

**Spinning Off The Path: The Failed Dream of Bicycle Paths in the 1890s
and the Unintended Spinoff of a Combined Transportation System**

James Longhurst, Associate Professor of History

Dept. of History, UW - La Crosse, 1725 State St, La Crosse WI 54601

jlonghurst@uwlax.edu

Keywords: bicycle, path, sidepath, transportation, taxes

Abstract:

I'd like to present a fairly simple argument about the implications of something that failed to happen. Since one thing didn't happen, something else did, and we've come to take that outcome as inevitable. But the American road system we have now, with motor and human-powered vehicles combined, was not the goal for everyone; there were alternatives. Instead, the combined system might be considered an accidental spinoff of a 19th century political battle over taxation for public infrastructure. Today I'll present an overview of research I've recently published in the *Journal of Policy History* and in my book *Bike Battles: A History of Sharing the American Road*, forthcoming next year from the University of Washington Press.

The thing that failed to happen was the bicycle sidepath movement of the late 1890s, which imagined American cities and towns connected not only by roads but also by a separate, bicycle-specific network of improved paths that ran alongside them, in the same right of way. Supporters imagined a "trunk-line" of surfaced paths stretching from Minneapolis to New York City, connecting Chicago, Gary, Buffalo and Albany along the

way. Cities like Rochester and Minneapolis actually built their parts of this project, creating radial networks of bicycle paths alongside existing roads. These networks were specifically built for bicycles, protected by state law and funded by an innovative public/private partnership on the county and municipal level. But while sidepath systems were created and met with significant approval in a few places, the movement was severely limited by political opposition to taxation for this purpose, and development floundered by 1905. Most bicycle advocates threw their lot with the combined-use Good Roads movement rather than a separate system, and while bicycles were defined as vehicles on the new roads, automobiles eventually began to crowd them out of what was ostensibly a combined system. Since then, the sidepath movement has been largely forgotten by bicycle historians, environmental historians, and even scholars of American transportation.

One disclaimer here – the issue of separated bicycle infrastructure is now, and has been for many decades, a bitterly controversial and divisive issue among American cyclists. For more than a century, cyclists have argued for their status as vehicles, with equal claim to the shared resource of the road. Recovering the lost history of a separated system in the past can be seen as adding weight to calls for separated infrastructure now, or even unintentionally diminishing the status of bicycles as vehicles. As a pre-emptive defense, I'll say that I'm not advocating one type of infrastructure over another, but rather attempting to understand how we got to our combined system, and to put long-standing calls for separated infrastructure into perspective.

As background, we can note that as the bicycle became popular in the first golden age of American cycling of the 1890s, rural American roads were almost all terrible. Their unpaved surfaces lacked adequate drainage, were often built without professional surveys or engineering, and were nearly impassable mud bogs after rain or

snow. The dirt roads of the era were obviously an immense source of frustration for cyclists: the League of American Wheelmen wrote as much about road building as bicycles. In its weekly *Bulletin* and an occasionally-separate monthly, *Good Roads Magazine*, the LAW spent decades pushing for better roads.

The unfortunate state of 19th century roads was a symptom of an essentially local, decentralized system of financing, itself partly resulting from weak municipal governments and a distrust of public works. Put simply, before the 20th century, few roads were directly built by the state. Most urban streets in the 19th century were only paved when adjoining property owners – abutters – clubbed together to choose paving materials and set their own costs in special assessments they paid off themselves. Rural roads were built by the occasional “working out” of taxes, where nearby property owners were required to provide a week or so of their own labor in a work gang under the supervision of a county “pathmaster.” The road-gang or “statute labor” system appealed to cash-poor farmers and kept decision-making local, but had obvious limits; historian Michael Fein has called it “quasi-feudal.” Often derided by reformers as a “neighborhood picnic,” such gangs lacked engineering or surveying knowledge, specialized equipment, or incentive. Most repair work consisted of piling up loose dirt in the center of the road, in the hopes that it might level itself. The results were predictable: a winding skein of randomly built and poorly-maintained dirt roads. As usual, Mark Twain summarized the situation best, claiming that if he ever went to hell, then he would want to go by a bad road, so that he would at least be glad when he got to his destination.¹

¹ Quotes from Michael R. Fein, *Paving the Way*, 24, 26; McShane, *Down the Asphalt Path*, 6-7, 19, 63-73; Mason, “The League of American Wheelmen,” 84-6; possibly apocryphal Twain story from “A Very Bad Road,” *Good Roads* 1:3 (1892), 158.

Beginning in the 1880s, the poor condition of these roads was the central concern of Good Roads reformers, whose all-purpose solution was promoting general taxation for professional road improvements by the states. This movement began and had its first victories before the internal combustion automobile even existed, let alone transcended its early status as an expensive curiosity. Instead, road reform began with the bicycle and horse-drawn vehicle in mind. The great difficulty with such reform, as always, concerned who would pay. In Fein's words, farmers feared that they would be forced to pay for nearby improvements to meet the "recreational imperialism" of urban cyclists, following the traditional mode by which abutters funded road construction.²

Because of these early political divisions, cyclists in the 1890s tried to strike out on their own to create an alternative to unimproved dirt roads: separate bicycle paths with packed gravel or cinder surfaces. Their first projects included short leisure paths, financed by voluntary donations. But these paths had many limitations, beginning with the fact that they were not really useful for practical travel. Since they were intended for recreational purposes, most were built following their own routes across parks, forests or fields, only occasionally linking with roads. Even more importantly, these paths were funded by cyclists themselves, through charitable donations and club dues. Eventually, some cyclists found this "a slow and unsatisfactory method."³ Beginning in 1896, counties

² Quote from Fein, *Paving the Way*, 29. See also Fuller, "Good Roads and Rural Free Delivery of Mail," 69; Mason, "The League of American Wheelmen"; Hilles, "The Good Roads Movement in the United States"; Campbell, "The Good Roads Movement in Wisconsin," 273-293; Wells, "The Changing Nature of Country Roads," 148-151.

³ "Charles T. Raymond: A Brief Sketch . . ." *Sidepaths* 4 (February, 1901), 72. Hereinafter "A Brief Sketch."

across the Midwest and Northeast began exploring ways to institutionalize and publicly fund not just individual paths, but networks of bicycle-specific paths alongside roads, within the existing right-of-way. The first of these county-wide experiments inspired many subsequent projects, and earned the nickname "father of the sidepath movement" for its originator: Charles T. Raymond, who was an avid cyclist and successful businessman in the industrial city of Lockport in Niagara County, New York.

Raymond "adopted and promulgated the doctrine that 'what all use, all should pay for,'" according to a laudatory article. With that goal in mind, Raymond drafted an 1896 state law permitting Niagara county supervisors to tax *all* bicycle owners and build paths with the proceeds.⁴ After that, Raymond drafted a bill to expand the power to counties statewide.

But the LAW wasn't supportive; according to sidepath proponents, the group's leaders called "upon all wheelmen to strenuously oppose the passage of any such bills." At the time, the group was generally opposed to separate sidepaths as distractions from the matter at hand: building good roads as shared resources. One founding member wrote in an 1896 *Bulletin* that "I fear . . . that the result of obtaining special paths will be a strong feeling by drivers of horses that we don't belong *with them* on the good roads which we have done so much to create." A New Jersey member wrote to the editor in the same issue describing "selfish cycle paths" that could only "be of use to but part of the traveling public."⁵ With that reasoning, in 1897 members of the New York chapter "went to Albany and spent time and money till the defeat of the Raymond bill was

⁴ An 1895 bill failed on procedure but was reintroduced in 1896. *Journal of the Senate of the State of New York*, 322; Act of March 4, 1896, ch. 68, 1896 N.Y. Laws 90.

⁵ "A Brief Sketch," 73; "Roads and Side Paths," *LAW Bulletin* 23:24 (6/12/1896), 864; "Roads versus Paths, *ibid.*, 851.

assured." The leadership opposed similar legislation creating separate bicycle-specific paths in 1898, fearing that the latter threatened the passage of their preferred Higbie-Armstrong bill. That bill, a major Good Roads achievement, provided for a 50% state contribution towards road building for the first time. These types of legislative actions emphasized building improved roads that could be shared in common by varied users, not separate paths for bicycles alone. Political division amongst cyclists thus diluted their clout on sidepaths, and few counties followed Niagara's lead before 1898.⁶

When an 1896 bill based on the Niagara model proposed to allow Monroe to tax all cyclists one dollar and build paths which only some cyclists might use, it failed spectacularly. The editor of the *Post Express* claimed that many "regard the tax as an outrage" as it unfairly allowed cycle path riders "to reap substantial benefits at the expense of others, including women and children." The "vicious principle" of "class taxation" was the central problem, argued the writer: "there is no more reason why the bicyclists should be taxed for cinder paths than that owners of vehicles should be taxed for the construction of better highways."

This was the state of the sidepath movement before 1899, as the pushback against taxation left the idea without a dependable funding stream. While California, Washington, New Jersey, and the Province of Ontario passed state-level sidepath laws before 1899, they were quite limited, merely allowing charitably-built sidepaths to exist but not providing funding or directing counties to build them.⁷

⁶ "A Brief Sketch," 72-3; cf. Mason, "The League of American Wheelmen," 121. See also . See also William W. Armstrong, *The Higbie-Armstrong Good Roads Law ...* (Buffalo, New York: LAW, 1898).

⁷ Act of March 11, 1897, ch. LIII §2, 1897 Wash. Sess. Laws 89; Act of March 18, 1896, ch. 62, 1896 N.J. Laws 100; "Cycling," *Trenton (NJ) Evening Times*, March 22, 1896; for Ontario, see Norcliffe, *Ride to Modernity*, ch. 5 n. 35.

As of 1898, six different New York counties had passed six different sidepath laws. Hoping to address this confusion, Frank J. Amsden and Charles Raymond collaborated to draft unified state-wide legislation after a November, 1898 convention of sidepath advocates in Rochester. The resulting legislation would spark a nationwide sidepath boom.⁸

New York's General Sidepath Act of 1899 allowed a county judge, "upon the petition of fifty wheelmen of the county," to appoint a commission of five or seven persons, "each of whom shall be a cyclist," to represent the county. These commissioners were "authorized to construct and maintain sidepaths along any public road, or street" with the approval of elected officials. As such, the sidepath commissioners sidestepped the authority of traditional "pathmasters," or county officials charged to oversee the workgangs on public roads; Good Roads reformers had dismissed these political appointees as lazy and corrupt.⁹

Before most roads were widened and paved, and before cities required (or assessed) abutters to install concrete sidewalks and curbing, advocates took advantage of the transitional state of the built environment to insert sidepaths into the urban landscape. The proposed paths "shall not be less than three feet or more than six feet wide . . . and shall be constructed within the outside lines and along and upon either side of such public roads and streets." While they were to be built within the already-established legal right of way, the sidepaths were segregated from both the adjoining

⁸ For a more detailed account, see Longhurst, "The Sidepath Not Taken," 566; "A Brief Sketch," 73.

⁹ Act of March 27, 1899, ch. 152, 1899 N.Y. Laws 301.

road and from already-existing sidewalks. They were to be a separate network, set apart from foot and vehicle traffic, solely for bicycles.¹⁰

The 1899 New York state law, and its 1900 revision, still had to avoid portrayals of negative elitism. While his original Niagara law was tax-based, the blowback in Monroe appeared to convince Charles Raymond that "the license system was more equitable and would be more popular." Thus the state law avoided taxing all county property owners, or all cyclists, and was instead based on charging only those who chose to ride on the path (what later policy makers would call a user-fee model).¹¹ Commissions were to "adopt a form of license, badge, emblem, or device suitable to be affixed to a bicycle." The tag would cost at least 50 cents a year, and the proceeds (along with any charitable donations) were to be the entire operating budget of the commission. Such funds were to be used to purchase land and materials, to build and maintain sidepaths, to keep order on them by sending scofflaws and speeding bikers to county court, and to plant "shade trees along such paths" where appropriate.¹²

There were still a few legal potholes. Courts thought that bicycles could be taxed as property in theory, but in the decades before the motor vehicle, the practice of levying a special fee as a prerequisite for bicyclists to use a common resource -- and banning scofflaws for failing to pay -- was problematic. Out of this conflict, courts concluded that taxation was only possible if governments did not block a bicyclist's right to travel on the public roads. Late 19th century political philosophy held that the police power could be

¹⁰ Quote from *ibid.*; Greene, *The Highway Law*, 246; *Ryan v. Preston*, 10 N.Y. Ann. Cas. 5. (N.Y.S. 1901).

¹¹ Quote from "A Brief Sketch," 72-3; Act of March 27, 1899, ch. 152, 1899 N.Y. Laws 301; Act of April 24, 1900, ch. 640, 1900 N.Y. Laws 1393.

¹² Greene, *The Highway Law*, 335-8; for examples of these tags, see "Bicycle Path License Plate," Realia Collection, MSHS.

used to regulate, but not impede a constitutionally-protected freedom of movement. Nor could it make bicyclists a uniquely beleaguered class of road users, regulated differently from other vehicles. Along with the philosophical problems, an 1896 Chicago newspaper story also argued that as vehicles, bicyclists could not be practically excluded: "The trouble . . . lies in the fact that wheelmen will always want to go wherever other vehicles are allowed, and will not be content with separate paths."¹³

Because of these limits, sidepath legislation based on Charles Raymond's original taxation model ran into legal problems in Oregon, Washington and Pennsylvania, stalling developments there. While legislation taxing all bicycles was defeated in those three states, the user-fee model of New York state was encountering success in a bicycle-mad world. Eight more New York counties took steps to create bicycle paths, following the initial six. The scale of these projects varied widely, with Niagara and Monroe counties dwarfing all others.¹⁴ With their early starts, Monroe and Niagara were the obvious success stories, with Monroe completing 150 miles of paths by 1900.¹⁵

By the new century, a nationwide sidepath boom was in full swing. Avoiding the difficulties of Oregon, Pennsylvania and Washington, all subsequent state laws were modeled on New York's 1899 act, with legislatures enabling county-level sidepath

¹³ "Rights of Wheelmen," *CDT* (5/24/1896), 38.

¹⁴ "Annual Report - Sidepath Commission by R.E. Archibald," December 21, 1901, Record Series: Highway Papers-Sidepath Commission, Warren County Archives, Lake George, New York; cf. *Sidepaths* 3:24, (1900), 456-7.

¹⁵ "Monroe County Sidepath Guide," 1900, Pamphlet Folder, RPL; also in NYS. Hereinafter "Monroe County Sidepath Guide."

commissions to raise funds through license sales. Maryland, Ohio and Rhode Island passed their state sidepath laws in 1900, and the next year Connecticut, Florida, and Minnesota followed suit.¹⁶ Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont and Wisconsin all explored New York-style sidepath bills in 1900 and 1901.¹⁷ Nor was the sidepath boom limited to the U.S.; the Canadian provinces of Ontario and Manitoba were reported to be working on their own cycle-path licensing laws in 1900, with Manitoba's passing in 1901. Winnipeg was eventually hugely successful, with more than 8,000 riders purchasing licenses annually by 1905.¹⁸

Paper legislation did not necessarily translate into physical paths. Florida's law was largely identical to the others, but there is no evidence that any sidepath commissions were formed. On the other hand, individual cities or counties could dabble in sidepaths without the aid of state legislation. Salt Lake City, Utah; Keene, New Hampshire; Spokane, Washington; and Portage County, Ohio, all created user-fee tag systems or built paths without the help of state legislation.¹⁹

While a number of paths had already been built through voluntary contributions in Minneapolis and St. Paul, the perceived problem was that while the existing charitable

¹⁶ Act of April 10, 1900, ch. 658, 1900 Md. Laws 1047; Act of April 13, 1900, H.B. 605, 94 Ohio Laws 138; Act of May 4, 1900, ch. 757, 1900 R.I. Pub Laws 58; Act of June 17, 1901, ch. 180, 1901 Conn. Pub. Acts. 147 ; Act of May 27, 1901, ch. 4948, 1901 Fla. Laws 83; Act of April 2, 1901, ch. 126, 1901 Minn. Laws 153.

¹⁷ "No Let Up," *Sidepaths* 3:23 (1900), 436; *LAW Magazine* 1:11 (1901), 16.

¹⁸ "Sidepaths in Canada," *Sidepaths* 3:23 (1900), 436-7; Act of March 29th, 1901, ch. 53, 1901 S.M. 235; Norcliffe, *Ride to Modernity*, 149-157; Lehr and Selwood, "Two-Wheeled Workhorse," 6.

¹⁹ Salt Lake City, UT Code ch. LI § 727, (1903); "Cycle Path in the Granite State," *LAW Bulletin* 28:22 (1898), 392; "Cycle-Paths in Ohio," *LAW Bulletin* 28:16 (1898), 290; "Activity in the Far West," *LAW Magazine* 1:6 (1900), 3.

system had too many "free riders," it would nonetheless be unjust to force everyone to pay for the resource. "The cost of side paths is not equally shared," worried a journalist in 1900: "A small number do all the work. Last year 2,300 St. Paul wheelmen contributed . . . while 7,500 received the same benefits without lending any assistance whatever." On the other hand, the first city ordinance intended to create "an equitable distribution of the cost of the cycle paths" was quickly vetoed.²⁰ Approving of the mayor's action, the editors of the *St. Paul Globe* described the ordinance as "radically obnoxious" and objected to the aspects of the plan that smacked of "class legislation": "The public thoroughfares are public property, and their use should be free and unrestricted," wrote the editor.

By 1902, the private St. Paul Cycle Path Association had declared itself defunct, and transferred its funds as well as its officers to a new county sidepath commission. Minneapolis chose not to create a commission, and instead stuck with its previous ad-hoc alliance of multiple governments, agencies, and the volunteer cycle path association. But by 1902, both approaches appeared successful: St. Paul boasted an incredible 115 miles of paths built for the use of a reported 12,000 cyclists. Selling tags through the city clerk, Minneapolis built a network of more than 50 miles of sidepaths by 1902, expanding to 74 miles of paths within the city "and perhaps as much more outside the limits" by 1906.²¹

With success across the nation, the first years of the new century were the high point of the sidepath movement, fostering fever-dreams of a two-wheeled future.

²⁰ "New Laws Needed," *St. Paul Globe*, (3/11/1900), 10.

²¹ Quote from "Want Commissioners Named," *St. Paul Globe*, (4/14/1901); "Cycle Paths of City," *St. Paul Globe*, (6/8/1902), 12; "Cycle Path Plans," *Minneapolis Journal*, (4/15/1901), 9; Isaac Houlgate, "Guide to Minneapolis Bicycle Paths," 1902, pamphlet in MSHS; quote from Horace B. Hudson, *Dictionary of Minneapolis and Vicinity*, (Minneapolis: Hudson Publishing, 1906), 12.

Newspapers imagined a network of bicycle-only paths stretching uninterrupted "from New York to Buffalo and between Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee and Minneapolis," thus creating a "transcontinental highway" of sidepaths, putting Europe to shame and making the U.S. "pre-eminently the country for tourists." It wasn't entirely hot air, either: Monroe County boasted 200 miles of networked bicycle-specific paths in 1901, and cyclists in counties throughout the nation seemed to be pedaling in that direction. The Oneida County Sidepath Commissioner was prepared to claim victory, claiming at the 1900 sidepath convention in Utica that "the building of side paths, which was started as a matter of sentiment by public spirited citizens through voluntary subscriptions, has passed the experimental stage, and is now a matter of business."²²

By the end of the century even the LAW seemed to overcome its previous concerns. The group had still been hedging its bets in 1898, when the LAW president grudgingly committed to "the construction of cycle-paths in those parts of the country where good roads are not found and cannot reasonably be looked for in the near future." But for several years after 1900, sidepath and good roads advocacy existed side-by-side in LAW publications; one proclaimed that "within five years this country will possess a system of sidepaths that will extend almost everywhere."²³

But the dream of a sidepath nation was already fading. From their height just after the turn of the century, sidepath commissions withered away through the rest of the decade. Like a receding tide revealing rotten piers, by 1905 the decline of the exuberant

²² "Bicycle Sidepaths," *GDN* (4/18/1900); McCally, "Bloomers & Bicycles," 14; "License System Commended," *LAW Magazine* 1:6 (1900) 2.

²³ "Cycle Paths," *LAW Bulletin* 28:1 (1898), 42; "Cycle Path Legislation," *LAW Bulletin* 28:27 (1898), 476; "Director Dodge Interested," *LAW Magazine* 1:5 (1900), 2.

bike fad left the sidepath movement exposed and unable to support itself. The disappearing public interest exposed the inherent weakness in the movement's institutional structure, as a small, isolated part of society proved unable to create lasting infrastructure without broader support.

The mismatch was obvious in Genesee County, New York. The sidepath commission ran out of funds at the very beginning of the summer construction season of 1900, bringing a halt to work on June 14. The *Daily News* tried to put a good face on it: "As soon as the Commissioners secure additional funds the path from Le Roy east to the county line . . . will be completed." But no new construction took place in 1900 due to lack of funds, and the commissioners had a grand total of \$1.78 in the bank to start 1901. They scaled back both fundraising and operations, cancelling the fund-raising auction "as so little interest was manifested." They also declared that "no new paths should be undertaken at the outset, or at any time during the season, unless the sales of tags warranted." It got worse; by May there were not enough cyclists purchasing tags to finance repair or maintenance. "The wheelmen seem to take little interest," mourned the *Daily News*: "Without funds the Sidepath Commission can do no work on the paths, and there is no way to get money except from the sale of tags. The paths . . . are not in firstclass condition and cannot be improved until coin is obtained . . . It rests with wheelmen to decide whether the necessary improvements shall be made."²⁴ The decision was in the negative: after 1901, there are no additional stories about either the sidepath commissioners or their creations in the pages of the *Daily News*. In Genesee

²⁴ "Sidepath Funds Gone," *GDN* (6/14/1900); in another cost-saving measure, the paths were to be covered with gravel instead of cinders: "Preparations for Work," *GDN* (5/30/1901); "Sale of Sidepath Tags Slow," *GDN*, (5/2/1901).

and elsewhere, the much-ballyhooed sidepath network was falling apart as its charitable support dwindled.

The last gasp of the sidepath movement was an attempt to re-introduce the idea of taxation. While some counties were still successful with user fees, the Fulton County's *Gloversville Daily Leader* lamented that "in many the receipts are largely expended in repairs, and few extensions are being made, and in some counties the commissioners have given up and resigned in despair." Movement founder Charles Raymond was prepared re-open the issue of taxation. At a state convention of sidepath commissioners, Raymond argued that "the time has arrived, when a part of the construction should be borne by the entire community and not thrown upon the shoulders of a few wheelmen." Road building offered a handy comparison: "No one would think of attempting to build all the roads in the state from the proceeds of a license on vehicles using them," argued the paper. "The slogan of Mr. Raymond would be 'What is of benefit to all, all should pay for.'" With that change, opined the newspaper, the state could still be "gridironed with a perfect system of sidepaths."²⁵ But Raymond's new proposal never made it to the state legislature.

As sidepath commissions weakened, their paths eventually disappeared under newly-paved roads. The *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, after describing the exhaustion of the long-suffering and oft-sued Suffolk County Sidepath commissioners in 1907, worried that "it is possible that when the state engineer comes along" to survey for newly-funded state roads "he will demand that the entire width of the roadways where sidepaths now are, be graded, which would cut out the sidepaths." With prescience the newspaper opined that "it is to the interest of everybody, school children especially, that the sidepaths be allowed to stand, as it is too dangerous in these days of automobiling for a

²⁵ "State Sidepath Commission," *Gloversville (NY) Daily Leader*, (9/13/1902).

bicyclist to be compelled to ride in the road."²⁶ But that appears to be exactly what happened: where sidepaths existed at the turn of the century, state-funded roads were paved in the coming decades. These widened roads expanded their surfaces over the top of the adjoining sidepaths. In Monroe County, the roads that were improved and paved in the first decades of the twentieth century were the same roads that had been chosen for accompanying sidepaths just a few years before; comparing maps indicates that paths simply disappeared under the widened road beds. At the time, many cyclists were delighted by the newly paved roads; few knew then that automobiles would eventually threaten their travel on a commonly-held road. This outcome would have been inconceivable to the *Daily News* journalist who confidently predicted in 1900 that the paths would never disappear since legal sources assured him that "a strip of land 'once a sidepath, would always be a sidepath.'"²⁷ No one seemed to anticipate that the paths would simply be paved over.

Examining the forgotten history of the failed sidepath movement means thinking about both the philosophy of taxation that doomed the movement, and the unexpected spinoff of choosing a combined system of shared roads for all transportation rather than a separated system for disparate technologies. What didn't happen is nearly as important as what did: Since the late 1960s, many American cities have attempted to reintroduce the bicycle to auto-centric streets of the combined transportation system, but a century of decisions privileging the car are making it difficult. Right now, major American

²⁶ "Lupton Bill Disappointing," *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, (5/8/1907).

²⁷ Compare "Side Paths of Monroe County," a map dated 1897 and attributed to Frank J. Amsden, with "Good Roads Map" of Monroe County dated 1902, RPL; quote from "Bicycle Sidepaths," *GDN* (4/18/1900).

cities are attempting, in the midst of usual pushback against change, to add physically separated bicycle-specific infrastructure in many forms, from bike lanes to cycletracks, bike boulevards or green lanes. The sidepath movement was a path not taken in American urban development, one that would have changed the way that cities connect with themselves, their surroundings and each other; it would have created a separated bicycle path network connecting city center with suburb and exurb throughout the 20th century. It would also have offered a foundation for the largely-fledgling bikeway revolution of the 1970s, or the Complete Streets philosophy of the present. But instead, the failure of the sidepath movement would leave a commitment to a single, shared road network, granting as an unlikely spinoff an auto-centric city and an auto-dependent America.