

Shifting Attitudes: Torontonians and Their Response to the Great War

CHELSEA V. BARRANGER

Abstract: There exists little historical scholarship on Toronto during the First World War, or the impact of the war on its citizens. An examination of various tensions and oppositional activities in Toronto during the war complicates current interpretations of a 'united front' in the city. While the City of Toronto was 'united' in the sense that the majority of Torontonians supported the war effort in theory, between 1914 and 1918 there were serious debates and disagreements along various dividing lines regarding what support for the war constituted and required. The focus on homogeneity within the literature has resulted in a lack of analysis of the marginalized groups within the city, as well as the divides that existed within the British-Protestant community itself. The story of Toronto during the war is one of perceived unity, but in reality the city was rife with extensive divisions along national, ethnic, gendered, and religious lines. Far from uniting the city, the war brought forth long held tensions and xenophobia to the surface, resulting in violence in the streets of Toronto.

From September to December 1914, Toronto's daily newspapers criticized the University of Toronto for refusing to fire three German-born professors teaching at the institution.¹ As educators of a future generation of Canadians, the German ethnicity of these professors concerned many Torontonians, who demanded their resignation. Considering the increasingly widespread hostility to Germans residing in Canada at the time, the editors of the Toronto dailies assumed that the German professors would be fired, and the issue dealt with quickly. This was not to be the case. The standoff between the University of

¹ Dailies refer to the main Toronto daily newspapers: *The Evening Telegram*, *The Toronto Daily Star*, *The Globe* and *The World*. These four newspapers had high circulations and readership within the city. According to Ian Miller, reading a newspaper was "part of the daily routine." Ian Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief: Torontonians and the Great War* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press 2002), 9-10.

Toronto and several daily newspapers was only one of many altercations in the city during the First World War. This paper will examine a number of instances of disagreement and debate throughout 1914-1918, including but not restricted to prohibition, 'enemy aliens,' and the riots of August 1918. Despite the numerous contentious incidents in the city during the war, the Toronto home front remains understudied. Toronto is often only mentioned as a side note in other scholarship with severely limited analysis of the impact of the war on its citizens.² A lack of scholarship has led to the simplistic depiction of Toronto as 'united' in its support for the war effort. This perception is inaccurate, as during the war divisions were prevalent in Toronto along several different levels.

Organizations such as the Canadian government, churches, and newspapers created the perception that Canadians of a British-Protestant background were at war with anyone who challenged their loyalty to Britain – at first, Canadians of an 'enemy alien' background, and later anyone who challenged their established framework of national, ethnic, gendered, and religious belonging.³ These groupings were social constructions that reinforced power structures and hierarchies within Toronto by emphasizing perceived differences.⁴

² Eric Jarvis and Melvin Baker, "Clio in Hogtown: A Brief Bibliography," *Ontario History* 76, no. 3 (1984): 290. Jarvis and Baker mention how very few studies exist on the city during the war. In writing his book on Toronto during the First World War, Miller also noted few works on the city in this period exist. Ian Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 9.

³ Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity Without Groups* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 2, 14-7; Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 20. 'Enemy aliens' refers to those who were born in lands at war with Canada – specifically subjects of German or Austro-Hungarian birth. Bohdan S. Kordan, *No Free Man: Canada, the Great War and the Enemy Alien Experience* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2016), 6-7, 22-3. *The War Measures Act* gave the Canadian government the power to arrest, detain and deport 'enemy aliens' whom they believed posed a threat to "the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada." Statutes of Canada, *The War Measures Act, 1914* (Ottawa: J. de L. Tache, 1914 George V, Chapter 2), 6-7. Further, the definition of who qualified as an 'enemy alien' changed over the course of the conflict to include Ottomans, Russians, and anyone "perceived to have shifted their loyalty." Brock Millman, *Polarity, Patriotism, and Dissent in Great War Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 9.

⁴ Brubaker, *Ethnicity Without Groups*, 17. While acknowledging these groupings were social constructions, for the purpose of this paper I will use these groupings because people at the time perceived these differences to be real. These groupings thus provide a useful tool for examining the 'us versus them' mentality that existed within the city.

These constructed divisions often resulted in prejudicial treatment and violence against anyone deemed different, or belonging to a social 'other.'⁵ The focus on homogeneity within the literature has resulted in a lack of analysis of the marginalized groups within the city, as well as the divides that existed within the British-Protestant community itself. The story of Toronto during the war is one of perceived unity, but in reality the city was rife with extensive divisions along national, ethnic, gendered, and religious lines.

In *Hometown Horizons: Local Responses to Canada's Great War*, Robert Rutherford argues that examining how home front populations responded to the war can help historians to better understand how relationships of gender, class, and nationality shifted over the course of the conflict.⁶ Despite this, historians have focussed on the military and combat history of the war at the expense of examining the experiences of civilians on the home front. While numerous historians have pointed out the need for more research on the Canadian home front, the scholarship is still developing.⁷ In his 2016 work *Polarity, Patriotism, and Dissent in Great War Canada*, Brock Millman argues that while some studies have begun to analyze aspects of the home front, they are often specific and do not connect to "the greater Canadian reality" in terms of pre and post-war Canada.⁸ Current scholarship on the home front fails to adequately analyze Canadian support for the war, especially regarding discussions of loyalty. Canadian historians have argued that ancestral and emotional ties explain what they perceive as unified support within Ontario for Britain and the war.⁹ Historians have argued that enthusiasm for the

⁵ Brubaker, *Ethnicity Without Groups*, 16; Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 178-9.

⁶ Robert Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons: Local Responses to Canada's Great War* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004), xii, xv, xviii. In his analysis of three cities (Lethbridge, Alberta, Guelph, Ontario, and Trois-Rivières, Quebec) Rutherford argues that civilians were forced to develop new interpretations of the war and relationships amongst each other as they faced wartime realities.

⁷ Tim Cook, "Wet Canteens and Worrying Mothers: Alcohol, Soldiers and Temperance Groups in the Great War," *Social History* 35, no. 70 (November 2002): 312; Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 9; Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons*, xii, xv; Jeffrey Keshen, *Propaganda and Censorship During Canada's Great War* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1996), x, xii; Millman, *Polarity, Patriotism, and Dissent*, 2-3.

⁸ Millman, *Polarity, Patriotism, and Dissent*, 2.

⁹ Barbara M. Wilson, *Ontario and the First World War, 1914-1918* (Toronto: Champlain Society for the Government of Ontario, 1977), ix; Desmond Morton and J.L. Granatstein, *'Marching to Armageddon': Canadians and the Great War, 1914-1919* (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1989), 27; Ian Radforth, *Royal Spectacle:*

war was linked to the population's high proportion of Canadians of British descent, especially in Toronto, where Ian Miller calculates that roughly 85% of the population in the period had a British background.¹⁰ Historians have used this fact to justify the argument that Ontarians were predominately in support of the war, with minimal dissent. However, Brian Douglas Tennyson argues that careful analysis of support for the war in Canada, especially at the war's outbreak, has yet to be completed, leaving unanswered questions about how 'pro-war' the country really was.¹¹ Tennyson points to Adrian Gregory's work which indicates that, in the British context, enthusiasm for the war was weaker than traditionally discussed. Without similar research on the Canadian context, Tennyson believes a study on war support in Canada is needed.¹² Further, Adam Crerar argues the perception of widespread belief among Ontarians that the war was 'just' has created the false impression that Ontarians were homogenous in their support for the war.¹³

Ian Miller attempts to address this gap in the literature by examining the civilian experiences of Torontonians and their continued support of the war effort. While Miller acknowledges divides of gender, class, and race existed within the city, he concludes "that the conflict proved to be a remarkably unifying force."¹⁴ However, Miller admits that there were limits to this 'unity,' as it also created other social divisions in Canadian society. For instance, he argues that British Canadians were "drawn together by the stresses of total war" and "took deliberate action to marginalize others."¹⁵ The 'unification' Miller discusses demonstrates how strong perceived differences were within the city, as British Canadians were 'united' by their

The 1860 Visit of the Prince of Wales to Canada and the United States (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 19.

¹⁰ Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 8; Brian Douglas Tennyson, *Canada's Great War, 1914-1918: How Canada Helped Save the British Empire and Became a North American Nation* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 6; Keith Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 9.

¹¹ Tennyson, *Canada's Great War, 1914-1918*, 9.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Adam Crerar, "Ontario and the Great War," in *Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honour of Robert Craig Brown*, ed. David MacKenzie (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2005), 233.

¹⁴ Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 200.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 182.

marginalization of other groups. Nowhere is this more apparent than in one's understanding of loyalty and 'correct' war support.

Pressure to demonstrate loyalty to the Canadian state and to Great Britain divided public opinion in Toronto as much as it fostered unity among segments of the population. Canadians, as British subjects, owed their allegiance to the British Crown and were expected to stand to defend the British Empire and its principles. In the case of the war, Britain's constitutional monarchy was presented as embodying "freedom, justice and the independence of the people," while Germany was depicted as representing autocracy and militarism.¹⁶ This was most apparent in Canada's treatment of 'enemy aliens' during the war.¹⁷ Bohdan S. Kordan argues that the term 'enemy alien' is profoundly important, as it established an official framework of 'friend versus foe' within Canadian society.¹⁸ As a result of this framework, many British Canadians distrusted 'enemy aliens.' Even when these marginalized groups attempted to demonstrate their loyalty to Canada and Britain, their actions were often treated with scepticism.¹⁹ Cities with large concentrations of British-Protestants, such as Toronto, also experienced elevated levels of racism during the war, as fears of foreign invasion and infiltration caused many British Canadians to blur distinctions between 'enemy aliens' and 'friendly aliens.'²⁰ As a result, anyone in the city deemed 'foreign' came under suspicion and attack.

¹⁶ Kordan, *No Free Man*, 24, 35; Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 30-1. Canada at this time did not possess its own legal citizenship status. Canadians were British subjects – either natural born British subjects or immigrants who came to Canada and applied/attained naturalization as British subjects. Statutes of Canada, *An Act Respecting British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens, 1914* (Ottawa: SC 4-5 George V, Chapter 44), 289-92. Like Britain, Germany was also a constitutional monarchy, however, the emperor had enormous powers and could and often did ignore the Parliament. British monarchs at the time did not have the same kind of powers.

¹⁷ According to Kordan, some 8,579 'enemy aliens' were interned in Canada during the war. Kordan, *No Free Man*, 7.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid., 22-3.

²⁰ Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons*, 121. See also George Buri, "Enemies within our Gates": Brandon's Alien Detention Centre During the Great War," *Manitoba History* no. 56 (October 2007): 9-10. 'Friendly aliens' refers to individuals born outside of Canada of a minority status within the Austro-Hungarian and Turkish Empires – including Czechs, Greeks, Italians, Poles, Ukrainians, etc. and as such likely opposed to their imperial rule. According to Kordan, the Allies hoped to "cultivate" support from these individuals. Kordan, *No Free Man*, 133.

These divisions were made most apparent on the pages of Toronto's newspapers.

Although they are imperfect sources, this article will rely heavily on newspapers, specifically the main Toronto daily newspapers: *The Evening Telegram*, *The Toronto Daily Star*, *The Globe* and *The World*.²¹ These papers were highly competitive and reflected a range of political leanings, from the conservative *Telegram* and *World* to the liberal *Star* and *Globe*.²² Newspapers provide a limited view into the 'public mood,' as it is impossible to know how any given paper was received by its readers. Nonetheless, newspapers and other print media provide an excellent glimpse into what material was available to the public at the time, and the ways in which an historical episode was presented: from the language used to describe an event, to the frequency of coverage. Newspapers of the period were also widely read and provided a forum for citizens to respond to events through letters to the editor sections.²³ Media engagement was particularly important in the case of the German professors at the University of Toronto.

Racial tensions at the University of Toronto came to the fore when the principal of Harbord Collegiate, Edward Hagarty, began to hold student assemblies and speak out against both Germany and German citizens in 1914.²⁴ Paul Mueller, a German-born professor at the University of Toronto and father of three students at Harbord Collegiate, challenged Hagarty's anti-German rhetoric.²⁵ As a result,

²¹ Miller argues in his introduction that one of the reasons for very few works on Toronto in this period is a lack of archival sources. As a result, the best source of information on the period is the city's numerous newspapers. Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 9, 208. Based on my own research, I have to concur with his findings. As such, this article relies heavily on a number of printed media sources.

²² Keshen argues that newspapers in this period were in the process of building specific readership bases and wrote stories that would appeal to the interests of their targeted readership. Keshen, *Propaganda and Censorship*, xii, xv; In his discussion on sources, Miller argues that each Toronto newspaper had its own personality and leanings, and were the "primary vehicle through which citizens learned about their world." Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 9, 205-8.

²³ Historians have argued that the analysis of newspapers in this period can provide insight into how citizens understood and interpreted the war, as well as how some people behaved. Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 9, 208; Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons*, xiii-v.

²⁴ Crerar, "Ontario and the Great War," 255.

²⁵ The case of the German professors is discussed in the exhibition and accompanying booklet *We Will Do Our Share: The University of Toronto and the Great War*, exhibition by the University of Toronto Archives, ed. P.J. Carefoote & Philip

Hagarty focused his attention on Mueller and his fellow German-born professors at the University of Toronto: Bonno Tapper and Immanuel Benzinger.²⁶ The Toronto dailies praised Hagarty for his patriotic stance, and increasingly scrutinized Mueller and his fellow professors. The conservative newspaper *The Evening Telegram* praised Hagarty for “instilling in the minds of his pupils a love of justice and inevitably a hatred of the tyranny and lust of power which has been demonstrated by Germany.”²⁷ The same paper stated that Professor Mueller was “evidently a hot headed egotistical German or he would have had sense enough to keep his mouth shut.”²⁸ The attacks against these professors were widespread; even the more liberal daily, *The Toronto Daily Star*, had harsh words for the German professors, accusing them of having “Prussian ambitions” and of placing the University of Toronto under suspicion.²⁹ Accusing the professors of having “Prussian ambitions” was a derogatory remark because it connected the professors to the belief that German peoples were militaristic and aggressive, as Prussia was often associated with militarism.

These attacks against the German professors represented the beginning of the process of ‘othering’ perceived enemies in Toronto. Professor Mueller had lived in Canada for two decades, and was no longer a German citizen, although he had not applied for naturalization.³⁰ Despite living in Canada for years, the editors and writers of the dailies referred to Professor Mueller exclusively as German. To them, his place of birth superseded his time in Canada, establishing him as part of the feared and disloyal ‘other’ – the ‘enemy alien.’ All three professors were accused of instilling German ideals of ‘kultur’ into the minds of their students. Kultur refers to German culture, specifically military culture. Its use to discuss Germany or German-born subjects was often derogatory and racist, as it promoted

Oldfield, catalogue and exhibition by Harold Averill, Marnee Gamble and Loryl MacDonald (Toronto, 2014), 9-11. The exhibition ran from 29 January to 2 May 2014 and contained archival sources on how the University prepared for and carried out duties during the war, as well as the impact of the war on the staff, students, and University itself.

²⁶ Mueller was the most ‘Canadian’ of the three. Benzinger had only recently returned to Toronto, with great difficulty, from Germany. Carefoote & Oldfield, *We Will Do Our Share*, 9.

²⁷ *Evening Telegram*, 9 September 1914 (Toronto).

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ *Toronto Daily Star*, 8 December 1914.

³⁰ Crerar, “Ontario and the Great War,” 255; Mueller applied for naturalization and received it during this dispute. Carefoote & Oldfield, *We Will Do Our Share*, 9-11.

the construction of Canadian ideals of democracy versus German ideals of autocracy. All three professors were language instructors, and no proof ever materialized of them engaging in espionage or promoting 'kultur.'³¹ After the declaration of war these professors came under attack for teaching their native language, which was part of a larger movement that made it difficult for German-born Canadians to openly embrace their German culture.³² Hostility to perceived threats meant that accusations needed very little credibility to be considered true.

Toronto's daily newspapers were not alone in attacking the professors. A number of students and civilians began to speak out about the dangers of not only the German professors at the University of Toronto but German-born immigrants in Toronto and Canada in general. In a letter to the editor of the University of Toronto student newspaper *The Varsity* H. Eric Machell argued that Germans in Canada were spies who posed a serious risk to the country's security. Machell was convinced that the only logical conclusion was "to place a private detective over every German in the country" and that "anyone objecting to such treatment should be immediately locked up."³³ Anti-German sentiment and pro-British nationalism is very apparent in Machell's letter. To Machell all German Canadians were threats, and the only way to deal with such threats was surveillance and imprisonment.

Since Ontario was predominantly populated by Canadians with a British background it was particularly susceptible to anti-German sentiment during the war. Millman argues that Ontario was "the heartland of British Canada;" the province was a bastion of British-Protestantism, the destination of most British immigrants, and the most

³¹ Professors Mueller and Tapper taught German classes, whilst Professor Benzinger taught Oriental studies and languages. Crerar, "Ontario and the Great War," 255; Carefoote & Oldfield, *We Will Do Our Share*, 9-11; Charles M. Johnston, *McMaster University, Volume 1: The Toronto Years* (McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015), 136-7.

³² Crerar, "Ontario and the Great War," 255-6; Johnston, *McMaster University, Volume 1*, 136. For a particularly stark example of the extremes to which these attacks could reach, one can look to the events of 1916 in Berlin, Ontario. The city, which contained a large number of people of Germanic ancestry, experienced a surge of anti-German sentiment, resulting in the name of the city being changed from Berlin to Kitchener. W.R. Chadwick, *The Battle for Berlin, Ontario: An Historical Drama* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1992); Patricia P. McKegney, *The Kaiser's Bust: A Study in War-Time Propaganda in Berlin, Ontario 1914-1918* (Bamberg, Ontario: Bamberg Press, 1991).

³³ University of Toronto Archives [hereafter cited as UTA], *The Varsity*, 16 October 1914.

“most important source of internal immigration” within the country.³⁴ As such, the attitudes of the British-Protestant population of Toronto could be representative of similar divisions and disputes surrounding social constructions of the ‘other’ and loyalty throughout the country. Since Britain and Germany were at war, British Canadians, especially within Toronto, viewed German-Canadian citizens in a negative light. After receiving reports of atrocities committed in Belgium by German invaders, emboldened British Canadians treated German Canadians with increasing hostility. These events resulted in Britain promoting the war against Germany as a battle of civilization versus barbarism.³⁵ In Canada, some British Canadians perceived that the fight was now against the German people as much as Germany itself.³⁶ The Canadian government, press, and British Canadian public re-imagined ‘enemy aliens’ as spies and potential saboteurs, and the British Canadian public became increasingly suspicious and fearful of them, as exemplified in Machell’s letter in *The Varsity*.³⁷

Despite the animosity towards German-born and German Canadians, President Falconer of the University of Toronto refused to fire the professors, or force his staff to resign simply because they were born in Germany.³⁸ Falconer released a letter to the newspaper, *The World*, in which he argued that the German professorate were experts in their fields, difficult to replace, and had “done nothing that should arouse any suspicion that they are injurious enemy aliens.”³⁹ A student, M. J. Clarke, wrote to *The Varsity* that he agreed the University should indeed support the war effort by having students enlist, but that the

³⁴ Millman, *Polarity, Patriotism, and Dissent*, 39, 246.

³⁵ Jonathan Vance, *Death so Noble* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997), 20; Wilson, *Ontario and the First World War*, ix; McKegney, *The Kaiser’s Bust*, 79.

³⁶ Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 46.

³⁷ Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons*, 131.

³⁸ In Berlin, Ontario, despite German Berliners’ support for the war effort, they experienced prejudicial treatment from the British Canadian population. German Canadians responded to this treatment by suppressing demonstrations of their culture in order to appear loyal. Crerar, “Ontario and the Great War,” 255-6; McKegney, *The Kaiser’s Bust*, 55, 63, 88.

³⁹ *The World*, 16 November 1914. Keshen has made the claim that President Falconer fired the three professors in order to assert the loyalty of the University to the war effort. However, this was not the case. While Falconer was pro-British (imploping students to unite behind the flag and enlist) he fought and almost lost his job in defense of these professors. He even tried to help them secure work in the United States, but to no avail. Keshen, *Propaganda and Censorship*, 23; Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 60; Carefoote & Oldfield, *We Will Do Our Share*, 10-11; Johnston, *McMaster University, Volume 1*, 136-7.

University had a more important role to play than firing or spying on Germans.⁴⁰ Clarke concluded that while it was appropriate for students to support the war effort through drill and the darning of socks, it was “the duty” of the student and University to consider the intellectual aspects of the war as well.⁴¹ He argued that the “race-hatred” extolled by Torontonians and in the newspapers was doing the country harm. Clarke believed that Canadians were being blinded by intolerance and fear, which could damage efforts toward a lasting peace at the war’s conclusion.⁴² Although both President Falconer and M.J. Clarke supported the war effort, they did not share the opinion of the Toronto dailies that all ‘Germans’ were evil or dangerous.

Toronto newspapers turned against the University, its faculty, and its students, for possessing more ‘tolerant’ views regarding the professors. In an interview with *The Evening Telegram*, President Falconer was presented with a rather severe line of leading questions including: “Do you wish to appear as the champion protecting these Germans?” and “Will you resign your position as president of Toronto University?”⁴³ The Toronto dailies also published harsh words against *The Varsity* for defending the professors. Throughout December 1914, the editorial section of *The Varsity* was dedicated not only to defending the honour of the University, President Falconer, and the German professors, but also to addressing misquotes and accusations slung at them by *The Evening Telegram* and *The World*. In one issue of *The Varsity* the editor went as far as to question:

Are we to have a reign of terror in Toronto? Is each person to accuse everyone else of being pro-German, when everyone else refuses to become infected with indiscriminating, flag-waving, traitor-denouncing hysteria?⁴⁴

This demonstrates the extent to which the conception of loyalty divided the populace of Toronto. The media rejected the idea that ‘enemy aliens’ could be trusted. For refusing to renounce German-born professors, the University and its students were called ‘disloyal.’ Anyone who attempted to defend ‘enemy aliens’ was also grouped as part of the ‘other.’

⁴⁰ UTA, *The Varsity*, 21 October 1914.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ *Evening Telegram*, 9 December 1914 (Toronto).

⁴⁴ UTA, Toronto *The Varsity*, 4 December 1914.

This anti-German sentiment was also expressed in an article of the *Canadian Law Journal*. In "Alien Enemies in Public Positions," the author expressed hostile attitudes and responses to both Germans in Canada and at the University of Toronto. They argued that the nationality of the German professors made them untrustworthy and put the country at risk.⁴⁵ Regarding the university the author stated: "[i]t is of no importance whatever, during this war for our national existence, whether there is or is not a University at all, unless it be used as a recruiting centre."⁴⁶ The author felt so strongly that 'Germans' were the enemy that they implied the University of Toronto should be closed or turned into a recruiting centre, stating: "Canada can do without teachers for a few months."⁴⁷ Like Haggarty and Machell, the author believed 'Germans' could not be trusted, and that refusing to fire the professors made the University itself 'disloyal.' The situation finally came to an end in December 1941, when all three professors resigned from the University of Toronto due to the constant harassment of the newspapers, pressure from the Board of Governors at the university, and the possibility that Falconer would be fired for his stance.⁴⁸ While all parties involved in this issue were supportive of the war effort, they had differing views of what constituted loyalty and who could be considered loyal.

The treatment of 'enemy aliens' became a source of major media debate again in 1917 when many businesses began to experience labour shortages. In order to address this shortage an increasing number of employers, and even the federal government, made use of the labour of 'enemy aliens.' Many 'enemy aliens' were even recruited for work by the same employers who had fired them at the beginning of the war.⁴⁹ Returning soldiers, however, were particularly angered by this. For many soldiers, there was no difference between the enemy they had fought overseas and the civilians in Toronto who were of German and Austro-Hungarian ancestry. These soldiers had risked their lives fighting overseas and felt cheated and frustrated when they

⁴⁵ Law Society of Upper Canada, Canadian Bar Association, "Alien Enemies in Public Positions," *Canadian Law Journal* 51, no. 1 (January 1915): 1-2.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ Carefoote & Oldfield, *We Will Do Our Share*, 10-11.

⁴⁹ Donald Avery, 'Dangerous Foreigners': *European Immigrant Workers and Labour Radicalism in Canada, 1896-1932* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1979), 67-9; Craig Heron and Myer Siemiatycki, "The Great War, the State, and Working-Class Canada," in *The Workers' Revolt in Canada, 1917-1925*, ed. Craig Heron (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1998), 19.

returned to find people they considered ‘enemy aliens’ “stealing their jobs.”⁵⁰ A number of Toronto veterans sought to address the problem by conducting raids, or ‘hunts,’ of ‘enemy aliens’ throughout the city.

In April 1917, both Child’s Restaurant and the Russell Motor Company were subject to these raids. Child’s Restaurant on Yonge Street experienced the first disturbance. According to newspaper accounts, an Austrian employee of the restaurant harassed a disabled soldier. Soon after, a mob of roughly five hundred soldiers and civilians marched to the restaurant calling out to those they passed “to join them in their crusade to wipe out the enemy in their midst.”⁵¹ The owner of the restaurant allowed the soldiers to look but they were unable to find the Austrian employee. Instead, the soldiers accosted and injured anyone they deemed ‘foreign.’ They apprehended one Russian and one Swiss employee (though neither qualified as enemies) and assaulted the Italian cook who was “hit in the eye with a broken plate.”⁵² The next day, a group of soldiers raided the Russell Motor Company munitions factory in a similar search. Again, unable to find any ‘enemy aliens’ the soldiers rounded up suspected ‘foreigners’ and dragged them from their workstations to police headquarters.⁵³ Throughout April, the raids occurred not only in public places, but also in private homes, with soldiers pulling people from their beds.⁵⁴ No soldiers were punished for their violent and unlawful conduct but Torontonians grew increasingly frustrated and tired with the behaviour of these soldiers. When referring to another legal case one Torontonian wrote: “a number of soldiers raided Toronto hotels, restaurants and munitions plants and no soldiers were given 30 days [in jail].”⁵⁵ *The Toronto Daily Star*, while supporting the soldiers’ right to complain about jobs and ‘foreigners,’ did not support the soldiers taking the law into their own hands.⁵⁶

The raids finally came to an end due to the intervention of Toronto’s mayor Tommy Church, who called for an end to the “hunting of enemy aliens” and promised the veterans that he would

⁵⁰ Heron and Siemiatycki, “The Great War, the State, and Working-Class Canada,” 23.

⁵¹ *The Globe*, 13 April 1917 (Toronto).

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *The Globe*, 14 April 1917 (Toronto)

⁵⁴ Zoriana Yaworksy Sokolsky, “The Beginnings of Ukrainian Settlement in Toronto, 1891-1939,” in *Gathering Place: Peoples and Neighbourhoods of Toronto, 1834-1945*, ed. Robert F. Harney (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1985), 299-300.

⁵⁵ UTA, *The Canadian Forward*, 25 June 1917.

⁵⁶ *Toronto Daily Star*, 13 April 1917.

take their concerns to the federal government.⁵⁷ Mayor Church supported men fighting overseas by attending send-offs and ensuring that city funds aided soldiers' families.⁵⁸ These actions were not solely motivated by patriotism; Mayor Church understood that following the conclusion of the war a large proportion of the voting male population in Toronto would be veterans. The mayor hoped that if he catered to the demands of veterans during the war, he could guarantee their electoral support at the war's end.⁵⁹ The mayor saw these raids as an opportunity to act as a champion for frustrated returning soldiers.⁶⁰ The raids were unpopular and violent though, and the mayor had to put a stop to them. However, in order to maintain the soldiers' support, he channelled their anti 'enemy alien' sentiment into legislation.

Mayor Church put forward a proposal to petition the federal government to limit the rights of 'enemy aliens' to vote.⁶¹ This proposal targeted Germans and Austro-Hungarians who had become naturalized British subjects – meaning they had taken an oath of allegiance to the Crown.⁶² Interestingly, considering their patriotic stance and attacks on the German professors in 1914, many of the Toronto newspapers were against the mayor's proposal. *The Toronto Daily Star* noted that "a large portion of the German population is loyal, and most of the Austrians are far more influenced by their Canadian environment than by any sentimental attachment to Austria."⁶³ Members of the Toronto City Council appeared to be of the same mind and chose not to support Mayor Church's proposal. One alderman, Councillor Joseph Gibbons, called the mayor's proposal "a cheap bit of patriotism" before going on to argue: "If the alien is good enough to come to this country and work side by side with British workingmen he is good enough to vote or he should be kept out

⁵⁷ *Toronto Daily Star*, 18 April 1917.

⁵⁸ Desmond Morton and Glenn Wright, *Winning the Second Battle: Canadian Veterans and the Return to Civilian Life, 1915-1930* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 66.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Toronto Daily Star*, 18 April 1917.

⁶¹ The proposal would strip naturalized natives of enemy countries of their right to vote unless they had lived and been naturalized in Canada for twenty-five years. *The Naturalization Act* of 1914 stated that a certificate of naturalization guaranteed the rights, privileges and powers of a natural born British subject, including the right to vote. *An Act Respecting British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens, 1914*, 290.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Toronto Daily Star*, 18 April 1917

altogether.”⁶⁴ Members of the council and the newspapers did not see the mayor’s proposal as patriotic, but as a blatant attempt to garner votes.

The mayor defended his proposal in *The Globe*, by saying, “We do not want another Quebec in Canada. The Austro-German vote is ruling in the Northwest today. The Austro-German vote must be abolished in Canada. [...] If this country is worth fighting for it is worth keeping British.”⁶⁵ The words of Mayor Church show the constructed division of the people of Toronto into ‘us versus them’ during the war. His proposal would disenfranchise those considered ‘British subjects’ by the *Naturalization Act*; to the mayor, one could not be Austro-Hungarian or German, and a British subject at the same time. Further, he considered their votes as dangerous, disloyal, and a threat to the predominantly British makeup of the city.

Despite opposition from the members of the city council and some newspaper editors, Mayor Church continued to push forward his motion for ‘alien’ disenfranchisement. On 30 April 1917, after much pressure from the mayor, City Council passed a motion to petition the federal government to disenfranchise any Germans and Austro-Hungarians who had not been naturalized British subjects of Canada for more than twenty-five years.⁶⁶ Church took his motion further, petitioning to deport at the end of the war anyone “found guilty of using seditious language, or of sympathy with the German cause.”⁶⁷ The city’s daily newspapers continued to express opposition to this proposal. An article in the *Toronto Daily Star* argued that the government should *only* be allowed to strip men of their right to vote if they were found guilty of treasonous offences.⁶⁸ The article also accused the government of disenfranchising ‘enemy aliens’ in order to win an election.⁶⁹ An article in *The Globe* expressed similar viewpoints. It claimed that stripping naturalized ‘enemy aliens’ of their right to vote was a “breach with the best traditions of the British Empire.”⁷⁰ The article also asserted that the Act only accomplished the

⁶⁴ *The Globe*, 17 April 1917 (Toronto).

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ City of Toronto Archives, Mayor T.L. Church and City Clerk W.A. Littlejohn, *Minutes of Proceedings: Council of the Corporation City of Toronto* (Toronto: Industrial and Technical Press, City Printers, 1917), 69.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 96-7.

⁶⁸ *Toronto Daily Star*, 14 September 1917.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ *The Globe*, 8 September 1917 (Toronto).

creation of thousands of enemies out of innocent people who had come to Canada to make a new life.⁷¹ Far from stepping down on the issue, two of Toronto's biggest daily newspapers continued to publish their protests against the government's treatment of 'enemy aliens.'

Ultimately, the animosity toward 'enemy aliens' was strong enough in Canada that it drowned out the voices calling for caution and fair treatment. On 21 September 1917, the federal government passed the *Wartime Elections Act*, which disenfranchised 'enemy aliens' who had not been naturalized citizens prior to 31 March 1902.⁷² Peter Price argues that naturalization laws are important as they define your membership within a state, while also embodying strong assumptions about one's character and allegiance.⁷³ As such, the actions of the Canadian government did more than remove the right to vote. They further reinforced the conception of 'enemy aliens' as 'outsiders' who were 'un-Canadian.' 'Enemy aliens' lost their right to vote, but also their legal protections, and proof of 'loyalty' and belonging within the predominantly British community of Canada.⁷⁴ Prejudices held by the mayor and soldiers predated the war. Theories of racial supremacy and eugenics were incredibly popular in Canada and elevated those of British origin above other racial groups.⁷⁵ Many British Canadians feared an increase in 'undesirable' immigrants who were thought to be unwilling or unable to assimilate to British culture.⁷⁶ Angus McLaren argues many Canadians believed the nation's problems "were the product of the outsider."⁷⁷ The war amplified these prejudices and caused Canadians to blur distinctions between 'enemy aliens' and

⁷¹ *The Globe*, 8 September 1917 (Toronto).

⁷² Dominion Government, *Wartime Elections Act* (Ottawa, 1917), 370-1. Millman argues that while there were portions of the Canadian population who challenged or fought what they deemed "significant illiberal distortions" to national life due to the war, the voices against them "proved more powerful." Millman, *Polarity, Patriotism, and Dissent*, 46.

⁷³ Peter Price, "Naturalising Subjects, Creating Citizens: Naturalization Law and the Conditioning of 'Citizenship' in Canada, 1881-1914," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 45, no. 1 (2017): 2, 17.

⁷⁴ Kordan, *No Free Man*, 36.

⁷⁵ Buri, "'Enemies within our Gates,'" 10; Avery, *'Dangerous Foreigners,'* 14; Keshen, *Propaganda and Censorship*, 4; Daniel Francis, *National Dreams: Myth, Memory, and Canadian History* (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1997), 70; Angus McLaren, *Our Own Master Race: Eugenics in Canada, 1885-1945* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990), 27, 46-7.

⁷⁶ Buri, "'Enemies within our Gates,'" 3-4; Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons*, 124; Avery, *'Dangerous Foreigners,'* 13; McLaren, *Our Own Master Race*, 46-7, 67.

⁷⁷ McLaren, *Our Own Master Race*, 67.

‘friendly aliens.’⁷⁸ As a result, anyone deemed ‘foreign’ came under suspicion and attack from the dominant British Canadian community.

The treatment of the Greek community is a prime example of the suspicion and hostility of the British Canadian community in Toronto during the war. At the beginning of the war, Greece remained neutral. Greek immigrants and Greek Canadians within Toronto were divided as to whether they should stay neutral or support the British. These divisions caused verbal and violent confrontations in coffeehouses and churches, resulting in the intervention of local authorities.⁷⁹ Some Torontonians were angry and bitter at Greece for not supporting the Allied cause at the outset of the war. As such, Greek Canadians and Greek immigrants faced verbal and physical confrontations within their divided community and also from members of the British Canadian community.⁸⁰ These tensions were not resolved with Greece’s entrance into the war on the side of the British in 1917. Greek Canadians in Toronto assumed there could be no doubt of their loyalty, as Greek Canadians had contributed roughly 2,000 men from across Canada to fight overseas.⁸¹ However, British Canadian Torontonians still harboured bitterness for Greece’s initial neutrality. In March of 1918 members of Toronto’s Greek community wrote to *The Globe* that Greeks in Toronto were “misjudged and sometimes ill-treated, many Canadians apparently believing them to be pro-German.”⁸² The Greek community in Toronto could not understand why they continued to be ill treated by British Canadians, especially since Greek Canadians believed they had done enough to support the war effort.

The Catholic population of Toronto, like the Greeks, were quick to learn that supporting the war effort did not guarantee safety from criticism or attack. At the start of the war the Pope declared that the Catholic Church would remain neutral. The Archbishop of Toronto, Neil McNeil, wrote a pastoral letter to explain the position of the Catholic Church and Catholics on the war. He reasoned that the Pope had to remain neutral on the subject of war because if he “condemned

⁷⁸ Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons*, 121.

⁷⁹ Lia Douramakou-Petroleka, “The Elusive Community: Greek Settlement in Toronto, 1900-1940,” in *Gathering Place: Peoples and Neighbourhoods of Toronto, 1834-1945*, ed. Robert F. Harney (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1985), 268.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ *Toronto Daily Star*, 7 August 1918.

⁸² *The Globe*, 2 March 1918 (Toronto).

either group of belligerents” then he would put millions of Catholics “in the agonizing necessity of choosing between their Church and their Country...”⁸³ By staying neutral, the Pope allowed Catholics to be loyal to both their faith and their country. Many Catholics understood the Pope’s message to mean just that. However, many non-Catholics could not understand how the leader of the Catholic Church could be neutral but its followers could support the war, especially considering the anti-war stance of Irish Catholics in the United States, and French Catholics in Quebec. However, the Catholic community in Toronto was very committed to supporting the war effort and demonstrating their loyalty to the British crown.

Throughout the 1800s Catholics in Canada had experienced attacks at the hands of the Orange Order – a British-Protestant fraternal organization with members in high ranking political and social positions – who presented Catholics as bigots and anti-Empire.⁸⁴ According to Mark McGowan, the war provided Catholics in the city an opportunity to demonstrate their loyalty to Canada and the Empire, while remaining Catholic.⁸⁵ Catholics volunteered for overseas service, supported conscription, bought war bonds, and even pressured their family members to enlist.⁸⁶ Despite such patriotic support for the war effort, Toronto Catholics still faced criticism and harsh treatment. In a letter to the editor of *The Toronto Daily Star* James F. Coughlin responded to an article accusing Catholics of being disloyal. Coughlin wrote: “Catholics have risen to the requirements of duty, loyalty, and patriotism” and “all we ask is the right to live peacefully, and not be hounded about and suspected of things which never enter our heads.”⁸⁷ L. Fleming wrote to Toronto Archbishop McNeil, detailing how upset

⁸³ Archives of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto (hereafter cited as ARCAT), FW WE04, 13 - War Effort – Pastoral, Archbishop McNeil, “The Pope and the War,” February 1918, 3.

⁸⁴ Mark McGowan, *The Waning of the Green: Catholics, the Irish, and Identity in Toronto, 1887-1922* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1999), 283; David A. Wilson, *The Orange Order in Canada* (Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 2007), 10, 14.

⁸⁵ Mark McGowan, “‘To Share in the Burden of Empire’: Toronto’s Catholics and the Great War, 1914-1918,” in *Catholics at the ‘Gathering Place’: Historical Essays on the Archdiocese of Toronto, 1884-1991*, ed. Mark McGowan and Brian P. Clarke (Toronto: The Catholic Historical Association, 1993), 178.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 178, 182; Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 8-9; Millman, *Polarity, Patriotism, and Dissent*, 88.

⁸⁷ ARCAT, FW WE07, 20 - War Effort - Conscription/Attitude of Quebec & Catholics to War, James F. Coughlin, “Editor of the Toronto Daily Star,” 22 March 1917.

he was at seeing newspaper articles portraying Catholics as pro-German or not doing enough for the war effort.⁸⁸ Fleming believed this treatment in Toronto showed “the hatred and malice borne against the Roman Catholic Church and the Vicar of Christ [the Pope].”⁸⁹ These letters reveal the level of suspicion and harassment Toronto Catholics experienced within the city. Despite attempts to demonstrate their loyalty, Toronto Catholics were still indiscriminately viewed as the ‘other’ by Toronto’s British-Protestant community. Any groups this community deemed ‘different,’ based on their country of birth or religious beliefs, were grouped as a part of the ‘other’ and faced criticism regarding their loyalty to Canada and Britain – even when they had taken many steps to demonstrate this loyalty.

Divisions and accusations regarding loyalty and ‘appropriate’ war support were not solely directed at groups perceived as the ‘other,’ they were also present within the Canadian British-Protestant community itself. Obligations regarding ‘proper’ male behaviour were major sources of contention within the city. Gender norms of the period reinforced the belief in a natural binary which divided men and women into ‘acceptable’ roles and behaviours based on perceived physiological and social differences.⁹⁰ Societal norms reified the perception of men as physically strong and rational, whereas women were perceived to be weak and emotionally frail in comparison. These constructed differences reinforced the conception that education, status, and political power required a strong and therefore male body, and relegated women to the status of caretakers of children and the home.⁹¹ The war established new roles for the sexes, creating an intersection of patriotism and gender. Men were expected to serve the empire in combat while women were expected to sacrifice their sons and volunteer their time and money to support the war effort from

⁸⁸ ARCAT, FW WE07, 21 - War Effort - Conscription/Attitude of Quebec & Catholics to War, L. Fleming, “Your Grace Archbishop of Toronto,” 7 June 1918.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University, 1988), 32; Gail Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 7; George L. Mosse, *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 4, 6.

⁹¹ Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons*, 41; Aileen S. Kraditor, *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981), 15, 18, 20, 24; Bederman, *Manliness & Civilization*, 14.

home.⁹² Many mothers saw themselves as engaged in “sacrificing” their sons for a greater cause: civilization and the British Empire.⁹³ A woman’s value was tied to her relation to a man—either a son, a husband, or brother—and her willingness to let them serve, even if it meant losing them. Judith Butler argues that gender binaries are often so imbedded into the public consciousness that any deviation or failure to ‘perform’ in a manner “considered appropriate to one’s gender” is met with punishment.⁹⁴ Men and women were expected to fulfill their wartime roles in order to demonstrate loyalty to the cause. However, as events in the city demonstrate, not everyone agreed on the meaning of appropriate or patriotic behaviour.

A great example of this diverse understanding of patriotism was in disputes regarding prohibition. The leading group for prohibition was the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU). Although technically non-denominational, the WCTU was closely tied to Protestant Churches and also promoted various social reforms within the family, city, and even health care infrastructure. Despite its varied goals, the WCTU primarily focused on the sale and consumption of alcohol. To the WCTU, alcohol was responsible for many of society’s problems, including violence in the home. Further, they believed alcohol was detrimental to the war effort, as grain was used to make alcohol rather than to feed the troops.⁹⁵ The WCTU saw it as their patriotic duty to ban the sale and consumption of alcohol. However, soldiers returning from war did not see alcohol as evil and were opposed to prohibition. According to Tim Cook, alcohol not only provided soldiers with a reminder of the comforts of civilian life, but also afforded them a mechanism through which they could cope with the war, and make their war experiences more bearable.⁹⁶ To these soldiers, alcohol was a staple of survival both during and after their war service.⁹⁷ They did not consider the banning of the sale and consumption of alcohol, be it overseas or on the home front, to be

⁹² Suzanne Evans, *Mothers of Heroes, Mothers of Martyrs: World War I and the Politics of Grief* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2007), 4, 12-3, 42; Rutherdale, *Hometown Horizons*, 194, 222.

⁹³ Evans, *Mothers of Heroes, Mothers of Martyrs*, 42, 76.

⁹⁴ Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 178-9.

⁹⁵ Cook, “Wet Canteens and Worrying Mothers,” 315-7; Tim Cook, “‘More a Medicine than a Beverage’: ‘Demon Rum’ and the Canadian Trench Soldier of the First World War,” *Canadian Military History* 9, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 10; *The Globe*, 15 February 1915 (Toronto).

⁹⁶ Cook, “Wet Canteens and Worrying Mothers,” 312.

⁹⁷ Cook, “‘More a Medicine than a Beverage,’” 15.

patriotic. These differing perspectives regarding alcohol eventually spilled out onto the streets of Toronto.

On 8 March 1916, the WCTU and supporters marched to the provincial Parliament building in Toronto. Their goal was to drop off a petition containing more than a thousand signatures in favour of passing prohibition in Ontario.⁹⁸ As the parade passed local armouries, soldiers followed and verbally harassed the participants.⁹⁹ Amongst the members and supporters of the parade was a section of male students from the University of Toronto who had not enlisted. Quickly, the focus of the soldiers shifted from harassing the prohibitionists to taunting students in the parade whom the soldiers viewed as shirkers.¹⁰⁰ C. Kent Duff, an engineering student at the parade, wrote to his mother and described how the soldiers intimidated the students, and called them cowards, slackers, and shirkers.¹⁰¹ Verbal harassment against these young male marchers quickly turned physical. One witness at the parade told *The Toronto Daily Star* that civilians and soldiers became increasingly hostile regarding the males' lack of uniform, with some recruiters becoming so aggressive the young men had to run away in order to escape them.¹⁰² As the parade continued and the physical harassment escalated, soldiers threw snow and at ice at the marchers, and even assaulted the mounted policeman assigned to escort the parade.¹⁰³ According to Rutherford, the public discourse in Canada "privileged the myth of the volunteer and the valor of the active servicemen as a male ideal."¹⁰⁴ Thus, the students' lack of uniform made them unpatriotic and unmanly in the eyes of the soldiers.

Not everyone in Toronto approved of the behaviour of the soldiers at the parade. The writers at *The Toronto Daily Star* argued that since male spectators at sporting matches were not being harassed

⁹⁸ Archives of Ontario [hereafter cited as AO], London (Ont.) *The Canadian White Ribbon Tidings*, 1 April 1916.

⁹⁹ *Evening Telegram*, 9 March 1916 (Toronto).

¹⁰⁰ A shirker is someone considered cowardly for evading military service.

¹⁰¹ UTA, 2 Duff, C. Kent Fonds, B94-0001/001(003), C. Kent Duff, "Dear Mother," 9 March 1916.

¹⁰² *Toronto Daily Star*, 9 March 1916.

¹⁰³ UTA, 2 Duff, C. Kent Fonds, B94-0001/001(003), C. Kent Duff, "Dear Mother," 9 March 1916.

¹⁰⁴ Rutherford, *Hometown Horizons*, 200-201; Joan Scott argues that the war disrupted the 'natural order' resulting in the perception of some men as weak and unmanly, inverting the established gender dynamic. Joan W. Scott, "Women and War: A Focus for Rewriting History," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 12, no. 2, Teaching about Peace, War, and Women in the Military (Summer, 1984): 4.

neither should those “who are honestly advocating a cause which they regard as identified with the highest patriotism.”¹⁰⁵ Although a proponent of military service, the editor of the newspaper was clearly disturbed that civilians and soldiers seemed to indiscriminately select which men to harass. The WCTU also came to the defense of the young men marching in their parade, arguing that many men could not serve as they had either been turned down for service or needed to stay at home to support their families.¹⁰⁶ To the WCTU these young men were not ‘shirkers’ but rather demonstrated an alternative loyal masculinity.

Many newspapers also defended or at least provided an excuse for the behaviour of the soldiers. *The Evening Telegram* and *The World* argued that the soldiers had a right to protest, and that the combination of the presence of civilian women and the students in the parade standing their ground “forced” the soldiers to respond violently.¹⁰⁷ Even the WCTU defended the soldiers and asked Torontonians not to blame them for the attack.¹⁰⁸ During the war, Canadian society promoted the image and ideal of the hyper masculine soldier, particularly in contrast to the unmanly shirker.¹⁰⁹ The newspaper writers and WCTU excused the soldiers’ behaviour, suggesting they had no choice but to respond and prove their masculinity against the suspected shirkers, especially with women watching. This would not be the last time that male students of the University encountered backlash over their lack of uniforms.

In 1917 the University of Toronto began to pressure its students to enlist. In a letter to his mother, C. Kent Duff described how the university kept releasing forms for students to fill out and return regarding whether or not they had enlisted and encouraging them to do so.¹¹⁰ This pressure to enlist came from President Falconer who believed that it was the duty of the students to do so, stating: “this is no

¹⁰⁵ *Toronto Daily Star*, 10 March 1916.

¹⁰⁶ AO, *The Canadian White Ribbon Tidings*, 1 April 1916 (London, Ont.)

¹⁰⁷ *Evening Telegram*, 9 March 1916 (Toronto); *Toronto Daily Star*, 9 March 1916 – An article in *The Star* mentions an editorial in *The World* that defended the actions of the soldiers at the parade. *The Star* disagreed with the stance of *The World*. Due to a difficulty in attaining copies of *The World*, I have had to cite their article through *The Star*.

¹⁰⁸ AO, *The Canadian White Ribbon Tidings*, 1 April 1916 (London, Ont.)

¹⁰⁹ Rutherdale, *Hometown Horizons*, 79.

¹¹⁰ UTA, 2, Duff, C. Kent Fonds, B94-0001/001(003), C. Kent Duff, “Dear Mother,” 11 February 1916.

time for shirkers, in the classroom or elsewhere.”¹¹¹ In preparation for their eventual service, President Falconer also made drill sessions mandatory at the University of Toronto. In response, students wrote to *The Varsity* to complain about this change, as it increased the male students’ workload and threatened the completion of their degrees. One angry student accused the University Senate and authorities of having “gone insane over militarism and wishing to foist on us the German system.”¹¹² Another student protested that:

the authorities, as another correspondent pointed out, apparently intend to make the University a kind of sausage machine, into one end of which the freshman is put, to come out at the other end - what? Evidently a full[-]fledged militarist, crammed like his German prototype with Kultur.¹¹³

These accusations of ‘Germanizing’ the University and its students are reminiscent of the editorial attacks on the German professors. In 1914, the media accused the professors of fostering German autocratic ideals onto the students. While students had defended the professors, they now saw the introduction of mandatory drill as autocratic and hyper-militaristic, features they viewed as inherently German. While Falconer believed that mandatory drill was the male students’ duty, the students saw it as unpatriotic, turning them into the very thing they were supposed to be fighting.

The Varsity shut down the debate by refusing to publish any further letters regarding compulsory drill. The paper wrote: “The anti-drillers have evidently run out of ‘arguments,’ and all we hear now is a rehash of statements which have already been made.”¹¹⁴ The editors even accused the anti-drillers of having weak arguments and of harassing the staff of the newspaper.¹¹⁵ The staff of *The Varsity*, seeing “no real argument,” closed the debate. This decision is interesting, as in 1916 the editors of *The Varsity* had argued that not every man should or could serve overseas: “There are the ties of family, the obligations to others, the hundred and one things which loom large in the individual life, and yet are entirely unknown to the public.”¹¹⁶ Although supportive of the war effort and acknowledging the students who had

¹¹¹ UTA, *The Varsity*, 11 January 1915.

¹¹² UTA, *The Varsity*, 15 October 1917.

¹¹³ UTA, *The Varsity*, 19 October 1917.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ UTA, *The Varsity*, 7 February 1916.

fought and served, this note from the editors of *The Varsity* argued some obligations at home were just as important and supportive of the war effort as enlisting. By 1917, the new editors of *The Varsity* had a different view on the subject, siding with the University in their belief that mandatory drill and enlistment were masculine and patriotic.

These numerous divisions came to a head in August of 1918. At the beginning of the month, thousands of veterans gathered in Toronto for the Great War Veterans Convention. Violence quickly erupted when a story spread of a soldier being accosted by a 'foreigner' at the Greek owned White City Cafe on Yonge Street.¹¹⁷ As was the case with Child's Restaurant in 1917, soldiers assembled in large numbers and raided the restaurant. However, this raid quickly turned into a riot. A mob of almost a thousand soldiers and civilians descended upon the White City Cafe. From the evening of 2 August until the morning of 3 August, the mob destroyed ten different restaurants (almost all 'foreign' owned) along Yonge, Bloor and Queen Street.¹¹⁸ They smashed windows and doors, and stole registers and other supplies.¹¹⁹ The rioters were either unable to, or did not care to, differentiate between ally and enemy. For example, the owner of the Colonial Restaurant on Yonge Street, a well-known supporter of returned soldiers, pleaded to no avail as the mob plundered his business.¹²⁰

Although initially seeming to dissipate on 3 August, the riot increased in size to roughly 5,000 soldiers and citizens from 5 to 6 August.¹²¹ The mob gathered at Queen's Park and seemed intent on causing more damage to the city. In response, on 5 August, Mayor Church demanded that the mob disperse and the riot cease, only to be met by jeers and boos.¹²² As crowds marched through the streets, police advised them to disperse and go home. Soon after, men in the crowd began throwing stones at police officers.¹²³ The police responded to this violence by charging into the crowds and hitting the rioters indiscriminately with their batons.¹²⁴ In order to end the riot, the

¹¹⁷ Morton and Wright, *Winning the Second Battle*, 82-3.

¹¹⁸ *Evening Telegram*, 3 August 1918 (Toronto).

¹¹⁹ *Toronto Daily Star*, 3 August 1918.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ J. Castell Hopkins, *The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs* (Toronto: the Canadian Annual Review, Limited, 1919), 587.

¹²² *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 August 1918.

¹²³ *Evening Telegram*, 7 August 1918 (Toronto).

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

mayor threatened to read the *Riot Act* and had five hundred soldiers, under military control, brought into the city.¹²⁵ These soldiers patrolled the streets of Toronto mounted on horseback and carried heavy axe pick handles.¹²⁶ The intent was clear – they would preserve order by force. Through blows and intimidation, the mob finally dispersed. For more than a week, rioters had damaged property and injured many civilians. In less than one day the rioters had caused an estimated \$44,000 in damage.¹²⁷ Although many men were arrested and given jail time, many soldiers who called for a retrial or dismissal won their appeals.¹²⁸

These riots represented a culmination of prejudicial attitudes and behaviours within the city of Toronto. Pressure to demonstrate loyalty to the Canadian state and to Great Britain divided public opinion in Toronto as much as it fostered ‘unity’ among certain segments of the population. Throughout the war, Torontonians of a British-Protestant background perceived themselves to be united against the ‘unpatriotic others’ within their city – ‘enemy aliens,’ ‘foreigners,’ and ‘Catholics.’ However, the British-Protestant community itself was divided regarding appropriate gendered behaviour. The citizens of Toronto were well aware of the divisions that existed within their city, as many pre-dated the war itself. As the war continued, Government and media propaganda exacerbated notions of ‘us versus them’ until it became clear to Torontonians that if you were perceived to be a shirker or otherwise unpatriotic, then you were the enemy. The war highlighted the complexities of patriotism and loyalty among Torontonians. Few people seemed to share the same understanding of what support for the war meant, or who the enemy truly was. Further, the war revealed the strength of social constructions of difference within the city itself, sometimes leading to violent altercations. The story of Toronto during the war is one of perceived unity but in reality, there remained extensive divisions along national, ethnic, gendered, and religious lines.

¹²⁵ Hopkins, *The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs*, 587.

¹²⁶ Miller, *Our Glory and Our Grief*, 181.

¹²⁷ Hopkins, *The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs*, 586-7.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archives of Ontario.

The Canadian White Ribbon Tidings (London, Ont.)

Archives of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto.

FW WE04. (01-13) - War Effort - Pastoral "The Pope and the War."

FW WE07. (01-21) - War Effort - Conscription/Attitude of Quebec & Catholics to War.

City of Toronto Archives.

Mayor T.L. Church and City Clerk W.A. Littlejohn. *Minutes of Proceedings: Council of the Corporation City of Toronto*. Toronto: Industrial and Technical Press, City Printers, 1917.

Dominion Government. *Wartime Elections Act*. Ottawa: J. de L. Taché, 1917.

Hopkins, J. Castell. *The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs*. Toronto: The Canadian Annual Review, Limited, 1919.

Law Society of Upper Canada, Canadian Bar Association. "Alien Enemies in Public Positions." *Canadian Law Journal* vol. 51 no. 1 (January 1915): 1-9.

Newspapers

The Evening Telegram (Toronto)

The Globe (Toronto)

The Toronto Daily Star (Toronto)

The World (Toronto)

Statutes of Canada. *An Act Respecting British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens, 1914*. Ottawa: SC 4-5 George V, Chapter 44.

Statutes of Canada. *The War Measures Act, 1914*. Ottawa: J. de L. Tache, 1914 George V, Chapter 2.

University of Toronto Archives.

B94-0001/001(003). Duff, C. Kent Fonds.

The Canadian Forward (Toronto)

The Varsity (Toronto)

Secondary Sources

Avery, Donald. *'Dangerous Foreigners': European Immigrant Workers and Labour Radicalism in Canada, 1896-1932*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1979.

- Bederman, Gail. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Brubaker, Roger. *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Buri, George. "'Enemies within our Gates': Brandon's Alien Detention Centre During the Great War." *Manitoba History* no. 56 (Oct 2007): 3-11.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Chadwick, W.R. *The Battle for Berlin, Ontario: An Historical Drama*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1992.
- Cook, Tim. "Wet Canteens and Worrying Mothers: Alcohol, Soldiers and Temperance Groups in the Great War." *Social History* 35 no. 70 (November 2002): 311-330.
- . "'More a Medicine than a Beverage': 'Demon Rum' and the Canadian Trench Soldier of the First World War." *Canadian Military History* 9, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 6-22.
- Crerar, Adam. "Ontario and the Great War," in *Canada and the First World War: Essays in Honour of Robert Craig Brown*, edited by David MacKenzie: 230-271. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Douramakou-Petroleka, Lia. "The Elusive Community: Greek Settlement in Toronto, 1900-1940." In *Gathering Place: Peoples and Neighbourhoods of Toronto, 1834-1945*, edited by Robert F. Harney: 257-278. Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1985.
- Evans, Suzanne. *Mothers of Heroes, Mothers of Martyrs: World War I and the Politics of Grief*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007.
- Francis, Daniel. *National Dreams: Myth, Memory, and Canadian History*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1997.
- Heron, Craig and Myer Siemiatycki. "The Great War, the State, and Working-Class Canada." In *The Workers' Revolt in Canada, 1917-1925*, edited by Craig Heron: 11-42. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Jarvis, Eric and Melvin Baker. "Clio in Hogtown: A Brief Bibliography." *Ontario History* 76 no. 3 (1984): 287-294.
- Johnston, Charles M. *McMaster University, Volume 1: The Toronto Years*. McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015.

- Keshen, Jeffrey. *Propaganda and Censorship During Canada's Great War*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1996.
- Kordan, Bohdan S. *No Free Man: Canada, the Great War and the Enemy Alien Experience*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2016.
- Kraditor, Aileen S. *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981.
- McGowan, Mark. *The Waning of the Green: Catholics, the Irish, and identity in Toronto, 1887-1922*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.
- . "'To Share in the Burden of Empire': Toronto's Catholics and the Great War, 1914-1918." In *Catholics at the 'Gathering Place': Historical Essays on the Archdiocese of Toronto, 1884-1991*, edited by Mark McGowan and Brian P. Clarke: 177-207. Toronto: The Catholic Historical Association, 1993.
- McKegney, Patricia P. *The Kaiser's Bust: A Study in War-Time Propaganda in Berlin, Ontario 1914-1918*. Bamberg, ON: Bamberg Press, 1991.
- McLaren, Angus. *Our Own Master Race: Eugenics in Canada, 1885-1945*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990.
- Miller, Ian. *Our Glory and Our Grief: Torontonians and the Great War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Millman, Brock. *Polarity, Patriotism, and Dissent in Great War Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016.
- Morton, Desmond and Glenn Wright. *Winning the Second Battle: Canadian Veterans and the Return to Civilian Life, 1915-1930*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Morton, Desmond and J.L. Granatstein. *'Marching to Armageddon': Canadians and the Great War, 1914-1919*. Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys, 1989.
- Mosse, George L. *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Price, Peter. "Naturalising Subjects, Creating Citizens: Naturalization Law and the Conditioning of 'Citizenship' in Canada, 1881-1914." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 45, no. 1 (2017): 1-21.
- Radforth, Ian. *Royal Spectacle: The 1860 Visit of the Prince of Wales to Canada and the United States*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Rutherford, Robert. *Hometown Horizons: Local Responses to Canada's Great War*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004.

- Scott, Joan Wallach. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University, 1988.
- . “Women and War: A Focus for Rewriting History.” *Women’s Studies Quarterly* 12, no. 2, Teaching about Peace, War, and Women in the Military (Summer, 1984): 2-6.
- Sokolsky, Zoriana Yaworksy. “The Beginnings of Ukrainian Settlement in Toronto, 1891-1939.” In *Gathering Place: Peoples and Neighbourhoods of Toronto, 1834-1945*, edited by Robert F. Harney: 279-302. Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1985.
- Tennyson, Brian Douglas. *Canada’s Great War, 1914-1918: How Canada Helped Save the British Empire and Became a North American Nation*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.
- Vance, Jonathan. *Death so Noble*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997.
- Walden, Keith. *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- We Will Do Our Share: The University of Toronto and the Great War*. Exhibition by the University of Toronto Archives. General editors P.J. Carefoote & Philip Old Field, catalogue and exhibition by Harold Averill, Marnee Gamble and Loryl MacDonald. Toronto: Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, 2014.
- Wilson, Barbara M. *Ontario and the First World War, 1914-1918*. Toronto: Champlain Society for the Government of Ontario, 1977.
- Wilson, David A. *The Orange Order in Canada*. Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 2007.