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Abstract

Urban ethnic landscapes have received little attention in the immigration and ethnic studies and cultural geography literatures. Marxist historical materialism, speculations on modern(ist) urbanism and assimilation have either denied or neglected the study of ethnic landscapes in the city. A small body of literature on the ethnic use and meaning of space is beginning to emerge which shows that ungrounded theoretical speculation can misinform us about both ethnicity and the built environment. This study of retail facades in Toronto's post-war Little Italy addresses the debate and shows that more empirical case studies are needed before we can theorize the urban landscape.

The retail strip along St. Clair Ave. around Dufferin St. was the focal point of post-war Italian immigration to Toronto. Although the strip was mostly built up in the second decade of this century, documentary photographs from the Toronto Real Estate Board's Multiple Listing Service show that it changed little before Italian immigration. Property assessment data for the City of Toronto show a rapid ethnic succession from British-origin and Jewish to Italian for St. Clair stores, providing information on tenure, business type, and occupants' names. With this information, I was able to contact Italian-origin merchants along St. Clair for informant interviews on their renovations and the changing identity and meaning of St. Clair.

Using the photographs, I conclude that St. Clair is an urban ethnic landscape for a number of reasons: Italian immigration and entrepreneurship brought visible changes to the original Georgian idiom of
the strip, namely the widespread use of stucco, marble/granite and tile. Georgian features were also removed and/or replaced. Vestibules were coopted for plate glass windows, cafe windows installed to serve sidewalk patrons and new outdoor patios for cafes and restaurants. These changes can be explained by the pre-migratory experiences of Italian immigrants and the public quality of Italian culture.

I could further support this conclusion with information from my interviews. The interviews revealed that retail facades and the streetscape is imbued with ethnic pride and tensions. Merchants spoke of their pride and preference for Italian-style renovations, work which was usually done with the aid of family and community members. Merchants’ also told me about their dislike for the aesthetic choices of non-Italian entrepreneurs. It quickly became clear that retail facades were being used as a vehicle to express discontent with St. Clair’s previous population and the visible minorities that are now beginning to dominate the area numerically.

The process and meaning of change behind St. Clair’s retail facades ultimately speak of the strip’s territorial history. Ethnic pride and community involvement helped to change its original identity. Yet this is balanced by ethnic bigotry expressed as discontent for the aesthetic preferences of others. Thus, in contrast to the dominant theoretical viewpoints on the urban landscape, the meaning and visible appearance of St. Clair has been influenced by ethnic relations to produce an urban ethnic landscape.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In the period since WW2, Toronto has become one of the most ethnically diverse cities in the world. That diversity has come to be reflected in the urban landscape and has been a source of ethnic pride and, in some cases, tensions. As immigration continues to diversify the city, so the urban landscape will continue to reflect its changing population. In this study, I document and interpret landscape change in one retail strip in Toronto in the post-war period--St. Clair Ave. in the vicinity of Dufferin St.. I examine how St. Clair's original British identity, embodied in commercial building facades, has been refashioned by Italian immigration and settlement in the area.

How does one choose a part of the city for ethnic landscape study? Districts known for their ethnic residential composition make obvious choices. Very early after WW2, St. Clair came to be known as the major centre of Italian settlement in Toronto. So common was this view that Italian presidents have made time to visit the strip while in Toronto in 1967 and 1986. In 1982, after celebrations on St. Clair for Italy’s victory in an international soccer tournament, Italy became aware of the large number of Italians residing in Toronto with such strong ties to their homeland. As a result, the Banca Commerciale Italiana of Canada was opened for business just east of Dufferin on St. Clair. Perhaps most significant, as part of Toronto’s sesquicentennial celebration in 1984, the Queen of England was shown the area on foot as a display of the city’s diversity and harmony (Toronto Star, 1984). St. Clair was the centre of Toronto’s Italian community for decades beginning in the 1950s: by 1961, so many Italians had settled around St. Clair that approximately 30 000 Italian-origin residents lived in nearby neighbourhoods. All around the St. Clair and Dufferin district, this
number expanded until the 1970s. Italians were the first immigrant group to really alter the ethnic composition of Toronto which, up to WW2, had been mostly British-origin. As such, Italian immigrants and the urban landscape around St. Clair together represent Toronto’s first steps towards ethnic diversification.

So we know why St. Clair might make a good candidate for urban ethnic landscape study. But we need to know more about immigration and ethnicity to better appreciate how urban space can take on different identities. In chapter two, I review the literature on immigration and ethnic studies, focusing on ethnic identity and relations, with specific reference to Italians in post-war Toronto. I define ethnicity as the process of identifying oneself or being identified as belonging to a group based on appearance, origin, language, religion or any similar aspect. Thus, ethnic identity and affiliation is determined both from within and without the ethnic group. Individual members find comfort and familiarity within their own group, this being especially important in the case of immigration. When ethnic groups come into contact, however, differences can turn into tension and exclusion, as it did for post-war Torontonians. Incumbent Torontonians were not as receptive of Italians as they could have been. Meanwhile, having come quickly and in large numbers, and finding pre-war compatriots already established in the city, Italians did not have to go beyond their group boundary for their wants and needs. By 1971, the more than 300 000 Italian-origin residents of Toronto had developed links of internal dependency that diminished the need for extra-group contact. The history of Italian identity and relations with the wider Toronto society is important background for understanding landscape change along St. Clair.
In chapter three, I go on to discuss landscape studies as a background to my empirical work on St. Clair. I define landscape as a distinct set of physical structures and patterns shaped by and shaping its inhabitants, having meaning for them and containing their identity. Despite the volume of immigration to cities like Toronto and the academic attention it has received, urban ethnic landscapes have been overlooked. Three theoretical viewpoints have downplayed the analysis of ethnic identity in the built environment: some view ethnic identity in urban space as ersatz, subject to the whims of consumer fashions, thus turning otherwise true ethnic identity into a saleable commodity. Others argue that modern urbanism precludes the construction of ethnically significant spaces. Still others argue that ethnically marked space conceals, if only briefly, the more enduring landscape of assimilation because, they believe, assimilation itself is inevitable. All three perspectives have led to the perception that urban ethnic landscapes are too short-lived or false spaces to be worthwhile subjects. I argue otherwise--theoretically in chapter three and substantively in chapter five using St. Clair as my case study.

To date, the most useful concept for the study of urban ethnic landscapes is Dolores Hayden's 'territorial history'. She brings together the separate literatures of immigration, ethnicity and landscape. In keeping with recent social theory, Hayden argues that territoriality can mean more than the defense and control of space--that it also entails the redemptive role that space can play in social relations. Territorial history is a useful framework for providing a balanced account of urban space and ethnicity as multiple and contested realities.

In chapter four, I present my methodology and sources. The three primary data sources used were Ontario property assessment records for the City of Toronto, documentary photographs mostly from the Toronto Real
Estate Board’s Multiple Listing Service, and oral history interviews with fifteen St. Clair merchants. In addition, I also use fire insurance atlases and the census, all to document and interpret retail facades as reflections of St. Clair’s changing ethnic composition throughout the twentieth century. The property assessment data provided a general picture of ethnic changeover in St. Clair’s retail establishments and were used to identify individual merchants for prospective interviews. The appearance of St. Clair shops were then traced back in time with photographs to ascertain changes in the ethnic affiliation of storefront design. Obvious clues of ethnicity are business sign language and product displays. For example, one informant, Mary DeLeo, told me how she changed the name of business in 1956 from Imperial Bakery to Tre Mari Bakery. Some facade changes were also easy to spot in the photographs, such as the use of different materials like stucco versus original red brick. Other clues, like the removal of doorways and adaptations to fenestration, were less obvious and I would not have noticed them had it not been for my oral history interviews. The interviews also provided information on merchants’ own ideas about their shops and St. Clair’s overall change, as well as information I could use in my own interpretation of landscape change.

Finally, in chapter five, I present my research results. The basic question I ask is: ‘do urban ethnic landscapes exist?’ Although I provide a theoretical ‘yes’ in chapter three, I substantiate the answer using St. Clair’s post-war experience. Its development in the early part of this century adhered to planning norms and the dominant aesthetic choice in Toronto at that time: the two-part commercial block (two-storey building) was the most popular type of commercial-residential structure used in North America from 1800 though 1950 (Longstreth, 1986, 1987). Long and narrow lots determined like
buildings which were divided into two sections in terms of intended use and appearance. Because of internal and external configuration could vary little, the leading historian of retail design for this period, Richard Longstreth, argues that facade is the most important characteristic when analyzing main street architecture. As such, it is important to know that a Georgian idiom was popular in the city when St. Clair was mostly built up. The style has certain distinctive features, many of which are directly compatible with the two-part commercial block; box-like symmetry owing to its classical emphasis and formal entrance bays or vestibules. The two-part commercial block and the Georgian style were combined the St. Clair strip in the first half of the twentieth century. The strip reflected its surrounding British-origin population.

Shortly after WW2 ended and Italian immigration began to gather momentum, St. Clair started to change. Into the 1920s, St. Clair was still new, not needing any work at all. The Depression and, shortly thereafter, the War ensured that little upkeep and renovation took place. By the 1950s, with buildings thirty to forty years old, Italian entrepreneurs encountered properties that needed revitalization. They began with their own tastes in mind. One informant told me of his renovation in 1963, many others taking place later that decade and most in the 1970s. Stucco, tile and marble/granite replace red brick, windows were changed, doorways removed and walk-spaces reconfigured. In all, the streetscape was significantly altered—enough to make it an urban ethnic landscape.

Although I do argue that post-war St. Clair is an urban ethnic landscape, I also conclude that it did not become totally Italian-looking. Many of its Georgian features remain in the streetscape. Sometimes striking contrasts exist in a single building with original features showing through
apparently Italian buildings. Overall, St. Clair still contains many traces of its original Georgian style. And because newer immigrants have started to make their mark in the 1980s, I conclude that, not since it was originally built in a Georgian idiom, has St. Clair contained a uniform style. Italians made the landscape look more Italian, the overall effect being a heterogeneous strip of contrasting styles.

Aside from the use of different materials and adaptations to the use of space, oral histories indicate that changes made to the landscape reflected ethnic tensions as well as cultural pluralism. To merchants, St. Clair was maintained and improved. Their sense of pride, they told me, kept the area 'respectable'. However, their accounts of improvement were often associated with ethnicity. Their renovations, I was told, were better than the styles of predecessors and those of new merchants of recent immigrant status. Merchants felt that what they had done was better because it was Italian. That their choice of renovating in an Italian style necessarily improved upon St. Clair and now suffers at the hands of new immigrants to the area speaks of ethnic chauvinism. Based on my oral history interviews, along with my substantive work on visible landscape change, the St. Clair strip conforms to the notion of territorial history. Both its visible identity and its meaning from within the Italian community speak to the existence of an urban ethnic landscape, its reflection of ethnic identity and, as I speculate in the conclusion, the capacity for urban space to shed light on immigration and ethnic relations.
Chapter 2: Immigrant and Ethnic Identity: Italians in Toronto

The field of immigration and ethnic studies has developed mostly in the post-war period in response to the demographic multiculturalism of North America. The literature in the field, from theoretical to historical, is immense. In this chapter, I start with a review of ethnic identity formation as a process that takes place within ethnic groups and at their boundaries as they come into contact with other groups. I then provide a framework of ethnic antagonism based not only on opinions of immigrants but also the response they receive. Finally, to provide a background for my interpretation of the St. Clair landscape around Dufferin in Toronto, I give a brief account of Italian immigrants' experience in Toronto in the post-war period, overviewing identity formation and their relations with the receiving society.

Canada is generally regarded as a place of inter-ethnic harmony. As Harney (1991) notes, comparisons with the U.S., Europe and the Middle East often conclude that Canadian race and ethnic relations are relatively unproblematic. This has led to the popular perception of Canada as qualitatively different in its ability to integrate new and different people. Harney (1991, 174) argues that the idea of conflict "fits ill with Canadian stereotypes about the land as a 'peaceable kingdom'" and yet, even a cursory review of selected immigrant groups' experiences in Canada exposes this false veneer. Given that Canadian history is in part a history of ethnic relations, then it seems appropriate to first dispel righteous myths of the Canadian ethnic haven, bring the problem into view and thereby address it.

I should note that this chapter develops a particular view of ethnic identity and relations based on antagonism. The degree of conflict varies
from one group to the next and my review should not be taken to represent the Canadian immigrant experience nor the entire experience of any one group.

For those who choose to see the immigrant experience in terms of ethnic boundaries, inter-ethnic hostility and abatement of friction through acculturation, prejudice and responses to it, once granted explanatory power, become a vortex swallowing up analysis of every aspect of group behaviour and turning ethnic studies into a vehicle for claims of victimization or conversely the triumphal assertion of easy assimilation (Harney, 1985, 54).

Having said this, the existence of hostility, derision and violence may represent the experience of some groups more than others. Indeed, the experiences of Chinese, Japanese and black Canadians are among the most extreme in this respect because of racialized connotations among white Canadians. Although I do not want to type Canadian immigration and ethnic history as conflict-ridden, I do, however, want to make the point that inter-ethnic hostility forms part of Canadian immigrant histories. It is this element that I choose to bring forth in this chapter because I have found it to be an important theme in the changing identity of St. Clair Ave. in the post-war period.

A Framework of Ethnic Identity Formation

When immigrants leave one place for another, the course of their identity begins to diverge from that of their origin society. Their place of origin carries on along its own course, hardly noticing the loss of out-migrants, unless they leave in vast numbers. The immigrants, though, leave off with an identity that had developed in their origin society up to the point
of departure. With their old identities ‘frozen in time’, they clash to a greater or lesser degree with that of the receiving society and they are forced to adjust through resistance and adaptation. Anderson and Frideres (1981, 266-271) outline four minority group ‘responses’ to external influences on their identity. The first of these, annihilation, refers to cultural/physical genocide. Despite isolated examples among Canada’s First Nations, is mostly inapplicable to Canadian immigration. Less extreme is expulsion. Here, the intention is not to eliminate a minority group but to displace it, as in Canada’s internment of its Japanese-origin population and others during the Second World War. Both annihilation and expulsion have occurred in Canadian history and have likely produced drastic landscapes of despair but they are uncommon and sit outside the purview of this study.

The third and fourth minority responses, assimilation and identity retention respectively, are more common in Canada. Assimilation and pluralism provide a useful starting point for understanding ethnic identity in the landscape yet they represent a theoretical chasm in historical scholarship. At one extreme end is Oscar Handlin's now common view that immigration consists of a process of identity loss and adoption resulting in the end in assimilation to the host society. The immigrant, in Handlin’s terms, loses his/her identity when s/he is uprooted from the village of origin. Handlin’s immigrant settler then encounters a new identity to fill the void.

Emigration took the people out of traditional, accustomed environments and replanted them in strange ground among strangers, where strange manners prevailed...With old ties snapped, men faced the enormous compulsion of working out new relationships, new meanings to their lives... (Handlin, 1951, 5).
A counterweight to the assimilationist perspective is the notion of ethnic identity persistence, or pluralism. Immigrants become ethnics, it is argued, because they maintain their old-world culture--values and way of life. Vecoli’s (1964) study of Chicago’s Italian immigrants exemplifies this viewpoint. Southern Italians were atypical among European immigrants, Vecoli demonstrated, because they were family-centred rather than village-centred. "The idealized peasant village which Handlin depicts in 'The Uprooted' did not exist in southern Italy of the late nineteenth century" (Vecoli, 1964, 404). Their family-centred lifeworld helped to maintain a "sense of belonging" and their old-world customs--experiences thought to erode according to assimilationists. In contrast to the uprooted immigrant, then, Vecoli’s case study represents a transplanted immigrant identity.\(^1\)

The biotic analogies of the uprooted versus transplanted immigrant are useful heuristic devices. The uprooted immigrant, at one extreme, carries no identity, assimilating imperceptibly into the host society. Should the assimilated immigrant group cluster--an unlikely prospect--their territory would probably not look like a distinct landscape. The immigrant that resists identity loss, on the other hand, stands quite apart from the host society. Their landscape is likely to differ markedly from the host society's. But these concepts, and Handlin and Vecoli too, were products of their time; Handlin of the contemporary assimilationist orthodoxy in immediate post-war America and Vecoli a 1960s pluralist seeking to refute conformity. They represent

---

\(^1\)The distinction between immigrant and ethnic identity is often unclear. Immigrant bring with them an old world culture, or values and way of life. When that culture comes into contact with a host society that is appreciably different, as with Italians in post-War Toronto, that cultural baggage is unpacked in a way to help immigrants negotiate their adjustment. Some elements of the old world, now left behind and changing itself, are kept or adapted, others are dropped, and some host society elements accepted. That negotiation process, constantly in flux and somewhere between uprooted and transplanted identities, is the basis for ethnic identity and group formation, or ethnicity.
opposing tensions in a continuum of possible immigrant identities that may exist in social reality for different groups, depending on their idiosyncratic experiences. Taken alone, each is too simplistic; immigrants either assimilate or they persist. Rather, the process of identity loss and formation is much more complex. In ethnic revivalism, for example, immigrants adapt to their new settings, their identity dissipating generationally as ethnicity becomes more or less contentious and individuals explore and valorize their roots (Darroch, 1981; Noble, 1992b; 400). Ethnic identity neither follows an easy course to assimilation, nor does it persist intact. Thus, the third generation may revive the first generation's landscape, maintaining a traditional space. Alternatively, revivalists may reproduce an identity in the landscape if it was totally lost, a traditionalistic space. Exactly where groups are found on the traditional assimilation-pluralism continuum, and what shape their landscape takes, depends on the process of identity formation.

Within this broad framework of uprooted versus transplanted identity, more specific scenarios can be identified, each having implications for the sort of landscape that can be produced (Postiglione, 1983). We can differentiate between Handlin's uprooted immigrant and other forms of assimilation. Handlin's immigrant is a tabula rasa, awaiting acculturation by the host society. Normally, in the North American context, we think of assimilation as conformity with a British heritage. Rather than severing old-world ties, immigrants carry with them an identity that is lost in the face of Anglo-Saxon ethnic domination. Here, assimilation is "a process of interpretation and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life" (Anderson and Frideres, 1981, 271). In this case, ethnic landscapes vary little from the
ethnic British landscape, and only for a short period of time. The same is true if, when faced with domination, the immigrant group assimilates with a non-dominant ethnic group already present in their host society. The recent immigrants are unlikely to produce distinctive geographical space but will instead adopt that of another minority group. Moving closer to the mid-way point between assimilation and pluralism, we have the notion of the melting pot. This toned-down assimilationist view grew out of the early twentieth century and borrows its name from Israel Zangwill's 1908 play, The Melting Pot. Associated with American society, immigrants are thought only to maintain a small portion of their identity, taking on most of the host society's values and way of life. Although some traits of all groups survive in this perspective, host society domination insures that immigrants have little impact. In all these assimilationist perspectives, an immigrant landscape seems unlikely.

Pluralism, too, encompasses a continuum of possibilities. Militant ethnics make it their ambition to retain as much as possible of their old world values and ways of life by secession or withdrawal. As the history of Ukrainians in western Canada tells us, even a militant pursuit of identity maintenance cannot succeed in keeping old-world ways and values intact (Kostash, 1977). Critical pluralism, like the melting pot concept of assimilation, moves away from its theoretical exemplar of unaltered ethnic identity, or persistence. Here ethnic groups struggle to maintain their identity and succeed to a large extent despite external attempts at domination (Banton, 1981; Cohen, 1978). Some identity is lost but immigrants are able to keep most of it in spite of out-group attempts at oppression. In Vecoli's case, pluralism is less confrontational, or militant, and is yet further from the extreme. It does not grow out of inter-group hostility but rather immigrants' need to
draw on their own transplanted cultural baggage to cope and adapt. The latter is known as cultural pluralism, giving more weight to amiable coexistence of disparate groups whose identities form the basis for survival. Unlike the undifferentiated space we expect to find for assimilated immigrants, landscapes created by persistent immigrants tend to be more marked. For example, as I have experience first-hand, Ukrainian architecture abounds in western Canada, most noticeably in the colourful domed churches signifying the importance of the Eastern Orthodox religion in their community. Drawing on their own conceptions of the use of space and architectural traditions, immigrants create territories that emulate their degree of persistence.

To this point, we have worked in toward the centre of ethnic identity formation from the polar opposites of uprooted assimilation and militant pluralism. As we move toward the centre, somewhere between the melting pot and cultural pluralism, we encounter the reality of most immigrants' experiences. What we find in the middle is that ethnic identity is usually found between our theoretical exemplars of assimilation and pluralism. As with revivalism, identity loss and formation is complex and can move in either direction. At the centre of this division is what historians of immigration call ethnogenesis. Here, when the host society comes into contact with new immigrants, a new identity is created which characterizes the society as a whole. Neither straight line assimilation nor persistence, this emerging culture is in constant flux as new groups are continually added. They merge but also retain their distinctiveness. In theory, a number of possibilities exist as identities are lost, maintained, adapted and revived. These possibilities are simplifications of what may actually happen in reality. And since ethnicity is always a process of mediation between pure persistence
and assimilation, the landscape would likely reflect a combination of identities of dominant and minority groups. In fact, St. Clair speaks most to the process of ethnogenesis because it has accumulated a number of identities over the course of its development.

As indicated in the introduction, I define ethnicity as the process of identifying oneself or being identified as an ethnic with a particular culture, that culture based on subjective and/or objective differences. This definition of ethnicity addresses several issues. First, it immediately does away with a traditional dichotomy in theories of ethnic identity formation (McAll, 1990, 58): on the one hand, ethnicity has been treated as an outgrowth of inter-group relations while on the other, it is constituted internally by the cultural substance of the group itself (the parallel with assimilated versus pluralist identity is clear enough). Aligned with this division is a host of approaches. Arguments have been made for ethnic groups as collections of individual personality types from a psychological view or as groups of individuals who recognize the advantages of 'strength in numbers' for achieving their goals (Anderson and Frideres, 1981; Isajiw, 1995; Banton, 1983). Those espousing a social-psychological perspective, in contrast, focus on the mutual effects of individual and group identities rather than the individual alone. All these approaches, while useful in their own respects, focus on the isolated ethnic group at some level without considering a broader societal context.

Pluralism, while meaning the opposite of assimilation, also refers to the theoretical position that ethnic identity is created out of contact with other groups (Banton, 1981; Cohen, 1978). As with any theoretical position, pluralism presents a trade-off; intra-group dynamics are played down at the

\[2\text{See Dashevsky, 187, for a discussion of approaches to ethnicity that conform to disciplinary lines.}\]
expense of understanding the "social attributes of the social system" (Anderson and Frideres, 1981, 9-10). While useful in thinking about how ethnic groups come to be, in reality they are formed by both processes of inter- and intra-group dynamics. In the first instance, difference must grow out of some internal indicators on which groups can initially be differentiated. In the latter case, where ethnicity is an island unto itself, there must also be an external basis for contrast between groups. Otherwise, what we have is an 'ethnic', or national identity and not an ethnic group. Ethnicity necessarily implies at least two collectivities differentiated in some subjective or objective way (Yinger, 1986, 23). So we see that these traditional opposing perspectives actually rely on one another, even if only implicitly.

The most important feature of my definition of ethnicity is that it accounts for the complementary nature of subjective and objective ethnic belonging, making more explicit group formation and function. Ethnic identity can exist if one feels a sense of belonging due to ancestry, place of origin, communal ties or any similar perceived difference. In this case, membership is determined from within, among individual members' own consciousness of kind. A change in that consciousness implies that individuals no longer include themselves or exclude others from their ethnic group based on their sense of belonging; indeed, once consciousness dissipates, the self-defined ethnic group ceases to exist. In contrast to subjective belonging, ethnic identities may be associated with observable markers like dance, dress, food, language (retention) and sometimes religion. Objective markers work at the societal level to categorize oneself and others regardless of ethnic consciousness. An objective change in membership means, for example, that an English-speaking Canadian of Italian descent is fully assimilated based on language alone—that s/he is Canadian. While
subjective and objective ethnicity can and often do occur at the same time, they can also be fairly independent of one another. For example, most second generation Canadians of Italian origin speak English daily, may not know all their ancestral Italian folk songs and dances and eat a variety of different foods. Objectively, it would seem safe to argue that they have lost much of their Italian-origin identity. However, their ethnic consciousness remains strong. For example, in relation to international sporting matches, Italian ethnicity becomes a fervent issue in the post-war Italian enclave of Toronto's St. Clair district. In the face of defeat, they often endure taunting from Torontoites of other backgrounds. Their reply can be violent (Globe and Mail, 1994a, 1994b; Toronto Star, 1990): the territory of their community's post-war settlement in the city is imbued with historic sentiment and emotional attachment. St. Clair is the place to go in times of ethnic rallying. Thus, among younger members of Toronto Italia who may only speak a dialect variant of Italian and mistakenly chant 'Viva Italia' instead of 'Viva L'Italia, their ethnic consciousness nonetheless turns into an observable defense of their origins. Hidden behind their structural assimilation--status and behaviour similar to that of the host population--is a collective subjectivity that brings violence to the street. Assumptions of ethnic identity loss based on language retention or structural assimilation more generally can be mistaken (Darroch, 1981, 93; Yinger, 1986, 23, 39).

So we see that theories of ethnicity can arbitrarily partition social reality and that an integration is necessary (Anderson and Frideres, 1981, 10; Darroch, 1981; Yinger, 1986). Whether ethnicity grows out of objective indicators like language or out of consciousness in the first instance, the result is the same: in- and out-group membership is ultimately determined by opinions regarding identity. This has implications for our conceptions of ethnic
identity. If immigrants are indeed uprooted, how do we measure that? Is it sufficient to say that they have lost their pre-migratory identities because they speak the host society’s language? As our example of second-generation Italians shows, this assumption can be erroneous. Still, does the loss of mother tongue not mean that ethnic identity has changed to some degree? Opinions regarding identity, be they mythical ancestry of superiority or the spoken word, therefore have profound effects on the formation of ethnic groups. Thus, it is at the level of opinions that we can better understand where ethnic groups fall along the transplanted versus uprooted continuum, and also determine to what degree ethnic groups are formed by inter-group contact versus their own consciousness of kind.

Social Distance and Social Action

Ethnicity, and its attendant features of identity and group formation can be neutral concepts—a way of ordering the world to make it more intelligible. However, ethnic relations can become antagonistic when they include and exclude. For example, a minority group’s language might be meaningful as the centre of their collective consciousness. However, it may mean something quite different for the host society: cultural backwardness, or unassimilability. So identity markers can hold different meanings for the process of inclusion and exclusion: “Any aspect or cultural trait, no matter how superficial, can serve as a starting point for the familiar tendency to monopolistic closure” (Weber, 1961, 306). Once set in motion, opposition then feeds off itself.

The process begins when social distance is manifested in a concrete way, such as verbal derision or physical abuse. Upon arrival in a new place,
immigrants immediately feel the separation; avoidance, exclusion, mocking stares, verbal abuse or battering. Their everyday lives tell the story of their experiences, both as individuals and collectivity. John Bodnar (1985) popularized the notion that everyday life is significant for the immigrant coping with change. "Immigrant adjustment to capitalism in America was ultimately a product of a dynamic between the expanding economic and cultural imperatives of capitalism and the life strategies of ordinary people" (Bodnar, 1985, 207). To cope, immigrants turned to those controllable elements in their lives--family and household, neighbourhood and community. But capitalism is not the only force that immigrants in urban America have had to contend with. They have often had to defend themselves from hostility, which may or may not be related to adjustment to capitalism. Harney (1991, 180) makes this point in comparing pre-War and contemporary Canadian cities:

For then as now the personal identity of each individual in an encounter was in a complex relationship with the existence, or the perception of the existence, of a collectivity with whom he or she was identified by others, or an ethnie with whom he or she identified....Characteristics attributed to a whole ethnic group seem always to be invoked in articulating irritation or hostility to a single member of that group.

An emphasis on immigrant everyday life mediates between the theoretical exemplars of uprooted and transplanted identity, or assimilation and persistence. Like Bodnar who makes this point with reference to capitalism, Barth (1969) argues that group boundaries of distinction are maintained in everyday life depending on both in- and out-group contact. According to Isajiw (1995, 3), ethnicity "is something that is being negotiated and constructed in everyday living. Ethnicity is a process which continues to
Thus, it seems useful to approach social distance as social action since it makes attitudes and beliefs observable through the actions of ethnic agents. The level of abstraction increases as one moves from the ethnic group through ethnic identity to concepts of ethnicity (Yinger, 1986, 23). A focus on action addresses the everyday ethnic experience. That experience may, in turn, affect social distance thus repeating the cycle over again, perhaps intensifying it.

In the historical literature, the most noted study of exclusionary attitudes toward immigrant groups is Higham's *Strangers in the Land*. He coined the term nativism as "opposition to an internal minority on the grounds of its foreign...connections" (Higham, 1855, 4). Many have found nativism to be a useful way of understanding why host societies oppose immigrant groups, some accepting Higham's definition (Ward, 1990) while others have proposed alternatives (Shepard, 1985). The argument is that nativism grows out of nationalist sentiments of the host society. A characteristic of the minority group is targeted as a means of exclusion, usually in times of host society insecurity. A foreign language, for example, might be taken by the host society to mean that an immigrant group resists assimilation and therefore presents a threat to national identity. Social distance is immediately established and, as pluralist theory maintains, ethnicity becomes "a series of nesting dichotomizations of inclusiveness and exclusiveness" (Cohen, 1978, 387). In multi-ethnic settings, social distance is most visible (Isajiw, 1995) and ethnic group boundaries are trenchantly maintained (Barth, 1969).

For Shepard (1985), a strict nativist perspective is inappropriate in Canada because, as even Higham admitted, it is based on a 'distinctively
American' nationalism. According to Shepard, the variety of experiences of different groups cannot be adequately addressed by this approach:

Proponents of nativism offer a hierarchy of acceptability to explain differences, but this is insufficient because it does not explain where such attitudes originated, how they were transmitted, or why the level of antagonism varied from group to group (Shepard, 1985, 365).

Shepard develops his argument in a discussion of racism among white Canadians of the prairies at the turn of the century. In response to Oklahoma black immigrants fleeing the racist American south, Albertans revealed a level of intolerance disproportionate to the number of blacks in the province at the time. Intolerance often turned into violence unknown to white minorities anywhere in Canada. Important to Shepard's thesis is that western Canadians were emulating prejudicial opinions and attitudes imported into Canada through British immigration. The international perception of blacks was important because Canadians had had little contact with black peoples up to the twentieth century. Resistance to black immigration was therefore a product of international racism, not internal nationalist sentiments. The strength of Shepard's argument in refuting a strict nativist perspective lies, then, in the fact that Oklahoma blacks were opposed on racist rather than nationalist grounds, that racism against blacks had not developed in Canada but elsewhere and finally that this sort of response is qualitatively different from that of white non-British immigrants to Canada who did feel the brunt of nativism.

Oklahoma black immigrants in Alberta experienced what white immigrants to Canada generally have not: systematic violence. Racialization, an outgrowth of ignorance and intolerance, grafts on to the
identity of visible minorities a set of derogatory morals and behaviours based solely on their appearance. An identity is conceived from outside the immigrant group without foundation and regard for that group’s self-definition. The result can be verbal abuse and violence stemming from a misinformed system of beliefs at the individual and group levels (Anderson, 1991; Palmer, 1982; Walker, 1985; Ward, 1990). A strict nativist perspective, while suited for Higham’s original work, may be inadequate for all immigrant groups. As a general theme, however, it heightens our awareness of resistance which, as Palmer (1982, 173) argues, may occur for a number of reasons: rate and/or recency of immigration, size of the immigrant group, class, education, urban/rural residence, value differences, male-female ratio, political behaviour, religion, racial differences. Further, a nativist perspective need not be limited to the ‘study of opinions’ as Higham suggested. It can also be a study of responses toward immigrants beginning with opinions and resulting in the concurrent shaping of their experiences, identities and conflict. In other words, we may study nativism to better understand the transformation of social distance into adversarial social action.

The nativist response toward immigrants is the first step in creating opposing ethnic groups. Of course, immigrants bring their own cultural baggage, including ethnic bigotry. But immigrants encounter a numerically dominant receiving society that can and often does shape their experience in a negative way. As mentioned earlier, nativism is most apparent in times of

---

3It is important to differentiate racial and ethnic groups, not because of phenotypic differences but because their experiences are different. Some argue that use of the term ‘race’ should be avoided because it has little utility in understanding culture and behaviour (Anderson and Frideres, 1981, 19). However, the term might still be used to refer to those groups targeted for racialized abuse whose experience thereby contrasts significantly with that of non-visible minorities (Jackson and Penrose, 1993). While the distinction is a matter of type and not degrees, our theme of conflict applies to both race and ethnicity to varying degrees who both define themselves and are defined by host societies.
instability; when the host society experiences economic downturn, when they perceive threat from the immigrants, or any other destabilizing event. When opposition is directed at successive waves of immigrants, scapegoating sets in. Here, blame for the host society’s ills is directed at the most recent immigrants, relieving their predecessors of the burden of abuse. Canadian immigration is full of examples, constituting a historical process of scapegoating: In the mid-nineteenth century, Irish famine immigrants were not particularly welcomed by colonial-thinking Canadians. Once Canadians got past their sense of charity for the struggling Irish and began to experience relations with Irish immigrants in Canada, their sense of obligation quickly turned into rejection (Parr, 1974). In the late nineteenth century, Chinese men were brought in to build parts of the Canadian railway system. Although they helped to unify Canada, they were mistreated every step along the way, among the worst mistreated in Canadian history (Anderson, 1991; Ward, 1990). Ukrainian immigrants also came in large numbers in response to the Canadian unity issue. Brought in as agriculturalists to settle the Canadian prairie west, Ukrainians fulfilled their obligations as farmers but, they too, were regarded as invading foreigners and treated accordingly. Unlike the Chinese, physical abuse was not a major issue. Social-psychological derision was (Kostash, 1977). The pre-War urban immigrant stream was made up mostly of Italians and Jews. Italians made significant contributions to Canadian urban infrastructure and yet they suffered at the hands of nativists. The Jews, an even larger urban immigrant group in Canadian cities, had a similar experience. Tulchinsky (1992) argues that antisemitism and a more general rejection of Jews was not a defining factor of their pre-War experience but was nonetheless present in the Canadian round of life.
In the post-war period, the story changes little. Given our distance from colonial imperialism and our demographic diversity through post-war immigration, one would expect a level of understanding about the hardships of migration. Yet the experiences of our most recent immigrants, visible minorities from developing regions around the world, shows us that scapegoating is an enduring element of Canadian society (Henry, 1994; Iacovetta, 1992, 123). For visible minorities, racialization has been the vehicle in establishing social distance between them and their multi-ethnic destinations. And yet for every one of these groups, although it has been shown to varying degrees by scholars, they have had an internal ethnic consciousness, and identity to help them cope with the host society. We see in Toronto's post-war Italian immigrant experience.

ITALIANS IN TORONTO

Although Italian immigrants and their children are presently among Canada's most successful social groups, they were Toronto's post-war scapegoats. As we see below, Italophobia--negative stereotypes of Italian immigrants as racially inferior and culturally backward--framed the Italian immigrant experience in Toronto. Other factors influenced their experience, especially their adjustment to blue collar work for the many southern Italians who were accustomed to farming in Italy. Moreover, the new experiences of capitalism and hostile social distance were experienced differently by men and women (Iacovetta, 1992). In this section, I look specifically at Italian settlement and identity throughout the post-war period. Their relations and settlement provide an important background for my interpretation of the St.
Clair landscape as a manifestation of internal ethnic identity and ethnic antagonism.

Given that this is a study of an urban ethnic landscape, it is worth noting that the landscape theme is non-existent in the immigration and ethnic studies literature. The major studies of Italians in North America prove the point: In comparison with the number of histories of ethnic groups in the New World, studies of their landscapes are scant. Among the notable studies of Italian immigrants, Herbert Gans' (1962) *The Urban Villagers* is a classic community study of Italians in west end Chicago but no mention is made of landscape, material culture, vernacular architecture or anything to do with ethnic identity in space. Thomas Kessner's (1977) *The Golden Door* is a study of Italians in New York, emphasizing only residential and occupational mobility. Similarly, Humbert Nelli's (1970) *The Italians of Chicago* is a mobility study which, apart from discussing the 'slum-like' conditions of Italian neighbourhoods, pays equally little attention to landscape. In Canada, Robert Harney's (1978, 1981) work pays little attention to ethnic identity in space, as does John Zucchi's (1988) *Italians in Toronto*.

Equally problematic is the fact that most studies of Italians in Canada deal with the pre-war period despite their much larger movement starting in the 1950s. This imbalance might be attributed to the interest in the greater number of pre-War Italian migrant to America which, as always, influences what happens in the Canadian academe. Alternatively, postwar Italians may be too recent to warrant historical attention, and maybe too distant for sociological study!. Still major post-war studies do not tackle the urban ethnic landscape. In "If One Were to Write a History...", a collection of works by Robert Harney, there is no discussion of ethnic identity in space. Indeed, although it lacks a landscape component, it was not until Franca Iacovetta's
(1992) Such Hardworking People that the 300 000 plus Torontonians of Italian origin were finally given due attention, focusing mainly on the immigrants in the immediate post-war. Thus, the literature on this large group, for many years the largest urban minority anywhere in Canada, is still small. More generally for Italians anywhere in North America at any time, like for most other immigrant groups, their landscapes have been understudied.

Post-war immigration to Canada has been very different from that during the era of Mass Migration (1880-1930). In the pre-war period, sojourning males came to fill labour shortages in an expanding Canadian economy. But around 1910, in-migration began to balance out with more women and children (Harney, 1978, 15). In total, 60,000 Italians arrived in Canada during this period (Harney, 1978, 9), most settling in Montreal and only 18,000 settling in Toronto (Iacovetta, 1992, xix). Overall, Italians did not disrupt the Anglo-Saxon and Protestant character of Toronto but their nucleated settlement pattern did make them highly visible (Zucchi, 1988, 19) (see Figure 1). In fact, Toronto's Italian and Jewish populations were the most segregated of any ethnic group (Kalbach, 1980, 14), both occupying streets in St. John's Ward (Zucchi, 1988, 40). Chain migration brought many southern Italians to the city and because, unlike sojourners, they had established families, many of them settled. Within the ethnic enclave, hometown/regional identities were maintained and an Italian national identity developed because diverse regions and hometowns were now in closer contact (Zucchi, 1988). In contrast to Italians' internal identity, perceptions of Italians from outside the enclaves, among Torontonians generally, was that Italians were 'hot blooded' and 'culturally backward' peasants (Iacovetta, 1992, 105). Overall, though, the Italian experience in pre-War Toronto was not dominated by Italophobia. Rather, isolation in their new context was the most important feature of their
Figure 1: Italian Settlement in Toronto Before 1940.

Note that many nucleations existed, organized around Italian hometown and regional ties. The main area of settlement was, initially, in The Ward. Following that, the College and Grace area became the main area of Italian settlement and continued to be until St. Clair took over in the 1960s.

Source: Zucchi, 1988, 38.
experience. Hometown/regional links and a new Italian national identity helped Toronto's Italian immigrants to cope with their detachment from their hometowns and from Italy (Zucchi, 1988, 194).

From 1921 through 1951, immigration to Canada had slowed considerably. The Depression and World War Two insured that even British in-migration would decrease. For Italians seeking entrance into Canada, the rise of Fascism in Italy coupled with World War Two grafted onto them an 'enemy alien' status in immigration policy (Harney, 1978, 34). Italian migration was brought to a halt for thirty years. Once enemy alien status was phased out of immigration policy between 1947 and 1951, a number of factors insured that Italians would come to Canada in large numbers: Canada felt international pressures to accept Italian immigrants in order to slow the spread of communist ideology in Europe, chain migration reestablished pre-War links, economic boom meant Italians were needed to fill a labour shortage and, like always, prospective migrants were always ready to escape Italy's stagnant rural south (Iacovetta, 1992, 27; Sturino, 1985a, 67). Once the flood gates opened, the impact was enormous. The census indicates that only one percent of Canadian residents were of Italian origin in 1941. In the twenty years up to 1961, this proportion had doubled with more than 450 000 Italians residing in Canada. In contrast to the pre-War experience, the ratio of females to males was almost equal throughout, many young families bringing their children to settle in Canada.

Italians in Canada after World War Two became highly urbanized: By 1961, one third of all Italian Canadians resided in Montreal and Toronto alone. The Toronto census metropolitan area, with a population of 1 824 481, contained 140 378 Italians. Although Montreal was the major pre-War "magnet" of Italian settlement, the tide shifted to Toronto beginning in 1951.
Of the Italian-origin residents in that year, 74 percent were Italian born in Toronto as compared with 64 percent in Montreal. Between 1951 and 1981, the population of Toronto doubled while the number of Italians in the city increased tenfold (Harney, 1991b, 65). By the 1980s, about one of every ten Torontonians was of Italian origin. Their numbers alone display a magnitude in movement from Italy to Toronto that differed greatly from the pre-War period and exceeded the movement of any other group to the city. With this influx came an even more distinct pattern of settlement as compared to the pre-War. Figure 2 displays the residential distribution of Italians in the Toronto region. Their sector-like residential migration past the metropolitan boundary, heading suburban sprawl, is concomitant with post-war urban growth in the region. Their large numbers allowed them to dominate many suburban neighbourhoods.

The explosion in numbers brought problems. Italophobia had set in again--this time with greater potency, sparked by the realization that the stream of Italian immigrants outnumbered their British counterparts in 1958 (Sturino, 1985a, 71). In fact, it was not only an increase in the number of Italians that created the ‘problem’ but a fall in British-origin immigration. Harney argues that Italophobia is not the main experience of post-war arrivals to the city nor does it characterize Italian experience anywhere in North America. He does concede, however, that “It is clear nonetheless that the encounter with bigotry does shape aspects of Italian North American history” (Harney, 1985, 54). As Harney (1985, 1992) and Iacovetta (1992) argue, Italians were not subject to official or systematic discrimination, but an anti-Italian prejudice permeated Toronto life in the 1950s and 1960s. Iacovetta argues that much of it had to do with the difference between the perceived cultural greatness of Italy and the immigrants visible in Toronto’s streets. The mud-
Figure 2: Residential Concentration of Toronto's Italian Origin Population, 1981.

spattered trench-diggers and seemingly distraught women seen in the city were at odds with popular images of Italians steeped in culture and romance. Because southern Italians were viewed as less desirable prospective immigrants and yet made up the main stream, racialized stereotypes intensified.

Portrayed as stocky, dark-skinned, and suffering from malnutrition and poor levels of education, southern Italians were considered to be among the least capable of adjusting to the industrial economies of North America....These immigrants, conventional wisdom had it, lacked both the resources and the resourcefulness to make the transition to urban life in North America. Southern Italians were also thought to be highly emotional, temperamental, and lacking inner discipline (Iacovetta, 1992, 105).

When combined with economic recession in 1958, nativist attitudes abounded (Sturino, 1985a, 71). Questions about the racial integrity of Canada were coupled with doubts about the 'usefulness' of unskilled labourers from southern Italy. The reality of the problem was that "Canada's postwar rebuilding and expansion of infrastructure was coming to an end....The fact was that the Canadian economy no longer needed the strong backs of Italian labourers" (Sturino, 1985a, 71). Italophobia continued into the 1960s and combined with the introduction of an immigration 'points system' based on education and training, "the poorer, labouring classes of Italy were politely but firmly told that they were no longer of sufficient 'quality' for Canada" (Sturino, 1985a, 71). Iacovetta (1992, 103-4), captures this sentiment thus:

By the mid-1960s the Italian 'invasion' of early postwar Toronto was nearly complete and several images of the Italian had become etched on the minds of the city's Anglo-Celtic residents....There were positive images, though they were often expressed with a patronizing tone, but more often than not in this period of heavy immigration the Italians emerged as a target of scorn....The immigrants' propensity for
clustering in distinct neighbourhoods, the darker skin colouring of many of the newcomers, particularly those who hailed from Italy's Deep South, and their concentration among the city's working class made the Italians all the more visible to nativists.

Reliance on the nativist portrayal of Italians in Toronto, especially of the southern Italian, leaves us with a bitter impression of their history. However, like any immigrant history, there is another side to the story—one that even sympathetic Torontonians voiced on behalf of the 'New Canadians'. Even if they were loath to admit it, outsiders observed "that within a short period of time the Italians had proved themselves to be diligent, thrifty, and resourceful, and dutiful parents as well..." (Iacovetta, 1992, 118). As immigrants usually do, Italians collectively showed a concern for everyday matters like their families, households, neighbourhoods and communities. Like Italians' collective memory in Toronto, some Torontonians recognized these characteristics without qualification. Others expressed these sentiments in a patronizing manner. Most Torontonians, however, sided with nativist racial stereotypes that accompanied avoidance, rude stares and harsh exchanges.

This mixed response toward Italians, at once hostile and sympathetic, is best illustrated through measures of success and identity. John Porter's *The Vertical Mosaic* makes the argument that class and ethnicity tend to converge at the bottom of the social scale. In writing about many immigrant groups, including post-war Italians, he argues that entrance status—which implies low occupational status—appears to perpetuate and maintain distinctions between ethnics and charter groups. Italians, he demonstrated, had tended to concentrate in manual unskilled jobs. Porter's study popularized this segregated view of social structure. Only two years after Porter's book was
published, Richmond (1967, 21) stated; "Generally speaking, the evidence confirms Porter's view of the association between ethnicity and occupational status." Sturino (1985b) criticizes these sorts of analyses on the basis that they misrepresent immigrants' own measures of success. Although Porter does write that recency of immigration is an important consideration for ethnics' social status, Sturino (1985b, 123) argues that recency combined with certain measures of status will misrepresent immigrant mobility. In fact, since both these studies used 1961 census data, socioeconomic marginality was a foregone conclusion. Studies of this sort continued to misjudge Italian success. The high educational and occupational status of the Italian immigrants' sons and daughters, Sturino argues, often went unnoticed. "Since the achievement of the second and subsequent generations is usually lost within the aggregate mobility rates of the group as a whole, one would never suspect this intergenerational change from reviewing most of the literature" (Sturino, 1985b, 125).

One measure of success that is more meaningful for Italians, Sturino contends, is that of home ownership because it brings together both 'outside' and 'inside' concepts of mobility. Outside concepts--those of socioeconomic status--are mistakenly taken ex nihilo of the immigrants' own measure of success. For Italians, Sturino argues, home ownership is a more appropriate measure. The landless peasant background of many immigrants instilled in them a reverence and hatred for landowners and was transferred into ambitious home ownership in the New World (Iacovetta, 1992, 16; Sturino, 1985b, 125). Home ownership is not only a socioeconomic measure of success for society at large, it is also an 'inside' measure--one within the Italian community because it represents a vast improvement over the misery of the old country. Home ownership is a useful measure with which to assess
immigrants' own ideas of success and to gauge their mobility with the rest of society's. In 1971, 77 percent of Italian Canadians owned their own homes. In Toronto, the proportion was even greater at 83 percent. In both cases, these rates were higher than any other social group, rivaled only by the Portuguese of Toronto.

While home ownership is useful in dispelling myths of Italian success in Toronto, it is also central to the Italians’ world view. The drive to own one’s own home stems from the folk world view that owning a home is to stake one’s claim in the ‘land of the living’ (Del Guidice, 1993). Apart from the house, other elements, as Iacovetta (1992) demonstrates, set Italian immigrants apart in Toronto: Roman Catholicism is an important part of the community’s identity. Not fully accepted by the archdiocese, their religion, especially that practiced by southerners who made up the majority of the migrant stream, was actually a mixture of peasant folklore and Catholicism. Along with religion, community size insured that many institutions would be created to help immigrants, even if self-help and community support was the hallmark of the immigrant generation. Also important is the convergence of ethnic and class identity within the Italian community. Italians led the way in militant class-based strikes as blue-collar workers in Toronto fought for improved working conditions in the early 1960s. Finally, Iacovetta discusses the different experience of men and women as immigrants in a new urban industrial environment. Men defined themselves in terms of providing for their families. Their wives who also worked for pay, thereby improving the material well-being of home life, mediated the transition from rural to urban industrial life for their families and values. Like immigrants in other times and places, they focused on home life, community and religion, or everyday things, in order to cope and
assert control what they could in the face of change and antagonism. As immigrants, they were concerned with everyday matters which shaped their identity.

For the most part, the experience of post-war Italian immigrants to Toronto was one of success. This should not divert our attention from the fact that Italians were mistreated in the early years. That experience helps us understand landscape evolution in Toronto's St. Clair and Dufferin district. Usually, Italians were placed low on the list of preferences of prospective immigrants. Anglo-Celtic myths of superiority resulted in numerous deprecating stereotypes of the Italian immigrant. Even when they were favourably commended for their ability to endure hard work, recognition was patronizing. This external social distance, often the cause of social-psychological derision and occasionally violence, was balanced by an internal identity. Italians' consciousness of kind, even in their Canadian-born ranks, was made possible by their large numbers and self-definitions of identity and success. Home ownership continues to be part of this identity, as is hard work and familism.

How is it that within twenty short years, between the conflict-ridden 1950s and 1960s and the apparently more liberal 1980s, Italians became an accepted part of Toronto's social fabric? It is possible that the Italian community has achieved an acceptable identity according to host society standards? Home ownership supports this argument. Alternatively, a multicultural ethos may have permeated Toronto, making immigrants more acceptable. The large number of Italians has allowed the group to maintain internal cohesion and set its own course. Their internal cohesiveness is apparent in their changing pattern of settlement. Many Italians have moved north of Metropolitan Toronto, well into the middle class suburb of
Vaughan, but this has hardly dampened their residential segregation and, by inference, ethnic persistence (Davies and Murdie, 1993; Kalbach, 1980). Familism and community ties still define the Italian community of all generations. Since an Italian identity persists, it is plausible that Toronto has become more cosmopolitan. A third explanation is possible: that “as many new immigrants have arrived, controversy has surrounded the racial and religious minorities from Developing countries. In short, Toronto has found new scapegoats” (Iacovetta, 1992, 123). It may not be a change within the Italian community that made it more acceptable, nor a multicultural ethos within Toronto, but a process of scapegoating which has re-allocated scorn from Italians to recent immigrants. We explore these possibilities in the next chapter in relation to urban ethnic landscapes.
In a work like this, traditionally separate literatures have to be brought together. Ethnicity and landscape have rarely received treatment together although programmatic calls have been made for this union (Noble, 1992; Upton, 1981). Partly as a reflection of this division, this work presents ethnicity and landscape reviews in separate chapters. Using my empirical results in chapter five, I show that the urban landscape can be used as a medium for the study of ethnic identity and relations and that we may also learn about landscape by bringing our knowledge of ethnicity to urban space. Like ethnicity, landscape can mean different things. In modern geography, we have gone from the traditional school of ‘observing and explaining’ the landscape to ‘reading and representing it, albeit partially.’ Throughout this evolution, we have also seen a change in focus; from rural to urban landscapes and from substantive fieldwork to theoretical deduction (Mikesell, 1994). This heterogeneity in landscape interpretation makes it difficult to know what questions to ask. An empirical approach on rural areas will necessitate different questions from, say, Marxist historical materialism on the city. In fact, historical materialism has been an important theoretical component of the new cultural geography. Although interrupted in the 1960s by logical positivism, humanism also remains a strong body of theory that counterposes itself to historical materialism (Hugill and Foote, 1994; Kobayashi and Mackenzie, 1989). Given the numerous approaches possible, I discuss in the first section the fundamental questions we need to ask about landscape. Favouring neither of the main approaches mentioned, these questions set the parameters for my definition of landscape.
Since the rise of the new cultural geography and a shift in focus from urban to rural landscapes, Marxist historical materialism has been one of the main theories employed by geographers. Although materialism aims to understand social relations as the products of people’s material conditions, their study of the landscape has been misapplied. Despite a lack of case studies, conclusion of commodification have been made about all sorts of urban landscapes. As a retail strip, St. Clair is a prime candidate for such an interpretation. However, the development and modification of St. Clair within Toronto’s retail geography, as we see in section two of this chapter, does not relegate it to the whims of consumerism. The primary purpose of St. Clair, and any other retail area, is sales and consumption but even a seemingly commodified landscape can involve a high level of human agency (Ley and Olds, 1988).

In the final section, I expand on the role of ethnic agency as an important factor in landscape creation and modification, again contrasting it with a materialist reading. I overview the forces at work and what exactly may be produced that represents an ethnic landscape in the city. Again, the basic questions laid out in the first section are important because they provide a link with my discussion of ethnicity in the previous chapter. Like ethnicity, the urban landscapes that reflect ethnic identity do not adhere to simple theories of pure assimilation or persistence. Most important, landscape creation by immigrants and ethnics speaks to the broader issue of space as an important factor in social relations. Urban ethnic landscapes can contribute to our understanding of both ethnicity and landscape by shedding light on both as they influence one another through time.
Defining Landscape

In everyday language, the term landscape has various meanings. At an art exhibit, the term would be used to refer to a rendition of geographical space. For architects, it refers to a parcel of land that can be or already is modified in professional practice. To others still, it might just mean landscaping. Human geographers have yet another use of the word landscape, referring to real geographical space embodying evidence of human influence (Meinig, 1979). Given that landscape can refer to so many different things, an explicit definition is necessary. A human landscape is any real geographical space consisting of physical structures and patterns shaped by its inhabitants. These can include urban spaces designed under the aegis of corporate and bureaucratic authority or rural villages that have grown incrementally over time and anything in between. Put simply, the human geographer’s landscape can be seen and touched by its occupants.

Landscapes are more than reflections of culture. They can also promote, mediate and constrain activity. In their reaction against logical positivism, humanists argued for the importance of space as an influence on social relations. The argument was made using the concept of place. Humanist geographers in the 1970s developed the notion of place to refer to a set of physical structures in space, the activities contained therein and their meanings that space holds for people (Relph, 1976). We normally think of places, unlike landscapes, as bounded entities containing meaning and attachment for people. Historically, what place and landscape have shared is the notion that an identity can be represented in the built environment. But both ‘place’ and ‘landscape’ have become less rigid. Through social theory, place has taken on a more relational definition depending on the position of
the subject under study; the meaning of place depends on the beholding eye (Meinig, 1979). And through the merger of social and cultural geography, landscape has been influenced by humanist notions of place such that landscape and place can hardly be differentiated today (see Duncan, 1990). Landscapes, then are distinct physical structures and patterns shaped by their inhabitants, having meaning for them and containing an identity. In this way, the urban ethnic landscape may act back on the ethnic group concerned, and may even influence the wider society, although this can be in a negative manner.

Implicit in this definition of landscape, I have hinted at why landscapes are important. Why study them at all? Carlson (1993) writes that we have yet to develop a justificatory theory, or philosophy, for landscape assessment. One argument could be that we may learn about culture by examining what social groups have done with their local spaces. Modifying space to look and function differently is, in part, a reflection of culture, or values and way of life. Since people are also influenced by space, that is, the meanings, possibilities, and constraints it presents, then we are also concerned with those elements of the landscape that influence social relations. So we may study urban landscapes in and of themselves or to learn about culture. But this is limiting since landscape and social relations influence one another. Indeed, it is because of this reciprocal influence that a study of landscape for either purpose alone is necessarily partial and abstracted. The most significant potential contribution of landscape study is an understanding of the dynamic and reciprocal relationship between people and their surroundings. Like Soja’s (1989) argument for a ‘spatialized ontology’, my argument is that social relations are constituted and constitutive of space: the two are inextricably linked.
Half of the reciprocal relationship between people and the built environment is quite obviously people. Aside from knowing the landscape itself, we need to ask the social theoretical questions of class, ethnicity and gender. My review of ethnic identity and relations and Italians in Toronto has provided a background for my subsequent interpretation of Toronto's St. Clair district around Dufferin. In general, we need to know the 'who' in order to interpret the changing form and content of any landscape; we cannot rely on the landscape alone. For example, we may ask 'was it a community or individual effort?' or 'was it a matter of families exchanging favours or was work done contractually?'

The other half of the relationship is the 'what'. What are important features of a landscape, and what sets it apart from other landscapes? The answer quickly becomes complicated. The typical North American inner city is quite different from its suburban counterpart and yet both constitute the urban landscape. Any one aspect of the cityscape--its housing, retail districts or industrial zones for example, may be viewed as constituting an urban landscape type. At first, this seems limiting but the heterogeneity of housing alone, including style, structure and location, reveals just how daunting it is to study the whole urban landscape. In fact, the phrase urban landscape does not even invoke an image of all these housing considerations, let alone the considerations of different sorts of land uses. Thus, the 'what' in the people-space relationship is of obvious importance if we want to know that relationship better. As we see below in relation to urban ethnic landscapes, a number of defining characteristics may exist.

Beyond description, the study of urban landscapes must ask how and why geographical space has been fashioned as it has. In fact, many of the descriptive questions above go part way in providing answers, even if only
intuitively. For example, once we have answered 'who created this space?', we are implying that the characteristics of a social group, whether an elite older gentry in North Vancouver or an immigrant group in post-war Toronto, has had an impact on the look of the physical environment. Depending on our level of knowledge (maybe even stereotypes), we may have an impression of how the landscape might look. However, asking why have they made their housing or retail districts to look like this depends less on intuition than on a thorough analysis of the social groups itself. And since the landscape can influence social relations, it must figure into that analysis, eventually explaining, in part, its subsequent form.

The important questions to ask about landscapes, then, range from the descriptive to the analytical. As Meinig argues, the questions we ask may reflect our individual biases. However, according to Lewis (1994), if we stick to a set of axioms on the important questions to consider as I have presented, we can produce analyses that address culture and cultural change through time. In the third section, I provide more detail for all these questions in relation to urban ethnic landscapes. Next I turn to retailing activity as one type of urban landscape to provide a background for my work on St. Clair Ave.

Urban Retailing

The definition of landscape provided is broad enough so that any part of the city can be included. Stores are no exception. But just as housing in itself in the North American city presents us with a wide variety of styles, structures, construction periods and locations, retailing too is heterogeneous. This makes it necessary to identify the different types of urban retailing so as
to locate St. Clair in its appropriate context. Before turning to urban ethnic landscapes, we need to consider the various types of retail landscapes that may exist in the city given that St. Clair fits in this broad category as an unplanned retail strip.

Retailing in the city can be grouped into a hierarchy or taxonomy of types based on several factors: spatial form, the functions of the businesses involved, who they serve and occupancy and ownership patterns (Jones and Simmons, 1987, 188). Dominant in the post-war years has been the development of local and regional malls. Challenging the CBD—a retail type defined geographically, the mall has superseded it in terms of market share in the average Canadian city (Simmons, 1991). Unlike the CBD, the mall is a planned environment, as is the strip plaza—a third type of retail structure. Both the mall and the strip plaza are post-war phenomena, growing out of corporate developer and chain store dominance. The fourth type, the retail strip along major thoroughfares, is like the CBD in that it predates malls and plazas and is unplanned. Despite the increasing attention given to malls (Hopkins, 1992) and attendant discussions of the hollowing of central city consumption (Simmons, 1991), in the post-war era, the CBD and retail strip combined still provided most of the retail and service space in the Canadian city (Jones and Simmons, 1987, 185, 192). Given that the “heyday of the large regional mall is over”, according to Simmons (1991, 239), the retail strip remains a significant component of the urban retail hierarchy.

Areas like St. Clair are still vital in the urban retail structure in Canada. Occupancy is dominated by independent retailers rather than the chain stores of shopping malls. Also, the range of goods is usually of a lower order like textiles, clothing and bread, relying upon pedestrian traffic and nearby residents. But even within the unplanned retail strip type, there exists a
variety including specialty strips (furniture, cars), fast food, the gentrified strip and the ethnic strip (Jones, 1991, 395); my concern is with the latter. Usually located within the central city the unplanned ethnic retail strip caters primarily to a specific market. Patrons and merchants share the same ethnicity and the strip is defined by a specialized range of goods that stand apart from the city’s. The ethnic retail strip is unstable because it relies on individual shop-keepers who can come and go very quickly (Jones, 1991). Instability is also an outcome of changing preferences within the ethnic community, or ethnic identity change. First and subsequent generations within a minority, for example, will not display the same preferences in consumption thus forcing retailers to change their strategies if they hope to remain viable.

However unstable, the strip catering to immigrants and ethnics serves an important economic function in the retail hierarchy of the city. As the main source of their consumer needs—at least for specialty goods unavailable elsewhere—the strip is also a focal point of the community. It is more than an area for immigrants and ethnics to enjoy near-exclusive shopping ‘rights’. Like places of worship, it is a centre of their community. Among the different settlement patterns that immigrants and ethnics can produce (Agocs, 1981), St. Clair is an example of an immigrant reception area because most post-war Italians settled nearby when they arrived to Toronto. Once enough time had passed, St. Clair developed a full complement of shops and services catering to the proximate Italian community; St. Clair was a focal point of Italian immigrant adjustment in Toronto. As one informant told me, shopping for Italian products switched from College St., the pre-War immigrant reception area, to St. Clair in the mid-1960s. Business occupancy data shows numerous

---

4Interviewed on 18 October 1996.
Italian-owned and run shops at St. Clair by 1961, the full range having been established by 1971. Despite a general residential migration north (Figure 2), the strip remains the symbolic and, to a lesser degree, commercial centre of Toronto’s Italian community. Serving less today as a daily shopping area for Toronto Italia, St. Clair is still occasionally frequented by Italians for specialty items and for the experience of shopping in the old neighbourhood. One informant, Joe Liuzza, expressed it this way: “we don’t speak Italian around here any more, except on Saturday.”

This comment by Mr. Liuzza alludes to another important theme in urban retail geography—leisure-based shopping (Jones, 1991, 395). Ethnic strips are being increasingly transformed into specialty retail areas associated with leisure-based consumption. Immigrant and ethnic identity is cleansed and popularized as ethnic strips come to evoke mass market images of ethnic identity. The strip thus becomes more attractive to the wider society and the composition of shoppers changes from immigrants and ethnics to young middle class. David Ley has argued that gentrification is partly fueled by the lure of central city cultural amenities. St. Clair is also subject to this process of commodification. For example, Figure 3 is one example of the heightened emphasis on retail facade design as part of the ‘rediscovery’ of the retail strip. The Montreal-based Jewish owner saw fit to locate such a store in the Italian enclave, give it an Italian name and adorn the facade with allusions to Italian classical architecture. Yet Sposabella has little relation to the Italian immigrant identity in the area. Its high-priced gowns and ostentatious facade have more to do with high order consumerism than immigrant settlement and entrepreneurship. Equally detached from the Italian immigrant identity

---

5Interviewed on 5 November 1996. I use informants names where they have given me permission for me to do so. In cases where informants wished not to have their names used, I refer to them as ‘informants’. No pseudonyms are used.
Figure 3: Posh Wedding Gown Shop on St. Clair Just West of Dufferin. Quoins, accented sills and dentilled cornice tell us the building was constructed before WW2. But the facelift on the ground floor does not fit the streetscape. The professionally designed pedimented facade and palladian doorway evoke exclusivity, as do the columns (which fit no particular classical order). The facade is intended as an attention-grabber.
### Table 1: Types of Business on St. Clair, 1951-1991

#### Number of Stores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cafe/Billard</th>
<th>Chain Store</th>
<th>Clothing/Shoes</th>
<th>Furniture/Hardware/Applications</th>
<th>Grocery/Bakery</th>
<th>Jewellery</th>
<th>Public/Institutional/Religious</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cafe/Billard</th>
<th>Chain Store</th>
<th>Clothing/Shoes</th>
<th>Furniture/Hardware/Applications</th>
<th>Grocery/Bakery</th>
<th>Jewellery</th>
<th>Public/Institutional/Religious</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>34.51</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ontario Property Assessment Records for the City of Toronto
of the area are the chain stores that have come and gone on St. Clair (Table 1). The number of chain stores along the strip has never changed. However, recent chains have taken advantage of St. Clair's increasingly leisure status. Whereas St. Clair's chain stores used to include Loblaws, SS Kresge and Woolworth, only the latter remained in 1981. These sorts of chains served the immigrant community, even hiring Italian-speaking community to improve patronage. However, in place of these chains have come Benneton, Stefanel (both fashion), Il Fornello (dining) and Second Cup (coffee shop). With obvious differences from previous chains, these cater to a younger market regardless of ethnic background. Indeed, many informants told me that St. Clair has lost its older Italian generation, that only young Italians 'hang out' there now and that they stay inside the clubs, restaurants and cafes unlike the older generation who conversed and enjoyed friendly encounter in the street. Mr. Liuzza's comment also corresponds to informants' observation that people of other backgrounds also frequent St. Clair more now than previously. Because Italians have largely moved north of the city, new immigrants have supplanted them, and St. Clair now attracts shoppers from beyond local neighbourhoods, the age and background of people in the street differs form say the 1970s when Italians dominated nearby neighbourhoods. The younger consumer, Italian or otherwise, seeks entertainment and high-priced goods not found in immigrant-serving shops. Like Sposabella, chain store merchandise and facades resemble the whims of popular culture, not the needs and wants of the Italian immigrant community. Because St. Clair has an ethnically-based leisure status, it has been a popular choice for chain stores that take advantage of leisure-based shopping.
The advent of leisure-based shopping and its attendant chain stores has been discussed in the literature. In general, speculations on heightened consumerism have been applied to landscapes although without any support from case studies. These have often come from Marxist historical materialists. Since materialists emphasize the social relations of capitalism and the importance of material existence in producing consciousness, they assert that urban culture is produced by economic relations. As Ley and Olds (1988, 191) argue, materialists assume the existence of a mass culture, defined as "the culture industry, imposing hegemonic meanings through spectacles onto a depoliticized mass audience." Urban landscapes, according to Jackson (1993) are seen by materialists as outgrowths of the appropriative logic of capital: they are seen as commodities subject to the manipulation of marketing and sales techniques. It follows that economic competition focuses on carefully 'choreographed' place-making: "The shaping of place identity and local tradition is very much within the purview of workers within the cultural mass..." writes David Harvey (1993, 26). The 'serial replication of homogeneity' leads inevitably to the conclusion that only "earlier and less commercial cultures may sustain more stable symbolic codes" (Harvey, 1993, Cosgrove and Daniels, 1988, 8). The end result is that landscape contains short-lived, market-oriented meanings feeding the 'apparent fullness' of 'visual experience' at the expense of 'real historical meaning'. (Cosgrove and Daniels, 1990; Smith, 1993). The implication for urban ethnic landscapes—at least those centred around the retail strip—is clear: they are nothing more than commodified forms of saleable ethnicity. This explains why the urban village, quite unlike Gans' use of the word, have become so important in retailing as leisure-based consumerism gains momentum. For 'quartiers' imbued with an ethnic identity or a historic past comprise an important
element in the changing retail environment of Canadian cities and Western
cities in general (Jones, 1991; Harvey, 1989).

As we see in the next section, recent trends in retailing including
leisure-based shopping may be mistakenly taken to indicate the identity of
urban landscapes. Ostentatious facades like the one above may divert our
attention from the surrounding landscape and lead to economistic
interpretations. As Table 1 shows, chain stores have never made up more
than six percent of all stores in the St. Clair strip. At most, this represents
fourteen stores out of the 250 or so that line the street. The impact on the
identity of St. Clair is therefore minimal if not negligible. In the following
section, we will look at the possible interpretations that have been offered for
urban landscapes with emphasis on those ethnically based.

Urban Ethnic Landscapes

I have already referred to the existence of a theoretical chasm between
Marxist historical materialism and humanism in geography. In the early
1980s, when the new cultural geography took hold, the city became a new
field of study. Diminishing interest in rural cultural geography was
concomitant with an increasing emphasis on the current cultural make-up of
cities. This has had an important impact on the study of urban landscapes
including what we see as the relationship between people and space and how
they can modify it to reflect their likes and needs. In general, the ahistorical
materialist emphasis on contemporary cities has led to a skepticism of the
importance of human agency for effective place-making. Belief in the
appropriative logic of capitalism, high consumerism, etc., has led to a
commodified perspective on city space. Urban ethnic landscapes are no exception.

In terms of commodification, the principal problem with historical materialist theorizing on urban ethnic landscapes is that it is ahistorical. In the previous section, I presented the facade of a wedding gown boutique on St. Clair which speaks to commodification; its facade is embellished, it has little historical meaning in the St. Clair context. Similar renovations exist but I argue with a different meaning from that implied in materialist logic: for many shops along St. Clair, recent renovations that look highly commodified actually conform to humanist notions of agency and placefulness (Figure 4).

Community involvement and renovators’ intentions of producing an Italian style reduces the determinative role of mass culture as the impetus for renovation styles. An ahistorical assessment of St. Clair, with the aid of materialism, might have led to an economistic explanation of changing styles in the enclave. This corroborates what Ley and Olds (1988) conclude in their study of the experience of Expo ‘86 visitors in Vancouver. The theme of Expo is science and education but Ley and Olds note that these themes may have been too ‘boring’ to attract visitors. Consequently Expo’s small political and economic elite searched for an alternative strategy to get people out and consuming; it turned out to be “spectacle, fantasy and entertainment to enchant and divert the masses from more serious matters” (p. 199). Yet Ley and Olds (p. 191) argue that popular culture theory—“active interpretation of cultural producers and consumers, which includes the capacity for resistance to the web of signification spun by dominant elites”—best characterizes activity at Expo. “The cultural dupes posed by mass culture theorists are less visible on the ground than they are in nonempirical speculation” (p. 209). Rather, Expo visitors actively engaged in the opportunities presented to them
Figure 4: St. Clair Streetscape Near Lansdowne. Original red brick structures are now the exception in this block-face as many merchants have opted for the popular look of stucco. However, despite the purchase of stucco, the owners of Grace Textile and La Duchessa think of stucco as an Italian style and not a popular fetish. They used stucco because they wanted their shops to look Italian.
during their visits which challenges the hegemony of mass culture theorizing. In this respect, Jackson (1993, 223) writes; "Theorists cannot afford the luxury of assuming that they know how consumers read the landscape..."

Of course, part of the issue here is that materialists emphasize the construction of commodified landscapes whereas Ley and Olds address the experiences of people in place. Nonetheless, it is clear that the assumption of mass culture can distort reality, including its assumed effect on ethnic identity. Indeed, as Cohen (1990) argues for Chicago’s pre-war ethnic industrial workers, ethnic groups may encounter mass production and mass markets in ways that actually reinforce their identities instead of homogenizing them.

Along with Marxist historical materialism, the study of urban ethnic landscapes faces other theoretical hurdles as well. First, some see urban ethnic landscapes as increasingly vestigial or non-existent due to the encroaching elements of modern urbanism (Conzen, 1990). The misconception of speculative building, state planning and modernist ideology hastens the call for landscape preservation or submission to these forces altogether. Importance is given to the ‘commercial force that undermines all cultural landscapes’ and the ‘plastic identities’ of high-rise apartments and office buildings (Olson and Kobayashi, 1993, 151-2). Along with the materialist narrative presented above, the broader ideological movement of modernism is seen as an impediment to the creation of meaningful places in the city: “there seems to be widespread acceptance...that the authenticity of dwelling rootedness is being destroyed by the modern spread of technology, rationalism, mass production and mass values” (Harvey, 1993, 12). Thus, in addition to the materialist insistence on the appropriative role of capitalism,
modernist urbanism is also seen as a force that precludes and erodes ethnic landscapes.

Perhaps the most effective counter-argument to this view of urbanism is Henri Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space*. His account of the evolution of real and abstract space agrees with the conception that place-rootedness has diminished with modernity: decorporealization, urban function and modern scientific objectivity are the catalysts of the changing nature of place in thought and in the real world. Yet, despite this change in people’s ‘way of being’, as Harvey (1989) puts it, he disagrees with a placeless view of urbanism. For Lefebvre, capitalism and modernity have changed place-making and place-identity by way of spatial practices—the structures and agents that affect places—but ”the preconditions of social space have their own particular way of enduring and remaining actual within that space.” Lefebvre continues;

Space so conceived might be called ‘organic’. In the immediacy of the links between groups, between members of groups, and between ‘society’ and nature, occupied space gives direct expression—’on the ground’, so to speak—to the relationships upon which social organization is founded. Abstraction has very little place in these relationships...” (Lefebvre, 1991, 229).

By focusing on spatial practices, Lefebvre does not exclude structural arguments but he does prioritize the spatial expression given to social relations. And the persistence of spatial ‘preconditions’, as he calls them, not only reflect social relations but also influence them because they are continually ‘founded’ in space. As we see below, this argument is consistent with the view that ethnic agency can produce meaningful landscapes in the modern city.
In addition to the view that modern urbanism foretells ethnic landscapes in the city, a poor understanding of immigration and ethnicity may also prevent us from fully appreciating urban ethnic landscapes. For example, Zelinsky (1991) defines ethnicity as national culture, smoothing over very different and often hostile groups in America, especially blacks and Latinos. He argues that immigrant groups in cities did not design nor build their surroundings and therefore have not created ethnic landscapes but only 'trivial' and 'exotic tidbits'. "The moral, of course, is that all these non-Wasp folks were expected to conform and melt into the larger physical fabric of American life as fully and rapidly as possible. And the overwhelming majority were only too delighted to do just that" (Zelinsky, 1991, 34).

Zelinsky’s perspective is assimilationist. In his view, ethnic landscapes are, by definition, differentiated for a short time if at all. Moreover, their “pseudo-ethnic styles” he says (pp. 34) are outgrowths of ethnic identities that the ethnics themselves were unaware of “until they were briefed on the matter by 100-percent Americans.” Not surprisingly, Zelinsky’s pedigree in the old school of landscape interpretation (Duncan, 1994) guides him to see first settlement, or the transformation of nature, as the American landscape. His Doctrine of First Effective Settlement states that the “first group to effect viable, self-perpetuating society are of crucial significance for the later social and cultural geography of the area no matter how tiny the initial band of settlers may have been” (Zelinsky, 1973, 13-4). Even the more sympathetic scholars of ethnicity have been influenced by this understanding, arguing that those ethnic groups ‘first on the scene’ determine the ‘cultural landscape of an area’ (Lewis, 1994; Noble, 1992, 400). Dell Upton (1986, 14) captured this perspective when he wrote “Large urban ethnic groups evidently built little that was distinctive...."
While it cannot be denied that American landscape tastes have been heavily influenced by British styles brought over with British in-migration (Hugill, 1986; Lewis, 1994), especially under colonial domination, their imprints have also been continually refashioned by subsequent immigrant groups (Conzen, 1990; Hayden, 1991). After all, we can easily distinguish between British and American culture today. It stands to reason that, as reflections of culture and cultural change, landscapes are not capsules of British colonization frozen in time. The reworking of landscape in urban America, and elsewhere, by immigrants and ethnics reflects their impact on host society culture, or ethnogenesis. In some cases, the observer must have a sensitive eye to notice ethnic adaptations in things like fenestration and the use of space, not to mention the foreign-language signs and products on display—what they are and how they are displayed. In other cases, like North America’s Chinatowns, even the non-observer can be overwhelmed by unusual shapes, colours and uses of space (Lai, 1991). The sloping red-tiled roof tops, recessed balconies and vibrant colours of Chinese enclaves are not ‘visual fakery’ hiding the truer landscape of standard Western architectural forms but ethnic agency in physical form.

It is important also not to overstate the opposite argument—to suggest that cultural pluralism, in contrast to assimilation, produces landscape that reflect immigrants’ national cultural of origin. When brought in to occupy Canada’s prairie west, Ukrainians enjoyed a high degree of rural isolation and concentration. They also brought with them a strong desire to maintain Ukrainian culture (Kostash, 1977). Apart from British-origin immigrants, Ukrainians have been presented with the best opportunities to maintain their pre-migratory culture. One might assume a Ukrainian landscape was created at some point. Yet the prairie landscape had already been defined in part by
the Dominion government with the aid of railway companies. What is clear from experiencing Prairie landscapes, as I have, is that Ukrainians have layered over the original landscape buildings that emulate impressive architecture 'from back home'. Yet neither the original partitioning of the land nor Ukrainian architecture constitute, on their own, the landscape. The extremes of assimilation and pluralism, again like any extreme in the literature, are useful frames of reference but may lead to partial representation. Like ethnogenesis, a mediation between assimilated and pluralist landscapes intimates social reality more closely. Once created and subsequently occupied by immigrants, the landscape takes a new course, never returning to what it was or might have been, never entirely of immigrant/ethnic identity but a combination of both on a new path changing in its own new way.

Landscape creation and modification, meaning and attachment are the sum expression of a large number of actors over time. Unlike the tightly knit elite of Expo who fabricated a landscape in a matter of months, urban ethnic landscapes grow by accretion and may be difficult to detect. Although Upton (1986) did write that urban ethnic groups have produced little that is distinctive, he added; "We cannot be too confident in making such assertions, however. The absence of urban ethnic architectures may be more apparent than real." For those groups encountering Zelinsky's (1991, 33) "pervasive, if largely subconscious, code governing the proper ways in which to arrange human affairs over American space..." they have not just a physical environment to contend with but also a built up space, an identity. I consider this to be the distinctive importance of urban ethnic landscape study: while modifying the natural environment involves a set of hardships, we hardly think of nature as having a human identity--even if definitions of nature
vary between cultures. Migrants to built up areas, on the other hand, are confronted with both a physical space and a social space that contains identity and meaning for previous occupants. Immigrants, then, may modify their surroundings for new uses and new meanings, the latter a challenge not faced in First Effective Settlement. As Hayden (1995) writes, “ethnicity, as well as race, class, and gender, can be uncovered as a shaping force of American urban places, provided one looks at the production of social space carefully.” But this is a theoretical counter-argument against a misunderstood immigration process and ethnic relations, as it is an argument against speculations on materialism and modernist urbanism. Since Zelinsky, like Marxist historical materialists, relies on speculation rather than substantive field work, we need case studies to provide some answers.

So the study of urban ethnic landscapes faces three theoretical challenges that remain unproven by case studies; the materialist interpretation of place-identity as concealed or appropriated by capital, a view that modern urbanism can only produce functional or generic space, and an understanding of ethnicity and immigration that precludes ethnic identity and therefore effective place-making in the first instance. But what factors might contribute to the creation of ethnic landscapes in the city? Here we return to the theoretical questions set out in the first section of this chapter. According to Conzen (1990), the spatial imprint of ethnic groups occurs under dynamic circumstances: the most important facilitating factor is volume of immigration. If that volume is high over a short period of time, then a distinct landscape is likely. Segregation and economic prosperity also facilitate the creation of distinct places. A dispersed, impoverished ethnic group will probably not create structures and patterns that reflect their identity even if it is strongly pronounced in other ways. A clustered ethnic
groups is more likely to transform its physical environment, especially if it has the means to do so, namely wealth. Also, an economically mobile group will probably achieve the level of ownership, private and business, to effect distinct spaces. Finally, we must consider the extent to which immigrants encounter a pre-existing built environment or is building one anew. As compared with the construction of a new cultural landscape out of a natural environment, encounter with an existing built environment leaves less for the immigrant to create. However, modification and attachment of existing space in an ethnic manner is still possible. All these factors cross-cut one another and may work in different combinations to produce urban ethnic landscapes but numerical dominance is the necessary facilitating factor.

However, even if all these conditions are met, the ethnic group will only produce a landscape if it has a strong self-definition. Alternatively, pronounced internal cohesion may result in a discernible landscape even if the above conditions are only moderately present. Pred’s (1963) analysis of ‘urban Negro culture’ in the retail strip is another example. Intuitively, one would expect that, like blacks in urban America, any oppressed group would hide its identity in the face discrimination and abuse. Indeed, Pred finds that certain land uses reflect blacks’ low class status which is more a matter of constraint than choice in concealing their identity. But he also finds that certain land uses have been overrepresented in Chicago’s 47th Street which are characteristic of urban black culture. Arguing that sub-cultural differences find expression in consumer behaviour and therefore land use patterns, Pred concludes that shops devoted to personal appearance, certain forms of leisure and entertainment (billiard halls, record shops) and storefront churches are representative of the surrounding predominantly black population. The visual effect, he argues, is representative of sub-cultural difference as well as
blocked opportunity. Thus, the numerically dominant, clustered, mobile and self-defined ethnic group is likely to be most expressive in geographic space.

This provides a better picture of the ‘who’ introduced in the first section. But ‘what’ exactly do we look for in the landscape that speaks of ethnic presence? Sometimes, the landscape may offer little or no clues and yet an ethnic identity may exist in the form of environmental meaning and attachment. A past event or folklore may breed what Walter Firey termed sentiment and symbolism and what geographers have called topophilia and geopiety. Through observation alone, this sort of landscape remains hidden.

What is required, then, is ethnographic research on the actors involved in producing social space. Yet too often in academic research, interpretation is detached from anything subjects have to say about their own situation as they see it and created it (Caulfield, 1993; Ley and Olds, 1988; Smith, 1984). The actors in the landscape have been particularly mute in the literature. Landscape interpretation has mostly been an activity associated with artifactual study and archival research to the neglect of human subjects' versions of their own scene. Duncan (1992, 11) notes; "Interviewing where possible or other means of collecting data...have rarely been attempted...[The] question of the meaning of landscape is usually addressed only from the researcher's own point of view." Identifying a landscape of the mind is not observable but may be real within the ethnic group, illustrating that the ‘who’ and the ‘what’ can be one and the same. Admittedly, this sort of landscape represents more a theoretical than real possibility. This is especially true if, going back to my theoretical discussion on ethnicity, we search for an ethnic landscape created by a group that is neither ethnically self-identified nor regarded as ethnic by others. Still, the landscape of collective ethnic memory raises our awareness that “if it is the purpose of a geographer to explain the
landscape, it is clear that he is unable to rely only on what he sees” (Darby, 1953, 9).

Given that landscapes must be addressed from multiple sources, landscape study must still take stock of physical structures and patterns, even if only as a first step. Although we may not know who has been involved and why they have made changes to their surroundings, as Alan Jacobs (1985) puts it, “you can tell a lot about a city by looking.” For example, a stroll through Toronto’s Cabbagetown neighborhood reveals that some houses have lost their front porches. Houses untouched by a frenzy of renovation work in the 1970s and 1980s still have their porches, although they do survive precariously. We may infer from this contrast that occupants of newer homes prefer the comforts of indoor privacy versus streetfront encounter. In fact, the new middle class occupants, the ones who probably frequent restaurants and cafes with outdoor patios, may indeed prefer to stay indoors when at home (see Caulfield, 1994). Although this trend may have more significance in terms of class than ethnicity, since Irish working-class cottages lost their porches to affluent gentrifiers, ethnic examples also exist. Street names, store names and vernacular arts traditions are the most obvious ones. Less valuable for historical study but valid in present contexts are languages spoken in the street, merchandise—what it is and how it is displayed—and tastes and aromas. But because all of these may only last a short while as compared with buildings and streets, these indicators are not so reliable for analyzing culture and cultural change.

Buildings, streets, and ethnic uses of space are the most important features of the built environment that may distinguish a landscape as ethnic. More effort is involved in creating a distinct identity in a storefront facade than with, say, changing a store name or street name. Immigrants and
ethnics carry with them cultural baggage which differentiates, among other things, their uses of space and aesthetic preferences. First and foremost, observable indicators tell us that an ethnic identity has persisted and/or adapted; that it has not assimilated. That cultural baggage not only marks part of the city as British, Indian or Italian, for example, it also distinguishes ethnic space from that created by builders developers. We think of the latter as the movers of modern urbanism, the ones, in theory, that prevent urban ethnic landscapes. To be sure, they may produce spaces that look ethnic but, after all, they only attempt to emulate vernacular traditions within immigrant and ethnic groups. And since they may be poor copies, it is the work of immigrants and ethnics we are concerned with. Immigrants and ethnics produce spaces that tell us about their everyday lives—the social basis of space that, as Lefebvre argues, even modern urbanism cannot completely erase. For example, Del Guidice (1993, 59) writes about the public nature of Italian domesticity in the early post-war years, stating that “A table under a pergola [grape vines], a veranda to enjoy the air and watch for human traffic, and an oven to make pizza and bread are traditional outdoor possessions which are cherished all the more because their use is compressed into a few months of clement weather. The Italian dreams of the sun.” After suburbanizing, writes Del Guidice (pp. 71), Italians’ use of space has changed: “Italians simply tend to be more private than they once were in their more compact ethnic [inner city] neighbourhoods.” In large part, Del Guidice’s observations were made first-hand, by looking. I have done the same for St. Clair: for example, relating to the public nature of Italian culture, the Italian cafe window (Figure 5) allows patrons to obtain coffee and ice cream out in the street without having to go indoors, thus allowing for friendly public encounter. Both these example speak to the public nature of Mediterranean culture, an ‘opening up’
La Paloma Cafe at St. Clair and Lansdowne.
At the centre of the ground floor, a tiny window, barely enough for two arms, allows for ice cream and coffee to be exchanged with sidewalk patrons. This type of window was non-existent on St. Clair before Italians came to occupy the area, and probably the rest of Toronto too. Note also the use of stucco and mosaic tile beneath the central window.
of space that Italians have brought to Toronto's domestic and commercial fronts. Iacovetta (1992) discusses Italian immigrant religious feasts as parades of devout Catholicism. What was an annual celebration of a town's patron saint in Italy was imported and aggrandized in Toronto as Italians of diverse regions collectively celebrated their religion out in the streets. However, as Iacovetta (pp.141) notes, this was perceived among Canadians to be 'offensive' and 'showy and "fed popular Protestant stereotypes of Roman Catholics as idolaters." For Italians, it was an annual public celebration, either in the small town square or in Toronto's streets. So, as these examples of domestic and commercial space illustrate, vernacular architecture growing out of immigrant and ethnic identity is the best indicator of urban ethnic landscapes.

Vernacular architecture has traditionally been defined as old rural domestic and agricultural buildings from pre-industrial time, or the geographically determined (climate, topography) construction of such buildings for a particular use. Academic study was accordingly defined. This has recently given way to all-encompassing perspectives of buildings as 'artifacts' created by 'ordinary people' that reveal something about their culture (Fitch, 1990; Wells, 1986) and more broadly as products of 'non-academic builders' creating their own 'landscapes' (Rapoport, 1990; Upton, 1981; Wells, 1986). Usually they are unexceptional buildings, paling in comparison to the grandiose size, style and cost of high-style architecture. The contrast between owner-built houses and sleek skyscrapers illustrates this point. Still, vernacular building traditions, those growing out of pre-migratory culture or way of life, are concrete evidence for the historical geographer of ethnic landscapes steeped in functional and aesthetic purpose.

"While many vernacular structures are not exceptional as architecture, their
age, scale and neighbourhood meaning may make them vital reminders of the ethnic past (Hayden, 1991, 15).

In the architectural literature, we find many of the same arguments made by humanists about the dynamic and reciprocal relationship between people and the place (King, 1993; Tiesdell and Oc, 1993). Buildings are constructed and given meaning in social contexts and help to define a sense of place (Relph, 1976; Van de Ven, 1993). The 'mythical' element of 'architectural discourse', it is argued, is that form, function and space is created by people and then acts back on them (Appleton, 1993; Lennard and Lennard, 1993; Markus, 1993). Both environmental interaction, and also landscape construction and modification, are present on St. Clair but our concern is mostly with the latter. Like ethnic landscapes generally, urban vernacular traditions, according to Fitch (1990) and Rapoport (1990), are not regarded as valid architecture by those in the high style camp and are set apart from high style and popular architecture. The division is arbitrary. It is usually based on the end product--architecture as a product, or on the means--technical knowledge and materials used. What vernacular, high style and popular traditions have in common, however, is architecture as a building process in transforming space (Hubka, 1986; Nuttgens, 1993). Here the belief is that architecture is defined by what it does and not by who does it or what is produced. Surely these are important and indeed allow us to differentiate between streams of practice. To define architecture as transformative, however, is more appropriate for two reason; traditions influence one another and differences are based on theoretical exemplars despite wide variations within traditions (Hubka, 1986; Rapoport, 1990). Thus, the boundaries between high and vernacular style, for example are blurred in reality, making definitions less workable.
If we rely on limiting perspectives of capitalism, modern urbanism and
ethnicity discussed earlier as well as vernacular architecture, urban ethnic
landscapes cannot be seen as real landscapes. Yet in seeing vernacular
architecture as fundamentally an architectural practice in transforming space,
given that our understanding of ethnicity, capitalism and urbanism must also
be more nuanced, one can begin to imagine the existence of urban ethnic
landscapes. In this respect, it is important to say something here about the
division that also exists between high style and retail architecture in social
thought. Barbara Rubin (1986) states that a division between these two
traditions was fortified in academic thought at the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair.
The White City, the progenitor of the City Beautiful movement in planning,
was physically separated from the Midway Plaisance, a ‘crude, peripheral’
section of the Fair for contemporary commentators. Like materialist
thinking, retail architecture is seen as the epitome of an intensifying
consumerist economy. According to Rubin, the division worked against the
identity of retail architecture which came to be seen as ‘garish’, plainly ‘ugly’
and even ‘immoral’. Brand’s (1994) description of retail architecture as ‘crass
seething’ substantiates Rubin’s argument that retail architecture is seen as
chaotic, disorganized: “the syntax of commercial architecture forms and
syntax of commercial competition conform to discernible patterns deriving
from a coherent system of belief and behavior, parallel to the ‘free enterprise’
logic that provides a rational basis for the analysis of economic behavior”
(1986, 505). The implication of this argument for my analysis of St. Clair, as
we see later on, are important. The building types found along St. Clair
match work done on main street architecture in the US which traces the
development of these sorts of structures back to pre-industrial Europe. They
initially appeared in Europe as vernacular buildings of artisans and craftsmen
The St. Clair Streetscape in 1923. Shops emulate the combined homes and workplaces of European artisans as far back Roman antiquity. The overall effect in the streetscape is uniformity in scale and rooflines as we see early on in St. Clair's growth.
vertically segregated from their workplace with living accommodations built directly above their place of work—all in one building (Figure 6). This became a high architectural style before being imported to colonial America, used for main street retailing (Longstreth, 1986) and, as I argue, returning to a vernacular tradition at the hands of Italian merchants. The historical development of the visual character of St. Clair is more than just crass and immoral consumerism but urban growth, immigration, settlement and ethnic relations.

Vernacular traditions, different uses of space and spatial patterns thus constitute urban ethnic landscapes. Taken with an understanding of how these landscapes come to be, that is, the actors behind their creation, we have a host of factors to consider in urban ethnic landscape study. In the first section, I laid out the pertinent questions we need to ask about landscapes and in reviewing their suppression, genesis and composition in this section, I have sought to provide some answers. The most coherent framework for the analysis of these different considerations is Dolores Hayden’s (1991) concept of territorial history. She defines territorial history as

the history of a bounded space, with some enforcement of the boundary, used as a way of defining political and economic power. It is the political and temporal complement of a cognitive map; it is an account of both inclusion and exclusion...That ethnic territorial history will...help to locate potential landmarks that are sites of political struggle—a church whose congregation led the civil rights movement or a crusading newspaper like the Los Angeles Eagle, whose editor took up fair housing” (pp. 16).

Borrowing from Robert Sack’s (1986, 19-20) discussion of human territoriality defined as “human spatial strategy to affect, influence and control resources and people by controlling area” (pp. 19-20), Hayden broadens its scope. For
Sack, territoriality implies confrontation. Recent interpretations of vernacular architecture do make the argument for built space as embodiment of power struggles (Fitch, 1990; Wells, 1986). In fact, the correlation with recent social theory is strong, suggesting that vernacular architecture can serve as a medium for the exploration of race and ethnic relations. Emphasizing the space-as-contested-ground perspective, mainly due to his reading of Foucault, Cole Harris (1991, 678) writes this about recent social theory;

"Social power is no longer conceived apart from its geographical context. Such power requires space, its exercise shapes space, and space shapes social power. The one cannot be conceptualized apart from the other; they exist in ongoing reciprocal interaction."

But Hayden's ethnic territorial history is broader, referring to both the defensive and redemptive role of space, including vernacular architecture (Appleton, 1993; Tiesdell and Oc, 1993). This balance is important to recognize, not only for immigration history but also for landscape studies. As we see in chapter 6, internal ethnic histories of even the most disliked minorities indicate a strong self-definition which, in creating the landscape, likely produces a positive interpretation of segregated urban spaces. Kay Anderson's study of Vancouver's Chinatown, although exemplary for providing an external, post-colonial analysis of the state's role in defining Chineseness and Chinatown, does little in the way of exposing what Chinese Canadians thought of their home space. The social geographical literatures does provide a more balanced view of ethnic relations and social space. The same is true for ethnic vernacular building which may represent boundaries or 'turf' and also affirm an internal identity (Appleton, 1993; Tiesdell and Oc, 1993). The ethnic basis of design may only be appreciated from within the group itself, by
those 'in the circle' of understanding (Glassie, 1972; Taylor, 1972). Still, since
ethnic landscapes have been understudied, the role of space and ethnicity
theory have not been utilized. Referring to assimilation and pluralism,
Noble, (1992, 400) writes; “None of these theories, which address primarily
the results of assimilation or acculturation, takes sufficient account of the
process involved, especially the operation of important geographical factors,
which are often overlooked or deemphasized...” In territorial history, we
have a concept which approaches urban space for both is positive and
negative roles for immigrants and ethnics. The concept has much in
common with Kobayashi’s (1993) prescription for the study of ethnic
landscapes using social theory and historical understanding. “For human
beings share not only systems of production, values, ideas and political
apparatuses, they share ground, as common ground, upon which their
coming together and moving apart and the conditions under which they do
so, constitute the history of common life” (Kobayashi, 1993, 209). This chapter
has addresses this issue and I attempt to bridge this gap further in the analysis
of St. Clair in chapter five.

In summary, a number of approaches exist for the study of urban ethnic
landscapes. Theorists of mass culture speak of consumerism and uniformity,
yet there are obvious exceptions, such as the landscapes created by specific
ethnic groups. We need to know more about these landscapes, so as to better
inform our theories of landscape and ethnicity. Urban ethnic landscapes are
not simply the effluvia of high consumerism, visual fakery concealing a real
landscape or obliterated by modern urbanism. From landscape of collective
memory to vernacular buildings and ethnic uses of space, the urban milieu is
replete with ethnic agency in space. St. Clair is one example. Before looking
more closely at my research on the St. Clair strip, we turn next to the methodologies used in this study.
Chapter 4: Research Methods

We have seen how ethnicity is a process of adaptation that grows out of internal and external group relations. As we saw in the last chapter, a host of other factors influence the development of urban ethnic landscapes, including volume of immigration, segregation, economic prosperity and the physical environment itself—whether newly built or existing. The following questions outline my specific concerns about the St. Clair streetscape around Dufferin in Toronto: was the number of Italians around St. Clair large enough to facilitate the creation of a distinctly ethnic space along the strip? who exactly was involved in renovation activity? what changes did they make? how has the look of St. Clair changed over time? what was the ethnic composition of St. Clair shops throughout the period in terms of ownership and occupancy? what do the actors themselves have to say about their own renovations, the changing character—visually and socially and ethnic relations generally? and finally, what do changes in the St. Clair streetscape mean to the actors involved? In this chapter, I discuss my rationale for using the national census, provincial Property Assessment records, historical photographs and oral history interviews, as well as my experiential knowledge of St. Clair and Toronto, to address the above questions.

To a large extent, it was the pattern of Italian settlement in Toronto that determined which segment of the urban landscape I would study. The census provides a useful summary of the changing social composition around St. Clair. For the census tracts immediately adjacent to the enclave, their residential composition was primarily British and Jewish in the 1950s. However, by 1961, the same census tracts had become over one half Italian. This proportion is high considering Toronto already had a pre-War Italian
reception area south of St. Clair centred around Grace and College streets. In fact, many Italians settling in the St. Clair area continued to shop on College until their neighbourhood obtained the critical mass necessary for its own complement of shops and services—this happened in the early 1960s. Nonetheless, after only ten years of immigration into Canada, the most populous Italian settlement area had been established around St. Clair and Dufferin and infilling would continue; by 1971, adjacent census tracts were three quarters Italian and remained over half Italian in the 1980s despite residential migration northward. Starting in the 1960s, then, Italians numerically dominated this segment of the city and it remains today the historic and symbolic centre of their community. Based on ethnic origin data (except for 1971 when mother tongue was used in the census), Italians have never constituted less than half the residential component of neighbourhoods surrounding St. Clair. Yet their representation in Metropolitan Toronto in 1961 and the Toronto CMA in censuses thereafter was far less, always around ten percent through the 1980s. In the 1990s, St. Clair has come to be shared by Italians (although not always amicably as we see in the chapter 5) with black Caribbean, Portuguese and South American residents. By 1991, the Italian presence in St. Clair’s neighbourhoods had fallen to one third and their predecessors, British and Jewish Canadians, were respectively reduced to one fifth and nearly none.

These numbers indicate the rapid and complete shift that occurred in Toronto’s post-war Italian reception area. The nearby Earlscourt neighbourhood, known popularly as ‘Little Britain’ in the pre-War period because of its many working-class British immigrants, had been taken over by the rapidly growing Italian community. The gathering of so many immigrants of one origin around a single retail strip encouraged the
development of retail establishments to serve their needs. Even if they did not live immediately around St. Clair, Italians still shopped there for goods unavailable anywhere else in the urban region. Having established both from the census and from the social geography literature that St. Clair would make an excellent historical case study of Italians in Toronto, I then needed to consult a data source for information on Italian retailers that came (and often went) throughout the study period. The census was uninformative and so I turned to information in Ontario's Property Assessment Records for the City of Toronto.

The Provincial Assessment Records

The assessment records are data collected by the provincial government for tax purposes. They are collected at the local scale and kept locally by small jurisdictions like the City of Toronto. I consulted the assessment records for the entire post-war period in ten year intervals beginning in 1951 through 1991—five data sets in total. I used the assessment records to obtain information on the (approximately) 250 street-level retail addresses contained in the study area, the relevant information being occupancy, tenure, ethnicity and business activity. This was done in ten year intervals to insure comparability with the census, especially so I could compare ethnic changeover in business with the surrounding residential area. Also, the assessments were used to obtain information on individual proprietors and shopkeepers for prospective interviews. Obtaining their

---

6 I should note here that my experience of St. Clair also informed my decision to study its historical geography. As a long-time resident of Toronto, I find it visually interesting landscape to experience first-hand. An experiential component was as important as the social geography literature in my decision to study its changing character.
names and addresses allowed me to determine if they had renovated—a further filtering criterion I discuss in the next section.

In terms of occupancy and tenure of St. Clair addresses, the assessment records were accurate and complete. If the owner of a property did not occupy the building, his principal address was listed in the file next to his St. Clair property address. Otherwise, his St. Clair address was also the principal address. If he was also the shopkeeper, then he would be listed as the owner and tenant. Tenancy for shopkeepers was listed as such (see Tables 2 and 3).

Determining ethnicity from this information source, however, was not as straightforward. Ethnicity was determined by inferring origin from the occupants'/owners' surname. Although this can present a problem with accuracy (see Hiebert, 1991), it is usually easy to differentiate between British and Italian surnames—as with Murray and Covello for example. Those with British or Italian names were thus categorized accordingly, as were the equally distinctive names of Portuguese shopkeepers in later years. I encountered more difficulty in determining whether some shopkeepers with east European surnames were Jewish or Catholic. Although an exact percentage is not available, for the 1951 and 1961 assessments, assessors were to ask for religious affiliation. In some cases, respondents revealed their religion making the task easy (assuming provincial assessors were unbiased). However, Jewish affiliation was seldomly indicated. Merchants with obvious Jewish surnames like Silverstein and Weisman were not categorized as Jewish. Where I suspected, for example, that a 1961 store owner was east European and Jewish, I used a dictionary of names to determine ethno-

---

7 It was almost invariably 'his' since proprietors, as in past census household data, were male and taken to represent the business despite the obvious involvement of other family members, including their wives.
religious origin. For example, Bobrowski, Meinke and Zwirek could have been east European Catholic but they turned out to be Jewish. Conversely, some names I suspected of being Jewish turned out to be British, as for Garaway, Lumiss and Pollock. The dictionary helped in most cases although this method obviously misses those people who changed their names and lied about their affiliation, probably to avoid scorn. For those people with names that were not identified as belonging to one of the above groups, such as LaCompte and Wang, they were slotted in the 'other' category. The 'other' category remained small in comparison to the dominant ethnic group of the time, whether British in 1951 or Italian in 1971.

The final category was 'not applicable/available'. This applied to those addresses in the assessment that listed no owner or occupant name but either an Ontario business registration number or just another municipal address. Here the St. Clair address was slotted in 'n/a' category. In the end, the proportion of 'n/a' cases was sometimes high, reaching almost one third of all addresses in some years. None the less, there always remained enough addresses in every year with ethnically identifiable names as to make the analysis of ethnicity meaningful. For example, Table 2 (pp. 77) shows that half of all the owners in 1991 were in the 'other' and 'n/a' categories. Still, I was able to identify 40% of all St. Clair occupants as Italian-origin.

For my purposes, though, the combined number of other ethnic groups and unresolved addresses did not obscure the overall picture of ethnic succession. Since the pattern of succession obtained in the Property Assessment Records are consistent with census information on residential

---

8Hiebert (1991) used the same dictionary for his study of pre-War Winnipeg. I found A Dictionary of Jewish Names and Their History by Benzion Kaganoff a useful starting point and complemented it with the more recent (1992) and thorough Jewish Family Names and Their Origins: An Etymological Dictionary, by the H. and E. Guggenheimer.
turnover in surrounding neighbourhoods, the Assessments appear to be quite accurate. This made comparison with surrounding residential turnover possible. Also, the sample of confirmed names was still large enough so that I could identify proprietors and shopkeepers for prospective interviews.

Contacting Informants for Oral Histories

Since I was concerned with the changing character and meaning of St. Clair through Italian occupancy and renovations, I deemed it important to speak with merchants and proprietors involved in renovating their shops. The objective was to understand what St. Clair had meant to these people and especially the role of renovations in producing a potential urban ethnic landscape. The first step was to sample prospective informants. The second step was to interview those sampled. I chose open-ended interviews questionnaire surveys because it allows for a freer flow of ideas between researcher and informant. It was more appropriate to speak with informants about my topic, centreing the discussion around three themes (with specific questions): opinions on the St. Clair neighbourhood and community throughout the post-war; its changing visual character; what the future might hold for St. Clair as an Italian area, socially and architecturally.

Initially, I intended to use permit application records from the City of Toronto Buildings Department to determine which St. Clair addresses had been renovated. Permit applications are documents indicating those municipal addresses for which renovation permits had been sought—a legal requirement. After I had narrowed the search for permits to facade renovations (those affecting the visual character of the streetscape, unlike
Table 2: Ethnic Changeover in Ownership of St. Clair Businesses, 1951-1991*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Total # of Shops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32.39</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>28.02</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>54.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>66.01</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>63.45</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* St. Clair between Oakwood Ave. to Lansdowne Ave..

### Table 3: Ethnic Changeover Occupancy of St. Clair Shops, 1951-1991*

#### Number Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Total # of Shops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>42.68</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>25.59</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>48.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>26.88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>56.75</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>27.38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>36.95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* St. Clair from Oakwood Ave. to Lansdowne Ave.

Source: Surnames obtained in the Ontario Property Assessment Records for the City of Toronto. Names then checked in "A Dictionary of Jewish Names and Their History" by Benzion Kaganoff and "Jewish Family Names and Their Origins: An Etymological Dictionary" by the H. and E. Guggenheimer (1992).
interior renovations), however, Buildings Department only produced 51 permit application files. Most records were for the 1970s and 1980s. Given the high (ethnic) turnover in occupancy and ownership (Tables 2 and 3), I expected that more than just twenty percent of all properties had applied for permits throughout the forty year period—especially since my assessment figures only provide a skeletal outline of succession. Moreover, the first 25 years of the post-war period was vastly underrepresented in the records. The latter fact, one might argue, might be explained by the rapid changeover in ethnic composition of the area—succession only captured in skeletal outline by my ten year sampling of property assessments. The new group might have prioritized business survival over cosmetic storefront modifications. This leaves two possible explanations for the lack of complete records: First, store owners and shopkeepers did not apply to renovate. For Italian immigrants with limited English-language skills and a do-it-yourself work ethic, this is a distinct possibility, especially for earlier years. Second, the City’s records are not easily accessible. I was not allowed to search for permits on my own. Rather, city employees conducted permit searches on my behalf. My request for a city employee search of so many property records, over one hundred in total (one address normally takes two to three days), exposed a cumbersome bureaucratic search process, one split between computer generated searches for post-1970 permit records but manual searches off-site for most pre-1970 material (another reason why the first 25 years of the post-war was underrepresented). Put simply, renovations permits were inaccessible because, as I suspect, the search would have produced more permits had I been allowed to do it myself.

To this point, I had not yet established a reliable method of identifying those Italian shopkeepers who had renovated. I was certain that more
renovations had occurred because of my personal knowledge of the streetscape. St. Clair today is a varied district, one containing buildings that are original in form with rotting wood-framed pane windows and chipped red brick, 1970s-style stucco facades, and ambitious column-clad boutiques belonging to a more posh leisure district than the St. Clair immigrant reception area. So just as my experience of St. Clair led me to choose it as a landscape study of Toronto Italia, that same experience informed my suspicion of permit applications as an information source. I needed an alternative method for identifying informants.

In my original work plan, I was to complement the permit application material with documentary photographs. In this way, I could determine more accurately which storefronts had been significantly changed, thus making my discussions with proprietors and shopkeepers more informative. Photographs were also to be used in the interview process so I could refer to specific elements in the renovations, say fenestration or tiling, and ask informants to speak to that visual aid. This, however, also proved difficult given the logistics of my search for documentary photos. I consulted several archival sources including the City of Toronto, York University, the National Archives and the local library at St. Clair and Dufferin. I was also a guest on CHIN Radio's Monday evening broadcast in autumn 1996 speaking about my research on the Italian community. I used this as an opportunity to ask the Italian community of the Toronto region for the use of any photos of St. Clair Avenue or portraits taken on the street. Like the archival search for photos, this proved to be of no use.

In the end, my primary source of documentary photographs was to be the Multiple Listing Service records of the Toronto Real Estate Board. The listings contain visual and written descriptions of properties for sale in the
**Figure 7:** A Typical Multiple Listing Service Advertisement.

Along with a photograph, the advertisement also includes information on price, location, property specifications and lease/sale conditions.
Toronto region according to a standardized format (Figure 7). Their paper volumes provide excellent coverage of St. Clair properties for the 15 years starting in 1960. I encountered some problems in using them. St. Clair was often scattered throughout the volumes, sometimes interspersed with Scarborough properties but most often in the west end of the city. Also, St. Clair properties were variously found within residential, commercial, industrial and out-of-town sections of the listings. The microfilmed records were better organized and much more useful since they covered the period 1950 through 1970. The microfilmed records of St. Clair contained all the information of the paper volumes. It was autumn 1996 when I finally reviewed the microfilms. Initially, I was informed early on that the microfilm records of the MLS were only a sample of the paper volumes which could not longer be kept. Accordingly, I decided not to rely on them. When I decided I should review them anyway, the interviews were already begun. They provided the majority of my collection of storefront photos--over 400 in total.9 Added to these is a sprinkling of photos from the store owners I interviewed. I used these photos mostly after the interviewing was completed in autumn 1996.

In describing the various difficulties I encountered in establishing a rationale for contacting informants, I have also described two of my intended information sources. Although the permit application records were of no use, the MLS photos have proven to be excellent for identifying changes in storefront design preferences among Italian store owners and shopkeepers. In

---

9I was also told that, in its early years, TREB included all properties sold in its MLS listings. As time passed, the MLS began to focus mostly on residential properties which explains why shops lining main streets like St. Clair appear less in the listings in the late 1970s. My occupancy and ownership data show that the 1970s experienced high turnover but listings do not appear. It is not clear whether this was a decision on the part of the MLS or the possibility that private transactions became prevalent, thus eliminating the MLS as a medium of advertisement.
the end, my sampling of informants relied first on the property assessment data described in the first section. At first, it was the only source I had, and fortunately it was reliable. From the assessment information, I ordered St. Clair addresses into different categories based on ownership and occupancy. Each property was categorized once, the relevant categories indicating Italian ownership and/or occupancy at some point from 1951 through 1991. I then chose to approach the owner or occupant of stores in each category until enough interviews had been completed.

After using the property assessment data to categorize St. Clair addresses, how exactly did I choose this shop and not that one? My first procedure was to approach those shops where the owners'/occupants' names appear several times in the property assessment data. A number of such cases existed and since these people tended to be early arrivals to the area—sometimes as early as by 1951, becoming successful and acquiring many properties—I thought it appropriate to talk to them about their properties and the area in general. So, with my list in hand on St. Clair Ave., I approached these shops, peering up at them to ensure they had had significant renovations. Three interviews were obtained this way, all the merchants having moved into their St. Clair properties in the mid-1950s. After having quickly depleted this strategy, I then used the existing landscape as a guideline, approaching prospective interviewees from the different categories noted. I carried my list on each of my excursions to the St. Clair district,

10 The categories include Italian presence from each of 1951-1981 through to 1991 including and Italian presence in 1991 alone. This presents an apparent sampling problem because the property assessment data was recorded in ten year intervals and is likely to miss ownership and occupancy changes in the interstitial periods. I avoided this problem by selecting for interviews only those addresses where the names of occupants and owners remained constant for longer periods. This is why I chose these categories as 'relevant'. The less relevant categories include addresses never owned/occupied by an Italian or those owned/occupied early on by an Italian but then changing hands, say in 1981, to someone of different descent.
picking out those properties which had been renovated. This informal gathering method, essentially a 'criss-crossing' of the St. Clair strip until an address on my list appeared to be significantly modified, is subjective. Since I hadn’t yet secured many photos of the strip’s original appearance, it involved an intuitive knowledge of the appearance element of contrasting older versus newer facades; original versus Italian ones. It was also eliminated the treatment of the strip as an experiment wherein my interpretation relied solely on those sampled according to formal techniques conducted at my work desk and not an encounter with the real landscape (Clay, 1987; Kobayashi, 1989). Most important, this sort of approach puts one 'in the circle' of meanings contained within the context of the streetscape, a circle of meaning necessary for a realistic interpretation of any field of reference, including St. Clair (Taylor, 1971). In this way, a landscape interpretation of Toronto Italia is understood from an inside point of view, as a participant in the street and not the detached scientific observer working with sampling techniques at a work station.

In the end, I obtained fifteen interviews from people throughout the entire district and for the entire period. Each decade is represented in my interviews with merchants arriving on the scene, the 1970s being best represented.

The Oral History Interviews

I interviewed St. Clair proprietors and merchants so that my interpretation and representation of the evolving look of the district is not detached from that of the ethnic agents involved. Their accounts of social
and architectural change in the area have proven important for my interpretation. In historical research, interviews are a luxury. I took advantage of this luxury and it proved to be an invaluable resource.

The number of completed interviews grew by accretion alongside successful and unsuccessful contact with different shopkeepers. Since I had neither a list of renovators from permit applications nor documentary photos, I was left only to use my property assessment information on addresses in different tenure categories. So as I went through the list, address by address on the street, identified those that had undergone renovation work, I slowly accumulated completed interviews. It was not a matter of working through a list of renovations through time and then contacting people connected with those addresses for interviews. Rather, the interviews were obtained as I worked through my property assessment records and the renovated landscape as it existed in autumn 1996. My selection of prospective oral history participants, then, was a matter of consulting the present landscape and working back through time to record and interpret modifications made to theirs and other buildings of the St. Clair district.

As I expected, the respondents themselves were helpful. They were intrigued that someone was actually interested in their renovations, especially those done in the early years. Approaching them was made easier by John DiMatteo, the current chairperson representing the Corso Italia business improvement area, who allowed me to use his name in introducing myself. This helped most put most people at ease and made for a more free flowing conversational introduction unlike the rigid one I had rehearsed. As we see below, my facility of the Italian language was equally useful in this respect.
Once inside a shop, I would identify myself and provide the shopkeeper with a written description of my work. I followed this with questions regarding the owner and/or occupant, specifically whether s/he would be interested in participating in an oral history interview regarding their shop and St. Clair history.\(^{11}\) In some cases, I had to contact absentee owners because they were responsible for the renovation work. These never worked out because they turned out to be uninterested, and in a few cases ill or deceased. Even though I was unsuccessful in contacting absentee landlords, I do not believe this introduced a bias in my results. Apart from being unavailable, there was nothing different about them: they were slotted in the same property assessment categories used for all addresses and none of their renovations were very different from those interviewed. Overall, face to face contact proved to be the most effective way of encouraging participation. Often, the first person I made contact with in the store was the owner or tenant, hardly ever hired help. The interview usually took place in the store. In one case it occurred in the apartment above the shop where the owner-occupier, Mary DeLeo, has lived for forty years. With scheduling delays beyond my control, I completed fifteen interviews during the months of October and November 1996. Most interviews were with men, three with women and two with husband-wife partners.

At first, in each interview, I asked basic questions relating to the respondent's background, renovation work, and opinions about St. Clair past, present and future (see the Appendix). Over the course of each interview, however, I became less formal, less guided by specific questions than by recurring themes. This made for a more hectic note-taking experience but for richer uninterrupted expression. I could only hope to capture it in its entirety

---

\(^{11}\)Three interviews were conducted, some in both English and Italian.
then and there. My increasing experience in conducting the interviews meant I did not have to cut off informants when they 'got off topic', hoping they would return to their relevant point when the corresponding question would surface some time later on. Equally important was my increasing awareness of recurring themes made explicit not by my direct questioning but by informants. I have already alluded to these themes in the introduction as the vernacular basis of renovation work, the functionalist view of renovations, and ethnic bigotry. I will explain them more fully in chapter 5.

Using Documentary Photographs

To this point, my research had taken me through reams of property assessment information and a series of fifteen oral history interviews. I then returned to the photos to document St. Clair's growth and change within the context of Toronto's morphogenesis and ethnic composition. The photos were useful in determining what sorts of building were created in the city at certain points in time. I complemented this with use of insurance atlas maps which indicated the stage of streetfront construction along St. Clair. More important, I used the photos to highlight architectural features and the role of the landscape in facilitating immigrant adjustment. In other words, I used the photographs to describe the original form and evolution of St. Clair up to the present. Next, I interpreted the meaning of these renovations, individually and collectively, within the context of merchants' own accounts. Here, I used the interviews in combination with storefront samples in a 'before and after' manner to illustrate changes made to the area and what these changes have meant to interviewees. Finally, I developed visually my own interpretation of ethnic relations and identity formation in Canada. The
interviewees addressed this issue. Informants had much to say about their experience in Canada, and how that history can or cannot be gleaned from their St. Clair landscape. I complemented the oral history information with what others have said about ethnicity using landscapes and also by relating to Canadian immigrant history, including that of Italians, to provide my own interpretation on the matter.

The St. Clair landscape has changed dramatically at the hands of Toronto’s third largest ethnic group. Italians have had the most significant impact on Toronto’s landscape, if not through their dominance in a vertically integrated construction industry, then by the vernacular architects within their community. From the time post-war immigrants entered Toronto, the look of the city has been in the hands of Italian immigrants. For St. Clair, the changes are modest. The changes Italians could make within the confines of city by-laws and building codes were subtle. None the less, changes were made. I was able to track the ‘who’ and ‘what’ of those changes using property assessment records and documentary photographs.

As for interpretation, as we see in the next chapter, these sources are complemented by my ‘insideness’ in Toronto’s Italian community. As an insider, I had some advantages. We have already seen this in my case in the selection of St. Clair as a study area and in knowing that Toronto permit records were unhelpful in focusing my search for informants and stores. More important, as an insider, I had the obvious advantage of offering to speak Italian with some informants who conveyed valuable information which they would not have been to do in English. Because of this, and because I am an insider with whom informants could identify, I gained the their trust. As a result, I could obtain information from them about
renovations, the St. Clair landscape and Canadian immigration that might not have been accessible in English. In the next chapter, I discuss my results on the changing St. Clair landscape.
Chapter 5: St. Clair’s Identity Throughout the Twentieth Century

In the first two decades of this century, St. Clair in the vicinity of Dufferin grew with Toronto. The strip’s form and style resulted from planning constraint, specifically limitations on lot and building sizes, and popular style. I argue that St. Clair entered the second half of this century with a uniformity in style that was distinctively British in character. With this background, the rapid influx of Italians beginning in the 1950s brought a wave of change. St. Clair became a streetscape with obvious Italian styles and, less obviously, Italian uses of space, all of this layered over its original features. Italian proprietors and merchants brought so much change to the area that St. Clair now looks quite different from the way it did in the 1920s. What was once exclusively British in style and form has become equally British and Italian today.

In the final section of this chapter, I provide an overview of the main themes that came out of my oral history interviews. What I found is that three interrelated themes were connected to renovations and opinions about the streetscape: the preference of Italian style among informants, the need to maintain and/or upgrade shops in disrepair and the view that Italian styles are necessarily better than others’. The view among my informants that Italian styles are functionally and stylistically better than antecedent and subsequent forms and styles speaks to the broader issue of ethnic antagonism because alternative styles, I found in my interviews, were associated with other ethnic groups. What I argue below is that an Italian community vernacular tradition has produced much of the change in St. Clair streetscape. The landscape is constantly changing but its evolution is grounded in ethnic pride, agency and antagonism. To be sure, many informants did say that they
renovated because of self-promotion, thus speaking to the issue of commodification. In a commercial district, this is to be expected. But I argue that ethnic relations have been at least equally as important as commercial self-promotion in producing the post-war streetscape around St. Clair and Dufferin. In this way, I conclude that St. Clair is an urban ethnic landscape that has reflected the identity and change of its various occupants, and relations between them as shown in the interviews, throughout the twentieth century.

Toronto: Background

Over the course of the twentieth century Toronto’s ethnic composition has changed drastically. As we have seen earlier with respect to Italians, changes have always stirred hostility, especially when groups have come from places other than northern Europe. Immigrants have been drawn to Toronto throughout this century because of the city’s continued prosperity. Immigrants came and the city grew. In the post-WW2 era, the trend continued.

In terms of migration streams, WW2 is an important dividing line (Table 4). Previously, the ethnic composition of the city had been mostly British. The mid-nineteenth century Irish famine immigration to Toronto brought its own set of social tensions but, looking back, never really challenged the ethnic make-up of the city. It was not until Italian and Jewish migration in the early years of this century that Toronto had its first taste of true cultural diversity. Up to 1910, not many Italians had settled in Toronto. The nature of their immigration was such that Toronto was only a dormitory for temporary stop-overs between seasons of hinterland employment.
Table 4: Ethnic Composition of Toronto Residents, 1901-1981 (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Peoples</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labouring sojourners came to Canada to earn a nest-egg in hopes of permanently returning to Italy. Sojourners were always men. Thus, through the 1900s, Italians had little impact on the city's ethnic character. Despite a more numerous Jewish group (Kalbach, 1980, 6), it seems the make-up of late Victorian Toronto persisted well into the twentieth century. By 1901, only two percent of the city's population was Italian or Jewish—and most were the latter. These two groups also were the city's largest non-British ethnic groups. Meanwhile, well over ninety percent of the city's population originated in Britain.

It was around 1910 that female-male ratios started to balance Italian migration to Toronto, reflecting immigrants' intentions of settling in Canada. Bringing their children with them, young Italian couples came to Toronto to stay. They settled mostly in St. John's Ward, also the major nucleus of Jewish residence (Hiebert, 1993; Zucchi, 1988). By 1910, for Italians and Jews, the impact of immigration was becoming more apparent. Highly segregated settlement in St. John's Ward set Italians and Jews physically apart from the rest of Toronto (see Figure 1). More important, major cultural and social differences from Anglo-Celtic Toronto insured that physical distance was matched by social distance. Nonetheless, the number of Jews and Italians continued to grow, reducing the proportion of British-origin residents in the city to about three quarters by 1941. Again, Jews outnumbered Italians who had by 1941 made up over two percent of Toronto's population (Kalbach, 1980, 6). So even though the number of Italians steadily increased, there still remained a British-origin majority throughout the first half of this century in Toronto.

Just as the ethnic make-up of Toronto is marked by a mid-century division, so is the city's growth. Still, the city did grow rapidly compared with
other Canadian cities up to 1920. At the turn of the century, Toronto was competing with Montreal for metropolitan dominance in the Canadian economic system. Competition for corporate management, finance and insurance activity began by the mid-1880s (Harris, 1996, 23). The process continued such that by the 1970s, Toronto had become the major metropolitan centre of the Canadian economy. Regarding the economic impetus behind Toronto’s growth, Harris (1996, 23) writes: “It was its national role that underlay Toronto’s unusually rapid growth in the early decades of the twentieth century, and transformed a modest city into a major metropolitan area.”

St. Clair, in the vicinity of Dufferin, was the product of rapid growth from 1901 to 1913. Healthy industrial growth in the late nineteenth century was followed by economic boom from 1898-1914. Owing to this economic boom, much of pre-War Toronto was built (Figure 8). The city continued to grow and infill up to 1921 after which, as Harris (1996) demonstrates with a map for 1941, Toronto experienced less rapid expansion. Even the roaring twenties did not add significantly to the 1921 picture and the Depression surely brought construction, like most things, to a halt. The pall of the Depression could hardly subside before WW2 became imminent, thus confining Toronto’s pre-WW2 spatial expansion to the first two decades of the century—when St. Clair was built up. An important aspect of Toronto’s growth for my story is the construction of the city’s streetcar system (Pursley, 1961). As Figure 8 shows, a commuter rail line existed along St. Clair as of 1914. The Toronto Railway Company, a private company, owned the rights to run a transit system in the city for thirty years beginning in 1891. They did not build along St. Clair. The TRC hoped to keep profitability high by building only where density would ensure profits. Since the fringe areas were
Figure 8: The Spatial Extent of Toronto’s Growth, 1914.
Note also the transit line at the mid-northern limit of the city. Here, along St. Clair, rapid construction took place once the streetcar line was begun in 1911.

less dense, the TRC averted calls for lines to the northwest and northeast. Moreover, since Toronto only annexed suburban areas like West Toronto—containing St. Clair—in 1909, the courts upheld the TRC’s contention that they were only obligated to build rail lines within Toronto’s 1891 boundaries. In response to public demand for commuter streetcar service and the TRC’s unresponsiveness, the municipal government undertook to build its own rail lines for suburban residents. For St. Clair, the line was commenced in 1911 and opened for service in 1913.

Opening at the end of a boom period, this streetcar line brought the construction of commercial buildings to St. Clair. Using insurance atlases, Harris (1996) argues that streetcars did not lead the way to suburban residential development in Toronto. The atlases also show that most commercial buildings along St. Clair did not appear until after the streetcar line was installed. In fact, lots had been subdivided as early as 1890 but, despite prosperous economic growth after 1898, hardly anything was built. Up to 1912 the street was only spotted with buildings. Insurance atlases show that only fifty-two buildings lined St. Clair by 1912. Many of these were houses with sheds; only twenty-nine buildings look like the long and narrow retail structures that would eventually dominate the streetscape. Public Works photographs for St. Clair confirm that most structures were houses and that only a few commercial structures existed (Figure 9). However, by 1915, just after the streetcar line opened, more than half of St. Clair was occupied by streetfront buildings. St. Clair was infilled with more commercial buildings up to 1923 leaving little room for more construction. Toronto’s insurance atlas for 1923 shows 235 streetfront buildings, the great majority long and narrow in the form of mainstreet retail architecture. With few exceptions, there were no more houses and sheds. City of Toronto property
Figure 9: Free-standing commercial building on St. Clair, 1911. Built before the St. Clair boom, #1348 was one of the first combined commercial-residential structures to dot the streetscape. It stood out amidst surrounding houses and open space.
data maps for 1994 show that St. Clair's form has not changed much since the 1920s. These recent maps show 238 streetfront buildings with only a few changes on certain block faces. The overall picture is that St. Clair of the 1920s persists in form right up to the present. Thus, with the construction of the municipal streetcar line which opened in 1913, St. Clair was transformed from a concession road, as Pursley (1961) described it, to a commuter road with a complement of retail activities to serve surrounding residents.

The spatial growth of Toronto and its ethnic make-up in the first fifty years of this century happened mostly between 1900 and 1930. Although these changes were formidable compared with most other cities, urban growth and ethnic diversification during that period were modest in comparison with the post-war scene. Toronto, like North American cities generally, underwent a process of central-city renewal and suburban growth that changed the city. Whereas the 1941 built-up area of Toronto hardly extended beyond City of Toronto limits, the growth in the forty years after 1951 has been much more expansive as has the ethnic diversification of its population. Common to many cities, suburban 'sprawl' fueled by automobile dependency and the continued drive for single-family suburban housing has pushed Toronto's fringe to previously rural areas. As we saw in Figure 2, by 1986, the sectoral movement of Italians had spread north of metropolitan city limits. The difference with pre-War trends is clear. Italians made up ten percent of the 1971 CMA population—the largest of any ethnic minority. By this time, the British-origin population had fallen to just over half of all residents. Although Italian immigration slowed to a trickle by 1971, new immigrants continued to define the ethnic character of Toronto. By 1991, less than half of the city was of British-origin.
In short, Toronto has experienced greater suburban growth and ethnic diversification in the latter fifty years of the twentieth century. Italians have played an important part in both these trends; they redefined the ethnic character of the city in the twenty years after 1951 while also pushing city boundaries further afield. A residual community of Italians still live in the St. Clair enclave. The area is still thought of as Italian in the city despite many new black Caribbean and Portuguese residents. In the following section, we look at the identity of St. Clair as embodied in its streetfront buildings and how this has changed through time.

A Changing St. Clair Landscape

Given St. Clair's context of growth and ethnic diversification, St. Clair has taken on different meanings through time as indicated by its appearance. What was once Little Britain became Little Italy; the historical geography of St. Clair embodies Toronto's change generally and all the problems and possibilities it entailed for those involved.

In the previous section, we saw how the municipal streetcar service spurred construction along St. Clair between Lansdowne and Oakwood. St. Clair's short period of construction in the early twentieth century has resulted in a discernible pattern of form and style. Longstreth (1986, 1987) provides an excellent overview of American mainstreet retail architecture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Although a comparable Canadian study does not exist, Longstreth's work can be applied to the Canadian city and to St. Clair at the risk of suggesting a common North American experience (see Goldberg and Mercer, 1986). Given its time of construction, St. Clair was mostly built with what Longstreth calls the 'two-part commercial block'.
Figure 10: Original Two-Part Commercial Block Intact, 1996.
Although the second floor of the property on the left is used for commercial purposes, there still exists a visible division between ground floor and second floor appearance and intended use.
Usually two to four storeys, the two-part commercial block is characterized by a horizontal division between two distinct zones of building appearance and use. The lower zone is intended for public use such as retailing whereas private uses, usually residential, occupy the upper floor(s) (Figure 10). Dating this form as far back as Roman antiquity, Longstreth argues that the American adaptation became prevalent from 1800 through 1950. After Independence, the American colony became more than a trading outpost. Market squares and trading stations gave way to the need for urban retailing. Predated by the commercial palace but preceding the post-war planned shopping environment, the two-part commercial block was the principal structure of retail for 150 years in America—and probably Canada. Throughout St. Clair, this form dominates and can be seen in the other examples I have provided throughout my study (Figures 3-7).

Other forms do exist in the St. Clair streetscape. Also common is what Longstreth terms the ‘one-part commercial block’. As the name suggests, the difference with its larger cousin described above is that only one visible and functional storey exists; in fact, it is a derivative fragment of the two-part building (Figure 11). Due to rapid growth, the Victorian city required new space for commercial activity. The one-part building represented a claim to space while requiring little investment in construction, especially important if building supplies were limited or expensive. When it became feasible, these structures were expanded upward. The ‘enframed wall’, another form of mainstreet architecture, is like the one-part building except that the facade appears like a frame enclosing an opening or a large window-glazed surface (Figure 12). Usually one storey but not always, the enframed wall type was intended explicitly for retailing whereas the one-part building was popular for banks. Other types do exist in the St. Clair streetscape but they are less
Figure 11: The One-Part Block.
Unlike most of St. Clair, the style here is Renaissance Revival. The style was very popular for bank and government buildings before WW2, here displaying the characteristics of classical symmetry, pilasters, and decorative arabesque. Once a bank, the building is now occupied by a trendy cafe.
Figure 12: The Enframed Wall, 1996.
The enframed wall was more commercially-oriented than the one-part block. As figure 5 shows, this building would eventually have a second floor, it too used for commercial activity.
common. In fact, the area has always had a variety of building types. Even today, while some degree of visual uniformity has been achieved in roof lines, many institutional, residential and religious buildings diversify the streetscape.

What was more homogeneous about St. Clair when it was originally built was its style. A Georgian idiom was dominant. With reference to Toronto, McHugh (1986, 14-5) defines the Georgian style as "an Anglo-Dutch simplification of Italian Renaissance and Baroque architecture." It is distinguished by a combination of features—the following pertaining to retail architecture (Figure 13): plain or dentilled cornices, a corbel table beneath it, sliding-sash windows with six, nine or twelve panes, straight or curved window heads, protruding window sills and lintels—often of stone, decorative quoins and a formal entrance bay or vestibule. Since it is an Anglo-Dutch derivative, I should add that many original St. Clair buildings were crowned with a Dutch arch (Figure 10). Some also were built with parlour floors—a two or three step elevation of the main floor. The stylistic trend, McHugh says, spanned the period 1800-1940 with only a twenty year lapse beginning in about 1876.

The form and content of St. Clair was a product of compatible stylistic choice and planning constraint which forced construction along the streetfront to produce long and narrow structures. As Longstreth argues, the most important feature for the study of mainstreet architecture is facade. Since American (and probably Canadian) subdivision created 25' by 100' lots, buildings could not vary much in their shape and interior organization. Thus, compositional type is, for Longstreth, determined by intended use and appearance. A comparison of mainstreet architecture, especially the two-part commercial block, and the Georgian style shows their compatibility. With
Figure 13: An Original Georgian Structure at St. Clair and Dufferin, 1911. A humble two-part commercial block, many Georgian features are present: dentilled cornice, curved window-heads, stone sills, sliding sash windows, and vestibule. Built before the boom in construction along St. Clair, the building stands alone.
central vestibules or side-hall entranceways and box-like symmetry, Georgian form was applicable to mainstreet buildings. What is most important about the St. Clair buildings is their context of development. Both Longstreth and McHugh point to the European origin of mainstreet and Georgian architecture. Like others (Hugill, 1986; Lewis, 1994), they make reference to the importation of design preferences with the movement of people, especially from Britain. Only within this sort of ethnic make-up could the Georgian style become so pervasive—indeed for over a century. Regarding the first phase of Georgian style, McHugh (1986, 14) states that “this small-scale classicism was the young colony’s first real architectural expression.” St. Clair’s Georgian style represents the British composition of pre-War Toronto.

Photographic evidence shows that St. Clair’s buildings remained in original form long after they were built (Figure 14). Prosperity in the 1920s brought little change because the buildings were still new. By the Depression, individuals had limited capital and it was unlikely to be used on relatively new buildings—even for cosmetic modifications. By the onset of WW2, little time had passed and the pall of the Depression still lingered. St. Clair properties, most of them only about fifteen to twenty years old by this time, were unlikely to see much renovation work. The structures encountered by Italian immigrants along the St. Clair strip were mostly original in form and style. Informants arriving on St. Clair early in the post-war period stated that the area appeared ‘old’ and ‘run down’. They said existing shopkeepers had not done their part in maintaining their properties. This is one reason why informants as a group believed they improved the area, both aesthetically and structurally, not to mention socially. While discussing the condition and
Figure 14: St. Clair and Dufferin, 1938.
Cornice work and fenestration is distinctly Georgian. By the 1930s, St. Clair was almost entirely built up with commercial-residential buildings which remained the same until Italian immigration in the 1950s and 1960s.
look of St. Clair when he arrived in 1956, Antonio Ferrantone offered a judgement of its style but also referred to its state of repair when he described the streetscape as having 'un ambiente fredda e senza vita'; a cold and lifeless feel. Its state of disrepair, according to Mr. Ferrantone and others, confirm that not much had changed in the thirty years since St. Clair was built.

What specifically was it that Italians did to St. Clair to alter the landscape? It is important to say that St. Clair has been an Italian landscape more in memory and sentiment than in actual appearance. The discussion in chapter two about the defense of the enclave by Italians in times of ethnic rallies points to its historic and emotive attachment. This landscape of collective memory is more pronounced than the observable streetscape. To the eye, the strip is more heterogeneous in style today than in its Georgian heyday. Infilling has made the streetline more uniform but these newer structures invariably take on the non-descript style common of post-war plazas. For those shops that persisted from the pre-War period, their renovation, no matter how numerous, has not created a uniformly Italian landscape; that is to say, St. Clair was not transformed entirely to match national Italian architecture, nor popular Italian imagery, not even Italian immigrant identity in Toronto. Traces of newer arrivals to the city and enclave further complicate the strip's identity—alternative ethnic language signs, foods, and music to name a few. Knowing that ethnic groups themselves never retain their pre-migratory identities nor fully assimilate, we also expect their settlement areas to be heterogeneous.

What can be said about St. Clair is that it contains many features that are distinctively Italian. Among those particular features, a high degree of uniformity exists. Few studies of Italians exist that do take into account

---

12 Interviewed on 16 October 1996.
identity in the built environment. They happen to be Canadian; not surprisingly, two concern Toronto. Cameron (1988) and Del Guidice (1993) identify the archvilla as a common house type in Toronto’s domestic landscape: balconies, balustrades and most important, arches mark the archvilla. Del Guidice locates the genesis of the archvilla in Italian immigrant memory, in their pre-migratory experience with architecture in Italy and particularly of the invention of the arch in Roman antiquity. The arch became such an important element in Italian domestic architecture in Toronto because of internal and external factors: the arch symbolized ownership and ethnic pride. But this pride was also an external source of tension for the wider Toronto society for whom the arch was decidedly foreign. Thus, the arch marked an inter-ethnic boundary. And because inter-ethnic boundaries are in constant flux, so is the arch as a boundary phenomenon: “the incongruous effects one sometimes finds are frequently the result of unresolved compromises between the English or American aesthetic, and the Italian classical one” (Cameron, 1988, 87). In space, then, the archvilla represents the adaptation of immigrants who manage to express their identities despite broad constraints. The arch in Toronto is, Cameron and Del Guidice argue, ‘a genuine art of artisans, an art of the people’; what urban ethnic landscapes are made of.

In both their studies, Cameron and Del Guidice mention other architectural forms which also indicate an Italian identity with particular reference to Toronto: wrought iron, gardens, statuary, stucco and columns. Clearly the emphasis of these two studies is on Italian domestic space. The third landscape study of Italians in Canada deals with Vancouver’s Little Italy retail strip 1921-1961. Gale’s (1972) study of retail facades concludes that stucco, mosaic tile, wrought iron, stone, and banding figure importantly in
Italian alterations. Thus, there is a basis—albeit a small one—on which to identify the Italian elements used by St. Clair’s merchants.

The TREB photos were used to track changes in storefronts and to contrast current storefronts with buildings’ original form and style. The most common features used by St. Clair’s Italian shopkeepers and proprietors have been stucco, tile and marble (see figures 4, 5). A stroll down St. Clair, whether today or in the seventies, tellingly shows the pervasiveness of these features, especially stucco. We might say that, whereas the strip used to be mostly red, today it is more than half white and beige. Merchants like Joe Calamia and Maria Rotella told me that stucco makes the streetscape look more Italian.13

The original red brick of St. Clair, one couple explained, represented its English history.14

What is less conspicuous about the changes made to St. Clair are adaptations to the organization of space. What has often happened is that space has been reconfigured to accommodate different uses. As we saw in Figure 5, an opening window was added to the plate glass so that patrons could enjoy libation or ice cream without leaving the sidewalk. In fact, several establishments have this feature. Figure 15 shows the central cafe window but also indicates another adaptation in the use of space—the outdoor eating area. Like the cafe window, the open-air eating area did not exist in pre-war St. Clair and probably hardly at all through the rest of the city. Usually cordoned off by wrought iron (more common in domestic architecture), the space in front of this establishment and others throughout the strip have been thus adapted. Other features are even more illusive.

Figure 16 displays the now obvious clue of Italianness—the central opening
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13Interviewed on 15 October and 21 October 1996 respectively.
14Interviewed on 6 November 1996.
Figure 15: The Cafe Patio
Along with the cafe window (figure 5), this establishment also makes use of its little frontage space with a tiny patio. Like the cafe window, the patio was new to St. Clair, as it was to the rest of Toronto. The name, however, was never changed from A. C. Ranch.
Figure 16: Removal of Vestibule
Antonio Ferrantone decided to ‘open up’ his cafe by removing the formal entrance bay that once centred his property. Now, with the entrance moved to the side, a cafe window is used during summer months to serve outdoor patron, while in winter the place-glass is intended to evoke an open air feeling.
window, not to mention the name 'L'Espresso Bar'. However, the central vestibule—a feature of Georgian formal classicism—that once existed in this property was removed by the owner in 1963. In domestic Georgian architecture, vestibules provide a formal division between public and private space. It appears to have had the same effect for retail architecture. When asked why he removed the central doorway, Mr. Ferrantone replied that he wanted to evoke the ambiance of an open-air cafe for patrons. The harsh Canadian winter, he reasoned, necessitated the 'opening up' of interior space. In other words, he wanted to mitigate the division between interior and exterior space for his cafe. The central entrance way, a defining characteristic of Georgian architecture, has been replaced by a large, plate-glass window meant to evoke an Italian open-air cafe; patrons now enter by the entrance to the side of the main window.

If stucco, tile and marble became so pervasive early on and persist today, space is adapted and Georgian features are sometimes totally replaced, can we not say that St. Clair around Dufferin is now an Italian space? It is a matter of historical circumstance that St. Clair buildings required work during Italian occupancy. Drawing on competent hand in the community to help with renovations, confident in numbers, financially able to do so (even if necessary work was delayed) and adamant of their heritage (as we see below), Italians, one might assume, have completely transformed the St. Clair landscape. Figures 17 and 18 show more dramatic contrasts. On the one hand we have a building that existed since the 1920s (Figure 17). Original Georgian features are there: brick corbel table, curved window heads with radial brick and stone window sills: a two-part commercial block made Georgian. Directly across the street, we have its Mediterranean-coloured neighbour (Figure 18). Red brick has been covered by pastel blue stucco, larger windows have been
Figure 17: Original Features Still Intact, 1996. Corbel brick tables and fenestration tell us these buildings are original in style. However, they fit the streetscape less as time passes.
Figure 18: Italian Features Attempt to Conceal Georgian Original. 
The use of stucco throughout this block is more in keeping with the post-war trend in St. Clair's style. The first building stands in direct contrast to its neighbour across the street (figure 19). However the pastel blue stucco and fenestration out front cannot conceal its original stone sills and curved window heads along the side of the building. Like the overall streetscape, this building is a hybrid of styles.
installed in front and an outdoor eating area has been appended to the side. What remains that appears original—at first anyway—is the cornice, although it too has been updated and coloured. Upon closer inspection, we find that the building actually conceals its Georgian heritage only out in front. Just like the original across the street, windows along the side of the structure have curved heads—probably of radial red brick. And although the stone sills have been painted over, their protrusion confirms that this building is a combination of styles—Italian immigrant over Georgian original. As in this example, the St. Clair landscape as a whole is a collection of contrasting styles and uses of space not only historically but also in the present situation. The St. Clair landscape has been significantly transformed from its original form and style but not to the point that its heritage has been totally supplanted. It reflects the varied cultures of a succession of occupants.

In fact, the building shown in Figure 18 raises a number of issues. First, the 'Boyz and Galz Cafe' is a recent renovation and appears to reflect mass culture idealized Italian villa rather than the immigrant entrepreneur's shop. The owner is not an Italian immigrant, the cafe plays mostly non-Italian music, it is filled with billiard tables and indeed, it acts more as a bar than a cafe. On every count, this establishment differs from St. Clair’s original Italian cafes. Despite this, outsiders would surely say the building looks Italian, especially given its location. Bruno Commande, an informant, expressed this point by saying "if you ask a Canadian, he will say [the area] looks Italian."\(^1\) But according to him, the area is British in character. The area was originally British, he told me, and recent renovations only use Italianess to attract consumers. The area does not say 'Italian', Commande told me, as materialists would reason, Italianess has been fetishized in

\(^1\)Interviewed on 22 October 1996.
renovations and layered over the true British-origin streetscape. In responding to my question about the Italianness of St. Clair, another informant was more direct by asking me: "what’s Italian?"\textsuperscript{16} He explained that St. Clair is as different from mainstreets in Italy as St. Clair is from other Toronto streets. Their skepticism corresponds to an argument that Del Guidice makes about Toronto’s archvilla. It is pronounced in Toronto because it, like Italianness in the city, is a boundary phenomenon embodying the ethnicity process. Depending one one’s viewpoint, whether inside or outside the community, whether first or second generation, the Boyz and Galz cafe may mark different boundaries. What we see in the next section is that merchants have a number of ideas about the identity of St. Clair based on its physical appearance. Some see the area as distinctly Italian, others as ethnically mixed and still others as purely commercial devoid of ethnicity. As for the Boyz and Galz Cafe, contemporary theorists of the urban landscape might conclude that Italianness has been commodified. One way to test this argument is to consider in more detail what merchants have told me about their renovations and the area.

Speaking With Informants

The point raised by Mr. Commande that renovations along St. Clair represent fake uses of popular Italianness barely concealing British styles surprised me when I interviewed him. I did not expect to find that for those people who changed the face of the street, Italianness was non-existent. Mr. Commande’s opinions matche Zelinsky’s argument that urban ethnic group’s can only tinker with ‘the’ landscape; that they can only produce ‘pseudo-

\textsuperscript{16}Interviewed on 29 October 1996.
ethnic styles.' Zelinsky's assimilationist view of immigration and ethnic relations precludes him from regarding ethnically-marked space as pluralist. Along with this view of ethnicity, as discussed in chapter three, modern urbanism and commodification are also thought to prevent and erode urban ethnic landscapes. It was not surprising to learn from the interviews that renovations were done, in part, to make stores more appealing. Several informants told me that they had renovated, in part, because they wanted to attract customers. This might seem obvious since St. Clair is, after all, a commercial strip. However, this does not undermine my argument that Italian merchants collectively altered St. Clair by way of their identity and self-expressiveness. True, commodification is part of the story. But the story is complex. What I found in fact was that a number of factors were important along with the need to appeal to customers. In terms of style, informants told me that they felt it was important to produce an Italian style in their renovations. Another theme was that their renovations improved St. Clair. These first two points, that renovations be Italian and they improved the streetscape, were sometimes linked. In other words, for some informants, Italian-style renovations necessarily improved upon the St. Clair they encountered upon arrival. This view of improvement extends to opinions of the present landscape as informants looked favourably upon recent Italian-style renovations and unfavourably upon changes associated with other ethnic minorities. Taking these into consideration, what I have found is a history of post-war renovation work better described as placeful rather than placeless and truly ethnic rather than ersatz or assimilated. It corresponds with the interpretative framework of territorial history introduced in chapter two, wherein space takes on both positive and negative meanings. St. Clair embodies the identity of the various ethnic groups that have come to occupy
its area throughout this century, especially British and Italian. By interviewing Italian merchants, the strip is also shown to embody the relations between ethnic groups.

Quite unlike Mr. Commande's description of St. Clair as British, another interview with the DiMatteo's--the husband-wife team who asked "what's Italian?"--told me that St. Clair became more Italian because "nobody knew what Italian was." Zucchi (1988) made a similar argument about the Italian identity in pre-war Toronto, showing that previously region- and family-centred Italians, once brought together by migration to the city, produced an Italian national identity. For the DiMatteos, because St. Clair was renovated by Italians in styles that differed from the original landscape, and appeared to be Italian, like pre-war Italian identity, Italianness was defined in space. In the process of defining ethnic identity, some things are adapted and others are dropped. The same is true for architecture. Stucco and the arch, for example, have been played up in Toronto's landscape as expressions of Italian identity much like certain foods, language, and music. Architecture represents a boundary that is always shifting. One theme that emerged from my interviews that speaks of ethnic agency and place-making is that Italian style was important when renovating. Of the fifteen informants, eleven told me that they purposely used certain elements to evoke an Italian appearance in their storefronts. Robert Gileppo, a shoe store owner new to the area, told me that his columns expressed Italian antiquity and that they gave his store an elegant appearance. Joe Calamia, a long-time textile vendor, told me that he used stucco for his storefront because it is used in Italy. Palma Nazzicone told me that stucco was Italian and that she used it to brighten up her shoe

17 Interviewed 29 October 1996.
18 Interviewed 9 October 1996.
19 Interviewed 15 October 1996.
store; "stores should be bright and clean." In two other interviews, the informants pondered my questions on stylistic choices and said that, in retrospect, they had renovated in an Italian style although they didn’t think of it that way when the work was done. In one of these interviews, I asked the husband-wife couple whether they had used red tiles in 1979 to evoke Italianess. Their response was that the tiles, along with fenestration and the property name, were not consciously Italian back then but that their background must have determined their choices. These examples illustrate that renovations helped define Italianess on St. Clair. So, although some might argue that ethnic groups may only tinker with urban space, the actors themselves can actually define themselves through that very same space.

Aside from the actual features used, the most important factor contributing to this theme of Italian-style renovations was the participatory nature of the work—an important element of all vernacular traditions (Glassie, 1990). Del Guidice discusses the exchange of favours in creating the archvilla: digging to painting, stucco, mosaic tile, and wrought iron are hardly ever done by one individual. Similarly along St. Clair, renovations involved relatives, co-regionalists, and friends. Referring to St. Clair renovations collectively, the Di Matteo’s believed the strip became more Italian because "our minds", the husband said, "are always Italian." "We like to do things ourselves" Paul Spagnuolo told me when we discussed his shoe store renovations. Past renovations, the ones done in the earlier years he told me, were more Italian than today’s because they involved help from within the community. Thus, in adapting certain aesthetic preferences and doing it in a participatory way, we begin to see that St. Clair’s visible features, always in
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20 Interviewed 30 October 1996.
21 Interviewed on 6 November 1996.
22 Interviewed on 12 November 1996.
flux like ethnicity, are not just commodities but persistent features of the urban landscape, influencing its subsequent development but never taking it over completely.

A second theme that points to effective place-making is the functionalist outlook of the Italian immigrant and its application to St. Clair renovations. For the Italian immigrant, Del Guidice (1993, 60) argues, "land is viewed not as mere nature to be admired, or a manicured replica in the shape of an English garden, but as a productive asset capable of yielding wealth." Cantinas and vegetable gardens are the result for the archvilla. The same argument can be made for certain stylistic features of St. Clair shops. In the traditional literature on vernacular architecture, importance is given to the adaptation of space to suit climate and geography. In an urban context where immigrants encounter existing human environments, the need to contend with nature is lost. Still, adaptation is required. For Italians in the St. Clair enclave, functionalism took the form of keeping the area clean, orderly and appealing—all flowing from their pride and ability to do so. For example, Maria Rotella and Joe Calamia both told me that they chose granite and marble because it is more durable than brick.23 Another informant was equally pragmatic, describing how easily granite can be cleaned, thus keeping his storefront presentable.24 In this way, the strip, according to informants, was 'maintained', 'upgraded', 'modernized', 'given life' and 'cleaned up'. Again, this relates back to the perception that St. Clair looked 'pretty rough' when Italians started coming in large numbers; it look like 'an old city' to Nicola Bavaro, a fruit vendor on St. Clair since 1956.25 Thus, facilitated by the notion that something had to be done, we have the increasingly common

23Interviewed on 21 October and 15 October 1996 respectively.
24Interviewed on 9 October 1996.
25Interviewed on 15 October 1996.
theme in immigration history that migrants brought improvement. There is no doubt that St. Clair would have needed work: most buildings were already over thirty years old when Italians first arrived and over fifty years old in the 1970s, the main period of Italian occupancy. Objectively, then, St. Clair was at the very least maintained and, depending on one’s aesthetic tastes, improved as well.

The two themes of ‘Italianness’ and ‘improvement’ are separate issues but they also converged in my interviews. This is exemplified in discussions on recent changes in the area. When I asked informants to tell me about what they thought of recent storefront changes along St. Clair, I received both positive and negative responses. Initially, there appeared to be a difference of opinions but I soon found that merchants were expressing discontent with the influx of dollar stores but encouragement for Italian-like renovations. Those buildings that appeared to be Italian, they told me, added to the appeal of St. Clair. On the other hand, for those dollar stores that displayed their seemingly junky products chaotically on the sidewalk, lament was widespread and criticism severe. It became apparent that displeasure with the dollar stores and their way of doing business had much to do with their owners—a new set of immigrant entrepreneurs catering to their own communities. St. Clair, according to my informants, could not be maintained and upgraded if these sorts of shops and businesses were to proliferate. In fact, their view that Italian styles are necessarily better than other styles was also a factor when merchants described how they ‘improved’ St. Clair from its original form. Overall, of the eleven merchants who told me that they wanted their storefront to look more Italian, six were explicit when they said that their Italian style necessarily improved upon anything else in the streetscape. When we add to these the two merchants who did not initially
consider their work to be Italian but, in retrospect, reasoned that it must have been what influenced the Italianness of their storefronts, eight of fifteen informant interviews tied St. Clair improvement with their cultural background. Thus, Italian style renovations and improvement of St. Clair are separate issues but, for some informants, were one and the same.

Here we have the final major theme to emerge from my oral history interviews on St. Clair's renovations--that of ethnic antagonism. Just as Italian style and improvement were sometimes connected, antagonism cannot be understood apart from the other themes. Recent changes in the area associated with other ethnic groups were expressed deprecatingly; 'the foreigners have arrived' one informant told me, another likening St. Clair to the Jarvis and Queen district, a part of Toronto associated with low rents and alternative lifestyles. St. Clair has become 'scruffy' looking because, as many informants told me, the new ethnics take little pride in their businesses. I should note here that social space was not equally important for all those interviewed. Three informants felt that space could not reflect social relations and that their renovation work, even early on in this period, was neutral despite divisions between Italians and the wider Toronto society. When questioned about the role of the streetscape in reflecting how open St. Clair is to diverse ethnic groups, one informant responded by saying "appearance can't reflect openness." Two informants who felt that space is neutral, as well as others interviewed, however, cited sidewalk produce displays as a major indicator of the Italian past on St. Clair. Produce displays, many told me, takes them back to the heyday of Italian settlement and symbolized prosperity and a thriving street atmosphere. The 'low status' displays of 'foreigners', on the other hand, are described as dreary and blamed

26Interviewed on 29 October 1996.
in part, for business downturn. Apparently, associating use of space with ethnicity finds Italian produce displays nostalgic and meaningful but dollar store displays junky and limiting of sidewalk space. Overall, even for those who explicitly said that space is neutral, the streetscape contains an identity which evokes mixed feeling based on ethnic affiliation.

Like any of the three major themes described, not all interviews were the same. For ethnic tensions, there were enough expressions of discontent to make it a major issue for St. Clair--at least for recent changes. To be fair, however, there were some who expressed sympathy with the plight of recent visible minority merchants in the strip. Both Maria DeLeo and Antonio Ferrantone told me that the recent black, Somali and Chinese shopkeepers of St. Clair are no different than the Italians of the 1950s and 1960s.27 Both these informants arrived in the 1950s and have the advantage of historical depth in making this judgment. Mr. Ferrantone had much the same view, adding that migrants to Italy have received the same sort of treatment as Italians have in Canada. 'Ignorance', he said, is the cause and no single group can be blamed. Through these responses and views of St. Clair's changing ethnic composition, we are reminded of the process of scapegoating described in chapter two. The importance of style in renovation work--and that it be Italian, the view that renovation work improved St. Clair and that recent immigrants are, in effect, ruining the area, are all interrelated themes. Since we are dealing with a retail strip wherein facades are meant to be consciously expressive, I feel that the three themes presented are that much more significant. That Italian merchants see themselves as the re-designers of St. Clair, necessarily improving upon what was there and suffering by what

27 Interviewed on 18 October and 16 October 1996 respectively.
seems imminently to follow, could not fit any better with the notion of territorial history.

St. Clair’s historical development shows us that urban ethnic landscapes can and do exist. The Georgian aesthetic of early twentieth century Toronto was a reflection of its predominantly British-origin population. The Georgian style was compatible with the sorts of buildings constructed along St. Clair—especially the two-part commercial block, their form also traced back to British origins in colonizations. As most immigrants to urban areas do, Italian immigrants in the 1950s and 1960s encountered a St. Clair landscape that was unfamiliar. Given the perception that buildings needed work, the numerical dominance of Italians in the area was sure to bring quite different tastes and styles to the streetscape. Stucco, tile and marble proliferated, as did alternative uses of space like patios and sidewalk cafes. As I have shown, however, the streetscape was altered significantly but not entirely. It remains today a combination of styles, mostly Georgian and Italian immigrant.

Beyond description, the interviews contextualize landscape change and show that St. Clair contains a territorial history. For my informants, the importance of producing an Italian style in their renovations attests to internal ethnic identity, as does the perceived improvement of St. Clair as a consequence of doing things ‘the Italian way’. But in seeing their work as improvement, there is also a source of external tension. For some informants, the association of old St. Clair with Toronto’s British-origin population and their dislike of its prior style—Georgian being the city’s first real architectural style—speaks to the antagonistic relations between them. After enjoying a relatively long period of stability, the Italian ‘intruders’ of the 1950s and 60s have, in turn, become grudging ‘hosts’ for recent ‘foreigners’.
Recent changes to the streetscape are regarded ambivalently depending on their ethnic affiliation. Italian styles are preferred while the work of recent ethnic entrepreneurs are not. No doubt recent immigrants have brought their own preferences for the use and look of space just as Italians had to a British-style St. Clair. Perhaps the new immigrants feel that St. Clair is today 'cold and lifeless' much like Italians did when they first arrived. What is clear is that the tensions that have followed the temporal pattern of spatial redefinition have happened alongside the scapegoating and ethnic bigotry evident in wider social relations. St. Clair is an urban ethnic landscape with a territorial history representing the larger in-migration and race and ethnic relations experience of Toronto. Through this example, the urban ethnic landscapes have something to say about immigration, settlement and race and ethnic relations.
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

In this chapter, I summarize the methodology and conclusions of my work on the St. Clair landscape. I make clear why I proceeded with a particular methodology given the literature on immigration and ethnic studies and landscape. My research concludes with a positive answer to the central question 'do urban ethnic landscapes exist?' Based on my interpretation of St. Clair, the simple answer is 'yes' and I review the reasons behind my answer below. I also speculate on the use of urban ethnic landscapes as a source for immigration and ethnic studies. Using the example of St. Clair, I argue that the landscape contains clues to the immigrant experience and ethnic relations that other sources might not. I do this by interpreting the trend in aesthetic preferences evident in the St. Clair streetscape and in the light of my oral history interviews. I broaden the interpretation of St. Clair's changes by tying them to the Canadian immigrant experience, particularly ethnic identity and inter-ethnic tensions.

Theoretical speculations on modern urbanism, assimilation and commodification have led to views of ethnically marked space as non-existent or ersatz. However, my use of property assessment records, historical photographs and oral history interviews has allowed me to check these theoretical perspectives with the following conclusions about the evolving identity of St. Clair: first, because St. Clair is an unplanned retail strip composed mostly of the two-part commercial block, it facilitated immigrant settlement and adjustment. Jewish and British merchants had once lived in upstairs residences while also maintaining main floor businesses. Later, many Italians did the same. In this case, urban form was conducive to the development of an immigrant reception area. Also, because St. Clair is an
unplanned retail strip, it allowed for settlement, adjustment and individual storefront expression. The strict rules of planned retail environments might have precluded individual expression, let alone anchoring an immigrant community for its shopping needs. Since merchants on St. Clair could cut the costs of shelter and entrepreneurship by combining them in their two-part commercial buildings and also model their storefront facades according to personal tastes, an ethnic streetscape was made possible. Because Italian immigrants came quickly and in large numbers to settle around St. Clair, the development of a distinctly Italian space seems to have been inevitable.

Second, up to the 1990s, ethnic persistence has played an important role in determining the evolving identity of the strip. Merchants recounted how they wanted to make their shops look Italian by using certain materials, namely stucco, tile and marble/granite. Since all but one merchant interviewed had renovated with the help of friends and family within the Italian community, the re-making St. Clair has been a participatory effort—a necessary element of vernacular traditions. I should note here that, although I conclude that St. Clair is an urban ethnic landscape, in terms of ethnic identity, the strip does not adhere to strict cultural pluralism, or identity persistence. Even though it has changed significantly, St. Clair never became wholly Italian-looking. Like ethnic identity more generally, St. Clair conforms to the notion of ethnogenesis—the abandonment, adaptation, and emphasis of cultural traits in ethnic relations: the strip falls somewhere between the theoretical extremes of assimilation and pluralism. It now contains a mix of Italian immigrant and Georgian features. Nonetheless, to produce a landscape of ethnogenesis, individual changes were made out of ethnic identity persistence. Since Italian immigrants were so different from their receiving society in Toronto, or at least both sides thought they were
very different in the immediate post-war Toronto context—objective and subjective ethnicity—the St. Clair landscape was infused with elements of Italian immigrant aesthetic preferences.

Third, by using historical photographs and speaking with merchants, I have shown that the commodification of ethnic identity did not govern facade renovations. To be sure, most merchants did say they wanted to appeal to potential customers and that renovating was one way of doing this. Still, it could only help business to present one's shop as Italian, especially in the early years when most local shoppers were Italian immigrants. Of course, this means that shopkeepers' choices could have involved some degree of out-group exclusion, intentional or not. But as shown earlier, many preferred an 'Italian style' as a direct expression of identity and pride. Styles were not ultimately determined by garish commercialism—neon signs and giant fast-food facades, for example. Had they been produced by speculative British shopkeepers, for example, one might conclude that St. Clair's retail facades adhere to the increasing purchase of things Italian in popular culture; that Italianness has been commodified in space. However, because many of the merchants had been in the St. Clair area for thirty or forty years and since they wanted to produce something that represented their cultural background, I conclude that popular culture and commercialism is at least equaled by ethnic agency in their aesthetic choices. And since so many informants, immigrants or their subsequent generations, changed their storefronts with help from within the Italian community, the participatory nature of their work reduces the importance of commercialism and confirms its vernacular basis. The stucco, marble and tile that have become so popular in retail architecture from posh downtown districts to suburban malls were first used along St. Clair Ave. in the vicinity of Dufferin St.
What was also original on St. Clair and which counters speculations on assimilation and commodification was an Italian use of space. The public nature of Italian culture brought distinctive changes to individual buildings. So common were these changes that they now constitute an important element of the streetscape. Most obvious is the patio. Not in evidence in any pre-Italian photographs in the area, the patio was fashioned out of the cultural value of public encounter. The opening cafe window can be equally explained. The removal of central vestibules, a defining characteristic of Georgian architecture, and their replacement with plate-glass windows to emulate open-air cafes or just to make merchandise more visible, is a less obvious adaptation of space. In many cases, these sorts of changes to the organization and use of space are subtle. But they occur often enough to indicate cultural difference. By eliminating Georgian features and/or adding Italian immigrant ones, the strip’s cultural expression changed.

Added to these conclusions is another important theme embedded in the evolving visual character of St. Clair, that of inter-ethnic tensions. Merchants told me that their renovations improved the area. Since St. Clair’s buildings were over forty years old by the 1960s, and since little maintenance had been done, updating the area was inevitable. Long-time merchants told me how they kept the area clean, respectable-looking and orderly. Even if most merchants did not do more than just maintain their properties, one could say that, as immigrants usually do, Italian brought improvement. Yet tied to this view of improvement was the common opinion among informants that their Italian-style renovations necessarily bettered the area. What merchants did, according to the people I interviewed, was improve upon an ‘old-looking’, ‘scruffy’ part of town. Since they associated what they found with its British- and Jewish-origin incumbents, they championed their
background and aesthetic tastes over that of others'. In addition, the recent association of 'junky-looking' storefronts with recent 'foreign' shopkeepers reinforced the view among informants that the Italian way of doing things is inherently better. Thus, along with internal ethnic pride, the St. Clair streetscape represents tensions as well.

What are the theoretical implications of these conclusions? The use of specific materials, the role of the built environment in facilitating entrepreneurial success and ethnic expression, and the willingness of merchants to express their identities with community help tells us that St. Clair is a true ethnic landscape. As such, St. Clair is not a collection of 'exotic tidbits' awaiting elimination through assimilation, nor has its ethnic identity been undermined by capitalism's absorptive capacity to commodify. On the other hand, internal pride has also led to another side of the story--inter-ethnic tensions. By speaking with informants, I uncovered elements in the landscape that represent conflict between groups' tastes. Discontent with others' preferences, however, was only a vehicle for inter-ethnic bigotry.

Based on this study, then, speculations on modern urbanism, on the commodification of ethnicity by Marxist historical materialists and on assimilation, while useful frames of reference in theory, seem less applicable when tested empirically 'on the ground'.

In addition to showing that theory is too detached from reality, what this case study also shows is that urban ethnic landscapes can be territorial histories. Dolores Hayden intended territorial history to mean both the internal ethnic pride and inter-group tensions found in urban space. In this way, the landscape can be used to better understand the immigrant experience and ethnic relations. In counterposing St. Clair to the major theoretical perspectives to show that urban ethnic landscapes exist, I have also shown
how its territorial history speaks to immigration, settlement, adjustment. The groups involved have had the greatest impact on Toronto's ethnic composition and relations, from original British-origin occupants, through Italian immigrants to recent visible minorities. The duality of St. Clair's territorial history from within the Italian community does parallel Toronto's post-war immigrant experience and ethnic relations. Indeed, there is a direct correspondence between the strip's territorial history and the process of scapegoating in Canadian history outlined in chapter two. However, since it was not my objective to uncover a 'landscape of scapegoating', this is not a conclusion but a theoretical argument based more on the compatibility between the concept of territorial history and Canadian immigration history. Still, this study hints at the usefulness of urban ethnic landscapes as media for immigration history and ethnic relations.

We can take this argument further. I offer this not as a conclusion but a speculation, a prospectus for further study—perhaps using the landscape as a primary source. In the early years, Italian immigrants set an internal boundary when they arrived in Toronto, partly due to their large numbers but also because of their reception in the city. The desire among St. Clair merchants to make their storefronts look Italian speaks to this internal cohesion. Considering the degree of social distance fostered by Toronto's other residents, one can imagine that Italians were that much more willing to define a sense of 'we-ness'. In turn, as for other immigrants throughout Canadian history, Italians continued to be criticized for being so insular, for the unwillingness to Canadianize. More pronounced from my interviews was the negative description of recent renovations by non-Italians. As I suspect, new immigrants are not just the scapegoats of third and fourth generation Canadians but also of post-war Italians—the latter ironically
having been relieved of scapegoat status by newer immigrants. Once the intruders with their own preferences, Italians are now, according to merchants, being 'intruded' upon by new-groups with a new set of tastes. Newly established shopkeepers on St. Clair are shunned because they do things in an un-Italian way—in the same way that immigrants are shunned for being un-Canadian. Is it possible that Italians, by virtue of their Canadian experience, have learned how to dislike the cultural expressions of others? If they already possessed the attitudes and beliefs necessary to define others as less worthy, then has the Canadian experience hardened those attributes? Has their Canadian experience shown them how tomete scorn to others? If so, have others gone through the same process, including those groups that have received the most scorn in our history? Is this Canadian? Historians of immigration have yet to ask these questions. Based on merchants use of storefront tastes to express dislike for those of non-Italian background, one can see how the landscape can be used to provide some answers. It will take further investigation but my research on the St. Clair landscape suggests that antagonism is something reinforced by the immigrant experience, if not learned by it. What we need to test these ideas, as well as to prove that urban ethnic landscapes do exist, is more case studies. Then we will be able to say with more certainty whether urban ethnic landscapes exist, if they conform to the notion of territorial history and if they can be used to better understand immigration, ethnicity and urban space.

The above speculations are not the sorts of things we expect to hear when one investigates landscape change in the city. We do expect to hear that, for St. Clair, it became more Italian-looking, shopkeepers wanted it that way, they did it with help from their own community, and maybe even that they did it because they dislike what they found when they first arrived.
These are essential to any documentation and interpretation. But recent social theory challenges us to think of urban space as contested ground, and urban ethnic space particularly as both defensive and redemptive (Harris, 1991; Kobayashi, 1989; Hayden, 1991). Historical photographs and oral history interviews provide evidence that St. Clair contains all of these. But broadening the interpretation to look at the pattern of changes and how they are viewed among merchants who champion what they have done over all else, we can make a connection between the landscape and the immigrant experience. The landscape speaks to immigration, adjustment, territoriality, ethnic persistence and antagonism. It is a medium for the study of the immigrant experience. Similarly, knowledge of immigration and ethnicity can sharpen our understanding of urban space; how it is shaped and re-shaped by its occupants to take on expression and meaning for all city dwellers. Since ethnic groups and urban space influence one another, the study of urban ethnic landscapes raises our horizon of understanding each of them and also how they may influence one another.
Appendix A: Interview Structure for Pre-1980 Store Owners on St. Clair

Informants were identified using property assessment data for the City of Toronto. If owners or tenants satisfied certain occupancy criteria (date of arrival on St. Clair, length of occupancy, Italian origin, etc.,) and had renovated, they were approached for an interview. On the whole, most people were willing to help with an interview, many taking place in St. Clair shops at the time they were approached. As more interviews were completed, they became less rigid, using the interview structure outlined below only as a guideline for questioning informants. Fifteen interviews were completed in the fall of 1996. For a more complete discussion of the interviews and the methodology, see Chapter 4.

**Background**
Name:
Address:
Phone #:
DOB:
M/F:
Tenure:
Ethnicity:

1. When (date) did you move into the St. Clair area?

2. What was St. Clair like when you moved into the area?
   -probe;
   -people that lived there
   -types of shops there
   -activities/street life
   -appearance of the area

3. When did Italian immigrants begin to change St. Clair to suit their needs?
4. How did Italian immigrants begin to change St. Clair to suit their needs?  
   Probe;  
   - Street life  
   - Types of retailing activities  
   - Visible modifications in contrast to its original appearance

5. In your opinion, what was the most significant change made to St. Clair by Italians as they came to occupy the area in large numbers?

6. When (confirm dates) and why did you modify your storefront?  
   Probe;  
   - Needed to/disrepair  
   - Dislike of previous style/your own shop-your own style  
   - Desired an Italian style  
   - Others doing it  
   (for either of last two, get them to expand on what their 'own style' is or what specifically they 'disliked of the previous style)

7. Did you make these changes yourself, with help from others within the Italian community, or was the work done for you?  
   Probe;  
   - Line of contact within the community (friends, paesani, relatives)  
   - Non-Italians

9. How would you describe the type of storefront which you chose?

10. How important was style in your renovation work? What specifically did you consider? (refer to photos)  
    Probe;  
    - Italian style  
    - Italian regional  
    - Non-Italian

11. How did you arrive at this style for your storefront?  
    Probe;  
    - Attract customers--Italian &/or non-Italian--how  
    - What you thought your own store should look like  
    - Economical/$
12. Do you believe these types of renovations express(ed) St. Clair's Italian ambiente?
   Probe;
   -through modifications, a public space Italians visibly call their own
   -identity of Toronto Italia
   -ambiente because others doing it, community help, similar styles--combined

13. Do you believe St. Clair has been given a distinct identity because of the sorts of renovations you've made to your shop?
   Probe;
   -distinct among Toronto's commercial districts
   -distinctly Italian
   -not really distinct, no collective identity

14. Were other St. Clair store owners doing the same sorts of things to their shops? If yes, when?
   Probe;
   -before/after you renovated
   -similar styles
   -examples

15. Thinking back to the early years (50s into 70s), do you see the renovations made by Italians on St. Clair as; 1)exclusive boundaries, speaking to and welcoming only Italians, 2)as neutral renovation work, or 3)as a statement to the rest of Torontonians that Italians wanted to belong in their own way.
   Probe;
   -refer to reason for renos above--Italian style, personal style, dislike of pervious style

16. Does your understanding of renovations work (choice of 1 of 3 above) match your impression of relations between incumbent Torontonians and Italian immigrants in the early years (ie. what were relations like?)?

17. Thinking about the neighbourhood around St. Clair, is it now 1)mostly Italian 2)a mixture of types 3)mostly non-Italian?

18. Has this changed much in the last decade?

19. Do you consider today's St. Clair area/neighborhood to be an open or closed community?
   Probe;
   -types of shops reflect that
   -appearance of the area reflect that
20. What makes St. Clair different today than when it was mostly of Italian immigrants—say around 1970?
   Probe;
   -people that live there
   -activities/street life
   -notice any changes in the look of the area
   -storefronts related to changing retail activities/diff. ethnic shopkeepers

21. What brought on these changes?
   Probe;
   -A change within the Italian immigrant community
   -People moved out?—Why?
   -Events that symbolized change within the Italian community
   -New people moving into the area

22. Can you comment on the change in the look of St. Clair and the types of stores that have come to dominate.
   Probe;
   -compare older storefronts versus newly renovated ones
   -types of businesses once there (60s/70s) newer businesses (80s and 90s)
   -examples of what is different and what persists

23. If I were to walk on St. Clair today, what do you think I will see that indicates an Italian immigrant past (ie. what remains the same?)?
   Probe;
   -storefronts, examples
   -types of businesses
   -people

24. In your opinion, is today's Corso Italia representative of what St. Clair was like when Italians first moved in? Has it changed so much since it was mostly Italian that the immigrant identity is lost?
   Probe;
   -What has been lost—changed the most?
   -What remains that is authentic—invokes the immigrant past?
   -opinion on the direction the retail/look of the area has taken
Appendix B: Interview Structure for Post-1980 Store Owners on St. Clair

Background
Name: 
Address: 
Phone #: 
DOB: 
M/F: 
Tenure: 
Ethnicity: 

1. When (date) did you move into the St. Clair area?

2. What was St. Clair like when you first moved in? 
   Probe; 
   -people that lived there 
   -types of shops there 
   -activities/street life 
   -appearance of the area

3. Have there been any significant changes in the St. Clair community during your tenure here? 
   Probe; 
   -class/ethnicity of the people 
   -types of businesses

4. When and how did Italian immigrants begin to change St. Clair to suit their needs? 
   Probe; 
   - Street life 
   -Types of retailing activities 
   -Visible modifications in contrast to its original appearance

5. Do you consider storefront renovations significant in the history and identity of St. Clair West. 
   Probe; 
   -compared with street life, types of shops 
   -compared with other districts
18. Can you comment on the change in the look of St. Clair and the types of stores that have come to dominate.

Probe;
- compare older storefronts versus newly renovated ones
- types of businesses once there (60s/70s) newer businesses (80s and 90s)
- examples of what is different and what persists

19. In your opinion, is today’s Corso Italia representative of what St. Clair was like when Italians first moved in?

Probe;
- What has been lost--changed the most?
- What remains that is authentic--invokes the immigrant past?
- opinion on the direction the retail/look of the area has taken

**At the end of each interview, I asked whether the informant(s) would agree to let me use their name in connection with my research. I explained their name could be used in the thesis and in publications to reference ideas and quotations they had given me during the interview.**
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6. When and why did you modify your storefront?
   Probe;
   -needed to/wanted to
   -dislike of previous style
   -your own shop--your own style
   (for either of last two, get them to expand on what their 'own style' is or what specifically they 'disliked of the previous style)

7. Did you make these changes yourself or was the work done for you?
   Probe;
   -Who--ethnicity?
   -line of contact within your own community (friends, relatives)

8. How important was style in your renovation work? What specifically did you consider? (refer to photos)
   Probe;
   Italian style
   Italian regional
   non-Italian

9. How did you arrive at this style for your storefront?
   Probe;
   -would attract customers
   -economical/$ constraints
   -accords with style/image of the area
   -an ethnic/personal style (what is ethnic/personal about it?)

10. Were other store owners doing the same sorts of things to their shops?
    If yes, when?
    Probe;
    -before/after you renovated
    -similar styles
    -examples

11. In terms of storefronts, do you believe an ethnic identity was ever created in the area through these types of renovations? Which has been most pronounced?
    Probe;
    British, Jewish, Italian, Other
12. At the time when St. Clair West started to serve as the symbolic centre of Toronto's Italian community, was the area/neighbourhood a closed space only for Italians or was it open for use by all Torontonians?

Probe;
-explain through your own/others' renovations
-see renovations as inclusive/exclusive boundary

13. Thinking about the community around here, would you say that it is now 1) mostly Italian 2) a mixture of many types 3) mostly non-Italian?

14. Do you consider today's St. Clair area/neighbourhood to be an open or closed community?
Probe;
-shops reflect that
-appearance of the area reflect that

15. What makes St. Clair different today than when it was mostly of Italian immigrants--say around 1970?

Probe;
-people that lived there
-activities/street life
-notice any changes in the look of the area
-storefronts related to changing retail activities/diff. ethnic shop-keepers

16. At what point did St. Clair start to change?

Probe;
-A change within the Italian immigrant community
-New people moving into the area
-Events that symbolized change within the Italian community

17. What is the same about St. Clair?

Probe--same as above


