carnegie libraries had sinks in children’s reading rooms, a nod to ProgressiveEra values that promoted public health through habits of cleanliness.³⁰

TANSEY IMAGE 13: Children in Main Public Library, Reading Room, 1890.
PUBLIC LIBRARY OF CINCINNATI AND HAMILTON COUNTY

With eight Carnegie branches in operation, and a ninth under construction, the trustees sought to acquire more branches to expand the reach of the library system even further. On June 1, 1914, the trustees wrote to Carnegie, requesting a third large grant for additional branches. James Bertram was skeptical, noting that Cincinnati's library situation was comparable to that of Cleveland: "[Cincinnati] has about one branch for every 38,000 population and it would appear to us, speaking generally, that this ought to suffice." Bertram attempted to validate his skepticism by contacting William Brett, librarian of the Cleveland Public Library, former president of ALA, and a frequent consultant on grant matters. He asked Brett to review Cincinnati's application and compare it to Cleveland's library system. Brett assured Bertram of his faith in the Cincinnati library trustees. Bertram notified Porter that while the corporation thought Cincinnati was well stocked with branch libraries, it would consider branches for areas of Hamilton County that were outside the city limits and the extent of the branch library system.³¹

A year and a half later, the trustees wrote to Bertram to request nine new libraries, which would have doubled the number of Carnegie libraries in the area. These included the communities of Camp Washington, Pleasant Ridge, Madisonville, Elmwood-Carthage, Hartwell-Wyoming, Lockland-Reading, Sayler Park, Oakley, and St. Bernard. Several of these locations were outside the city of Cincinnati or had only been recently annexed. Many of the areas received library services through rented or temporary quarters. In a second letter, the trustees requested eleven new branches, including Cheviot and Fairmount with the previous nine proposed locations. Moderating their possibly excessive request, they noted five "preferential locations," in the event that eleven could not be furnished. These five branches (Madisonville, Camp Washington, Lockland-Reading, Pleasant Ridge, and Sayler Park) would cost \$75,000. In March, the Corporation agreed to give \$75,000 for the erection of five more branches.³²

The success of the trustees in securing a third round of Carnegie funding was short-lived. On June 6, 1916, the Carnegie Corporation notified the trustees it was suspending all Ohio grants, citing its place near the bottom of state recipients in maintaining their 10% pledges. The letter also informed the trustees “in the neighboring State of Indiana there is not in this connection a single instance of a community which has failed to keep its pledge.” The corporation noted it was waiting for a reply from the Columbus library system regarding several unacknowledged letters. More than twenty Ohio communities had failed to maintain adequately their branches. Further blame was attributed to the state library; politicization was cited for its inability to put pressure on defaulting libraries.³³

The trustees quickly mobilized to defend their record of maintenance and attempted to save the third grant. Shortly after receiving this notice, Porter requested a meeting with the Carnegie Corporation (he was staying in New Jersey and attending the ALA conference with N. D. C. Hodges), and he and Hodges managed to meet briefly with Bertram. Following the meeting, they wrote to the Corporation, summarizing the meeting and providing assurances that they would work to get their fellow Ohioans in line. Bertram’s reply acknowledged Cincinnati’s good example while repeating that no further grants would be extended to Ohio.³⁴

Ohio’s library leaders echoed the concerns of Cincinnati’s trustees. In October 1916, Clyde W. Parks, president of the Ohio State Library Commission and a professor at the University of Cincinnati, spoke to delegates of the Ohio Library Association regarding the defaulting libraries. Apparently twenty-one of the twenty-seven “delinquent cities” made restitution after being warned by the state association. Parks noted, “[t]wenty-seven Carnegie libraries out of eighty-two in Ohio have failed to make good their pledge to the Carnegie Library Commission, and for

this reason no more Carnegie libraries will be established in this state until the record of Ohio is cleared.”³⁵

Ohio was one of the largest recipients of Carnegie grants, coming in third among states in total money received (\$2.8 million), behind New York and Pennsylvania. Indiana ranked first in Carnegie libraries by number of communities (155) and number of buildings (164), but it ranked fifth in terms of money received (\$2.5 million). That Indiana had managed to maintain all of the branches per the terms of the grants was even more impressive. Ohio was one state among several where grants were suspended; neighboring Kentucky and West Virginia had also inadequately maintained their branches, as well as Illinois, Kansas, and Iowa.³⁶

Local failures to maintain Carnegie branch maintenance turned into state issues, and in turn became a national issue addressed by large professional organizations. In May 1917, Porter asked Bertram for a list of defaulting Carnegie libraries for a trustees section meeting he was to chair at the Louisville ALA conference. On the agenda was the subject of Carnegie library contracts and the failure to maintain pledges. Bertram advised that he could not give out such information; that it was in the hands of Cleveland librarian William Brett, and George Utley, secretary of the ALA. Porter wrote to Bertram in June, informing him that Brett was allowing access to the material.³⁷

At the ALA conference, the trustees section showed particular interest in addressing defaulting Carnegie libraries. One presenter noted that five percent of Carnegie libraries were overdue in reporting to the corporation and six unidentified states were “very derelict.” Brett reported that an ALA appointed committee made progress in getting some of the “delinquent libraries” to report to the Corporation. One of the section participants suggested that the ten percent maintenance fee required by Carnegie was too low. The low amount required for

maintenance was a frequent criticism of the Carnegie library program, since it did not reflect the true costs of library operations.³⁸

The default problem for Ohio's Carnegie libraries dragged out for a few more years, with decreasing involvement from the Cincinnati trustees. In 1920, the president of the Ohio Library Association publicly addressed the politicization and inadequacy of the Ohio State Library in responding to the problem of delinquent Carnegie libraries. He reported that sixteen communities were listed by the Corporation as "unsatisfactory" and eight communities, including Columbus, completely failed to respond to the Carnegie Corporation's inquiries about maintenance pledges. Librarians as well as trustees were blamed for the failure of Ohio's libraries to maintain services and fiscal responsibility. It is unclear how Cincinnati's trustees were involved in the issue at this point, particularly as the library shifted focus to support World War I activities. By this time, the library trustees may have been satisfied that they did all they could to secure a number of Carnegie branches for Cincinnati. By extending library services further out from the historic basin, this helped form the foundation of a library system that would expand considerably to reach every part of Hamilton County. The construction of nine Carnegie branches in Cincinnati positioned the library as one of the best-developed library systems in the state by 1917--only that of Cleveland was larger, with fourteen branches. Furthermore, only four cities had more Carnegie libraries than Cincinnati: Cleveland, Baltimore (14), Philadelphia (25), and New York City (66). Louisville, Detroit, and Pittsburgh, like Cincinnati, each built nine Carnegie libraries.³⁹

Not every Carnegie branch would survive the post-World War II years. Due to declining circulation, library trustees moved to shut down the West End branch in the mid-1940s. As the library sought to sell the branch, legal issues developed due to the Carnegie funding. By June 1946, the county prosecutor informed the trustees that they would be permitted to sell the branch

property. Payments received from the sale of the property, however, were to be used for other library building expenses. The last Carnegie built in Cincinnati was the first branch (and thus far the only) to be demolished. After more than thirty years of service, the West End branch closed in 1947. A printing company briefly occupied the building until it was torn down, and then a gas station took over the lot. The nearest replacement was the Lincoln Park branch, built in the early 1960s. In early 2001, the branch changed its name to the West End branch. The East End branch was the second Carnegie library to close in Cincinnati. Citing low circulation and the planned opening of the new downtown library, the trustees recommended closing the branch by June 30, 1955. The branch survived for a few more years and closed in 1959. The Queen City Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police purchased the branch for \$35,000 in late June 1959, with plans for a basement gymnasium for teenagers. The branch closed on September 1, and users were redirected to the Hyde Park branch. The building later became a Veterans of Foreign Wars meeting hall. Today, the East End branch is an event space known as the Carnegie Center of Columbia Tusculum.⁴⁰

Of the nine original Carnegie branches in Cincinnati seven are still in operation. Some have been remodeled, but all except the Hyde Park branch (which was remodeled in the 1970s) have retained their distinctive “Carnegie look” and layouts similar to the original plans. Today, the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County is one of the top public library systems in the country, ranking third in the country in terms of library visits per capita (9.22 visits per capita annually). It currently has forty branches in operation, including the seven surviving Carnegie libraries.⁴¹

INSERT TANSEY IMAGE 14: Avondale Branch, Public Library, c. 1960.

CINCINNATI MUSEUM CENTER

The trustees faced several setbacks during the Carnegie period, such as running out of money, local politics, and the loss of the third grant. The tenacity and determination of Cincinnati's library trustees resulted in a useful, accessible, and important branch library system for Cincinnati, realized with grants from Andrew Carnegie. The spread of Carnegie branches followed the expansion of hillside neighborhoods as upwardly mobile Cincinnatians moved out of the historic urban basin. The trustees' decisions regarding branch locations reflected their commercial and civic values. Community groups, particularly those with business interests, appealed to the trustees to have their neighborhood selected for a Carnegie branch. As demonstrated by the numbers of clubs and classes that met in the auditoriums and club rooms, the schools visited, and the great numbers of both adult and child patrons, Cincinnati's Carnegie libraries were community anchors, and obtaining one was a major source of pride for neighborhood civic and business groups. The operation of Cincinnati's branches reflected many of the issues common to Progressive Era librarianship. In particular, librarians actively monitored patrons' reading habits, used libraries as a place to acculturate working-class users to middle-class reading and civic values, and simultaneously welcomed and exerted control over children. Carnegie libraries are an indelible part of American public libraries. In many ways, the usage of and civic attitudes toward Cincinnati's Carnegie libraries reflected common experiences from other cities. However, Cincinnati also illustrates an underappreciated aspect of Carnegie libraries, which is the impact of site location decisions that affect access to library services.

APPENDIX I

The Nine Original Carnegie Libraries, Opening Dates and Costs

Walnut Hills	April 9, 1906	\$46,150.30
East End	March 14, 1907	\$33,182.33
North Cincinnati (Corryville)	April 2, 1907	\$46,805.36
Norwood*	July 22, 1907	\$25,000.00
Cumminsville (Northside)	April 27, 1908	\$31,961.08
Price Hill	November 29, 1909	\$26,707.15
Hyde Park	August 6, 1912	\$39,094.13
Avondale	March 2, 1913	\$45,614.10
West End	December 6, 1915	\$30,116.46

The West End branch closed in 1947 and was demolished soon after. The East End branch closed in 1959, but the building still stands.

*The Norwood branch was part of a separate gift from the Carnegie Corporation. The branch was transferred to the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County after completion.

All figures come from tables sent by the library trustees to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Please see (Porter June 1, 1914) and (Schaefer, Porter 1916). The original table lists an incorrect opening date for the West End branch; the year has been revised to reflect the actual opening date, as documented by the trustees' minutes.

Notes

¹ Cheryl Malone, “Autonomy and Accommodation: Houston’s Colored Carnegie Library, 1907-1922,” *Libraries and Culture* 34 (Spring 1999), 95; Robert Sidney Martin, ed., *Carnegie Denied: Communities Rejecting Carnegie Library Construction Grants, 1898-1925* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1993); Shana L. Stuart, “‘My Duty and My Pleasure’: Alice S. Tyler’s Reluctant Oversight of Carnegie Library Philanthropy in Iowa,” *Information & Culture* 48 (2013), 91–111, 180; Paula Watson, “Carnegie Ladies, Lady Carnegies: Women and the Building of Libraries,” *Libraries & the Cultural Record* 31 (1996), 159; Wayne A. Wiegand, *Main Street Public Library: Community Places and Reading Spaces in the Rural Heartland, 1876-1956* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2011); Wayne A. Wiegand, *Part of Our Lives: A People’s History of the American Public Library* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015); Abigail Van Slyck, *Free to All: Carnegie Libraries & American Culture, 1890-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Louis Wilson, *The Geography of Reading: A Study of the Distribution and Status of Libraries in the United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), 174.

² Ohio State Library Board and Charles Burleigh Galbreath, *Sketches of Ohio Libraries* (Columbus, OH: F. J. Heer, 1902), 335; Ohio General Assembly and Ohio Secretary of State, *Acts of the State of Ohio* (Columbus, OH: N. Willis, 1900), 204; James A. Green, W. T. Porter, and N. D. C. Hodges to Andrew Carnegie, Jan. 17, 1902, Carnegie Corporation of [New York Records](#), reel 6, [Columbia University, Rare Books and Manuscript Library \[hereafter CU\]](#); Ohio State Library Board and Galbreath, *Sketches of Ohio Libraries*, 101; W.T. Porter to James Bertram, Jan. 7, 1903, Carnegie Corporation of [New York Records](#), reel 6, CU; Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Board of Trustees, Minutes, May 17, 1900, [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Records, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County \[hereafter PLCH\]](#).

³ Ohio State Library Board and Galbreath, *Sketches of Ohio Libraries*, 100–101; Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report* (Cincinnati, Ohio: Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, 1903–1904), 5; [Daniel J. Kenny, *Cincinnati Illustrated: A Pictorial Guide to Cincinnati and the Suburbs* \(Cincinnati, Ohio: Robert Clarke & Co., 1879\) 13](#); [American Library Association, *Proceedings* \(Boston; Chicago: American Library Association, 1905\), 194](#); [American Library Association, *ALA Bulletin* \(Chicago: American Library Association, 1907-1922\) 14:336, 2:51, 4:537 & 634, 16:496](#); Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1900-1901, 9; John Brough Shotwell, *A History of the Schools of Cincinnati* ([Cincinnati, Ohio](#): The School Life Company, 1902), 367; American Library Association, *ALA Bulletin*, 2: 258, 3:178.

⁴ George Bobinski, *Carnegie Libraries: Their History and Impact on American Public Library Development* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969), 35.

⁵ Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1915–1916, 29; [Van Slyck, *Free to All*, 78–79](#); [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Board of Trustees, Minutes](#), Mar. 7, 1901, [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Records, PLCH](#); Christie M. Koontz, “A History of Location of U.S. Public Libraries Within Community Place

and Space: Evolving Implications for the Library's Mission of Equitable Service," *Public Library Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (2007): 77, doi:10.1300/J118v26n01_05; Green, Porter, and Hodges to Carnegie, Jan. 17, 1902, in Carnegie Corporation of [New York Records](#), reel 6, CU.

⁶ Green, Porter, and Hodges to Carnegie, Mar. 15, 1902, in Carnegie Corporation of [New York Records](#), reel 6, CU; John Fleischman, *Free & Public: One Hundred and Fifty Years at the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, 1853-2003* ([Cincinnati, Ohio](#): Orange Frazer Press, 2003), 98.

⁷ "Carnegie Library Bond Decision," *Cincinnati Commercial Tribune*, Dec. 10, 1902; Drausin Wulsin, Porter, and Hodges to Carnegie, Jan. 30, 1903, in Carnegie Corporation of [New York Records](#), reel 6, CU; Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report, 1905-1906*, 50-51; *Ibid.*, 1903-1904, 6.

⁸ City Planning Commission, ed., *Summary, Existing Conditions Study, Walnut Hills Community study* (Cincinnati, Ohio: City Planning Commission, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1969), 3; [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Board of Trustees, Minutes](#), Mar. 28, 1904, [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Records, PLCH](#); William A. Hopkins to Andrew Carnegie, Oct. 7, 1904, in Carnegie Corporation of [New York Records](#), reel 6, CU; "Proposed Bills are Indorsed," *Cincinnati Commercial Tribune*, Mar. 5, 1902; Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report, 1904-1905*, 5-7; Cincinnati Historical Society and Cissie Dore Hill, eds., *Walnut Hills, City Neighborhood*, Cincinnati Historical Society Studies in Regional and Local History, no. 3 ([Cincinnati, Ohio](#): The Society, 1983), IX.

⁹ Cincinnati Historical Society and Cissie Dore Hill, eds., *Walnut Hills, City Neighborhood*, 20-21, 24.

¹⁰ Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report, 1905-1906*, 5-6; "Carnegie Gift Denounced, Mayor of Cincinnati Sorry the City Accepted a Library," *New York Times*, Apr. 13, 1906.

¹¹ [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Board of Trustees, Minutes](#), May 4, 1905, [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Records, PLCH](#).

¹² Bobinski, *Carnegie Libraries*, 102-103; Dee Garrison, *Apostles of Culture: The Public Librarian and American Society, 1876-1920* (New York: Macmillan Information, 1979), 49; "News and Political Comment," *The Ohio Democrat*, Aug. 10, 1905; "In the Wheeling District," *The Stark County Democrat*, Aug. 13, 1901; Martin, *Carnegie Denied*; Michael C. Pierce, *Striking with the Ballot: Ohio Labor and the Populist Party* (DeKalb, Ill: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010), 98-114; [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Board of Trustees, Minutes](#), June 20, 1901, Mar. 3, 1910, Sept. 8, 1910, [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Records, PLCH](#).

¹³ "Want Carnegie Offer Changed," *The Stark County Democrat*, Mar. 6, 1906; "Labor Unions Oppose Gift of Carnegie," *The Stark County Democrat*, Feb. 17, 1903; "Trouble Over Library,"

The Stark County Democrat, Mar. 3, 1903; “Coshocton Gets Library,” *The Stark County Democrat*, July 24, 1903; “Youngstown Yawnlettes,” *The Mahoning Dispatch*, June 6, 1911.

¹⁴ Bobinski, *Carnegie Libraries*, 66–69; “Come Again Mr. Carnegie,” *The Marion Daily Mirror*, Nov. 22, 1907; “Ohio’s Weekly Olio,” *The Hocking Sentinel*, Feb. 23, 1905; Green to James Bertram, Nov. 27, 1905, in Carnegie Corporation of [New York Records](#), reel 6, CU.

¹⁵ Rob Freestone, “The Geography of Urban Public Library Development,” *Minnesota Libraries* 25 (Summer 1978), 303; Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1906–1907, 42; Anna Lyle Cratty, “Report to the Librarian,” July 1, 1911, Price Hill branch [Records, PLCH](#); Cincinnati (Ohio), *The WPA Guide to Cincinnati: Cincinnati, a Guide to the Queen City and Its Neighbors* (Cincinnati Ohio: Cincinnati Historical Society, 1987), 459.

¹⁶ Henry Louis Taylor, ed., *Race and the City: Work, Community, and Protest in Cincinnati, 1820-1970*, Greater Cincinnati Bicentennial History Series (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 159–164.

¹⁷ Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1911–1912, 36; “Douglass School Was Prominent in History of Segregated Cincinnati Schools,” *The Cincinnati Herald*, Feb. 20, 2010; Geoffrey J. Giglierano and Greater Cincinnati Bicentennial Commission, *The Bicentennial Guide to Greater Cincinnati: A Portrait of Two Hundred Years* (Cincinnati, Ohio: Cincinnati Historical Society, 1988), 179.

¹⁸ [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, A Decade of Service, 1930-1940](#) (Cincinnati, Ohio: Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, 1941), 35.

¹⁹ [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Board of Trustees, Minutes](#), July 7, 1904, Feb. 23, 1905, Feb. 9, 1905 and May 19, 1910, [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Records, PLCH](#); Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1906, 10–11.

²⁰ Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1903–1904, 47; 1915–1916, 41–42. The village branches were in the outlying communities of Wyoming, Harrison, Madisonville, Lockland, Pleasant Ridge and Hartwell. James A. Green, W. T. Porter, and N. D. C. Hodges to Andrew Carnegie, Jan. 17, 1902, in Carnegie Corporation of [New York Records](#), reel 6, CU; Michelle M. Savoti, “Women and Their Roles in Nine Carnegie Branches in PLCH (Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County): A Historical Study” ([MLIS thesis, Kent State University, School of Library and Information Science, 2001](#)); [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Board of Trustees, Minutes](#), Feb. 20, 1912, [Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Records, PLCH](#).

²¹ Mary Cochran, “Reminiscences of the Early Days of the Cumminsville Branch Library,” Apr. 7, 1958, Cumminsville (Northside) [Branch Records, PLCH](#).

²² Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1907–1908, 53; *Ibid.*, 1912–1913, 5–6; *Ibid.*, 1908–1909, 6.

²³ *Ibid.*, 1909–1910, 5, 7, 60; *Ibid.*, 1910–1911, 11; *Ibid.*, 1911–1912, 8; *Ibid.*, 1915–1916, 32; Schaefer and Porter to Carnegie Corporation of New York, Mar. 20, 1916, Porter to Bertram, Apr. 30, 1914, Schaefer to Carnegie, Dec. 21, 1908, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU; Angela S. Farmer, *A History of the Norwood Branch Library (Cincinnati, Ohio: Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, 1991)*, 1-2; Bertram to Mills, Nov. 3, 1904, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 22, CU. Bertram's use of simplified spelling in correspondence has been modernized for clarity; Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Board of Trustees, Minutes, 1906, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Records, PLCH.

²⁴ Green, and R.H. West to Carnegie, May 7 1908, Bertram to Schaefer, Aug. 5, 1908, Bertram to Schaefer, Feb. 13, 1909, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU; Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1908–1909, 10; *Ibid.*, 1907–1908, 5–6; *Ibid.*, 1910–1911, 9. These three branches were located in Avondale, Hyde Park and the West End. *Ibid.*, 1912–1913, 5–6; R.A. Franks to Porter, Mar. 12, 1914, Porter to Franks, Mar. 14, 1914, Carnegie Corporation of New York to Porter, May 8, 1914, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU.

²⁵ Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1908–1909, 64; *Ibid.*, 1910–1911, 56; *Ibid.*, 1906–1907, 45; Kate McDowell, “Children’s Voices in Librarians’ Words, 1890-1930,” *Libraries and the Cultural Record* 46 (2011) 74.

²⁶ Savoti, “Women and Their Roles in Nine Carnegie Branches in PLCH (Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County)”, 55; Pauline Fihe, “Report to the Librarian,” Aug. 31, 1912, Hyde Park Branch Records, PLCH; Garrison, *Apostles of Culture*, 40–50; Anna Lyle Cratty, “Report to the Librarian,” July 5, 1912, Price Hill Branch Records, PLCH; Mary J. O’Connor, “Report to the Chief of the Children’s Department,” July 7, 1916, Price Hill Branch Records, PLCH.

²⁷ Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1915–1916, 14; Garrison, *Apostles of Culture*, 36, 61; Van Slyck, *Free to All*, 65-124; Cratty, “Report to the Librarian,” July 1, 1911, July 8, 1913, Price Hill ~~branch records~~Branch Records, PLCH; Wayne A Wiegand, *Main Street Public Library Community Places and Reading Spaces in the Rural Heartland, 1876-1956*, 185–186; Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1909–1910, 60.

²⁸ Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, *Annual Report*, 1905–1906, 55–56; Van Slyck, *Free to All*, 201–202; McDowell, “Children’s Voices in Librarians’ Words, 1890-1930,” 75; Fihe, “Report to the Librarian,” Hyde Park Branch Records, PLCH; Anna Lyle Cratty, “Report to the Librarian,” July 1, 1910, , Price Hill ~~branch records~~Branch Records, PLCH; Hodges to Carnegie Corporation of New York, Feb. 2, 1916, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU.

²⁹ Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Annual Report, 1907-1908, 9; Alexis McCrossen, “‘One Cathedral More’ or ‘Mere Lounging Places for Bummers’ The Cultural Politics of Leisure and the Public Library in Gilded Age America,” *Libraries and the Cultural Record* 41 (2006), 176; Van Slyck, *Free to All*, 176–177; Hodges to Carnegie Corporation of New York, Feb. 2, 1916, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU.

³⁰ Van Slyck, *Free to All*, 109; Garrison, *Apostles of Culture*, 40–42.

³¹ Bertram to Porter, June 6, 1914, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU; Bobinski, *Carnegie Libraries*, 31; Bertram to William Brett, June 8, 1914, Brett to Bertram, June 26, 1914, Bertram to Porter, June 29, 1914, Bertram to Porter, Aug. 3, 1914, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU.

³² Porter to Bertram, Feb. 14, 1916, Schaefer and Porter to Carnegie Corporation of New York, Mar. 20, 1916, Bertram to Porter, Mar. 31, 1916, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU.

³³ Bertram to Porter, June 6, 1916, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU; Bobinski, *Carnegie Libraries*, 98–99.

³⁴ Porter to Bertram, June 29, 1916, Porter and Hodges to Carnegie Corporation of New York, July 3, 1916, Bertram to Porter and Hodges, July 6, 1916, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU.

³⁵ “Pledge Is Broken by Libraries,” *Cincinnati Enquirer*, Oct. 4, 1916. Readers should note that according to Bobinski, Ohio had 105 Carnegie buildings (Bobinski, *Carnegie Libraries*, 20).

³⁶ Bobinski, *Carnegie Libraries*, 16–20, 98–99; Stuart, “My Duty and My Pleasure.”

³⁷ Porter to Bertram, May 19, 1917, Bertram to Porter, May 24, 1917, Porter to Bertram, June 5, 1917, in Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, reel 6, CU.

³⁸ American Library Association, Proceedings (Boston; Chicago: American Library Association, 1917) 349; Bobinski, *Carnegie Libraries*, 152–153.

³⁹ Joseph L. Wheeler, “The Library Situation in Ohio,” *Library Journal* 45 (Nov. 1, 1920): 877–882; Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Board of Trustees, Minutes, 1917–1918, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Records, PLCH; Bobinski, *Carnegie Libraries*, 207–242.

⁴⁰ “Legal Snag Intervenes in Branch Library Sale,” *Cincinnati Enquirer*, Dec. 6, 1945; “Branch Sale Legal in West End Case,” *Cincinnati Enquirer*, June 6, 1946; Steve Hoffman, “The Carnegie Library Legacy,” *Cincinnati Enquirer*, Apr. 7, 1981; “New Library Branch,” *Cincinnati Post*, Mar. 14, 1960; “New Names for Nine Branch Libraries,” *Cincinnati Post*, Dec.

30, 2000; “New Library to Open Jan. 17,” *Cincinnati Times-Star*, Nov. 8, 1954; “FOP buys library for lodge hall,” *Cincinnati Enquirer*, June 24, 1959. The [former East End](#) branch's status as a performing arts center was observed by the author during [2015](#).

⁴¹ “3,000 Jam Remodeled Library,” *Cincinnati Enquirer*, Feb. 8, 1971; “Top 25 Public Libraries by Library Visits,” *The Nation’s Largest Public Libraries: Top 25 Rankings*, Aug. 2014, <http://www.ala.org/tools/libfactsheets/alalibraryfactsheet13#toppopulation>; “Library Locations,” *Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County*, Dec. 2015, <http://www.cincinnati.library.org/info/locations.asp>.