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Abstract

“From Wilhelm to Hans: Ethnicity, Citizenship, and the German Community of Berlin/Kitchener, Ontario, 1871-1970s,” examines how the ethnic elite, a group of politicians, businessmen, professionals, and leaders of cultural organizations defined German ethnicity. It argues that claiming a place for Germans as loyal Canadian citizens was central to how the ethnic elite defined German ethnicity. The ethnic elite, however, did not define German ethnicity in isolation. Rather, German ethnic identity was arrived at through the interaction between the ethnic group and the host society. In forums such as public celebrations, newspaper debates, politics, and business, immigrants and established Canadians negotiated their respective identities and their relationship to one another. This relationship was shaped by factors such as the two World Wars, Canada’s relationship with Britain, and Canadians’ changing attitudes towards race and racism. German ethnicity, therefore, was not a static inheritance from the Old World. It was dynamic, continually being contested, negotiated, and redefined. Recently historians have looked to ethnic group identities to locate the origins of Canada’s multicultural identity. By studying German ethnicity through the lens of citizenship, however, this dissertation demonstrates that multicultural citizenship was not the inevitable result of immigration and ethnic diversity. To seek a place for Germans as Canadian citizens, the ethnic elite’s definition of German ethnicity was premised on the exclusion of others who did not fit the class, gender, or religious distinctions of Canadian citizenship. Furthermore, throughout the period under study, Anglo-Canadian critics challenged the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. At times, these critics were only a small minority, but there were others, such as the First World War, when the rights of Germans as Canadian citizens were challenged more broadly. Thus, the acceptance of Germans as Canadian citizens was always contingent and never fully settled.
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Introduction

If there was one symbol which best represented the German community of Berlin, Ontario at the end of the nineteenth century it was the stern, imperious bust of Kaiser Wilhelm I which stood watch over Berlin’s Victoria Park. By the 1970s the symbol which best represented the German community of the city (renamed Kitchener during the First World War) was Onkel Hans, the smiling and cheekily winking cartoon mascot of Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest which adorned billboards and promotional materials around the city, welcoming visitors and assuring them of good times ahead. Aside from prominent facial hair, these two symbols and the meaning which they conveyed could scarcely be more different. Kaiser Wilhelm evoked the might of the German Empire and portrayed the city’s Germans as modern, hardworking, and industrious. Onkel Hans called to mind the supposed peasant origins of the city’s Germans who were portrayed as traditional, fun-loving, and jovial. The juxtaposition of these symbols demonstrates that ethnicity is not a static, unchanging inheritance from the Old World, but is instead dynamic and ever-changing. By charting the journey from Wilhelm to Hans, we can examine how the definition of German ethnicity in Berlin/Kitchener, Ontario changed over time and what forces shaped its evolution.

The area that became Berlin was settled at the start of the nineteenth century by German-speaking Mennonites from Pennsylvania.¹ They were followed, beginning in the 1820s, by German immigrants from Europe. The German immigrants came from all over rather than a

¹ This land was part of a 600 000 acre tract that was purchased from the Mississauga by the British Crown and granted to the Six Nations in 1784 to compensate for the loss of their traditional territory during the American Revolution. In 1798, the Six Nations, led by Joseph Brant, sold 94 012 acres of this land to Colonel Richard Beasley. In 1803, Mennonites from Pennsylvania purchased the land that became Berlin from Beasley. John English and Kenneth McLaughlin, *Kitchener: An Illustrated History* (Toronto: Robin Brass Studio, 1983), 16-9; Mary Druke Becker, “Iroquois and Iroquoian in Canada,” in *Native Peoples: The Canadian Experience* 3rd Edition, eds. R. Bruce Morrison and C. Roderick Wilson (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2004), 240.
single region or state and came from several different religious denominations.² Whereas the Mennonites were mostly farmers, the Germans were primarily artisans and craftsmen who came to North America when the industrial revolution in Europe brought a decline in their income and status. Most arrived first in the United States and were then drawn north by the promise of a German-speaking settlement in Waterloo Township with Berlin at its centre.³ The number of German immigrants coming to Kitchener slowed after 1870 and then ceased entirely during the First World War when Germans, as enemy aliens, were barred from coming to Canada.⁴ According to the 1911 census, the number of people of German origins in Berlin was 10 633 or about 70 percent of the city’s population.⁵ Another wave of German immigrants came to Kitchener following the First World War, beginning in 1923 when Germans were once again permitted to enter Canada. This wave of immigrants included ethnic Germans from Romania, Hungary, Russia, and Yugoslavia along with immigrants from Germany itself. By the time immigration was halted once more with the onset of the Depression, the number of people of German origins in Kitchener was 16 345, or 53 percent of the city’s population.⁶ The final wave of German immigrants to Kitchener came in the years immediately following the end of the Second World War. This wave included German refugees from Eastern Europe who began arriving in Kitchener in 1947 and German nationals who were once again permitted to come to Canada from 1950. By the mid-1950s, however, the number of German immigrants to Kitchener declined sharply as the German economy recovered and began to flourish in the aftermath of the

² English and McLaughlin, Kitchener, 25.
⁴ English and McLaughlin, Kitchener, 89.
war.\(^7\) In 1971, the number of people of German origins in Kitchener was 35 920, comprising still 32 percent of the city’s population.\(^8\)

In this dissertation, I study the German community of Berlin/Kitchener, Ontario from 1871 to the 1970s. Specifically, I look at how the leaders of the community, whom I term the “ethnic elite” defined German ethnic identity and how this definition changed over the course of a century. I argue that positioning Germans as loyal Canadian citizens was central to how the ethnic elite defined German ethnic identity. The core aim of the ethnic elite in defining German ethnicity was to reconcile their difference with the definition of Canadian citizenship. Describing what it meant to be German in Berlin/Kitchener, the ethnic elite simultaneously offered their own definition of what it meant to be Canadian, and claimed a place at the centre of Canada as loyal citizens rather than at the margins as an immigrant “other”.

The ethnic elite did not define German ethnicity in isolation. German ethnic identity was arrived at through a process of negotiation between the immigrant group and the host society. This negotiation took place in what Royden Loewen and Gerald Friesen refer to as “boundary zones.” These were forums such as public celebration and commemoration, newspaper debates, politics, or business, where immigrants and established Canadians encountered one another and negotiated their respective identities and their relationship to one another.\(^9\) The result of this negotiation was a version of Canadian citizenship and identity which blurred the lines between the ethnic group and the host society. For the most of the period I study, most Anglo Canadians readily accepted Germans as Canadian citizens. By taking part in German-Canadian celebrations, echoing the rhetoric of the ethnic elite, patronizing German-Canadian businesses, and engaging


\(^8\) English and McLaughlin, *Kitchener*, 233.

with German Canadians as a political bloc, Anglo Canadians signaled their acceptance of the ethnic elite’s version of German ethnicity and the place of Germans as Canadian citizens.\textsuperscript{10}

In this dissertation, I analyze local English- and German-language newspapers, the personal papers of the men who comprised the ethnic elite, the records of German clubs and cultural organizations, and works of local history and historical fiction. These sources offer a window into the boundary zones where the ethnic elite and Anglo Canadians negotiated the meaning of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship. In these boundary zones, the ethnic elite deployed a privileged understanding of Canada’s, Germany’s, and Berlin/Kitchener’s history as what Eric Hobsbawm terms “well-supplied warehouses of official ritual, symbolism, and moral exhortation” to present a version of German ethnicity which posited that Germans were the ideal Canadian citizens.\textsuperscript{11}

In \textit{Immigrant Minds, American Identities}, historian Orm Øverland examines the “homemaking myths” which late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century European immigrants used to claim belonging in the United States.\textsuperscript{12} These myths, he states, are based “on myths and traditions of the old home country or on the real or imagined group experience in the new one.” Homemaking myths, Øverland continues, “insist on family relationships across the centuries and on continuities where historians see few if any connections.”\textsuperscript{13} Øverland argues that because of this dubious veracity, historians have largely ignored immigrants’ homemaking myths, dismissing them as “represent[ing] an amateurish historiography.” He maintains,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10} This is in contrast to the United States where Orm Øverland argues Anglo-Americans were not receptive to ethnic groups’ claims to belonging in America. Orm Øverland, \textit{Immigrant Minds, American Identities: Making the United States Home, 1870-1930} (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 13, 192.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Øverland organizes the homemaking myths into three thematic categories: “myths of foundation (‘we were here first or at least as early as you were”), myths of blood sacrifice (‘we fought and gave our lives for our chosen homeland’), and myths of ideological gifts or an ideological relationship (‘the ideas we brought with us are American ideas’).” Øverland, \textit{Immigrant Minds, American Identities}, 19.
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Øverland, \textit{Immigrant Minds, American Identities}, 8-9.
\end{itemize}
however, that they deserve to be studied “as expressions of an American identity created in the face of Anglo-American denials of such an identity.”¹⁴ Canadian historian Ross Fair uses Øverland’s homemaking myths as a framework to study the historiography of Ontario’s Pennsylvania Germans. Fair argues that homemaking myths should be seen as “a North American phenomenon” and not just a product of immigrants to the United States.¹⁵ He urges Canadian historians to use Øverland’s homemaking myths as a framework to study other ethnic group histories rather than dismissing them because they are produced by local amateurs.¹⁶ Fair states that “History and heritage, myth and memory, all play considerable roles in constructing a national narrative.” Historians, he says, should study how ethnic groups have used these forces to assert their place in Canada’s history alongside English and French Canadians.¹⁷

Like Øverland and Fair, I take these amateur histories of ethnic groups seriously as legitimate expressions of group identity. The ethnic elite employed their privileged understanding of history, their version of Øverland’s homemaking myths, in local histories and works of historical fiction and also in public celebrations, in editorials and letters to the editor, in advertisements for local businesses and civic booster publications, in letters and petitions lobbying politicians, and even in public monuments to assert their status as loyal Canadian citizens. As Øverland acknowledges, the claims these histories made were quite often tenuous, with little grounding in historical fact. Furthermore, they were volatile and subject to frequent revision or even wholesale change. I do not see this as a sign of their falsehood or weakness, however. Instead, I see this as a sign of strength and creativity as the ethnic elite responded to their changing circumstances in Canada. At the same time, the necessity to continually re-

¹⁴ Øverland, Immigrant Minds, American Identities, 21.
¹⁶ Fair, “‘Theirs was a deeper purpose’,” 656-7.
¹⁷ Fair, “‘Theirs was a deeper purpose’,” 683.
asserting and redefining their ethnic identity meant that the ethnic elite always maintained a
defensive tone in their expressions of German ethnicity. As the definition of what constituted a
loyal Canadian citizen changed over time, the ethnic elite displayed a great deal of creativity in
re-writing their history, inventing new traditions, and thereby adapting their ethnic identity to
retain its compatibility with the concept of Canadian citizenship.

Loewen and Friesen argue that by retaining their culture, ethnic groups throughout the
twentieth century were not attempting to resist assimilation into Anglo-Canadian society. Instead,
Loewen and Friesen argue that their ethnic culture and institutions “provid[ed] the very tools by
which the immigrant gained entry into the wider community.”18 Similarly, Orm Øverland argues
that when immigrants attempted to gain acceptance in the United States by shedding all the
trappings of their ethnic identity, this approach seldom resulted in acceptance by Anglo-
Americans. Instead, it served to alienate them from their own ethnic communities. Thus, more
commonly, immigrants chose “to affirm the Old World identity and to insist that it too was
American.”19 Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans likewise pursued belonging in Canada through their
ethnic group rather than by leaving the ethnic group. They sought to gain access to the material
benefits of Canadian citizenship while still maintaining the benefits of the social network
provided by their ethnic group. In seeking belonging in Canada, the ethnic elite benefitted from
Germans’ position near the top of the racist hierarchy, alongside the British as a fellow white,
Northern European “race”.

Citizenship as I use it here means more than just the legal definition. For most of the
period I study, the legal category of “Canadian citizen” did not actually exist. The legal category
of “Canadian citizen” was created in 1946. Prior to that, Canadians were legally classified as

18 Loewen and Friesen, Immigrants in Prairie Cities, 13-4.
19 Øverland, Immigrant Minds, American Identities, 1-2.
British subjects. Even prior to 1946, however, when Canadians discussed who belonged as a member of their newly-created nation, they discussed it in terms of “Canadian citizenship.” Discussions in Berlin/Kitchener of the place of Germans in Canada likewise made reference to “Canadian citizenship.” Bryan S. Turner defines citizenship as “that set of practices (juridical, political, economic, and cultural) which define a person as a competent member of society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups.” By using the term “practices,” Turner highlights that citizenship is not just a legal or political concept. Turner adds that “In general, therefore, citizenship is essentially about the nature of social membership within modern political collectives.” Similarly, Sonya O. Rose states that although citizenship can be a difficult concept to define, “Perhaps most commonly, citizenship is understood to be a membership category, one defining who does and who does not belong to a particular national community. In this sense, citizenship is a synonym for nationality.”

In his seminal essay “Citizenship and Social Class” British sociologist T.H. Marshall describes the evolution of citizenship over the previous 250 years. He divides citizenship rights into three categories: civil citizenship, political citizenship, and social citizenship. The first consists of “the rights necessary for individual freedom” such as freedom of speech, the right to justice, and the right to own property. The second consists of “the right to participate in the exercise of political power” by means such as voting or holding public office. The final category

---

21 Even the Canadian government used the incongruous term “Canadian citizenship.” During the Second World War for example, the government established the Committee on Co-operation in Canadian Citizenship to enlist the aid of ethnic minorities in the war effort. See Ivana Caccia, Managing the Canadian Mosaic in Wartime: Shaping Citizenship Policy, 1939-1945 (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2010), 90-114.
consists of “the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society.” Marshall locates the emergence of civil citizenship in the eighteenth century, political citizenship in the nineteenth century, and social citizenship in the twentieth century. In this essay, he portrays the evolution of citizenship as being “towards a fuller measure of equality, an enrichment of the stuff of which the status is made and an increase in the number of those on whom the status is bestowed.”

Since its initial publication in 1950, scholars have offered critiques of Marshall’s progressive, evolutionary model of citizenship. Marshall’s description of citizenship, as well as the strict legal definition of the concept, present citizenship as black and white: one either is or is not a citizen. Historically, however, individuals and groups have experienced citizenship and its attendant rights differently according to factors such as their race, class, gender, or religion. Anyone who deviated from the ideal of white, middle-class, mainstream Christian masculinity occupied a secondary class of citizenship. Even when laws are supposedly free of distinctions according to race, class, or gender, they are still present in the “informal mechanisms of our political culture.” Furthermore, contrary to Marshall’s portrayal of citizenship rights as steadily expanding to become more comprehensive and more inclusive, groups such as women and racial minorities continue to be barred from the category of citizen or else relegated to a lower status.

---

24 In feudal society, Marshall states, prior to the emergence of civil citizenship, “there was no uniform collection of rights and duties with which all men—noble and common, free and serf—were endowed by nature of their membership in the society. T.H. Marshall, “Citizenship and Social Class,” in The Citizenship Debates: A Reader ed. Gershon Shafir (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 94, 96.
Rogers M. Smith states that rather than becoming gradually more democratic and inclusive, citizenship in the United States has fluctuated “between more consensual and egalitarian and more ascriptive and inegalitarian arrangements with the long-term trends being products of contingent politics more than inexorable cultural necessities.” Smith adds that the experiences of groups such as African Americans demonstrates “that neither the possession nor the fresh achievement of greater equality can guarantee against later loss of status due to renewed support for various types of ascriptive hierarchy.”

Scholars have also challenged Marshall’s portrayal of citizenship rights as falling rigidly into the progressive categories of civil, political, and social rights. Bryan S. Turner, for example, argues that “it is not clear that civil and political rights have to come before social rights.” Similarly, Nancy Cott contends that the rights Marshall lists under his three categories were not necessarily granted as a whole, but were instead “unevenly and inconsistently allocated.” Others, meanwhile, have proposed additional categories of citizenship rights such as economic and cultural citizenship.

Building on the definition offered by Bryan S. Turner, I define citizenship as the practices which define a person as a member of a national community and therefore entitled to the set of rights associated with this status. These rights include the civil, political, and social rights described by Marshall as well as cultural rights such as the right to practice one’s distinct culture. Citizenship status is not black and white, however, and the rights of citizenship are not granted uniformly to all those who are deemed citizens. To qualify as a citizen, a person must fulfil the

---

28 Smith, Civic Ideals, 9, 471; Canaday, The Straight State, 8; Brodie, “Three Stories of Canadian Citizenship,” 54.
duties of citizenship. These duties include contributing to the nation’s growth and development (both material and cultural), maintaining the nation’s racial and moral character, and defending the nation against forces which threaten to destroy or undermine it. The specific emphasis placed on each of these duties varies according to the context of the period. During times of war, for example, contributing to the nation’s defence takes precedence over all other duties. The ability to fulfil one’s duties as a citizen was circumscribed based on factors such as race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, sexuality, or political beliefs. Groups such as women; racial, ethnic, and religious minorities; homosexuals; or communists have historically been regarded a priori as being incapable of fulfilling the duties of citizenship. As a result, these groups were relegated to a second-class citizen status or even refused acceptance as citizens altogether. In this dissertation, I study the practice of citizenship at a local level and the process by which a group, in this case ethnic Germans, were accepted or rejected as Canadian citizens. To claim a place for Germans as Canadian citizens, Berlin/Kitchener’s ethnic elite sought to define German ethnicity in such a way as to demonstrate that Germans fulfilled the duties of Canadian citizenship.

The ethnic elite defining and redefining German ethnicity in Berlin/Kitchener were not a formally constituted group with a defined membership. Members of the ethnic elite occupied positions of authority within the community. They were the leaders of cultural organizations, business owners, politicians, newspaper editors, and professionals. This loose collection of men was unified by their common understanding of German ethnicity which posited that Germans were ideal Canadian citizens. Aya Fujiwara argues that for ethnic elites in the twentieth century, “acquisition of political power in Canadian society was a major goal, but since influential positions in mainstream society were limited they had to use their ethnic backgrounds to bolster
their positions.” In Berlin/Kitchener, the ethnic elite likewise sought to use their ethnicity to attain positions of power and prestige in Canada. They recognized, however, that achieving and maintaining these positions was reliant on demonstrating that Germans were good Canadian citizens.

Members of the ethnic elite were also unified by their claim to speak on behalf of the entire German community. Through their positions of authority, the ethnic elite mediated the contact in boundary zones between the German community and Anglo Canadians. The ethnic elite controlled the script of public celebrations, wrote editorials about the German community, and lobbied politicians on behalf of the community. By claiming to represent the entire German community, the ethnic elite posited that theirs was the only legitimate definition of German ethnicity. In his study of Macedonian immigrants to Canada, Chris Kostov demonstrates that the leaders of competing factions within an ethnic group saw attaining recognition from the host society as vital to gaining legitimacy for their specific version of ethnic identity. In Berlin/Kitchener, the Anglo-Canadian elites who interacted with the ethnic elite acknowledged the ethnic elite elite’s claim to speak on behalf of the German community and so recognized their version of German ethnicity as the sole legitimate expression.

I purposely refer to the ethnic elite as a collection of men because, for nearly the entire period which I study, those who claimed to speak on behalf of the German community were exclusively men. Their version of German ethnicity portrayed Berlin/Kitchener’s German community as homogeneous and unified. In reality, Berlin/Kitchener’s German community was divided according to factors such as class, gender, religion, and even regional identities from the community.

---

Old World. To claim exclusive legitimacy for their version of German ethnicity, however, the ethnic elite sought to downplay any divisions within the community. Furthermore, to seek inclusion for Germans as Canadian citizens, the ethnic elite sought to suppress any alternate versions of German ethnicity or group identity which would challenge the class, gender, or racial status quo in Canada.

In an article on German-speaking Lutherans in Ontario, Benjamin Bryce claims that religious denomination is central to how ethnic groups define their identity. He argues that in Ontario, there was not a single, unified German community but that “the very existence of German-language Lutheran congregations meant that mutually exclusive communities oriented around denomination rather than ethnic heritage emerged.”

In Berlin/Kitchener, however, the ethnic elite almost never made reference to religious denomination in their definition of German ethnicity. In Berlin/Kitchener’s German community, the largest religious denomination was Lutheran, followed by Catholic. The rest of the city’s Germans belonged to one of a smattering of Protestant denominations including Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Anglicans, and (after 1925) the United Church. For the ethnic elite to make religion a cornerstone of their ethnic identity would thus divide rather than unify the German community. Owing to the sizeable German Catholic population, even pointing to Protestantism as a shared marker of identity was problematic. The ethnic elite recognized this and so eschewed discussing religion and opposed any attempts to stir up religious tensions. An editorial in the first issue of the *Berliner Journal* in 1859 called for religious tolerance and religious freedom and pledged to keep questions of

---


35 The 1931 census was the first to include a table listing Canada’s population according to racial origin and religion. For those of German origins in Kitchener (16 345 total), the table listed 7 179 Lutherans, 3 985 Roman Catholics, 1 332 members of the Evangelical Association, 955 United Church, 892 Mennonites, 605 Baptists, 388 Presbyterians, 267 Anglicans, and smaller numbers of various other Christian denominations. *Seventh Census of Canada, 1931 Volume IV: Cross Classification*, 904-5.
religion out of the newspaper. Notably, the founders of this newspaper John Motz and Friedrich Rittinger, were themselves Catholic and Lutheran respectively.\textsuperscript{36} 

There was another practical reason why religious denomination was not a component of the ethnic elite’s version of German ethnicity. Religion as the basis for a group identity is inward-looking and insular, expressed within the place of worship and reinforcing the bonds between fellow adherents. Ethno-religious denominations, such as the German-speaking Lutherans which Bryce studies, held services in their own language. This reinforced the walls which separated these communities from the rest of Canada.\textsuperscript{37} The ethnic elite’s expression of German ethnicity, however, was directed outwards to the rest of Canada. The ethnic elite eagerly courted interaction with the surrounding Anglo-Canadian population to negotiate a place for Germans as Canadian citizens.

Further complicating the ethnic elite’s efforts to present a homogeneous, unified German ethnic identity were the Mennonites. The Mennonites are a pacifist Anabaptist sect. Beginning in the seventeenth century, Mennonites began immigrating to North America to escape religious persecution in Europe. Although they shared a common language, the Mennonites defined themselves as distinct from Germans. As Berlin, Ontario grew and urbanized, many Mennonites moved into the outlying townships which surrounded Berlin to retain their separateness and continue to practice “the specific Mennonite way of life which was not easily reconciled with urban values.” For those who remained in Berlin, by the end of the nineteenth century, decades of

\textsuperscript{36} The diaries of local industrialist Louis Jacob Breithaupt (1855-1939) also suggest that the barriers between religious groups in Berlin/Kitchener’s German community may not have been as rigid as Bryce has claimed. Breithaupt, whose family belonged to the Evangelical Association, often attended services and lectures in churches from other denominations. In July, 1878, while travelling in Europe, he even attended a service in a Catholic Church after finding that there were no other churches in the small town in which he was staying. Lynn Elizabeth Richardson, “A Facile Pen: John Motz and the Berliner Journal, 1859-1911” (M.A. thesis: University of Waterloo, 1991), 87; University of Waterloo Doris Lewis Rare Book Room (hereafter UW), GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.5.3, L. J. Breithaupt Diaries, 21 April 1867, 3 October 1867, 4 April 1869, 21 July 1878, 2 October 1879, 11 October 1924, 1 January 1926.

\textsuperscript{37} Bryce, “Entangled Communities,” 204-5.
intermarriage between Mennonites and Germans, and descendants of Mennonite settlers converting to mainstream Christian denominations had blurred the lines between the two. While many of these Mennonites who remained in Berlin came to identify as German in their origins, they were distinct. The ethnic elite appropriated the Mennonites and their history when it suited their purposes, claiming the Mennonites as Germans. When the inclusion of the Mennonites threatened the place of Germans as Canadian citizens, however, the ethnic elite portrayed the two groups as distinct.

There certainly would have been many who objected to the ethnic elite’s version of German ethnicity. The ethnic elite themselves comprised only a small handful of the German community’s total population. Members of German cultural organizations or attendees at even the largest German cultural celebrations in Berlin/Kitchener likewise comprised only a fraction of the total population. As well, there is no guarantee that those who joined these cultural organizations or attended German celebrations would have agreed with or internalized the ethnic elite’s message. They could take part on a purely social level, ignoring the message the ethnic elite imparted. They could also attach their own meaning to the German cultural organizations and celebrations. In her study of the German communities of Waterloo County, Ontario and Buffalo, New York, for example, Barbara Lorenzkowski argues that the rank-and-file Germans who attended the 1901 Sängerfest in Buffalo refused to abide by the standards of decorum set by the ethnic elite. They instead took part in singing and merrymaking in the less formal setting of

38 English and McLaughlin, *Kitchener*, 44.
39 In 1939 the Concordia Club, the largest German club in Kitchener, claimed 392 members. According to the 1941 census, the number of people of German origins in Kitchener was 17 086. By 1977, the club’s membership had climbed to 3 000. This figure still represented less than 10 percent of the 31 310 people of German origins in Kitchener according to the 1981 census. “German Clubs Avow Loyalty,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 21 April 1939; English and McLaughlin, *Kitchener*, 198, 233.
the beer gardens, expressing an ethnic identity that reflected their own experiences.⁴⁰ Peoples’ identities are complex and multifaceted. An individual categorized as “German” according to the census, may have identified more as a worker, a woman, a Catholic, or a Hessian. They may have articulated their own version of German ethnicity which was shaped by a combination of factors such as these. They may even have come from a family that had resided in Canada for several generations and so had ceased to identify as German entirely.

To claim sole legitimacy for their version of German ethnicity, the ethnic elite downplayed these other factors which shaped peoples’ identities. As a result, the voices of anyone who objected to the ethnic elite’s version of German ethnicity or expressed their own version of German ethnicity are muted in the historical record. The ethnic elite refused to permit or even acknowledge the existence of other groups or voices in its expression of German ethnicity. German-Canadian workers, for example, were denied a voice in the creation of the elite version of German ethnicity which posited that German workers were naturally docile and compliant. From the fragmentary evidence available, however, Berlin/Kitchener’s German workers do not appear to have articulated their own coherent version of German ethnicity to counter the ethnic elite’s version. The workers may have selectively accepted or outright rejected the ethnic elite’s version of German ethnicity. Yet when they gathered, the city’s workers expressed an identity that was based on class solidarity rather than shared ethnicity.

The ethnic elite’s definition of German ethnicity had a material impact on all German Canadians, however, regardless of whether or not they accepted it. Whether Canadians saw Germans as loyal and valuable citizens or as dangerous subversives, for example, influenced whether Canadians would patronize German-owned businesses, hire German employees, or

permit Germans to practice their culture in public. It affected whether the government would permit further immigration from Germany, and even whether Germans would be protected from acts of violence or discrimination. Even if a person did not self-identify as “German”, if that person had a German name or a German accent, Anglo Canadians could view them as belonging to this group and thus treat them accordingly.\(^{41}\)

The ethnic elite’s definition of German ethnicity even had an impact on Germans outside of Berlin/Kitchener, as the negotiation over the place of Germans as Canadian citizens extended beyond the borders of the city. From the beginning, the ethnic elite sought to engage with Anglo-Canadian politicians and luminaries from outside Berlin, not just local notables. Even in the middle of the nineteenth century, German celebrations in Berlin were covered by newspapers outside of the town. These newspapers carried the ethnic elite’s message to their far-flung readers and provided their own commentary on the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. The ethnic elite were taking part in a national debate over the definition of Canadian citizenship and who it included. Benjamin Bryce argues, rightly, that Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans should not be seen as representative of all of Canada’s or Ontario’s Germans.\(^{42}\) For many Anglo Canadians, however, it was. Berlin/Kitchener’s German community was one of the largest and most well-known German communities in Canada, with the city self-styled as “Canada’s German Capital”. Many German cultural organizations which grew to become national in scope were founded in Berlin/Kitchener. Furthermore, local German celebrations such as the Sängerfeste of the nineteenth century or especially Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest in the twentieth century became part of the broader Canadian consciousness to a degree that German celebrations elsewhere did not.

\(^{41}\) During the First World War, even having a vaguely foreign name could brand a person as potentially German and therefore of suspect loyalty.

\(^{42}\) Bryce, “Entangled Communities,” 184, 206.
Berlin/Kitchener’s ethnic elite therefore carried an outsized influence in shaping how Canadians understood German ethnicity.

The fact that the debate over the place of Germans as Canadian citizens took place at a national, rather than purely local level, means that even when they comprised more than 70 percent of Berlin/Kitchener’s population, Germans could not act indiscriminately with no regard for how they were seen in the eyes of Anglo Canadians; local numerical superiority did not connote cultural hegemony. By 1871 when my analysis begins, Berlin was already politically, economically, and culturally intertwined with the rest of Canada. The members of the ethnic elite, many of whom were local industrialists, were aware that how Anglo Canadians viewed Germans had a direct impact on their own fortunes, the German community’s fortunes, and indeed the entire city’s fortunes.

The aim of this dissertation is to examine how German ethnic identity in Berlin/Kitchener, Ontario was created and sustained and how and why it evolved over the course of a century. I posit that the quest for belonging in Canada is the core feature of how ethnic groups have negotiated their identity, rather than the need to preserve their distinctiveness and resist assimilation. The leaders of ethnic groups recognized that complete isolation and separation from the rest of Canada was both undesirable and impossible. Instead of assimilating into Anglo-Canadian society, however, they sought inclusion on their own terms by making their ethnicity compatible with Canadian identity. In this dissertation, I will therefore consider the questions: how did Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans articulate an ethnic identity that rejected conformity with the rest of Canada and yet still sought acceptance as Canadians? Additionally, were the decades before the advent of the official policy of multiculturalism uniformly a period which placed a
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43 According to the 1911 census, 10,633 of Berlin’s residents, or 70% of the city’s population of 15,196, was of German origins. *Fifth Census of Canada, 1911 Volume II*, 374.
premium on Anglo-conformity, or was the definition of a “proper” Canadian citizen sufficiently flexible to allow Germans a place? I will demonstrate that in defining themselves, ethnic groups also helped to define what it meant to be Canadian. Historians Ross Fair and Patricia Wood argue that ethnic groups have traditionally been marginalized in national narratives of Canada’s history which focus on English and French Canadians. Studies of ethnic groups which emphasize their difference from the rest of Canada perpetuate this marginalization. Studying how they claimed belonging alongside English and French Canadians, however, places ethnic groups at the centre of Canadian history. Studying the creation and evolution of German ethnicity, I will also pay attention to divisions and fault lines within the ethnic community. I will ask: How were factors such as class, gender, and religion implicated in the creation of ethnic identities? Who was included in the ethnic elite’s definition of German ethnicity and who did this definition exclude?

To answer these questions, I engage with the historiography of immigration and ethnicity in Canada. Early works studying Canada’s different ethnic groups, published in the 1970s and early 1980s, reclaim the histories of groups that had previously been ignored but were now in vogue, in part owing to the acceptance of multiculturalism as the basis for Canada’s identity. Some, such as the volumes that comprise the Generations Series or Gottlieb Leibbrandt’s history of the Germans of Waterloo County, were even published using funding from the Federal Government to promote multiculturalism. These works are celebratory and focus on documenting “firsts” for the ethnic group and making the ethnic community appear respectable in the eyes of the rest of Canada. They do not interrogate the formation of ethnic group identity. They instead treat ethnicity as something brought over wholesale from the Old World and downplay any divisions within the ethnic group, treating it as a monolithic entity. In their relationship with the

receiving society, the ethnic group is stuck in a struggle between assimilating into Anglo-Canadian society or resisting and retaining their ethnic identity. In *Struggle and Hope*, one of the volumes from the Generations Series, the authors portray Canada’s Hungarian community as forced to choose between preserving their ethnic culture and identity or assimilation and modernization. They argue that the ultimate outcome, assimilation, was “gradual but irreversible” and ultimately preordained.⁴⁵

By the 1990s, historians had begun to more critically study ethnic groups and ethnic identity. They began to understand ethnicity as something formed as part of the process of immigrating and adjustment to life in the New World. Ethnic communities were not transplanted “fragment[s] of the Old World.” They were influenced by the New World context while drawing inspiration from the Old.⁴⁶ John Zucchi, for example, contends that the first wave of Italian immigrants who came to Toronto identified with their hometowns and regions. Through their experiences after their arrival which made them feel separate from the rest of Canada they came to identify as members of a larger ‘Italian’ community.⁴⁷ In their 1992 essay “The Invention of Ethnicity” American historians Kathleen Neils Conzen, David A. Gerber, Ewa Morawska, George E. Pozzetta, and Rudolph J. Vecoli contend that ethnicity was not just created in the process of immigration and settlement. Ethnic groups, they contend, “are constantly reinventing
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themselves, and ethnicity is continuously being reinvented in response to changing realities both within the group and the host society.48 Although these historians agree on the fundamental premise that ethnicity was “invented” in the process of immigration and settlement, they disagree on how it was created and by whom. Some portray group identity and cohesion as emerging spontaneously at a grassroots level.49 Others, however, emphasize the role of ethnic elites in the formation of ethnic identity. Carmela Patrias, for example, argues that ethnic identity is not spontaneously formed at a grassroots level and devoid of ideological content. Ethnicity is “an ideological construct permeated with political content”. Ignoring the role of the elite, she maintains, negates the influence of ideas in creating ethnic communities.50

Whereas previous studies portrayed ethnic groups as homogeneous, these historians recognized and studied divisions within ethnic groups. Orest Martynowych, Jaroslav Petryshyn, and Carmela Patrias examine conflicts among the ethnic elites who were divided by factors such as religion or politics and expressed competing versions of their ethnic identity.51 Historians such as Ruth Frager, Varpu Lindstrom, and Franca Iacovetta, meanwhile, began to examine how gender and class were implicated in the formation of ethnic identity.52 In their understanding of

49 See, for example Franca Iacovetta, Such Hardworking People: Italian Immigrants in Postwar Toronto (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1992); Tulchinsky, Taking Root; Zucchi, Italians in Toronto.
50 Orest Martynowych argues that Ukrainian immigrants were uneducated and illiterate and so it was up to the Ukrainian-Canadian intelligentsia to create and sustain a Ukrainian ethnic identity. Carmela Patrias, Patriots and Proletarians: Politicizing Hungarian Immigrants in Interwar Canada (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1994), 7-16; Orest T. Martynowych, Ukrainians in Canada: The Formative Period, 1891-1924 (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1991), xx.
51 Patrias, Patriots and Proletarians, 6-7, 14-5; Petryshyn, Peasants in the Promised Land, x, 210-1; Martynowych, Ukrainians in Canada, xxiii-xxiv.
52 There were still some such as Jaroslav Petryshyn regarded identification with one’s class, religion, or gender to be inimical to the formation of ethnic identity. Orest Martynowych even deliberately disregards women, arguing that they were restricted from the levers of power and so had no influence on community life. Contrarily, the essays from Looking into My Sister’s Eyes contend that women were vital to the creation and maintenance of ethnic communities despite being absent from positions of power. Varpu Lindstrom, Defiant Sisters: A Social History of Finnish Immigrant Women in Canada (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1988), 3-5; Ruth A. Frager, Sweatshop Strife: Class, Ethnicity, and Gender in the Jewish Labour Movement of Toronto, 1900-1939 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 6, 8-9; Iacovetta, Such Hardworking People, xxiv-xxvii; Petryshyn, Peasants in
how ethnic identity was created and their recognition of divisions within ethnic groups, these historians certainly present a more nuanced understanding of ethnicity than previous scholars. In their portrayal of the relationship between the ethnic group and the host society, however, these works still present the process of acculturation as more or less one sided, with only the ethnic group changing as a result of the process of immigration and settlement.

More recently, historians have characterized the relationship between ethnic groups and Anglo-Canadian society as one of mutual accommodation and exchange, albeit between unequal parties. While the Canadian context shaped ethnic group identity, ethnic groups had an impact on Canada as well. Franca Iacovetta, for example, examines the relationship between post-Second World War immigrants and “gatekeepers” such as government officials, journalists, teachers, service clubs, and social workers who sought to mould immigrants into good citizens. The newcomers, she argues, had an active role in shaping Canada’s Cold War culture “even as their own customs were modified.”

Similarly, Royden Loewen and Gerald Friesen assert that life in Prairie cities throughout the twentieth century was “distinguished by significant changes in both host and migrant societies.” In their relationship with Anglo-Canadian society, historians such as Iacovetta, Loewen and Friesen, as well as Aya Fujiwara, Frances Swyripa, and Patricia Wood contend that ethnic groups articulated their own multicultural version of Canadian identity long before it became enshrined as an official policy in 1971. These historians locate the origins of a more organic multicultural identity for Canada emerging from the experiences of ethnic groups as opposed to a manufactured multiculturalism handed down from above by the state. Fujiwara, for
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54 Loewen and Friesen, Immigrants in Prairie Cities, 3-4.
example, argues that ethnic elites maintained a multicultural understanding of Canadian identity before the Second World War. Similarly, Loewen and Friesen state that when Anglo Canadians finally embraced multiculturalism, “this recognition only acknowledged what migrants and their children had been expecting since their earliest days in Canada.\(^5^5\)

Another recent trend in the historiography of immigration and ethnicity is the adoption of a transnational framework. Although “Canadian nation building structured immigrants’ lives”, Alexander Freund argues, their lives were not bounded by Canada’s borders. Barbara Lorenzkowski states that “ties of family, ethnicity, and religion spanned the border, and border crossings represented the rule, not the exception.” These historians have thus studied ethnic groups as part of imagined communities which straddled national borders, particularly those of Canada and the United States.\(^5^6\) In sharp contrast to the early celebratory histories of ethnic groups, historians have also begun to examine less proud aspects of the history of ethnic groups such as support for the Nazis.\(^5^7\) There have been some good works which employ a gendered analysis of ethnicity. The edited collection *Sisters or Strangers?* (2004), published as a response to the earlier collection *Looking into My Sister’s Eyes* (1986), challenges the characterization of immigrant and ethnic women as “sisters” and examines difference as well as commonality among these women.\(^5^8\) In *Gatekeepers*, Franca Iacovetta demonstrates that gender played a crucial role
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in shaping the interaction between Canada’s gatekeepers and male and female immigrants.\textsuperscript{59} Studies which incorporate women and gender, however, continue to occupy a marginal place in the historiography of immigration and ethnicity.\textsuperscript{60} In particular, there has been very little discussion of masculinity as it relates to ethnicity; most works continue to focus exclusively on men as ungendered beings or simply do not ask questions about gender and identity.

This dissertation contributes to this body of literature by examining ethnicity through the lens of citizenship. The emphasis which recent historians have placed on locating the precursors of multiculturalism treats the final result as inevitable. Echoing T.H. Marshall, they treat Canada as becoming progressively more inclusive. The experience of Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans, however, demonstrates that citizenship, as Nancy Cott states, “can be delivered in varying degrees of permanence or strength.”\textsuperscript{61} In seeking acceptance as Canadian citizens, the city’s Germans benefitted from several factors such as their status as a white, Northern European race, and the fact that by the middle of the nineteenth century, Berlin had already become a small but prospering industrial centre. Even still, the place of Germans as Canadian citizens was always conditional and never fully settled. Throughout the period under study, Anglo-Canadian critics contested the ethnic elite’s definition of German ethnicity and challenged the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. At times, these critics represented only a fringe minority. There were other times, such as the First World War, when the topic of German-Canadian citizenship was vigorously debated and Germans’ rights as citizens were challenged. As a result, the ethnic elite never fully shed their defensive tone and their need to continually assert and re-assert the place of Germans as Canadian citizens.

\textsuperscript{59} Iacovetta, Gatekeepers, 10-1, 19.
\textsuperscript{60} Christiane Harzig argues that this is especially true in German-Canadian studies. Christiane Harzig, “Gender in German-Canadian Studies: Challenges from across the Borders,” in Beyond the Nation?: Immigrants’ Local Lives in Transnational Cultures ed. Alexander Freund (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 44.
\textsuperscript{61} Cott, “Marriage and Women’s Citizenship in the United States,” 1442.
Citizenship, which Ursula Vogel states is characterized by a “paradoxical nexus of exclusion and inclusion”, can also help to reveal how factors such as gender, class, race, political ideology, and religion are implicated in the creation of ethnic identity. Women have historically been excluded from the category of citizen, despite the supposed universality of the concept. Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann, and Anna Clark state that in Western culture, masculinity as a requirement for citizenship has been “both omnipresent and invisible.” Many men, however, have also historically found themselves excluded from the category of citizen or relegated to a second-class status based upon factors such as their race and class. In Berlin/Kitchener, the definition of German ethnicity included the race, class, and gender distinctions inherent in the definition of Canadian citizenship. The ideal German-Canadian citizen described by the ethnic elite was inherently male, although this was generally expressed implicitly rather than explicitly. The ethnic elite seldom discussed German women. When they did, it was to demonstrate that they too upheld proper gender roles. The archetypal German Canadian adhered to the hegemonic Anglo-Canadian middle class definition of masculinity. The definition of German ethnicity was therefore premised upon a hierarchical class structure. The ethnic elite asserted that the city’s German workers were naturally hard working and compliant, legitimating class inequality as part of their ethnic identity. The ethnic elite also vehemently opposed communism or any other radical political or religious doctrine which threatened to challenge the status quo of Canadian citizenship. Furthermore, prior to the 1950s, the ethnic elite only sought to make room for Germans alongside those of British origins as Canadian citizens. All other racial or ethnic groups

were excluded from the ethnic elite’s definition of Canadian citizenship.\textsuperscript{64} It is therefore incorrect to look to Berlin/Kitchener’s German community to locate the early origins of multiculturalism. When the ethnic elite eventually did embrace multiculturalism, this was based on a rational, self-interested determination that it offered the best means to secure their own acceptance as Canadian citizens. It was not a genuine commitment to ethnic pluralism. Furthermore, distinctions based on gender, class, and political ideology remained intact.

By studying ethnicity through the lens of citizenship, I move beyond discourses on ethnicity and Canadian identity and highlight the fact that the relationship between an ethnic group and the host society had material consequences. The ethnic elite’s goal of being accepted as Canadian citizens brought more than a general sense of belonging. When Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans were permitted to hold public celebrations or operate their ethnic clubs or, conversely, when they were denied the right to vote or encountered violence for merely speaking German in public, they experienced the material consequences of their acceptance or rejection as Canadian citizens. Notably, Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans could experience both acceptance and exclusion from the category of citizen in practice even while their legal status as citizens remained unchanged. Highlighting the material consequences of citizenship also demonstrates that, despite excellent recent scholarship adopting a transnational perspective, the nation remains a valid and important framework for studying ethnicity. This is not to deny that Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans maintained ties of family or friendship that stretched across national borders or that they may have had more in common with Germans who lived just across the border in the United States than they did with Germans who settled in Canada’s Prairie Provinces. When the ethnic elite

\textsuperscript{64} Orm Øverland similarly depicts the ethnic identity expressed through immigrants’ homemaking myths as being exclusionary. He states that through their homemaking myths, each immigrant group claimed an exclusive right to belonging in America alongside Anglo-Americans rather than articulating a pluralistic American identity. Øverland also states that homemaking myths were premised upon the middle class ideals of uplift and the American dream. Many working-class immigrants therefore rejected the homemaking myths as they did not reflect their experience in America. Øverland, \textit{Immigrant Minds, American Identities}, 8-9; 15; 17.
asserted their entitlement to civil, political, or social rights, however, they did so as Canadian citizens, not as part of a German diaspora or as members of a German community in the Great Lakes region.

This dissertation is organized chronologically to examine how the definition of German ethnicity in Berlin/Kitchener and its relationship to Canadian citizenship evolved over the course of more than a century. Eric Hobsbawm argues that the invention of traditions has occurred most frequently during periods of great change or upheaval “when a rapid transformation of society weakens or destroys the social patterns for which ‘old’ traditions had been designed”. The definition of German ethnicity was in a constant process of contestation, negotiation, and reformulation. Each chapter break, however, marks a period of more significant change when the definition of German ethnicity was rendered incompatible with the hegemonic understanding of Canadian citizenship and so needed to be overhauled to retain a place for Germans as loyal Canadian citizens. The forces that precipitated these changes could be great events such as the two World Wars, or more subtle such as changes in Canadians’ attitudes towards race or Canada’s relationship to Britain.

Chapter One examines how Berlin’s ethnic elite defined ethnicity from 1871 to 1914. It begins, however, by briefly discussing the decades prior to 1871. When it was first settled around the start of the nineteenth century, Berlin was the farthest inland settlement in Upper Canada. It was isolated from the rest of the province and as a result, this German community was not forced to consider its relationship to the predominantly British province in which it was situated. In the middle of the nineteenth century, forces such as state formation, industrialization, and nation building brought the hitherto isolated German population of Berlin into increasing communion with the rest of Canada, forcing the ethnic elite to consider their relationship to the
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65 Hobsbawm, “Introduction,” 4-5.
rest of Canada. Beginning with the local celebration of German unification on May 2, 1871 and continuing until the First World War, the ethnic elite articulated an identity for Berlin’s German community that had two major themes which sought to tap into the mainstreams of Canadian nationalism and thereby claim a place for Germans as Canadian citizens. First, they tried to reconcile their ethnicity with Canada’s dominant Anglo-conformist identity by arguing that “German” and “British” were two parts of the same whole. They did so by arguing that the Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon people were racial cousins and celebrating the ties of marriage that bound the German and British royal families. Second, Canada was seen at the time as a young nation, still in the process of being created with potentially limitless possibilities for its future. The ethnic elite argued that the thrifty, industrious Germans were integral to the process of building a modern nation in Canada and, as such, were ideal citizens. They pointed to the might of the German Empire and Berlin, Ontario’s prospering industries as proof of the value of German citizens.

During the First World War, the city’s Germans had their some of their most basic rights of citizenship challenged. In a series of contentious elections, over 100 men had their status as citizens called into question and were removed from the voters’ lists. As well, assaults and acts of vandalism directed against Germans were blamed on the victims for being “pro-German” and therefore went unpunished. Historians have generally cited these events as well as the change of the city’s name from Berlin to Kitchener to argue that the war was a cataclysm which destroyed the German community and forced Germans to assimilate. In Chapter Two, however, I argue that the ethnic elite continued to defend the place of Germans as loyal Canadian citizens. The ethnic elite touted all that German Canadians were doing to support the war effort as this was now the ultimate measure of citizenship. While British Canadians were coming to the aid of the land of their ancestors, German Canadians were not motivated by blood, but by higher ideals, namely a
reverence for the freedom offered by British institutions in Canada. This demonstrated that Germans were ideal citizens.

Chapter Three demonstrates that the interwar years were marked by a great deal of continuity with the prewar period rather than change. Despite the upheaval of the First World War, cultural life in Kitchener continued to have a German inflection. Initially, the ethnic elite articulated a “safe” version of German ethnicity which focused on the role of the Mennonites in local history. By the middle of the 1920s, however, they once again proclaimed a distinctively German ethnic identity. Although the specific content of this ethnic identity was necessarily different from the prewar years, its central purpose, reconciling the Germans’ distinctiveness with their claim to be loyal Canadian citizens, remained unchanged. The ethnic elite continued to assert that Kitchener’s Germans were agents of progress and nation building in Canada. To this, they added the claim that the city’s Germans had passed the ultimate test of their loyalty as citizens through their ready and willing service in the First World War.

Chapter Four examines how the ethnic elite responded to the rise of Adolf Hitler, the Second World War, and its aftermath. Although historians have not acknowledged it, prior to the Second World War, Kitchener’s ethnic elite were openly supportive of Hitler and the Nazis. Canadians did not object to the ethnic elite’s support for the Nazis because at the time many Canadians themselves also sympathized with the Nazis’ anticommunism and antisemitism. During the war, Kitchener’s Germans’ longstanding status as upstanding citizens meant that Canadians readily accepted the ethnic elites’ proclamation of loyalty and ignored their previous support for the Nazis. Kitchener’s Germans did not encounter the violence and discrimination which they had experienced during the First World War, unlike other groups such as Japanese, communists, and Jehovah’s Witnesses whose race, politics, and religion strayed too far from the Anglo-Canadian mainstream.
The final chapter focuses on the postwar decades when the understanding of Canadian identity based on Anglo-conformity declined and collapsed and was replaced by a definition of Canadian identity which celebrated diversity. Beginning in the early 1950s, Kitchener’s Germans contributed to the formation of Canada’s multicultural identity by articulating a new version of German ethnicity which celebrated the cultural contributions of Germans—alongside other ethnic groups—to the Canadian mosaic. The celebration of Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest, which began in 1969, was the full realization of the multicultural version of German ethnicity rather than a product of multiculturalism making German ethnicity once again acceptable in the public sphere.

In its lived experience, ethnicity is seen as timeless and, as Patricia Wood states, “predetermined” and “immutable”. The leaders of ethnic communities appear parochial and bound by unyielding tradition. Studying Berlin/Kitchener’s German community over the span of a century, however, reveals ethnicity to be dynamic and ever-changing. Throughout the journey from Wilhelm to Hans, the ethnic elite exhibited a great deal of sophistication and creativity as they responded to their changing circumstances in Canada, and interacted with Anglo Canadians to negotiate a definition of German ethnicity which included Germans as loyal Canadian citizens.
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Chapter 1: German Blood in Canadian Veins, 1871-1914

In 1905, the town clerk in Berlin, Ontario discovered that Prince Louis of Battenberg, (who was in Toronto at the time visiting the National Exhibition) came from the Hessen region of Germany, the place of origin for many of Berlin’s residents. Civic authorities jumped at the opportunity to invite him to visit.¹ He personified an identity that many of Berlin’s Germans claimed, although the Prince’s elevated class set him apart. A member of German nobility, he had married Queen Victoria’s granddaughter, become a naturalized British subject, and then an admiral in the Royal Navy.

Amazingly, the Prince accepted the invitation to visit this town of barely 10,000, requesting only, “a good German meal with beer instead of champagne.”² During his visit, the Prince was taken on a tour which included an obligatory visit to the town’s monument to Kaiser Wilhelm I. The Prince “reverently doffed his hat,” while the band in the nearby park pavilion played “Rule Britannia.” Speaking in German, he remarked that when he heard there was a town populated by Germans, he knew he had to visit his “countrymen from the old fatherland,” particularly since so many were from Hessen. He was happy to see that they, much like himself, were flourishing under the British flag. He closed by promising to tell his brother, the Grand Duke of Hessen, about Berlin, Ontario and about the hearty reception he received there.³ The theme of Anglo-German harmony and prosperity displayed in the Prince’s visit and in his family history demonstrated an (interwoven or complex) ethnic identity that many of Berlin’s Germans claimed as part of their composite identity as immigrants or descendants of immigrants.

¹ “Prince Louis of Battenberg,” Berlin Daily Telegraph, 23 August 1905.
Beginning with the local celebration of German unification on May 2, 1871 and continuing until the First World War, the ethnic elite articulated an identity for Berlin’s German community that had two major themes. Each tapped into the mainstreams of Canadian nationalism, and claimed a place for Germans as Canadian citizens. First, the ethnic elite tried to reconcile its’ ethnicity with Canada’s dominant Anglo-conformist identity by arguing that “German” and “British” were two parts of the same whole. Second, because Canada was seen at the time as a young nation, still in the process of creation, the ethnic elite argued that Germans were agents of peace, progress, and modernity and therefore integral to the process of building a modern nation in Canada. As such, they were ideal citizens. Both themes relied on a preferential reading of history (local and European) as well as on pseudo-scientific theories of race to assert the place of Germans, alongside the British, as charter members of the nascent Canadian nation. During this period, Anglo Canadians generally accepted the German community’s claims to Canadian citizenship. This acceptance, however, was active rather than passive. Anglo Canadians actively supported this portrayal of German ethnic identity and parroted back the rhetoric of the ethnic elite. Indeed, depictions of German ethnicity in German- and English- language sources were generally indistinguishable. In their response, then, the Anglo-Canadian population demonstrated that the definition of a “proper” Canadian at this time could be sufficiently flexible to allow these Germans a place.

Moving in from the Margins: Berlin Prior to 1871

For the first half of the nineteenth century, Berlin was isolated culturally and linguistically from the rest of Anglo-Celtic Upper Canada, but also physically, economically, and politically. With only limited contact with the rest of the province, the Germans were not forced to consider their own identity as it related to their Anglo-Celtic neighbours. By the middle of the nineteenth century, forces such as state formation, industrialization, and nation building had brought the
hitherto isolated German population of Berlin into increasing communion with the rest of Canada, forcing the ethnic elite to consider its relationship to the rest of Canada as it defined their group identity. German Canadians were not a pre-constituted group. German ethnic identity was formulated through their encounters with Canada’s predominantly Anglo-Celtic population.

When it was first settled, Berlin was the farthest inland settlement in Upper Canada and was physically removed from the rest of the province. Nearby Guelph was not founded until 1826, more than two decades after the first Mennonites had arrived in Berlin. The Grand River, on whose banks Berlin is situated, was not navigable above Brantford rendering Berlin inaccessible by water. Additionally, crossing the river could only be accomplished in a handful of locations and the first bridge was not built until 1820. There were also few roads to connect Berlin to the major centres of the province, the nearest of which, Dundas, was thirty miles away. Those roads that did exist were treacherous and, at times, impassable.

The manner by which Waterloo Township and Berlin were surveyed attests to its isolation from the rest of Upper Canada. In 1805, a group of Mennonites from Pennsylvania formed a company and purchased from merchant and land speculator Richard Beasley 60,000 acres of unsurveyed land which became Waterloo Township. Surveyors, who John Weaver describes as “forward agents of capitalism and the state,” had not yet penetrated this far inland. Unlike the rest of the province, this tract also had no loyalist land grants and no clergy or crown reserves. When the land was surveyed by the Mennonites, it did not follow the single front system used for much of the rest of the province, but instead was divided into equal sized lots which were
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distributed to the company shareholders by lottery. The survey also made no allowances for roads. The Great Road (later King Street), which became the axis along which Berlin developed, was built to connect the first lots that were settled and did not follow the surveyed boundaries or geographic features of the area. The lack of allowances for roads as well as the unusually large size of the lots meant that once settlement began, the actual boundaries of lots strayed from those initially outlined. The survey therefore had a lasting impact on the pattern of settlement, distinguishing Berlin from the rest of the province. In 1881, one observer described the layout of Berlin as, “a system of the most regular irregularity,” which required any visitors to use a map when touring the town.

There was initially little other evidence of the state’s authority in Berlin. Even after the Township of Waterloo was formed in 1816, there was no township office so landowners had to organize their own town meetings to take care of public business. The German settlers, however, did not wish to remain separate from the rest of the province. Rather, they took an active interest in public affairs and encouraged the expansion of the state. Berlin was given a post office and justice of the peace in 1838 after lobbying by Heinrich Wilhelm Peterson, founder and editor of Berlin’s first newspaper, the German-language Canada Museum und Allgemeine Zeitung. Peterson also pushed for Berlin to be named the “district town” in the political reorganization of the province. In 1852, Berlin outmanoeuvred the larger town of Galt to be
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named the seat of the newly created Waterloo County.\textsuperscript{14} German language newspapers, such as the \textit{Canada Museum}, also sought to integrate Berlin and Waterloo Township into Upper Canada by acquainting residents with the social and political conditions in their adopted homeland. While still providing news and literature from their homeland, newspapers encouraged readers to become naturalized British subjects and informed them of their rights in British North America.\textsuperscript{15}

The position of county seat brought to Berlin a court house and a branch of the Bank of Upper Canada, along with many English-speaking professionals and, for the first time, English-language newspapers.\textsuperscript{16} The influx of some non-German speaking immigrants and expansion of the authority of the state helped to bring Berlin into closer communion with the rest of Upper Canada. Nevertheless, by the start of the First World War, roughly seventy percent of Berlin’s population still identified as being of German origins.\textsuperscript{17}

Owing to the town’s new prestige, in 1856 the Grand Trunk Railway decided to extend its line from Toronto to Berlin.\textsuperscript{18} The arrival of rail ended Berlin’s isolation from the rest of the province. Earlier, Berlin’s newspapers keenly discussed the benefits that would accrue to the town from the opening of trade and communications with the rest of the province.\textsuperscript{19} Once the line was opened, Berlin’s residents visited and explored the rest of the province. Newspapers such as the Toronto \textit{Globe} began reporting on the satisfactory progress they witnessed in Berlin.\textsuperscript{20} Local newspapers reprinted the glowing praise Berlin received from outsiders. The \textit{Berlin Chronicle} stated “whatever other advantages the railway may have conferred upon us, it has at least drawn

\textsuperscript{14} English and McLaughlin, \textit{Kitchener}, 26-28.
\textsuperscript{15} Kalbfleisch, \textit{German Language Press}, 25-26, 88-89.
\textsuperscript{16} English and McLaughlin, \textit{Kitchener}, 32, 48.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Fifth Census of Canada, 1911 Volume II: Religions, Origins, Birthplace, Citizenship, Literacy and Infirmities, By Provinces, Districts and Sub-Districts} (Ottawa: C. H. Parmelee, Printer to the King’s Most Excellent Majesty, 1913), 374.
\textsuperscript{18} English and McLaughlin, \textit{Kitchener}, 32.
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Berlin Telegraph}, 22 April 1853.
\textsuperscript{20} “Railway Excursion,” \textit{Globe} (Toronto), 25 July 1856.
public attention to the town, and induced strangers to come among us.”21 The enthusiastic response of the people who participated in the excursions, and the tone of the newspaper articles which recorded them, convey how revolutionary was the advent of rail for Berlin. Suzanne Zeller argues that advances in science and technology such as railways and telegraphs made the idea of creating a nationality in such a large territory as British North America seem feasible.22 Railways overcame the geographic obstacles which had hitherto separated Berlin from the rest of Upper Canada. Outsiders who embarked on railway excursions to Waterloo found that, although the people they met had a different language and culture, they were no longer strangers.

By mid-century, Berlin was becoming a small but significant industrial centre, facilitated by the new rail line as well as the arrival of steam power in 1846.23 As Berlin became economically integrated with the rest of the province, its predominantly German businessmen forged connections with their largely Anglo-Celtic counterparts in the surrounding towns and cities. In his diary, a young Louis Jacob Breithaupt, the son of a German-born tannery owner, frequently made note of his father’s business trips which took him all over Upper Canada/Ontario. Later, after the business had grown and he had taken over, Louis Jacob’s business trips would take him across Canada, the United States, and even to Europe, demonstrating the increasingly wider circles of Berlin’s German businessmen.24

Berlin’s Germans enthusiastically celebrated Canada’s confederation in 1867. Members of the ethnic elite were part of the organizing committee for the festivities on July 1 which they

24 See, for example: University of Waterloo Doris Lewis Rare Book Room (hereafter UW), GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.5.3, L. J. Breithaupt Diaries, 23 May 1867, 23 August 1867, 2 May 1910.
referred to as “our national celebration.”25 The Berliner Journal optimistically described the celebration as “the inauguration of the new empire.”26 Through their eager participation in this event which toasted the Queen and the Prince of Wales, the Germans claimed membership in this new nation. They had yet, however, to reconcile their German identity with Canada’s British identity.

Improvements in communications and transportation, the growth of the state, and the embrace of industrial capitalism made it possible for Berlin’s Germans to feel part of Canada. Discussing the role of the Trans-Canada Telephone System in the creation of Canadian nationalism, however, Robert MacDougall cautions that communications technology cannot create a shared sense of identity because “how Canadians can talk to one another is only the first question; the question of greater import is what they might say.”27 Similarly, what remained for Berlin’s Germans was to figure out how they belonged in Canada.

Creating a German-Canadian Community: The Peace Festival of 1871

German unification provided a locus around which Berlin’s ethnic elite could formulate its identity and assert its members’ status as Canadian citizens. In his diary, Louis Jacob Breithaupt enthusiastically recorded the events of the Peace Festival of 1871 in Berlin, Ontario, which celebrated German unification and the end of the Franco-Prussian War. The day, declared a public holiday, began at 6:00am with the firing of cannons, followed by services in the German churches. Citizens then gathered at the railway station to greet visitors from out of town and from there moved in a procession to the courthouse where an oak tree was planted and speeches were delivered. In the afternoon, they gathered at the marketplace for more speeches and amusements

while the highlight of the evening was a torchlight procession from the drill shed to the courthouse for fireworks, singing, speeches, and the unveiling of a portrait of Germania.\footnote{28 UW, GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.5.3, L. J. Breithaupt Diaries, 2 May 1871.}

In some quarters, nearly every home and business was decorated with flags and banners for the occasion. Although this was ostensibly a festival to celebrate German unification, patriotic German, British, and Canadian symbols mingled freely during the celebration. The Union Jack and the Dominion Standard adorned the town, along with the flag of the North German Confederacy, which became the flag of the German Empire. This comingling of German, British, and Canadian patriotic symbols suggested their compatibility. One resident, Mr. Knell, made the message even more explicit, hanging the German, British, and Swiss flags above his home with an accompanying banner which read, “We want to be one united people of brothers.” The participants made it clear that they were celebrating, not as Germans, but as Canadians of German ancestry.\footnote{29 Another banner read, “dear Fatherland, fear not, we Canadians do not forget you.” The first half of this banner is an allusion to the refrain of “Die Wacht am Rhein.” “Das Friedensfest,” Berliner Journal, 11 May 1871.}

Furthermore, while the unveiling of Germania was accompanied by the singing of “Die Wacht am Rhein” and “Deutschland Uber Alles,” the proceedings closed faithfully and dutifully with “God Save the Queen.”\footnote{30 “The German Peace Festival,” Globe (Toronto), 3 May 1871, 4.}

Historians studying public spectacles have highlighted the importance of analyzing the spaces in which they take place. Public spaces were a contested terrain with the right to access them for the purpose of self-representation being unevenly distributed among social groups. Susan G. Davis states that in nineteenth-century Philadelphia, the right to public celebration was restricted to those who met the criteria for citizenship, namely white men. Others who sought access to public spaces for these purposes put themselves in physical or symbolic danger.\footnote{31 Mary P. Ryan argues that marginalized groups such as women could take part in public spectacles such as parades. Gaining access, however, required them to submit to “screenings and compromises” so that “by the time they appeared on the public stage, they projected highly selective images of themselves.” Susan G. Davis, Parades and}
their Peace Festival, the Germans were granted access to Berlin’s public spaces; this right was not contested, physically or symbolically. After the festival, the Ontario press reacted with unanimous praise, calling the celebration one of the greatest ever held in Canada. In the eyes of the Ontario press, it was the Germans’ qualities that supposedly made them good citizens which authorized them to access these public spaces. The *Dundas Banner*, for example, stated that since the Germans were frugal and industrious, it was fine for them to kick back and celebrate from time to time.32

The specific spaces the Germans occupied were particularly important. The Peace Festival was held in spaces such as the marketplace which were focal points of urban life. The drill shed and the courthouse, where the celebrants planted an oak tree (a German heraldic symbol) were local representations of the power of the state. The railway station, meanwhile, served as the gateway to the city for visitors. For important visitors such as politicians or royalty, their only interaction with the town occurred at the railway station. By claiming these spaces which were central to public life in Berlin, the Germans were claiming membership in the mainstream of Canadian society. Being granted access to these specific spaces demonstrates the negotiation which took place in this celebration and the acceptance of ethnic Germans as Canadians.33
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32 In its appraisal of the festival, the *London Advertiser* described the Germans as a “thrifty and law-abiding class,” and hoped that the Canadian government would take steps to encourage more immigration from Germany. Kitchener Public Library Grace Schmidt Room (hereafter KPL), MC 15, W.H.E. Schmalz Collection, MC.15.1a, “The Press on the Festival.”

33 Although Germans were the dominant social group in Berlin at this time, their position was not entirely uncontested. As aforementioned, being made the county seat brought a number of English-speaking professionals to Berlin. John English and Kenneth McLaughlin state that these men such as Aemilius Irving, Berlin’s first crowd attorney, “played an active role in the social life of the community,” which “served to temper the German influence in Berlin.” English and McLaughlin, *Kitchener*, 48-9.
It is also important to note who led the Peace Festival, and thus spoke on behalf of the German community. In this boundary zone, contact between the German community and the rest of Canada was mediated by the ethnic elite, comprised of German industrialists, professionals, politicians, and clergymen.\(^{34}\) They controlled the message of this celebration, presented a respectable face for their community, and suppressed any alternate visions of German identity which might threaten their acceptance in Canada. Negotiations of German ethnic identity, therefore, contained several telling silences as the ethnic elite denied certain groups a voice or chose to speak for them. In 1870, there were tensions and even fistfights in Waterloo County between Germans from Alsace and Lorraine and those from other German states, forcing the *Berliner Journal* to plead for order and calm.\(^{35}\) Speeches and banners at the Peace Festival, however, welcomed Alsace and Lorraine to the German Empire and discounted the possibility of any lingering regional animosity.\(^{36}\) Although Germany itself was riven by regional (and other) divisions even after unification, the Peace Festival presented the local German community as united in celebration.

In his study of St. Patrick’s Day parades in Toronto Michael Cottrell argues that parades were used by Irish Catholics to “publicize their distinctiveness.” They were halted in 1871 when the Irish Catholics sought to assimilate into Canada and the parades proved a barrier to that goal.\(^{37}\) Similarly, Craig Heron and Steve Penfold argue that Labour Day parades were meant to emphasize the exclusivity of unions and so outsiders could only watch, not participate.\(^{38}\) By contrast, non-Germans were involved in the planning and execution of the Peace Festival, albeit

\(^{34}\) “The German Peace Festival,” *Globe* (Toronto), 3 May 1871, 4.
\(^{38}\) Heron and Penfold, “The Craftmen’s Spectacle,” 375.
in a subordinate role. This participation was something that the ethnic elite actively encouraged. Prior to the festival, Berlin’s English-speaking residents organized a committee to liaise with the main fest committee and also petition the town council to donate two hundred dollars from the town finances to the festival. The Peace Festival’s organizers also invited a delegation of Berlin’s English-speaking residents to address the crowd during the event. Additionally, several members of the provincial and federal legislatures were invited to speak at the occasion. By inviting representatives of the Anglo-Canadian mainstream, the ethnic elite claimed membership in it, rather than distinctiveness from it. By agreeing to participate and in their speeches echoing the rhetoric of the ethnic elite, the representatives of the Anglo-Canadian mainstream signalled their acceptance of the Germans.

The speeches, both those given by the ethnic elite and the Anglo Canadians, shared several common themes. Speakers lauded the unification of Germany as a step forward for the cause of peace and civilization. Turning to Canada, they praised German immigrants for their positive qualities and the ties that bound the German and British people, both of which justified the German community’s claim to be partners with the British in constructing a great nation in Canada. At the planting of the oak tree, school trustee Otto Klotz spoke of the virtues the tree represented. Before the time of Christ, Klotz said, the ancient Germans held meetings under oak trees. Klotz claimed that these meetings were the origins of parliamentary life and so the ideas of freedom and individual rights were thus born in the forests of Germany. Klotz maintained that this was an indisputable fact which even non-German historians agreed upon. Canada therefore had Germany to thank for its enlightened system of government. Furthermore, as heirs to this

40 The delegation was comprised of local professionals, including lawyer John King, the father of future Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King. KPL, MC 15, W.H.E. Schmalz Collection, MC.15.1a, “German Peace Festival 1871, Address of the English Deputation to the Managing Committee.”
noble tradition, German immigrants were ideal citizens who would safeguard its tenets in Canada. The oak tree, then, was a reminder to the Germans of Waterloo County to emulate in Canada the virtues of their forefathers. \footnote{“Das Friedensfest,” Berliner Journal, 11 May 1871.} Charles Magill, the M.P. for Hamilton, stated that he was glad to see so many Germans who were British subjects. The good qualities Germans had demonstrated in the fatherland had survived the trip across the Atlantic and he knew they could be counted on to defend what was right in Canada. Not only did the German and British people share common ideals, both Magill and Isaac Buchanan, former member of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada for Toronto, pointed out that the British royal family was of German descent. \footnote{“The German Peace Festival,” Globe (Toronto), 3 May 1871, 4.} The address on behalf of Berlin’s English-speaking population claimed that the German and British people were united in their “reverence for truth, morality, and religion, the observance of law and order, and respect for constituted authority.” Gazing hopefully towards the future, the address closed, stating that together, they were building a “Great Canadian Nationality,” laying “a foundation similar to that upon which now stands the powerful and united Empire of Germany.” The only rivalry that would exist between the two would be in displaying the “truest patriotism, [and] the most elevated political and social virtues.” \footnote{KPL, MC 15, W.H.E. Schmalz Collection, MC.15.1a, “German Peace Festival 1871, Address of the English Deputation to the Managing Committee.”}

The Peace Festival was a foundational moment for Berlin’s Germans. Prior to the festival, ethnic associations in Berlin, which attempted to forge community cohesion, were small and sporadically supported. \footnote{Leibbrandt, Little Paradise, 127-128.} A Turnverein or gymnastics association, for example, was founded in Berlin in 1855; however it had folded by 1857. A new Verein was founded in 1858, but, like its counterparts in Preston, New Hamburg, and Waterloo, it was always on shaky footing. After an aborted attempt to form a national Turnerbund in 1857, the Berlin Turnverein, along with those
from Waterloo and Toronto created a “national” association in 1861. It too fell apart sometime in 1864-5 and by 1870 the individual Vereine had collapsed for a shortage of members.\textsuperscript{45} By contrast, the years immediately following the Peace Festival witnessed a flowering of German cultural institutions. In 1872, the German-language newspapers of Ontario formed a Deutsch-Canadischer Pressverein (German-Canadian Press Association) to lobby for the interests of German Canadians to the provincial and federal governments.\textsuperscript{46} In 1873, a group of Germans in Berlin founded the Concordia Singing Society. The club soon expanded beyond its original mandate as a choir to promote the German language, culture, and traditions.\textsuperscript{47} By 1874, the society had grown to the point that its members were able to procure their own quarters. The grand opening of the Concordia Hall was so well attended, even by representatives of the English-speaking population, that the facility was unable to hold everyone.\textsuperscript{48} In 1873, German singing societies across southern Ontario came together to form the Deutsch-Canadischer Sängerbund (German-Canadian Choir Federation). Under its aegis, Berlin and neighbouring Waterloo played host to eight Sängerfeste (singing festivals) over the next forty years drawing in singing societies from across the Great Lakes region, including the United States.\textsuperscript{49} The inaugural event was hosted by Waterloo in 1874 followed by Berlin in 1875.

The Peace Festival thus helped Berlin’s Germans coalesce as a community. It also provided the template for the ethnic elite’s claims to Canadian citizenship over the next four decades through its emphasis on the supposed inherent characteristics of the German people, the bonds between Germany and Britain, and the role of Germans as nation builders in Canada.

\textsuperscript{46} Kalbfleisch, \textit{German Language Press}, 77-78.
\textsuperscript{47} Leibbrandt, \textit{Little Paradise}, 133.
\textsuperscript{49} Barbara Lorenzkowski, \textit{Sounds of Ethnicity: Listening to German North America, 1850-1914} (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010), 154-155.
Subsequent ethnic celebrations, such as the Sängerfeste, also employed patriotic German and British/Canadian symbols and traditions in chorus to convey their harmony. Although the bulk of the songs sung during the Sängerfeste were German selections, there was also room for patriotic British numbers. The program for the 1886 Sängerfest, for example, included a group of three hundred children singing “Red, White and Blue,” while each waved a small Union Jack. These ethnic celebrations also occupied public spaces in Berlin and courted the involvement of non-Germans. To reach out to the non-German community, organizers of the 1875 Sängerfest printed programs in English to go along with those in German. As well, the festival included a mass meeting at Market Square to which Berlin’s town council and citizens were all invited. The right of the German community to self-representation extended beyond events that were primarily “ethnic” in nature. The German community was prominent in civic celebrations such as Berlin’s attainment of cityhood status in 1912, as well as in greeting distinguished visitors to Berlin, such as Canada’s Governors General. These ethnic and civic celebrations along with booster literature, newspaper debates, and different apparatuses of the state such as schools were the boundary zones where Berlin’s Germans and the Anglo-Canadian population negotiated their respective identities and the place of Germans as Canadian citizens.

**Two Parts of the Same Whole: Making German and British/Canadian Compatible**

Historians have characterized the decades prior to the First World War as a period that emphasized Anglo-conformity as necessary for acceptance in the mainstream of English-Canadian society. Howard Palmer, for example, states that Anglo-Saxons were regarded as the pinnacle, and all other groups were judged based on how far they strayed from this ideal. After

---

51 Waterloo Region Museum (hereafter WRM), X.963.183.001, “Programme Grand German Music Festival.”
immigrants from Britain, those from Northern and Western Europe, especially Germans and Scandinavians, were considered to be the most desirable. They allegedly possessed inherent racial qualities which were “the basis of civilization.” Immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, followed by Jews, Asians, and blacks were seen as undesirable. They were, by virtue of their race, allegedly lacking self-control, unsuited to dealing with “free institutions,” and therefore unassimilable.\(^5\)

Instead of challenging Canada’s Anglo-conformity, the ethnic elite sought to incorporate Germans into the mainstream, arguing that “German” and “British” were two parts of the same whole. This argument was aided by the fact that Germans already occupied a favourable position near the British at the top of the racial hierarchy. Carl Berger argues that during this period, Canadian imperialism, which sought closer ties with the British Empire, was one version of Canadian nationalism, one which relied upon “a certain understanding of history, the national character, and the national mission.”\(^5\) The ethnic elite articulated its own version of Canadian imperialism which utilized an understanding of history and race that venerated the German and British Empires side by side as partners.

Berlin’s Germans began celebrating the Kaiser’s birthday as early as the 1880s. This annual celebration took place on the premises of the Concordia Club rather than in a public space. These were not insular ethnic celebrations. Every year the Kaiser’s birthday was an “open evening” and as at the Peace Festival, non-Germans were invited to observe and participate. The proceedings typically began with a toast to the British monarch and the singing of the British
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national anthem, followed by toasts and songs in honour of the Kaiser. Appraising the 1911 celebration, the News Record reported that the hearty three cheers for King George left no doubt regarding the loyalties of the town’s Germans.\textsuperscript{55}

In 1894, Berlin’s Germans constructed a German village in the town skating rink. This village was the setting for a Kirmes, or traditional German village fair, held as a fundraiser for St. Peter’s Lutheran Church. This “typical” German village contained a kaffee garten, candy booth, spinning room, court house, and town hall. The men and women who staffed these booths were dressed in folk costumes. Visitors were entertained by recreations of village rituals as well as the performance of military drills.\textsuperscript{56} Although the organizers maintained that their village and fair were “authentic,” down to the smallest details, they contained several incongruent elements which belied this claim and demonstrated their vision of what it meant to be a German in Canada. The folk costumes worn by the Kirmes’ participants were intentionally drawn from several of the regions of Germany, condensing the entire nation into a single village.\textsuperscript{57} As at the Peace Festival, this portrayed Berlin’s German community as unified and free from a divisive provincial mindset. Not only did people from all regions of Germany coexist harmoniously in this village, so too did the concepts of “German” and “Canadian.” Describing this “German” village, the Berlin Daily Record observed that Canadian bunting hung over many of the booths. Additionally, the German flag that flew above the court house was accompanied by a Canadian flag.\textsuperscript{58} Furthermore, while the men who led the youthful “grenadiers” in drill were identified as former soldiers of the German army, the flag they paraded under on this occasion was Canadian.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{55} “The Emperor’s Birthday,” Berlin News Record, 27 January 1911.
\textsuperscript{56} “The Kirmes,” Berlin Daily Record, 13 October 1894; KPL, Waterloo Historical Society Collection (hereafter WHS), Kirmes Program, October 11-13, 1894, 8-16.
\textsuperscript{57} “Die Kirmeß,” Berliner Journal, 18 October 1894.
\textsuperscript{58} “The Kirmes,” Berlin Daily Record, 13 October 1894.
\textsuperscript{59} The Kirmes program simply stated that the grenadiers’ flag was the “Canadian military flag.” Presumably, this flag was the Red Ensign. KPL, WHS, Kirmes Program, October 11-13, 1894, 16.
The program for the *Kirmes* was printed in both German and English with the goal that it would attract not only German visitors who would be reminded of their childhood days in the fatherland, but non-Germans as well. Prior to the event, organizers sent out invitations to prominent men across the country.⁶⁰ Although most were unable to attend, many made financial contributions, including the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, Airey Kirkpatrick; George E. Foster, the Canadian Minister of Finance; the Minister of the Interior, Thomas Daly; the Premier of Ontario, Sir Oliver Mowat; and the Minister of Education, George Ross.⁶¹ Attracting an estimated crowd of 3,000 on this first day alone, the *Kirmes* proved so successful that another one was held two years later. It was much the same as before, however, notably, this time organizers billed it as a “great German-Canadian celebration.”⁶²

German and British/Canadian symbols mingled in civic as well as ethnic celebrations. Reviewing the Victoria Day festivities in 1895, the *Berlin Daily Record* reported that “no other town in Canada hangs out such a varied lot of bunting on the 24th but the citizens are as loyal as any.”⁶³ When Prime Minister John Thompson visited Berlin in 1893, a banner reading “Wilkommen,” surrounded by two Union Jacks hung in the skating rink where he spoke.⁶⁴ For the visit of Wilfrid Laurier in 1908, the decorations included a British flag flanked by the French and German flags, a rare instance where French Canadians were recognized as having a claim to citizenship equal to British and German Canadians.⁶⁵

The ethnic elite also pointed to the ties of marriage that bound the British and German monarchies as evidence of the special bond between Britain and Germany. Furthermore, the
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⁶⁰“A Kirmes,” *Berlin Daily Record*, 1 October 1894.
⁶¹KPL, WHS, Kirmes Program, October 11-13, 1894, 14.
⁶²KPL, WHS, Kirmes Program, October 1-3, 1896, 10.
⁶⁵Berlin’s Germans welcomed both Conservative and Liberal politicians with equal enthusiasm, papering over any political divisions within the community. “Laurier in Berlin,” *Berliner Journal*, 30 September 1908.
ethnic elite held the fact that the House of Hanover which ruled Britain was a German dynasty as proof that one could be a proud German and still a loyal Canadian citizen and British subject. This of course ignored the fact that the British royal family was linked by marriage to several of Europe’s monarchies. Prior to the visit of the Governor General the Marquis of Lorne in 1879, the Berlin Daily News suggested that Mayor Louis Breithaupt, father of Louis Jacob, should be knighted. This was particularly appropriate, the Daily News maintained, because Breithaupt was not only an example of the success one could achieve in Canada with just a bit of hard work, but he was also of the same race as the Queen and her daughter Louise, the wife of the Marquis.

During the 1890s, at the same time that British imperialism in Canada was becoming increasingly popular, reverence for the German Empire in Berlin was reaching its peak. As part of the festivities at the 1897 Sängerfest, the organizers decided to erect a bust of Kaiser Wilhelm I in Berlin’s Victoria Park to commemorate the Peace Festival of 1871. As during the Peace Festival, Berlin was decorated with British and German flags and colours. In a moment symbolic of the place Berlin’s Germans claimed for themselves in Canada, the unveiling ceremony commenced with the singing of the song “Heil Die Mein Vaterland,” which was played to the tune of “God Save the Queen.” Speeches, delivered in both German and English, all proclaimed that although the Germans revered their fatherland, they were still loyal Canadians. John Motz, president of the monument committee and editor of the Berliner Journal, even claimed that maintaining the traditions of the land of one’s forefathers was a prerequisite for

67 The growth in support for a connection to the British Empire during this decade is evidenced by the large celebrations for the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee in 1897 as well as the creation of Empire Day in Ontario’s schools in 1899 which coincided with the Queen’s eightieth birthday. Berger, The Sense of Power, 5; Robert Stamp, “Empire Day in the Schools of Ontario: The Training of Young Imperialists,” Journal of Canadian Studies 8, no. 3 (1973): 35-38.
68 “The Unveiling,” Berlin News Record, 13 August 1897.
69 “The Singing Societies are with us,” Berlin News Record, 12 August 1897; “The Concert and Ball” Berlin News Record, 13 August 1897.
being a good Canadian citizen. Accepting the monument on behalf of the park board, Louis Jacob Breithaupt called for another monument to be erected, to Queen Victoria. This would be fitting since the two were not only related but represented “the two greatest personages and Sovereigns of the nineteenth century.”\textsuperscript{70} The \textit{Berliner Journal} agreed that a statue of Queen Victoria would be an “appropriate counterpart” and suggested in place of the medallions depicting Otto von Bismarck and Helmuth von Moltke which adorned the base of the Kaiser’s bust, ones bearing the likeness of Sir John A. Macdonald and Alexander Mackenzie, Canada’s first two prime ministers, thus creating a pantheon for the greatest leaders in Canadian, British, and German history.\textsuperscript{71}

In 1911, Berlin finally erected the long-awaited monument to Queen Victoria.\textsuperscript{72} Speeches during the ceremony centred on the special relationship between Germany and Britain. Dr. H.G. Lackner, at that time M.P.P. for Waterloo North, noted with pleasure that Kaiser Wilhelm II had been the guest of honour at the recent unveiling of a statue of the Queen in front of Buckingham Palace. He then pointed to the nearby bust of the Kaiser’s late grandfather and stated that it was appropriate to have statues to these two great monarchs since they had both done more than anyone else to make their respective empires great. William Lyon Mackenzie King then praised Queen Victoria as “the sovereign who unites in a common ancestry the rulers of the British and German empires.”\textsuperscript{73}

To reinforce the compatibility of “British” and “German,” the ethnic elite employed an understanding of history which portrayed the British and German people as longstanding allies. Their relationship was therefore more than matrimonial. As allies, the two empires allegedly

\textsuperscript{71} “Das Sängerfest,” \textit{Berliner Journal}, 19 August 1897.
\textsuperscript{72} The statue was built after years of fundraising by the local chapter of the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire. rych mills, \textit{Victoria Park: 100 Years of a Park and Its People} (Kitchener: Twin City Dwyer Publishing Co. Ltd., 1996), 24-25.
shared common goals and ideals. The annual celebrations of the Kaiser’s birthday frequently dwelt on the historic ties between Germany and Britain. The 1911 celebration began, as always, with a toast to the British monarch. Emphasizing the theme of fraternity between Britain and Germany, the choir then sang a song titled, “Brothers Reach Your Hands Together,” and Mayor William Henry Schmalz delivered a speech on the relationship between the two empires.74

The ethnic elite held the Napoleonic Wars, in particular, as a time when Germany and Britain stood side by side, despite the fact that these events predated German unification by several decades. In October 1905, Louis Jacob Breithaupt spoke on behalf of Berlin’s Germans during the town’s celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the battle of Trafalgar. After discussing the heroic role of Nelson at the battle which made Britain master of the sea, he turned to the battle of Waterloo nearly ten years later where Britain and its German allies stood together to defeat Napoleon and secure peace in Europe.75 William Lyon Mackenzie King said at the unveiling of the Victoria statue in 1911 that the name of Waterloo County, “bespeaks of the deeds jointly wrought by German and British alliance,” and showed the industry and prosperity that could be accomplished by a union of the two peoples.76

This simplified version of history glossed over any unwanted complications such as that provided by the Spetz family of Waterloo County. Prior to immigrating to Waterloo County, Theobald Spetz I had actually served under Napoleon, rather than against him.77 Depictions of the ties between Germany and Britain likewise ignored Berlin and Waterloo County’s sizeable German Catholic population (which included the Spetz family). At the 1894 Kirmes, A.O.
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74 The name of the song in German was “Brüder reicht die Hand zum Bunde.” “Des Kaisers Geburtstag,” Berliner Journal, 1 February 1911.
76 “Eloquent and Patriotic Addresses Delivered at the Unveiling Ceremony,” Berlin Daily Telegraph, 30 May 1911.
77 Archives of Ontario (hereafter AO), F1405, Multicultural History Society of Ontario fonds, Series 60: German Canadian Papers (hereafter MHSO), F1405-60-55, Frank Kraemer textual records, container MU9487, file 14, “History of the Kraemer and Spetz families.”
Howland, member of provincial parliament from Toronto, identified Protestantism as a bond that unified the British and Germans. He declared that “the name of Luther is dear to Protestants everywhere.”\footnote{78}{“The Kirmes,” \textit{Berlin Daily Record}, 12 October 1894.} This was therefore a privileged interpretation of history which excluded anyone and anything that could jeopardize the German community’s claim to Canadian citizenship.

The British and German people, however, were bound by ties which ran deeper than their royal families, a fabricated shared history, and problematic religious connections. Contemporary theories of race posited that the Anglo-Saxons and Teutons were racial cousins. In his speech at the \textit{Kirmes} in 1894, A.O. Howland described the relationship between the German and British people using familial/biological terms. Howland told the patrons of the German “village” that Canada’s English-speaking citizens, while loyal to their “Motherland,” maintained an abiding respect for the “Fatherland.” Such a feeling was only natural, he said, “since the two great nations spring from a common origin.” In this metaphor, Howland posited that Canada was the racial offspring of these two great nations. Continuing his biological metaphor, he stated that Berlin’s residents had “German blood in Canadian veins.”\footnote{79}{“The Kirmes,” \textit{Berlin Daily Record}, 12 October 1894.} The ties that bound the German and British people thus ran much deeper than historic alliances and royal marriages; they were biological, timeless. In some instances, the German and British people were even said to form a single race. At the unveiling of the statue of Queen Victoria in Berlin in 1911, the Earl Grey stated that the presence of the German Kaiser at the recent unveiling of a statue of Queen Victoria in London, England, showed, “the strength and community of the ideals which bind together the whole Anglo-Teuton race.”\footnote{80}{“Earl Grey Delivers Eloquent Address at Unveiling Yesterday,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 30 May 1911.}

As the Earl Grey noted, the Anglo-Saxons and Teutons, at the pinnacle of the hierarchy of races, shared a set of values as well as a common mission to be the vanguard of civilization. At
the Berlin Board of Trade banquet in 1899, guest speaker A.B. Powell prophesized that the day was coming when the Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon races would join together in spreading the gospel and leading civilization. He even placed them above the French and Italians, two other European races, whom he claimed had turned their backs on God.⁸¹ When Queen Victoria died in 1901, churches across Berlin held special services of mourning. Zion Evangelical Church even held two, one in German, another in English. During the service at St. John’s Lutheran, the preacher praised the Kaiser for rushing to England to grieve with “the sons and daughters of Hanover.” This “noble act,” demonstrated that “Teuton and Saxon, German and British [were] united for the weal of all mankind.”⁸²

Maintaining the apparent compatibility of being good Germans and also loyal Canadian citizens and British subjects was complicated by the growing tensions between the British and German Empires. Berlin’s Germans were not naively unaware of events in Europe. Louis Jacob Breithaupt anxiously recorded the developments in Europe in his diary. He noted with hope instances, such as the visit of King Edward to the Kaiser in Berlin, which seemed to suggest a thawing of relations between the two powers.⁸³ In 1909, the Berliner Journal hinted at the growing tensions in Europe in its regularly featured satirical column written by the fictional character Joe Klotzkopp. In this column, Joe relayed the story of his friend, Groundhog George, who had returned to the fatherland to visit with his old friend, the Kaiser. While at dinner with the Kaiser, George saw the British ambassador and the German chancellor sitting across from one another, and observed, “The two were quite friendly to each other over the table, but, I noticed that they were continually kicking each other’s shins under the table. The emperor noticed it too,
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⁸² These views were repeated by Louis Jacob Breithaupt in a speech before the Ontario legislature. “A Day of Solemn Mourning,” Berlin News Record, 2 February 1901; “Speech by L.J. Breithaupt, M.P.P.,” Berlin Daily Telegraph, 11 February 1901.
⁸³ UW, GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.5.3, L. J. Breithaupt Diaries, 24 November 1908, 10 February 1909, 17 May 1911, 29 May 1913.
but he pretended not to see it, so that no war should break out between Germany and Great Britain.”

Unlike the Kaiser in this humorous anecdote, Berlin’s Germans could not ignore the growing tensions. Nevertheless, they rejected the possibility of conflict between Britain and Germany as contravening the course of history and scientific theories of race and therefore against the natural ordering of the world. Whatever hostility did exist, was the work of a few agitators rather than a result of genuine animus. In an editorial discussing the question of whether Canada should build warships for Britain, the Berliner Journal claimed that Canadian newspapers had been stoking fears of Germany in the Canadian people. The Journal stated that there were some over-zealous individuals “who are so English that they roll up their pants when it rains in London” and hoped that the Canadian government would not be swayed by these misguided people into throwing away millions of dollars. Besides, the editors continued, relations between the two powers were actually quite amicable; they had never in history met one another in battle and certainly never would.

At a 1909 rally, William Lyon Mackenzie King called on Britain and Germany to cease their talk of war and look at the prosperity of Waterloo County to see an example of “what a union of English and German might be expected to do for progress and civilization on earth.” Furthermore, he said the prospect of war was illogical. After all, the King of England was of German descent and the German and English people were “of a common Teutonic race.” For Mackenzie King and for Berlin’s German community, it was unthinkable that these two pillars of civilization would turn on one another. Although he acknowledged that friction did exist between Germany and Britain, Mackenzie King upheld Berlin’s Germans as good Canadians. He

---

emphasized the supposed ties that bound Germany and Britain and reinforced the notion that a partnership between British and German Canadians was vital for prosperity in Canada.

**Berlin Rises: Germans as Agents of Peace, Progress, and Modernity**

Although Canadians at the time identified as “British,” they wished for Canada to be more than a mere colony of Britain. Carl Berger argues that one facet of Canadian imperialism was a desire for a senior role within the British Empire and a belief that Canada was destined for a preeminent position in the world.87 Canada was therefore more than a colony; it was a great nation or empire in the making. A belief in progress and Canada’s destiny as a world power similarly animated the expansionist movement in the middle of the nineteenth century to annex and develop Hudson’s Bay Company lands in the west.88 Berlin’s leading Germans argued that by transforming a frontier village into a small but thriving industrial centre, they had accomplished in southern Ontario what the expansionist movement hoped to achieve in the west. This was because Germans, they claimed, were agents of peace, progress, and modernity.

In his foundational 1951 work, *The Uprooted*, Oscar Handlin argues that immigrants arriving in the United States were literally uprooted and disoriented in a new land where their old customs were ill-suited to the challenges of modern life. As a result, they had no choice but to abandon their traditions and struggle to assimilate.89 In a 1964 response to Handlin’s thesis, Rudolph Vecoli contends that the experience for immigrants in the New World was not necessarily one of disorganization and disintegration. Focusing on Italians in Chicago, he contends that these immigrants were successful in transplanting their traditional village life to
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industrial Chicago.\textsuperscript{90} Varpu Lindstrom describes Handlin’s thesis and the subsequent response, of which Vecoli was a part, as one of the key debates in the historiography of immigration.\textsuperscript{91} Franca Iacovetta contends that holding on to their culture did not mean immigrants were frozen in a pre-modern state. Their traditional culture, in fact, helped to mediate their transformation from peasants into industrial workers.\textsuperscript{92} In \textit{Sounds of Ethnicity}, a study which examines the relationship between language practices and ethnic identity in the German communities of Waterloo County, Ontario and Buffalo, New York, Barbara Lorenzkowski discusses ethnicity and modernity. She argues that in their efforts to preserve German language and music, ethnic gatekeepers transformed German from being a mother tongue to a modern language so that it “no longer denoted ethnicity alone.”\textsuperscript{93} I contend that in Berlin, the ethnic elite argued that their German ethnicity was not an antiquated relic of village life which needed to be shed in order to fit into modern society; rather it was their ethnicity itself which made them modern. This separated them from, and elevated them above, immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe and Asia who were seen by Canadians as being backwards, parochial peasants.\textsuperscript{94}

A frequent refrain when describing Berlin’s growth as an industrial centre was that it had been achieved despite Berlin lacking any natural advantages. The area was wanting for natural resources to develop and fuel industry, while the Grand River was neither suitable as a means of transportation nor a source of water power.\textsuperscript{95} According to the \textit{Berlin News Record}, along with

\textsuperscript{93} Lorenzkowski, \textit{Sounds of Ethnicity}, 215-216.
\textsuperscript{94} Palmer, “Reluctant Hosts,” 306.
lacking the advantages of other centres, Berlin, in fact, faced several natural disadvantages. All commenters agreed was that Berlin had one resource which distinguished it from other centres: its people. By developing this resource Berlin overcame its less than enviable starting position.

Berlin’s residents supposedly possessed certain qualities which made them such a valuable resource and thereby valuable citizens. Most commonly, they were portrayed as being thrifty and industrious. At the annual banquet of the Berlin Board of Trade in 1899, Louis Jacob Breithaupt proclaimed that Waterloo County was inhabited by a hardworking, industrious, law abiding people. These were apparently inherent characteristics of the German race. A booklet commemorating the apparent centennial of Berlin’s founding in 1906, described Germans as possessing, “industry without measure; a thoroughness that led them to exhaust every subject necessary to be mastered; and the sheet anchor of thrift.” Notably, these racial characteristics fitted Germans to succeed in a modern industrial capitalist society. Therefore, when Canada’s Governor General, the Earl Grey, visited Berlin in 1911, he commented on the town’s prosperity which he remarked was “only natural to expect from a German community.”

Claiming that they brought prosperity to the town despite it lacking any natural advantages the ethnic elite also portrayed Berlin’s Germans as embodying the ideal of self-made men. The characteristics which the ethnic elite attributed to Germans as a group, such as thrift

96 “Welcome to the Saengerfest,” Berlin News Record, 10 August 1898.
100 AO, MSHO, F1405-60-5, William H. E. Schmalz textual records, MFN24, “Berlin Today: Centennial Number in Celebration of the Old Boys’ and Girls’ Reunion, August 6th, 7th, 8th, 1906.”
and industry and, as will be shown, self-control and sobriety, mirrored those qualities which described the white middle-class ideal of masculinity. The self-made man was a central component of this ideal. These qualities furthermore described the ideal citizen, a status which, at the time, was inherently male. By defining their ethnic identity as being in line with the ideal masculinity, the ethnic elite therefore underscored its claim to Canadian citizenship.

Descriptions of Berlin in booster literature celebrated the city’s modern splendour which was a striking contrast to the supposed barren wilderness prior to the arrival of settlers. When Berlin became a city in 1912, the News Record reflected upon its transformation from a few sandhills into a thriving industrial centre. At this time, describing Berlin as “a centre of tall chimneys,” did not signify that it was a blight upon the natural landscape. Rather, it demonstrated that previously fallow land had been improved upon and made to be productive. Thus the program for the “Made in Berlin” industrial exhibition in 1905 proudly described the town’s factories “smoking unceasingly and producing almost every article in the catalogue of man’s needs,” while the centennial booklet boasted that Berlin had more industries per acre than any municipality of its size in Canada. At the same time, booster publications heralded Berlin’s

---


103 “The City of Berlin,” Berlin News Record, 10 June 1912.
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state-of-the-art transportation facilities, water supply, sewage treatment, fire brigade, and schools and included abundant photos of the neat, sturdy structures that housed them.\(^{106}\)

For the ethnic elite, Berlin’s bustling factories and sleek amenities emphasized its claim that the Germans had accomplished more on a marginal piece of land than others had in more bountiful tracts. In *The Great Land Rush*, John Weaver argues that in New World colonies, a doctrine of improvement was used to justify the taking and allocating of land hitherto occupied by indigenous people. This doctrine stipulated that the ability to increase the productivity was even more important than cultural assimilation in determining who had the right to ownership of a parcel of land.\(^{107}\) Berlin’s Germans articulated their own doctrine of improvement to justify their claim to Canadian citizenship. Their ability to foster progress was more important for their acceptance in Canada than assimilation into the dominant Anglo-Canadian culture.

The ethnic elite branded the pioneers who settled Berlin and the entrepreneurs who founded its industries as heroes. Their transformation of Berlin from barren wilderness to budding metropolis was characterized as a conquest over nature just as heroic as battle.\(^{108}\) In spite of this militaristic comparison, they stressed that this was a peaceful conquest. A historical sketch of the city in the *Berlin News Record*, claimed that Berlin had no history of war, turmoil, or conflict. Its residents, therefore, had “no reason to be ashamed of [Berlin’s] first settlers nor the way in which they obtained their land.\(^{109}\) Likewise, after describing the joint British and German victory over Napoleon in his Trafalgar Day address in 1905, Louis Jacob Breithaupt described the peaceful conquests German and British settlers had won in Berlin. “Hand in hand,” they had,


\(^{107}\) Weaver, *The Great Land Rush*, 5, 134.

\(^{108}\) “At Berlin,” *Globe* (Toronto), 31 August 1889.

“employed the victory and achievement of peace,” in arts and in industry and thereby “secured a desirable and brilliant future,” for coming generations.\textsuperscript{110}

This emphasis that Berlin’s advancement had been achieved through peace highlighted the positive attributes of the Teutonic race. From this point of view, Germans, together with Anglo-Saxons, stood at the top of the racial hierarchy and the forefront of civilization. They eschewed barbaric violence and instead achieved success through thrift and industry. At the Berlin Board of Trade annual banquet in 1898, the guest of honour, Judge Chisholm, emphasized that in Canada, they were building a nation that would lead civilization. Chisholm praised Canada as a nation, “conceived in peace and brought forth in peace.” He maintained that Canada was “the first country in the world that holds ‘peace on earth and good will to men.’”\textsuperscript{111}

In their pursuit of peaceful progress, the ethnic elite saw itself as following the lead of the German Empire. During celebrations of the Kaiser’s birthday, speakers singled out the German monarch as the agent preserving peace in Europe.\textsuperscript{112} In January, 1914, for example, former mayor William Henry Schmalz congratulated the Kaiser for maintaining peace throughout his entire twenty five year reign. Although he was often held as a war hero, Schmalz maintained that the Kaiser should be regarded as a “peace hero.”\textsuperscript{113} Prior to unification, the local German-language newspapers had been critical of the reactionary, anti-liberal atmosphere in the German states, particularly Prussia.\textsuperscript{114} These criticisms, however, did not fit with the narrative which

\textsuperscript{111} Gail Bederman argues that the concept of “civilization” at the time had both racial and gender connotations. Darwinism, she says, made civilization a racialized concept, portraying it as a stage in human racial evolution that only whites had attained. One of the hallmarks of how civilized a race was gender roles. Civilized men and women maintained highly differentiated gender roles, whereas savages conflated them. “Their Accomplishments,” \textit{Berlin Daily Telegraph}, 16 February 1898; Gail Bederman, \textit{Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 25-6.
began with the Peace Festival and held Germany as a bastion of peace and freedom and a model for Canada to follow, and so they were cast aside and forgotten.

Even though Germans came to Berlin in several smaller waves throughout the nineteenth century, and even though Berlin’s Germans did not coalesce as a community until the second half of the century, the ethnic elite drew an unbroken line connecting the early settlers to the Germans in the present day. They were all part of the same community. During the celebration of cityhood, member of provincial parliament, Dr. H.G. Lackner stated that Waterloo County’s first settlers were German artisans who had created the foundation for Berlin’s thriving industries. Accordingly, seventy five percent of Berlin’s industrialists in the present day were Germans.\textsuperscript{115} By establishing historical continuity between themselves and the town’s first settlers, the ethnic elite staked a claim as one of Canada’s charter peoples. Germans were therefore loyal citizens who had been part of the project of building a new nation in Canada from the beginning. At the Kaiser’s birthday in 1905, John Rittinger traced the roots of Berlin’s German community even farther back, claiming fellowship with the Germans who arrived in Nova Scotia at the start of the eighteenth century and whose descendants included great men such as Charles Tupper, former Prime Minister and father of Confederation.\textsuperscript{116}

The incongruity of the history that Berlin’s Germans claimed was underscored by the fact that Germans from Europe did not begin to arrive in Berlin until more than two decades after the first Mennonite settlers. Claiming that Germans were pioneers who had hacked a civilization out of the wilderness creating the foundation for Berlin’s present day prosperity required the Germans to appropriate the Mennonites and their history, claiming them as “German.” Accounts of Berlin’s early history therefore ignored or minimized the distinction between the two. In an


\textsuperscript{116} “Es lebe der Kaiser!” \textit{Berliner Journal}, 1 February 1905.
address to Prime Minister John Thompson in 1893, for example, Lutheran minister Reinhold von Pirch, stated that Berlin was founded by German pioneers who, though wishing to preserve their German language and customs, were just as loyal as their Anglo-Canadian fellow-citizens.\(^{117}\)

Interestingly, although Mennonites were subsumed as Germans, the same was not true for all other German speakers. In a letter to Wilfrid Laurier regarding filling a vacant senate seat which had been held by a representative from Waterloo County, Louis Jacob Breithaupt lobbied for the spot to be given to a German. Waterloo County, he said, was “settled mostly by Germans from the Fatherland and from Pennsylvania.” As the late senator was a German-speaking Swiss, Breithaupt protested that “the German element has not yet had the recognition to which they are so decidedly entitled.” Laurier agreed that Canadians of German origins were certainly deserving of recognition, however, he said they could not make distinctions between Germans of different geographic origins. Language, he said, should be the determining factor, thereby lumping Germans, Mennonites and Swiss under the same heading.\(^{118}\) While Mennonites had the crucial distinction of being Berlin’s first European settlers, Swiss Germans had played a marginal role in local history and so appropriating their history was of lesser importance.

The Mennonites were not always pleased to be counted as Germans. In September 1879, the *Waterloo Chronicle* complained that while the town’s German citizens were granted their own delegation to greet the governor general, the Marquis of Lorne upon his visit to Berlin, the town’s English-speaking and Mennonite citizens were not represented by their own delegations, suggesting that the latter should be regarded as a distinct group.\(^{119}\) Two months later, the *Berlin Daily News* objected to labelling Mennonites “German” as opposed to “Pennsylvania Dutch” or


\(^{118}\) UW, GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.5.2, L.J. Breithaupt correspondence, 1 Jan 1909, L.J. Breithaupt to Wilfrid Laurier; 8 Jan 1909, Wilfrid Laurier to L.J. Breithaupt.

another name which would signify their distinctiveness. The editor, P.E.W. Moyer, a descendant of the Mennonite settlers, claimed that it would be just as insulting to call a Mennonite Irish as it would be to call him German, for Mennonites had “no affinity for the latter,” and regarded the Germans as foreigners in Waterloo.\(^{120}\)

Ironically, while the Germans appropriated the history of the Mennonites in order to secure their claim to Canadian citizenship, historically the place of the Mennonites themselves as Canadians was not settled. According to Ross D. Fair, in the first half of the nineteenth century, the Mennonites’ refusal to swear oaths of allegiance and serve in the militia as well as their previous residence in the United States marked them as dubious citizens in the eyes of the Upper Canadian government. It was not until an 1855 act of Imperial Parliament, which granted the Mennonites full exemption from militia duty, that they were able to shed their questionable status. What Fair calls the “Loyalist paradigm,” argues that the Mennonites chose to come to Upper Canada in the wake of the American Revolution because they desired to remain British subjects and were granted religious freedom due to the benevolence of British institutions. In reality, he argues, they came for cheap land and were forced to constantly lobby to protect their beliefs. This myth, intended to paper over the Mennonites’ modest beginnings in Canada and burnish their credentials as Canadian citizens, has survived in some form or another in the

\(^{120}\) “Who Are Dutch?” *Berlin Daily News*, 13 November 1879.
historiography of the Mennonites to the present day.\textsuperscript{121} As it suited their own purposes, Berlin’s ethnic elite gladly furthered this myth and labelled the early settlers United Empire Loyalists.\textsuperscript{122} Thanks partly to the example of the United States, immigrant workers in Canada, particularly those from Southern and Eastern Europe, were commonly associated with socialism and labour strife. The neighbourhoods that they lived in were also seen as hotbeds of vice, crime, and social unrest.\textsuperscript{123} In his opening address at the 1875 \textit{Sängerfest}, Wilhelm Oelschläger stressed that these festivals did not seek to cause disorder or foment revolution. He implored English speaking citizens witnessing or taking part in such an event for the first time, to take notice of the fact that “proper decorum is observed throughout.”\textsuperscript{124} Reviewing the festival, the \textit{Berliner Journal} reported that English-speaking citizens were astonished that amidst the large crowds and frivolity, there was no trouble or breach of the peace that occurred when other nationalities held gatherings.\textsuperscript{125} This picture painted by Oelschläger and the \textit{Berliner Journal} of orderly jubilation was meant as a deliberate contrast to with how Canadians viewed other ethnic groups. For the ethnic elite, cultivating an image of Germans being orderly and law abiding was essential to their ethnic identity. Claiming a place as good Canadians required Germans to dissociate themselves from the ranks of these allegedly undesirable immigrants who were regarded as a threat to social order. Anglo Canadians generally accepted the narrative of the ethnic elite which claimed that the


\textsuperscript{124} Library and Archives Canada (hereafter LAC), MG30 C102, William Henry Schmalz fonds, “First Sägerfest, Berlin, Ontario, Address by Wm. Oelschläger.”

\textsuperscript{125} “Das Sängerfest,” \textit{Berliner Journal}, 26 August 1875.
Germans had turned Berlin into a modern, industrialized city, but had managed to do so while avoiding the ills of modernity such as urban crime and labour strife.

In speeches and booster literature, the ethnic elite and their Anglo-Canadian counterparts proudly boasted that Berlin had none of the problems with unions and strikes that dogged other industrial centres. Although they claimed that Berlin was pro-capital and always gave “fair and liberal treatment,” to its industrialists, this was not meant to suggest that labour peace had been achieved by running roughshod over the interests of labour. Instead, they credited the enlightened leadership of the employers and the many virtues of the, predominantly German, workers for the harmonious state of labour relations in Berlin. A booklet commemorating Berlin’s attainment of cityhood begins with a poem dedicated to the city’s workers. An ode to an obedient worker, it declares, “Man grows beneath his burdens, beneath the chain he wears; and still the toiler’s guerdon is worth the pain he bears. For there’s no satisfaction beneath the bending sky like that the man of action enjoys when the night is nigh.”

This poem posits that to work is the natural arrangement and exalts the man who stoically bears his load. From this point of view, Berlin’s workers understood their place in society and could be counted on to give their employers an honest day’s labour.

Praise for Berlin’s workers frequently made reference to their high rate of home ownership. The commonly cited figure of seventy percent of workers owning their own homes was supposedly much higher than the average Canadian city. The ethnic elite claimed that this was because the desire to own one’s own home was a peculiarly German trait. Importantly, home
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126 “The Germans in Canada,” Berlin Daily Telegraph, 3 July 1908; “President of Board of Trade Reviews the Year’s Work,” Berlin News Record, 9 January 1914.

127 AO, MHSO, F1405-60-5, William H. E. Schmalz textual records, container MU9480, file 12, “‘Made in Berlin’ Exhibition Programme 1905.”


ownership was also seen, at the time, as a central attribute of the ideal masculinity.\textsuperscript{130} The ethnic elite also credited home ownership with having an especially positive influence on the working class.\textsuperscript{131} In some instances, home ownership was said to be the key to Berlin’s prosperity. Home ownership gave workers a stake in the community. Even the best tenants would not make improvements to their home. Berlin was therefore a prosperous and beautiful place because of its homeowners. The high rate of home ownership was furthermore said to have a moderating influence on labour relations. A worker who owned his home was apparently less willing to jeopardize his job by going on strike than one who rented. In response, employers recognized the value of a stable workforce and so sought to resolve any legitimate issues.\textsuperscript{132} Germans workers had therefore bought into Canada’s industrial capitalist system. Unlike other immigrant workers whose ranks were allegedly rife with socialists and anarchists, the German workers were not a threat to challenge industrial capitalism.

While Berlin’s Germans were supposedly docile and compliant at work, in their spare time, they were similarly peaceable. A booster pamphlet, published in 1901 claimed that its residents were law abiding, leaving police very little work.\textsuperscript{133} Similarly, an article in \textit{Busy Man’s Magazine} which profiled the Germans of Waterloo County, claimed that there were no better

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{130} Henderson, “No Money,” 21-3; Rose, “Fit to Fight,” 134-5.
\textsuperscript{132} To illustrate this point, the booklet printed for Berlin’s centennial in 1906 told the story of an unnamed family who had come to Berlin from Germany twenty five years previously. When they arrived, they began by renting a small, run-down cottage. They were industrious, saved their money and were eventually able to buy their cottage and improve upon it, transforming the once shabby shack into a sturdy brick house. AO, MSHO, F1405-60-5, William H. E. Schmalz textual records, MFN24, “Berlin Today: Centennial Number in Celebration of the Old Boys’ and Girls’ Reunion, August 6th, 7th, 8th, 1906.”
\textsuperscript{133} UW, G14356, “The Town of Berlin” in \textit{20th Century Souvenir of Busy Berlin: The Best Town in Canada}. 
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settlers, as Germans were seldom found in court or police records. Even when they gathered in large numbers to celebrate, Berlin’s Germans were non-threatening. In contrast, some Canadians saw ethnic celebrations such as St. Patrick’s Day parades as a particularly volatile, troubling source of violence and disruption. Susan G. Davis argues that parades can be categorized as either orderly or disorderly. The former was meant to define social boundaries separating insiders from outsiders, while the latter was meant to transgress social boundaries and demand change.

To assert their status as respectable citizens and separate themselves from undesirable outsiders, the ethnic elite sought to ensure that their celebrations were seen as orderly, even if, in actuality, they were not always so. Nearly every English-language newspaper that reviewed the Peace Festival commented that the crowds of revellers were well-behaved. The Hamilton Times even elevated “order, fitness, and decorum,” to being inborn traits of the Teutonic race.

Despite the lofty rhetoric of the town’s boosters, crimes, of course, did occur in Berlin. Likewise, it was impossible to maintain complete control over the crowds that patronized the Sängерfeste and frequently numbered in excess of ten thousand. The instances where trouble did occur, however, were blamed on outsiders, not members of the German community. A profile of Berlin in the Toronto Globe, for example, posited that most of the few crimes committed in Berlin were done by people passing through and not locals. Similarly, at the 1875 Sängerfest, the only incident that took place was blamed on “rogues” from Guelph.

According to the ethnic elite, the pastimes Germans pursued were actually beneficial to society as a whole and not simply non-threatening. Wilhelm Oelschläger denounced English speakers who felt that singing festivals were a frivolous distraction, claiming that the festivals
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were actually a “moral as well as social advantage.” At the very least, he maintained, they provided wholesome recreation which released the mind “from the burdens of daily labour.” He also attributed more high-minded benefits to singing festivals such as promoting peace by bringing singers of different nationalities together. As evidence of this, he stated that even the French, erstwhile enemies of the Germans, had recently sent a delegation to the Grand Festival at the Rhine. Oelschläger thus stressed that Sängerfeste were, “of undoubted benefit to mankind.”

According to one booster publication, even though Berlin was a busy, hardworking town, there were still ample facilities to meet residents’ needs for recreation. Importantly, all of the recreation which took place in these facilities was of a positive, non-threatening type. The athletic facilities, for example, provided a forum for sports which encouraged the development of proper manhood, while the free library provided “mental food as well as recreation.” Along with their love of music, Germans were also said to be renowned for their love of education. This passion for education even continued after the end of formal schooling. Therefore, the Globe profile claimed while fiction, regarded as lowbrow, was still popular at the local library, the “metaphysical tendencies,” of Germans meant that philosophy was popular as well. Even in their recreation, then, Germans strove to promote progress.

While amusements such as singing, or “manly sport” were seen as constructive, at a time when temperance movements demonized alcohol as corroding the moral fabric of society, the German propensity to drink beer was potentially problematic. Drunkenness was also a vice typically associated with immigrants. The way that Germans drank, however, was portrayed as different from other, objectionable groups. For Germans, drinking was social and convivial and,
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unlike other groups, alcohol was not indulged in to the point of intoxication.\(^{144}\) This was also linked to the German desire for home ownership as a worker seeking to own his home needed to practice thrift and sobriety.\(^{145}\) Both German- and English-language newspapers in Berlin reported that although beer flowed freely during the town’s celebrations, there was no drunkenness.\(^{146}\) The *Busy Man’s Magazine* profile of the town’s Germans stated that the Germans were a sober people even though they did not support prohibition. This was because they knew how to moderate their consumption better than other groups such as the Irish, Scottish, or even English.\(^{147}\)

During the 1886 *Sängerfest*, the *Berliner Journal* reported that the lack of drunkenness and fistfights amazed visiting Anglo Canadians who did not know that such a thing was possible at such a large gathering.\(^{148}\) Germans thus claimed to be even more orderly and law-abiding than Anglo Canadians. According to the *Berliner Journal*, the three hundred English Canadians from Toronto that “(dis)honoured the town with their visit” to the 1898 *Sängerfest*, caused more trouble than fifteen times as many Germans. Of the approximately half dozen people arrested during the festival for disturbing the peace, the *Journal* proudly proclaimed that none were German.\(^{149}\) The ethnic elite therefore maintained that Berlin’s neighbourhoods were not filled with radicals and delinquents, but respectable workers. In their spare time, they engaged in moral pursuits which aimed at self-improvement rather than self-destruction through alcohol.

\(^{144}\) On October 2, 1879, Louis Jacob Breithaupt attended a lecture by American Methodist preacher Rev. Henry Ward Bucher on the topic of “amusements.” Despite the inherent consumption of alcohol, Bucher listed German beer gardens as an acceptable, family-friendly form of entertainment. UW, GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.5.3, L. J. Breithaupt Diaries, 2 October 1879.

\(^{145}\) AO, MHSO, F1405-60-5, William H. E. Schmalz textual records, MFN24, “Berlin Today: Centennial Number in Celebration of the Old Boys’ and Girls’ Reunion, August 6th, 7th, 8th, 1906.”


\(^{149}\) According to Mariana Valverde, respect for law and authority was seen as a particularly British quality. Claiming that Germans actually outstripped Anglo Canadians in this respect was therefore a significant boast. “Sängerfest-Notizen,” *Berliner Journal*, 18 August 1898; Valverde, “Racial Purity,” p.176.
Just how accurate was the ethnic elite’s depiction of Berlin’s compliant workers and tranquil class relations? In his diary, Louis Jacob Breithaupt nervously charted the labour unrest across North America and instances which suggested it could be coming to Berlin.\textsuperscript{150} He reacted with disappointment in 1909 when C. C. Hahn, a representative of labour interests, was elected mayor, and then with disgust when he was re-elected the following year.\textsuperscript{151} Hahn caused a stir during the municipal elections for 1911 when he accused his fellow candidate, William Henry Schmalz, of being a tool of manufacturing interests. For this, the \textit{Daily Telegraph} accused Hahn of trying to stir up class conflict. The newspaper thus told its readers to cast their ballots for Schmalz, a vote for harmony and progress.\textsuperscript{152}

Despite the concerns of Breithaupt and the \textit{Daily Telegraph}, however, class relations in Berlin do appear to have been relatively peaceful. Although there were occasional strikes, they did not escalate into protracted or acrimonious affairs. Moreover, the local correspondent for the \textit{Labour Gazette}, published monthly by the Department of Labour, frequently reported that relations between employers and employees were “cordial.”\textsuperscript{153} John English and Kenneth McLaughlin credit several factors for mitigating class conflict in Berlin. They argue that the shared ethnicity of employers and employees “softened the social distinctions and racial animosities that may have been caused by an Anglo-Saxon elite ruling over a predominantly German working class.” They also claim that Berlin’s orderly urban and industrial growth, which

\textsuperscript{150} See for example, UW, GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.5.3, L. J. Breithaupt Diaries, 27 April 1887, 27 July 1892, 6 July 1894, 30 March 1900, 2 May 1904, 26 November 1906, 18 July 1910.

\textsuperscript{151} UW, GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.5.3, L. J. Breithaupt Diaries, 4 January 1909, 27 December 1909.


was assiduously managed by the town council and the Board of Trade, meant that the town avoided the disruption, conflict, and chaos caused by rapid growth and industrialization in other centres. Finally, they maintain that the social life of the town, which centred on the German clubs, created a sense of community “that carried Berlin through the difficult times of industrialization.”

Berlin also provides an example of the continuation of traditional craft work and social arrangements during industrialization, which Robert Kristofferson calls “craft capitalism.” Many of Berlin’s leading industrialists such as the Breithaupts, Langs, and Vogelsangs, were initially craftsmen themselves and practiced their craft alongside their employees. By remaining living in close proximity to their factories and workers, and by holding social events such as company picnics, these industrialists demonstrated a continued common identification between masters and men, even at the end of the nineteenth century. Kristofferson argues that this alternate route to industrialization was a more positive experience for workers and helped to forestall the advent of class conflict.

While the image of Berlin’s virtuous German workers as compliant and peaceable thus may have contained a grain of truth, the workers themselves were denied a voice in its creation. At the same time, Berlin’s workers did not attempt to articulate their own version of German ethnic identity. The most prominent public event organized by the city’s workers, the annual Labour Day celebration, made no mention of the workers’ ethnicity. Rather, it focused on
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154 English and McLaughlin state that the Board of Trade and the town council, both of which were comprised of Berlin’s manufacturers and businessmen, worked together closely in promoting and managing the town’s industrial growth. The Board of Trade reviewed applications from new and existing industries for bonuses and tax exemptions to establish or expand operations in Berlin. Often, English and McLaughlin claim, the Board turned down more applications than it recommended to the council. As a result, nearly every company in Berlin which was supported by bonuses and tax exemptions “flourished and prospered.” English and McLaughlin, *Kitchener*, 57, 68-74, 84-5, 114-5.

demonstrating workers’ respectability and solidarity. In 1902, Berlin hosted the annual conference of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. On the final night, after most of the serious business of the conference had been concluded, the Berlin Trades and Labour Council treated the delegates to a “genuine German supper and social.” The speeches made during the banquet, however, made no mention of German ethnicity or the virtues of German workers. The banquet was therefore more of a nod to the background of the conference’s hosts than an affirmation of the ethnic elite’s version of German ethnicity or an attempt to assert a working class version of German ethnicity. This banquet, the Labour Day celebrations, as well as the workers’ attendance at events such as the Kirmes and Sängerfeste, suggest that Berlin’s German workers wanted German sociability, but that they did not necessarily internalize all that the elite version of German ethnicity entailed. The workers neither actively embraced, nor definitively rejected it.

On the whole, the ethnic identity cultivated by the ethnic elite was conservative and sought to minimize any challenge to the class and racial/ethnic status quo. Although they periodically described Berlin as “cosmopolitan,” a place where all races lived in harmony, and also praised British institutions for their tolerance, the ethnic elite did not challenge the


157 “Congress Concludes To-day,” Berlin News Record, 19 September 1902.
racial/ethnic hierarchy in Canada by advocating cultural pluralism.\textsuperscript{158} Their understanding of race and history made room for only the Germans alongside the British as the vanguard of civilization and pinnacle of Canadian society. Therefore, when Mayor Hugo Kranz welcomed the Governor General in 1874 and praised the British system of government for maintaining equality between people of different origins, he included the caveat that it did so “without destroying the social ladder.”\textsuperscript{159}

The identity the ethnic elite claimed also supported the gendered ordering of society. The archetypal German, who constituted the ideal Canadian citizen, was inherently male, even if this was generally expressed implicitly rather than explicitly. The elite, therefore, rarely discussed German women. When they did, it was to demonstrate that Germans could be counted on to uphold proper gender roles. In 1879, for example, the Marquis of Lorne told Berlin’s Germans that, “the domestic virtues of your wives and daughters are a beautiful example to all.”\textsuperscript{160} During the Kaiser’s birthday celebrations in 1914, William Henry Schmalz lauded the Kaiser for his ideal family life and described the Kaiserin as “a true companion.”\textsuperscript{161} Like the workers, German women played no part in the creation of this submissive, obedient image.

Advertisements promoting Berlin and its businesses were a significant means by which the ethnic identity of Berlin’s Germans was articulated and negotiated. Paula Hastings argues that by the start of the twentieth century when a booming economy helped to create optimism for Canada’s viability as a nation, images of Canada in advertisements were instrumental in

\textsuperscript{159} “Der General-Gouverneur in Berlin,” \textit{Berliner Journal}, 27 August 1874.
\textsuperscript{160} “A Living Princess in Berlin,” \textit{Berlin Daily News}, 17 September 1879.
developing and promoting a national consciousness in Canada. In Berlin, advertisements promoted the ethnic elite’s conception of German identity. Attaching German ethnicity to products produced by Berlin’s factories underscored the belief that German ethnicity was part of the modern, industrial world, not the peasant traditions of village life. Therefore, although the organizers of the Kirmes sought to create an “authentic” recreation of a traditional village fair, the program gave a prominent place to advertisements for Berlin’s businesses and industries, most of which were German-owned. This emphasized that the Germans themselves were not a parochial, tradition-bound people, but were instead modern and progressive.

The label “Made in Berlin,” which was proudly stamped on all goods produced in Berlin, as well as the town’s moniker “Busy Berlin,” testified to the thrift and industry of the Teutonic race. The ethnicity of the town’s residents was conspicuous during the “Made in Berlin” industrial exhibition held in 1905. The event reportedly drew huge crowds from across Ontario to marvel at displays of the wares produced in Berlin’s many factories. One of the most popular attractions, however, was a German restaurant with an accompanying German band. At the opening, the provincial minister of education, Dr. Pyne, observed that the industry and intelligence Germans displayed in their fatherland was well evident in Berlin. Similarly, the program for the event said of the town’s German population, “to their intelligence, industry and integrity must be attributed the marked success attained by Berlin as a thriving centre.”

The inauguration of Ontario Hydro which took place in Berlin in 1910 and Berlin’s attainment of cityhood status in 1912 were both accompanied by large public celebrations. These
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163 KPL, WHS, Kirmes Program, October 11-13, 1894.
164 “Large Crowds at the Exhibition,” Berlin Daily Telegraph, 18 October 1905.
166 AO, MHSO, FI405-60-5, William H. E. Schmalz textual records, container MU9480, file 12, “Made in Berlin’ Exhibition Programme 1905.”
events brought hundreds of out-of-town visitors, members of the media, and distinguished guests to Berlin. Two hundred eighty two newspapers from across Canada and the United States were invited to cover the hydro ceremony in 1910 while special trains were chartered from Toronto and London to carry the large number of visitors. These celebrations were thus advertisements which fixed the eyes of Canada on Berlin and displayed town’s progress and the starring role that Germans played in its achievement.

The movement advocating public ownership of power production and distribution in Ontario was proposed and, in its initial stages, spearheaded by businessmen from Berlin and Waterloo. Berlin was therefore chosen as the site for the first ceremony to celebrate receiving hydro-electric power from Niagara Falls. According to H.V. Nelles, the idea to use Ontario’s ample water supply as a source of power captured the imagination of the province as it offered the opportunity to free them from their reliance on coal from Pennsylvania. In the nineteenth century, the age of the steam engine, the lack of native coal deposits hampered industrial development in Ontario. A series of coal miner strikes in Pennsylvania which created a coal shortage on the eve of winter in 1902 underscored the perils of obtaining power from a foreign source. The “white coal” of hydro-electric power would not only break this dependence on American coal, it would spur industrial development and bring about a second industrial revolution in Canada. In addition to this tantalizing prospect, the use of manmade technology to tame the raw, awesome power of the falls gave hydro-electric power a mythic quality in the minds of Ontarians. As a guarantor of industrial growth and symbol of the victory of man over

---

nature, hydro-electric power signified progress. As Jarrett Henderson notes in his study of Canadian immigration handbooks, triumph over the forces of nature also denoted manliness. 170

Both the practical and symbolic significance of Niagara power were on display in the celebrations and editorials that accompanied its inauguration. Displays of dazzling lights were the chief feature of the decorations around Berlin for the event. The organizers of the celebration provided wiring and power free of charge to Berlin’s businesses to illuminate their exteriors, with the Economical Fire Insurance Company boasting that their display included eight hundred lights. There was even a plan to outfit members of the band with lights on their hats, however it was found to be unfeasible and scrapped. 171 The preponderance of lights distinguished the decorations for this celebration from those used in previous events in Berlin and demonstrated the triumph of science and technology represented by Niagara power. It was therefore with a sense of wonder that the Berlin News Record called Niagara power, “an undertaking unprecedented in the annals of science,” while the Mail and Empire described it as being “of the nature of miracles.” 172

A special insert in the Berlin News Record for the occasion discussed the genesis of the hydro power movement, the political and engineering hurdles which needed to be overcome for its realization, and also the benefits Berlin and Ontario stood to reap from it. In one article, Hydro Commissioner W. K. McNaught declared that the future of industry in Ontario depended on the public ownership of hydro-electric power. Although Ontario already had many preconditions for prosperity, namely, “fertile soil, busy workshops, and easy transportation for man and goods from place to place,” each could be improved upon by the application of hydro-electric power. 173

In his speech, Adam Beck, the chairman of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, stated that

171 “Program for Power Opening on Tuesday,” Berlin News Record, 7 October 1910.
along with helping to “turn the wheels of industry,” Niagara power would provide an inexpensive source of electricity to heat and light Ontarians’ homes.\textsuperscript{174} Exhibiting for citizens the everyday applications of cheap hydro-electric power and a glimpse into the now not-so-distant future, the skating rink where the inauguration ceremony took place included a display of the latest electrical appliances.\textsuperscript{175} To emphasize its domestic functions, the menu for the banquet afterwards included a notation that all the food was cooked using hydro-electric power.\textsuperscript{176}

This initiative was the result of cooperation between many different men and municipalities. Berlin, however, was more than happy to grab the lion’s share of the credit. Articles in local newspapers as well as speeches during the celebration emphasized the role that Berlin played in the hydro power movement. Adam Beck stated that it was “fitting that power should be first turned on in the town of Berlin…the home of men of vision, men who peered into the future with confidence and called the first meeting of representative men together to consider means and ways of securing a supply of electric power for manufacturing and other purposes.”\textsuperscript{177} Perhaps no single individual did as much to bring about the success of the Niagara power movement as Adam Beck whom Nelles describes as, “the most dynamic of the spokesmen for public ownership.”\textsuperscript{178} Beck, a provincial cabinet minister and former mayor of London, Ontario was born in Baden in Waterloo County and thus Berliners claimed him as their own although he had long since left Waterloo County.\textsuperscript{179} Suggesting both the important role Berlin played in its creation, as well as the benefits which would accrue to Berlin, prior to the inauguration, a reader

\textsuperscript{175} “Program for Power Opening on Tuesday,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 7 October 1910.
\textsuperscript{176} A special lunch served by the YWCA was similarly advertised as being “cooked by Niagara Falls.” “Whitney and Beck Press Button,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 12 October 1910; “Cooked By Niagara Falls,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 10 October 1910.
\textsuperscript{178} Nelles, \textit{The Politics of Development}, 247.
\textsuperscript{179} This was stated quite literally in the address of welcome to Beck. “Whitney and Beck Press Button,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 12 October 1910.
of the *News Record* wrote to the paper with a slogan for the occasion: “Niagara Falls—Berlin Rises.”

While Berlin’s Germans were not given specific credit for the Niagara power movement, their influence was alluded to throughout the celebration. Mayor Hahn stated that Berlin was chosen as the site for the inauguration of Niagara power based partly on the town’s contribution to the movement, but also as an acknowledgement of the town’s status as a thriving industrial centre. This status, Hahn claimed, was due to the thrift of Berlin’s workers, ninety percent of whom, he said, owned their own homes. Following Hahn’s speech, the address to Adam Beck on behalf of the town closed with a few words of welcome in German in recognition of his and Berlin’s heritage. The *Berlin News Record*, meanwhile, drew a parallel between the triumph of Niagara power and German unification, one of the great achievements of the previous century, heralding Adam Beck as the von Moltke of the power union. In his response, Beck observed that many of those in the crowd were, like him, of German ancestry. He stated that while they were all proud of their ancestry and fatherland, they were still thankful to be Canadian. At the climax of the ceremony, once Premier Whitney and Adam Beck together pressed the button which officially started the flow of power from Niagara Falls and bathed the Berlin skating rink in light, the band played “Die Wacht am Rhein,” followed by “God Save the King.” Like Beck’s speech, this choice of music suggested the harmony and prosperity arising from a union of German and British/Canadian. The only black mark on the otherwise glorious day was the pickpockets who victimized several onlookers. As always, the *Berlin News Record* assured

---

readers that a “careful investigation,” revealed that the as of yet unapprehend thieves had come from out of town.\textsuperscript{184}

The attainment of cityhood in 1912 was a benchmark that highlighted Berlin’s progress. Representing the provincial government during the celebration, Adam Beck stated that cityhood showed “this industrial centre has come to manhood.” By conferring the status of “manhood” upon Berlin, Beck affirmed that the city and its predominantly German residents were possessed of the qualities which fit them to be upright, productive Canadian citizens, something which was reserved for adult males. During the festivities that accompanied this achievement, the symbolic significance of civic manhood was held to be of greater importance than any practical or administrative changes it conferred. The theme of progress was a thread which ran throughout the festivities. To demonstrate the foundation of Berlin’s growth, the celebration was accompanied by an industrial exhibition which included among its displays of wares produced in Berlin’s factories, a plethora of modern electrical appliances.\textsuperscript{185}

In case there was any doubt as to who was responsible for Berlin’s progress, the ethnicity of Berlin’s residents was always prominent during the celebration. At midnight on June 10, when Berlin was officially declared a city, the band played “God Save the King,” and “Die Wacht am Rhein,” which had become standard selections to mark festive occasions, as well as “O Canada,” and “The Maple Leaf.”\textsuperscript{186} While the city received congratulations from King George, Mayor W. H. Schmalz also sent a message to the German Empress to notify her of the Canadian Berlin’s proud accomplishment.\textsuperscript{187} At the formal celebration the following month, Schmalz stated that Berlin’s residents had made the city what it was because of their typically German virtues of

\textsuperscript{184} “They Were Not From Berlin,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 13 October 1910.
\textsuperscript{185} “Made-In-Berlin Exhibition Is Now In Full Swing,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 16 July 1912.
\textsuperscript{186} “Busy Berlin is Now a City,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 10 June 1912.
\textsuperscript{187} “His Majesty Cables Congratulations,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 17 July 1912.
“industry, economy and progressiveness” which allowed them to triumph in the face of a lack of “natural advantages or being specially favored in any way.”

M.P.P. for Waterloo North, Dr. Lackner, was more explicit. He stated that Berlin’s thriving industries were a “natural development,” since it had been settled by German artisans. He boasted that seventy five percent of Berlin’s manufacturers in the present day were of German descent. A proud distinction which was repeated during the celebrations was that Berlin was the only place to wait until it had the requisite population of 15,000 before it petitioned for cityhood status. This demonstrated that the progress they were celebrating was real and not artificially inflated. As well, showing that they had followed the rules and eschewed political manoeuvering to attain the status of cityhood, underlined the portrayal of Germans as an orderly, law-abiding people.

Like the inauguration of Ontario Hydro in 1910, the festivities for the attainment of cityhood were more than just a celebration of Berlin’s prosperity. It was their contribution to the larger project of building a new and great nation in Canada. Even from the early days of Confederation, Berlin’s Germans claimed to be an integral part of the nation building project in Canada. In 1874, Berlin’s mayor Hugo Kranz welcomed Governor General Lord Dufferin to this town populated primarily by Germans who he said were playing their part in the construction of a Canadian nationality. At the time, Canada was seen as a young nation, still in its formative years, with its character and future not yet defined. Seeing that Canada was in this crucial stage of development, the Marquis of Lorne, in 1879, implored Berlin’s Germans “as citizens and founders of a new nation,” to work to guide and strengthen it by bringing the German love for

188 “City Celebration is Officially Opened,” Berlin News Record, 17 July 1912.
190 “The City of Berlin,” Berlin News Record, 10 June 1912.
science and education as well as German thrift and industry to Canada. At the unveiling of the Kaiser’s bust in 1897, Mayor John Christian Breithaupt, brother of Louis Jacob, similarly outlined why Germans had such a crucial role to play in Canada. Even three decades after Confederation, he cautioned that Canada was still a new country with much to learn. As such, Canadians should take what was best from the old world since there was “much worthy of imitation in the lives of our German forefathers.” Neither Breithaupt nor the Marquis of Lorne called for the wholesale importation of German culture into Canada, but instead just select aspects. This was the key as to why Berlin’s Germans had such an important role in securing a bright future for Canada. By combining in Canada the best aspects of German culture with the best aspects of British culture, they were creating a new empire which would be the heir to the mantle of the world’s two greatest empires.

In May, 1914, the Berliner Journal still retained this optimism for Canada’s future and the place of the Germans in it. In an editorial urging its readers to vote, the Journal looked back upon Canada’s progress over the previous ten years and predicted that soon Canada would overtake the United States and become one of the leading nations in the world. It credited Germans for Canada’s growth, and asserted that German immigrants were prized as citizens because of the skill of their workers and ability to adapt and become loyal members of their new lands. Consequently, Germans had the potential to be an important factor in Canadian political life, but only if they fulfilled their civic duty and voted. Mere months later, this optimism for their place in the “land of the future” was shattered by the start of the First World War.

The Best Class of Citizens: Rights, Duties, and Challenges

193 “The Unveiling,” Berlin News Record, 13 August 1897.
At the unveiling of the statue of Queen Victoria in 1911, the Earl Grey told Berlin’s residents that it was a “well known fact that those of German descent made the best class of citizens.” In the four decades after the Peace Festival of 1871, this sentiment was generally accepted as true. As befitting their status, Berlin’s Germans were entitled to the rights and material benefits of citizenship. Among these was the right to practice and maintain their language and culture. This was demonstrated by the access that they were granted to public spaces for ethnic celebrations as well as the prominent place of German ethnicity in Berlin’s civic celebrations. As well, although it was not recognized as such formally, in Berlin, German enjoyed a status as an official language. In municipal elections, for example, ballots were printed in English as well as German in the fraktur script.

Historians have argued that schools during this period were seen as an essential tool for the assimilation of the children of immigrants and fostering Anglo-conformity. Luigi Pennacchio, for example, argues that Toronto’s schools instilled in students what he calls “the four cornerstones of British-Canadian citizenship: imperial patriotism, Protestantism, the English language, and cleanliness.” In the schools of Berlin, however, the German language was one cornerstone of the local version of Canadian citizenship.

In June 1900, School Inspector Thomas Pearce investigated the supposedly poor English reading level at Berlin’s high school and in his report blamed the continued teaching of German
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in the public schools. In response, the leaders of Berlin’s German community formed the Deutsche Schule Verein, or German School Society, to lobby for the continuation and improvement of German-language classes in Berlin. In its initial meeting, the arguments that the members of the Verein offered in support of German-language classes were not simply based upon the preponderance of Germans in Berlin, but rather on the status of Germans as loyal citizens and the supposed role of the German language in the formation of productive, useful citizens. Conrad Bitzer declared that Berlin owed its standing to the thrifty Germans. He added that there was much Canada could learn from Germany which was renowned as a moderate, efficient, well-taught nation. Reverend W. C. Böse likewise held Germans as the source of Berlin’s prosperity. Louis Jacob Breithaupt contended that if Canadians wished to conduct business with Germany and Britain, the world’s most modern, advanced nations, it was important to know both languages otherwise Canadians would be at an economic disadvantage. The official resolution of the Deutsche Schule Verein claimed that they had the right as citizens to classes in German and, countering Pearce, stated that students

…in learning the German language will on that account be no less loyally and affectionately devoted to the fair Dominion of Canada and her institutions but doubly fitted to appreciate the blessings of true liberty, justice and equality, and for their broader education prove themselves better citizens, evincing the fact that one may be a true and loyal son of Canada and at the same time a good German scholar…
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199 Schooling in Berlin was initially conducted entirely in German, starting in 1818 when Bishop Benjamin Eby first began holding classes. Education in German began to decline in the latter half of the nineteenth century as Berlin’s Germans, who had no desire to segregate themselves from the surrounding population, came to see knowledge of English as vital to their success in Canada and increasingly sent their children to English-language schools. Despite dwindling enrollment in German classes, however, the 1901 census reported that nearly ninety percent of Berlin’s residents of German origins claimed German as their mother tongue, suggesting that many learned German in the home as opposed to the formal setting of the classroom. Thomas Pearce, “School History, Waterloo County and Berlin,” Waterloo Historical Society Annual Report, 2, (1914): 41; Barbara Lorenzkowski, “Languages of Ethnicity: Teaching German in Waterloo County’s Schools, 1850-1915,” Histoire Social/Social History 41, no. 81 (2008): 7-9, 25; “School Board Meeting,” Berlin News Record, 7 June 1900.


201 “German in the Public Schools,” Berlin News Record, 23 June 1900.
With the cooperation of the Berlin public school board and the Ontario Department of Education, German was made an optional subject in Berlin’s public schools. Textbooks were approved and purchased, and German was even included on high school entrance exams.\textsuperscript{202} The \textit{Deutsche Schule Verein} was influential with the Berlin public school board, which generally heeded the \textit{Deutsche Schule Verein}’s requests to improve German classes by hiring new teachers and constructing rooms to be used exclusively for German teaching.\textsuperscript{203} By 1911, the \textit{Deutsche Schule Verein} had achieved considerable success in its mission. It reported that 80\% of Berlin’s elementary school students were enrolled in this optional subject which they claimed was “a valuable supplement of Public School education in our polyglot country.”\textsuperscript{204}

Like the ethnic German celebrations which actively courted the participation of Anglo-Canadians, these classes were meant for children of non-German ancestry as well. The \textit{Deutsche Schule Verein} encouraged non-German parents to enrol their children and awarded prizes each semester to the top two students of German parentage and the top two students of English parentage in each class.\textsuperscript{205} By 1907, one-quarter of the students enrolled in these classes were of non-German parentage.\textsuperscript{206} Even membership in the \textit{Deutsche Schule Verein} itself was not limited to people of German ancestry. The initial meeting in 1900 which resulted in its creation was open to “all citizens whether of German or British descent” who felt that German-language classes were desirable and beneficial.\textsuperscript{207} Thus, as John Motz stated at the unveiling of the Kaiser’s bust in
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1897, Berlin’s Germans did not wish to be “a sectional State in this land.” Rather, they claimed to be, and were accepted as, loyal citizens.

At the same time that German-language classes were flourishing in Berlin’s public schools, French-language education outside of Quebec was under attack by Anglo Canadians. In 1912, the Ontario government introduced Regulation 17 which banned French language instruction after the first form, eliciting a passionate protest from Franco-Ontarians, most notably in Ottawa. While Berlin’s Germans watched such developments warily, prior to the First World War, they were not subjected to the same draconian measures as the Franco-Ontarians. Although the Germans only sought to have individual classes in German, rather than the entire curriculum to be taught in their language as the Franco-Ontarians demanded, after Inspector Pearce’s initial report in 1900, until the First World War, their right to this was never again called into question. During this period, therefore, the rights that Berlin’s Germans enjoyed as citizens surpassed those of other groups who were also included as citizens, such as French Canadians. Germans joined British Canadians as first class citizens.

While Berlin’s Germans enjoyed the full rights of citizenship, their duties as citizens were seldom tested. Prior to the First World War, these duties were only vaguely defined as contributing to Canada’s growth and prosperity. This they fulfilled by virtue of their racial status. The Boer War, however, provided a concrete test of their duties. Loyal Canadians were expected to jump to the defense of the British Empire. Unlike the First World War which required an all-encompassing effort, the Boer War was a more limited engagement. Berlin therefore had only a single volunteer, Herman Quirmbach the local telegraph operator, accepted for duty. His sending off was accompanied by a parade and rally at the train station where he was presented with one hundred dollars in gold, raised by subscription from Berlin’s citizens.

208 “The Big Sangerfest,” Globe (Toronto), 14 August 1897.
The defensive tone struck by Berlin’s newspapers in reporting on this event demonstrates that in this instance, Germans were seen, in the eyes of some, as potentially disloyal and therefore deficient in their duties as citizens. The newspapers defended the place of Germans as Canadian citizens, arguing that they were just as loyal as Canadians of British ancestry and were just as enthusiastic in supporting the war effort. The *Berlin News Record* mentioned several times that Quirmbach was a German Canadian fighting for the British Empire. The *News Record* also posited that it was not just Quirmbach who was doing his duty as a citizen but the entire town through its rousing demonstration of support for the war during the send-off.209 As well, the *Berliner Journal* stated that if parades and waving flags and donations of money were evidence of patriotism, “then nobody may question that Berlin, which from some places is unjustifiably criticized, is loyal through and through.”210 Speeches made during the rally were similarly defensive. Mayor John Eden stated that the rally should dispel any rumours of disloyalty. Quirmbach also addressed the crowd and declared, “of German parentage, a citizen of Berlin all my life and for many years coming in daily contact with its business men, I know I am bidding farewell to a loyal and large hearted class of people who are deeply interested in the welfare of the British subjects of the Queen, wherever they may be.”211

Contrary to Mayor Eden’s prediction, accusations of disloyalty aimed at Berlin and its German population did not abate after Quirmbach’s lavish departure. Newspapers responded by publicizing Berlin’s contributions to patriotic causes such as the Red Cross. This, they maintained, was a practical demonstration of their loyalty and fulfillment of their duties as citizens.212 Red Cross Commissioner G. Sterling Ryerson seemed to agree. In July 1900, he wrote

211 “The Soldier’s Farewell,” *Berlin News Record*, 3 January 1900.
to Reverend von Pirch and praised what Berlin’s Germans had done to support the Red Cross stating, “It is gratifying to know the sympathy of our German fellow citizens as well as their practical way of showing it.”

This was not the only time that their place as citizens was contested. Although Anglo-Canadians generally accepted Berlin’s Germans’ claim to citizenship, this acceptance was by no means universal. The *Berliner Journal* hinted at ethnic tensions prior to the Dominion Day celebrations in 1874 complaining that “conceited John Bull,” had accused Berlin’s Germans of disloyalty despite the fact that they were the ones doing all the work to prepare for Canada’s national holiday. The following year, the *Berliner Journal* again protested that if the Germans in Berlin did not make preparations for Dominion Day or the Queen’s birthday, then nothing would get done.

Prior to the unveiling of the Kaiser’s bust in 1897, the *Berlin Daily Telegraph* published an editorial which accused Berlin’s Germans of disloyalty. Perhaps because a celebration is ephemeral, while a bronze statue is much more permanent, the right of Berlin’s Germans to access this public space was not as readily conceded as before. The *Berlin News Record*, however, rushed to the defence of the German community. In a series of editorials, the *News Record* defended the place of Berlin’s Germans as loyal citizens against the criticism of the *Daily Telegraph*, reiterating the two main themes of German ethnic identity.

Calling the editor of the *Daily Telegraph* “more British than John Bull,” the *News Record* stated that the German community had never committed a disloyal act. Germans were law-abiding and so when they decided to erect a memorial, they first sought permission from the proper authorities. Demonstrating this approval, Prime Minister Laurier had even allowed the
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bust into the country duty free. The *News Record* conceded that cries of disloyalty would have been appropriate if the monument had been a bust of George Washington, a man who had fought against the British, however, the man who the bust depicted was an ally of Britain, “beloved at home and respected abroad.” A German therefore had a right to be proud of the great German Empire, “even if he has chosen to become a Canadian citizen.” Furthermore, Berlin’s prosperity showed that “the energetic Germans who laid its broad, substantial foundation,” were among the most desirable people a young country such as Canada could seek out. The Germans had not only demonstrated their value as citizens by contributing to Berlin’s success, they were even willing to stand up if greater tests of their citizenship arose. The *News Record* praised the editor of the *Deutsche Zeitung*, another local German-language newspaper, for his “manly utterance,” proclaiming that the Germans were willing to defend, even with their lives, the “adopted Fatherland,” if it was threatened. By contrast, the *News Record* speculated that those who were loudest in criticizing the German community would do the least to defend their country.216

The German community responded by thanking the *News Record* “for having defined their position with regard to their citizenship and their motive in erecting the Peace Memorial.” Seeing that its initial view was not widely accepted, a chastened *Daily Telegraph* conceded that 999 of every 1,000 Germans were loyal and it should not have attacked them indiscriminately.217 Once the festival was over, the *Berliner Journal* offered its own retort to the *Daily Telegraph* stating that the British and German flags flying side by side throughout the festival were, “an example for the handful of ‘jingoes’ in Berlin!”218

---

On May 26, 1914, the German flag that hung in Victoria Park was pulled down at night by vandals. Local newspapers immediately condemned the act which they characterized as an attack on the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. The *News Record* opined that the deed must have been perpetrated by a “crass stranger,” since “anyone who knows what Berlin owes to its citizens of German birth and extraction would never have committed it.”219 Much like for the unveiling of the Kaiser’s bust, a letter to the editor of the *News Record* on “the flag incident,” defended the place of Berlin’s Germans as Canadian citizens by asserting the compatibility of German and British and discussing what Germans had done to foster Berlin’s prosperity. The author, who wrote anonymously under the name “German-Canadian,” talked of what Germans had done for Canada and Waterloo County. Germans, the author argued, had made Waterloo County the best county in Ontario. Furthermore, authorities in Berlin had allowed the German flag to fly in Victoria Park in recognition of their accomplishments and as a demonstration of the esteem in which Germans were held. The author then pointed to the familial relationship between the German and British royal families. He stated that when the flag was torn down, it had been flying to honour the birthday of the late Queen Victoria. Tearing it down was therefore not only an insult to the German community, it dishonoured the Queen’s memory.220

These sentiments expressed by “German Canadian” had become common currency in Berlin in the four plus decades since the Peace Festival. The outbreak of the First World War less than two months later, however, rendered them untenable. During the tumultuous war years, Anglo Canadians no longer readily conceded the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. Members of the ethnic elite, then, were forced to reconfigure their ethnic identity in order to reclaim their former status.

Chapter 2: “We are of German descent, and are not ashamed of it,” 1914-1918

On August 12, 1914, the Berliner Journal issued a “call to the Germans of Ontario.” Lamenting the worst-case scenario which had arisen, the editors reminded readers of the peace and prosperity they had enjoyed in Canada. They beseeched Ontario’s Germans to “be calm, bear the difficult time with dignity and while you are a true German, be thankful for the land you have chosen and in which you have found a new homeland. Command duty and honour to show ourselves worthy of our new homeland.”

Difficult times did lay ahead. On August 22, 1914 vandals tore down the bust of Kaiser Wilhelm I in Victoria Park and tossed it into the adjacent lake. This act, roundly condemned, proved to be a portent of what was to come. On March 18, 1915, the Berlin Public School Board voted 5-3 to eliminate German-language classes from the curriculum. Along with the right to practice and maintain their language and culture, the Germans also had some of the most basic rights as citizens, such as the right to vote and the right to protection under the law, challenged during the war. Throughout the conflict, there were numerous instances of riotous mobs or acts of vandalism directed at the city’s German community. On February 15, 1916, soldiers of the 118th Battalion, which was being raised in Berlin, as well as some civilians, raided the Concordia Club. They destroyed and burned much of the property, and carried off the bust of Kaiser Wilhelm I which was being held out of sight in the club’s storage room. Those who participated in the raid were not punished; instead, an inquiry laid blame on the club itself for supposedly being pro-German. Less than one month later, on March 4, 1916, members of the battalion assaulted a Lutheran minister whom they accused of being disloyal. The ringleaders were given a suspended sentence rather than the fine of $100 and

1 “Aufruf an die Deutschen in Ontario,” Berliner Journal, 12 August 1914.
2 “Soldiers Break Loose and Wreck German Club Rooms In Concordia Hall,” Berlin News Record, 16 February 1916.
six months in jail the offense normally called for. On May 19, 1916, citizens voted by a narrow margin to change the name of the city. The following month, citizens selected the more patriotic Kitchener as the replacement. The vote was marked by low turnout and a high number of ballots spoiled in protest. Supporters of the name change used intimidation to prevent the opposition from organizing a strong campaign, to scare opponents away from voting on the plebiscite, and also prevent the opposition from having enough scrutineers to man the polls. Finally, the supporters of the name change succeeded in getting many of the city’s residents declared aliens and taken off the voters’ list for the plebiscite and the municipal elections the following January. This was done in advance of the federal Wartime Elections Act of September 1917 which disenfranchised those of enemy alien ancestry who had been naturalized for less than 15 years.

Historians have characterized the First World War as a cataclysm which destroyed Berlin’s German community, forcing Germans to assimilate into an Anglo-Canadian milieu. John English and Kenneth McLaughlin argue that the First World War helped to break down everything that had separated Berlin from the rest of Ontario and made it unique. They state that “the war years had assured that Kitchener could never again be Berlin.” Similarly, in his history of the German Canadians of Waterloo County, Gottlieb Leibbrandt claims that the two world wars “dismantled” the German community. According to H. K. Kalbfleisch, the war simply expedited a process of assimilation that was already well underway.
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6 English and McLaughlin, Kitchener, 12, 133.
8 Gerhard Friesen also argues that the war destroyed the German community. He blames the Berliner Journal for failing to provide leadership in defending the German community. Another work, Patricia McKegney’s The Kaiser’s Bust, is primarily concerned with explaining the origins of the conflicts that plagued Berlin/Kitchener during the First World War. She contends that the conflicts were a result of a combination of the city’s German character, its
I argue that in spite of the well-known events such as the name change or the destruction of the Kaiser’s bust, the German community was not simply maligned, pushed to the margins and forced to assimilate. Instead, the ethnic elite defended the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. During the war years, the city was divided into two factions. These groups contested the meaning of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship on a daily basis in speeches, in print, in courtrooms, in politics, and, quite often, physically in the streets. My portrayal of these forums as places where the meaning of Canadian citizenship and German ethnicity were debated and contested challenges Jeffrey Keshen’s argument that Canada’s communications networks, as well as Canadians themselves, were more or less unified in their attitudes towards the war, its prosecution, Canada’s place in the British Empire, and Germany.\(^9\) In Berlin/Kitchener, one group argued that loyalty to Canada and Britain required strict Anglo-conformity and vilified anyone who insisted that German ethnicity was nothing to be ashamed of. The other group maintained that ethnic Germans were loyal and valuable Canadian citizens and claimed that the principle of British fair play encouraged tolerance for diversity. Interestingly, the two groups were not simply divided according to ethnicity. There were many non-Germans who called for tolerance, while some of the most ardent advocates of Anglo-conformity were themselves of German ancestry.

In her study of citizenship policy in Canada during the Second World War, Ivana Caccia states that wars create anxiety about a nation’s identity and “a heightened urge to reinforce its cohesiveness, re-examine the imagined boundaries of its nationhood, and accelerate the process
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of nation-building.” In his study of Guelph, Ontario, Lethbridge, Alberta, and Trois-Rivières, Quebec during the First World War, Robert Rutherford asserts that the local level was “a crucial plane of experience on which national-level ‘realities’ were lived.” The conflict between the Anglo-conformists and the German defenders in Berlin/Kitchener is an example of a national-level reality, experienced at a local level. While the conflict in Berlin/Kitchener mirrored that which occurred in other locales and nationally, it did not do so exactly. The practice of citizenship in Berlin/Kitchener often deviated from the national definition in terms of who was included and in reference to the rights and duties accruing to those deemed citizens.

Berlin/Kitchener was not the only city to experience such tensions and conflicts over the presence of persons of enemy ancestry. Donald H. Avery states that across Canada enemy aliens, particularly Austrians, “became the object of intense Anglo-Canadian hostility.” The anti-German hysteria and attacks on the place of Germans as Canadian citizens witnessed in Berlin/Kitchener therefore also occurred in other places across Canada. In Toronto, for example, despite initial pleas of tolerance, Ian Miller states that residents became increasingly agitated by the presence of “enemy aliens.” Germans and Austrians were blamed for acts of mob violence directed against them. Toronto city council also moved that any enemy aliens using seditious language be deported, and that steps be taken to prevent them from immigrating to Canada postwar. James Pitsula describes similar violent and repressive acts directed against Regina’s
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sizeable German population during the First World War.  

Social reformers, Pitsula argues, also equated the war in Europe with their own war at home to Canadianize foreigners.  

As in Berlin/Kitchener, Regina experienced a conflict over foreign-language instruction in schools. In the Regina debate, there was a consensus that schools should be used to enforce Anglo-conformity. The dispute was over whether the process should be gradual or immediate.

Berlin/Kitchener differed from other cities, however, in that ethnic Germans not only formed a majority of the population, they had also won acceptance in the mainstream prior to the war. The Germans of Berlin/Kitchener were not a powerless, marginalized ethnic group. Actions against them could not be carried out indiscriminately. Instead, they occasioned debate over the place of ethnic Germans as Canadian citizens, even if, as will be seen, the voice of dissent was muffled, but not muzzled, by the war.

Defending German Ethnicity and Citizenship

The First World War rendered untenable many of the tenets of the ethnic identity which Berlin’s leading Germans had employed over the previous four decades to legitimate their acceptance as Canadian citizens. The Anglo-conformists presented Berlin’s Germans with the option of retaining their ethnic identity and being vilified or abandoning it entirely and assimilating. Many of Berlin’s Germans chose a third option. They reformulated the aspects of their ethnic identity that were no longer acceptable, such as their celebration of the German Empire, and retained what still worked in order to continue to claim a place for Germans as Canadian citizens, demonstrating the plasticity of ethnic identity.
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14 James M. Pitsula, For All We Have and Are: Regina and the Experience of the Great War (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2008), 39-43.
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Throughout the war, many of Berlin’s leading Germans continued to argue that Germans were pioneers and nation builders who were responsible for building the city into a prosperous industrial centre. Soon after the war began, the Berlin News Record published an editorial which condemned the “busybodies” who called for Germans in Berlin and Waterloo County to be arrested. The newspaper reminded its readers that “it is the descendants of German forebears who have made Berlin and Waterloo what they are to-day and placed this riding at the forefront amongst Canadian communities.” 17 Two weeks later, after vandals tore down the Kaiser’s bust, the News Record wrote another editorial deploring this act of “rowdyism.” The News Record defended the German community using gendered, racialized, and classed language to contrast the Germans, who were ideal citizens, with those who were deficient. The editors accused the perpetrators of lacking proper manhood. They claimed that the type of people who would commit such an act did nothing to support the war effort or their own families who were “dependent on their wives’ labors at the washtub.” By contrast, the Germans which these “miscreants” had insulted, were model citizens and men. The editors claimed that German immigrants always became loyal citizens of the country of their adoption, unlike lesser races such as “Jap” immigrants who would gladly betray their new country. Returning to the tropes which had been employed prior to the war, the News Record stated that it was “because of their industry, thrift, and enterprise [Berlin] has forged to the front of Canadian cities even though it lacked natural advantages.” 18 The Berliner Journal likewise denounced this attack on the peaceful German citizens whom the editors maintained had done as much as any other group to forge Canada into a strong, healthy nation. 19

17 “The Waterloo Incident,” Berlin News Record, 8 August 1914.
As the war dragged on, the editors of the *Berliner Journal* were forced to be much more guarded in expressing their opinion for fear of being shut down. As Anne Löchte explains, the *Berliner Journal* attempted to maintain a conciliatory approach and also made certain not to exaggerate anti-German incidents so as to avoid provoking further ire. After the name change, the newspaper printed fewer and fewer editorials and printed columns on innocuous topics such as “On Getting Up Early.” This caution proved to be for naught. In October 1918 the government banned publications in enemy languages by Order-in-Council. Debates in the city’s newspapers over the place of Germans as Canadian citizens therefore took place primarily in the English-language press. It was the *News Record* that took up the cause of defending the city’s Germans. The *News Record* also became the mouthpiece for the Citizens’ League, a political party formed in 1916 to defend the city’s German community. Conversely, the *Daily Telegraph* supported the Anglo-conformists and in 1916 became the organ for this faction’s political party, the British League.

In September 1914, the *News Record* stated that although the Kaiser and militarism were deplorable, the German people themselves had many admirable qualities. Strangely, this editorial still associated Berlin’s residents with the now-hated Kaiser. It continued claiming that “had it not been for the thrifty, sturdy, efficient and ambitious immigrants from the Kaiser’s empire, the northern part of this county would not be the important industrial centre that it is.” The *News Record* responded to an accusation made by the *London Advertiser* that German Americans were planning to invade Canada, by arguing that it was a characteristic of German immigrants in Canada and the United States to become loyal, productive citizens of their adopted home. In the
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United States and across the British Empire, they were renowned for their industry, thrift, and progressiveness which led them to surpass all other immigrants “in real worth and general desirability.” Furthermore, the News Record asserted that communities such as London, Ontario, “who do not have the good fortune to possess an asset of German citizenship do not know what they are saying when they question their loyalty or worth.”

Much of the content of these claims to be nation builders was thus little changed from the prewar decades. What differed, however, was the tone. Prior to the war, Berlin’s Germans asserted their place as proudly and confidently in public celebrations which affirmed their Canadian citizenship. During the war, with their citizenship now being questioned, they did so defensively in response to criticisms or attacks upon the community such as the change of the city’s name, a symbolic rejection of the acceptance of Germans in the mainstream.

Agitation to change the name of Berlin had existed since the start of the war. It was not until February 11, 1916, however, when a meeting was held to petition for a name change, that it coalesced into an organized movement. To limit opposition, the meeting was not generally advertised, although the organizers would subsequently claim that the meeting and its resolution were representative of the will of Berlin’s citizens generally. Thus only three men who were present—C. Asmussen, Louis Jacob Breithaupt, and Reverend J. Lynn—spoke up against the proposal. Lynn, who was of English and Scottish ancestry, called changing the city’s name “unjust and childish,” and argued that changing the city’s name would not change the fact that it was a German settlement. He also reminded those present that Berlin’s prosperity was thanks to the tireless industry of the German residents. In the aftermath of this meeting, the Berlin News Record quickly came out against the proposed name change. The name of the city, the News
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22 “Un-British Conduct,” Berlin News Record, 5 November 1914.
Record claimed, was not meant to honour the capital of Prussia, but rather the thrift and industry of the pioneers who founded Berlin and transformed it into “a great manufacturing hive in this new land.”

A letter to the editor of the Berliner Journal by F. G. E. Williams also used the achievements of Berlin’s Germans to oppose the name change. Williams, like Reverend Lynn a non-German, argued that even the greatest “German hater” had to admit that Germans were responsible for Berlin’s success and prosperity. Like the News Record, he implored the city’s residents to honour the pioneers who built the city by preserving its name.

In February 1916, William Henry Breithaupt wrote a lengthy letter opposing the name change which was published in the News Record, the Daily Telegraph, and the Berliner Journal. Tellingly, Breithaupt began his defence of the city’s name by outlining the Berlin’s history dating back to its founding at the start of the nineteenth century. Burnishing the Germans’ credentials as pioneers who opened up Canada’s interior, he stated that when the Pennsylvania Germans first arrived in 1800, they established the farthest inland settlement in Upper Canada at the time. While these hardy settlers were responsible for laying the foundations for civilization in the middle of the wilderness, Breithaupt credited the Germans who began to arrive from Germany in 1819 and their descendants with transforming this frontier settlement into a thriving industrial centre. The fact that Berlin’s Germans in the present were the descendants of these “men of energy and large undertakings,” gave their argument for retaining the city’s name greater legitimacy according to Breithaupt. By contrast, he argued that the majority of those who wished to change the city’s name were newcomers whose families had not been involved in Berlin’s growth for more than their own generation.
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The German defenders continued to trumpet their status as the founders of the city’s prosperity even after the vote to change the city’s name had passed. By asserting their claim to citizenship, the German defenders objected to the violence, intimidation, and disfranchisement of long-standing residents which helped to secure the vote’s passage. On July 2, 1916, shortly after Kitchener was selected as the new name for the city, the Berlin News Record claimed that because of the turmoil surrounding the name change, four “old and good families” had left Berlin while others were considering following suit. The families had come from “the class which forms the bone and sinew of our industrial forces and who have played such an important part in the up-building of Berlin.” At the same time, factory owner George Lang protested that the name-change election was unfair as men who had been resident in Berlin for more than 40 years had been prevented from voting. Like William Henry Breithaupt, he attempted to discredit the name change supporters by claiming that they were “a few light weights who are newcomers to the city,” and had not been involved in Berlin’s growth. At a meeting of the Citizens’ League during the heated civic election campaign in December 1916, speakers reiterated their status as nation builders in their defence of the city’s Germans. Aldermanic candidate A. L. Bitzer declared that the British League’s slogan “Protect Your City,” was a farce. After all, the British League had done nothing to protect the homes of men like William Henry Breithaupt who had opposed the name change or to protect German cultural institutions such as the Concordia Club. The British League, he stated, wanted to erase the city’s past. Bitzer railed that the British League wanted citizens “to forget the Breithaupts, the Langs and the Krugs who came here and started our industries.” He maintained that these great men should be celebrated.
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In defending their place as Canadian citizens, the role that the city’s Germans claimed in local and Canadian history remained largely intact during the war years. But as their adopted homeland was now at war with Germany, Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans were required to redefine their own relationship with the old fatherland as well as the relationship between it on the one hand and Canada and Britain on the other. Prior to the war, the city’s Germans celebrated the success of the German Empire, which they claimed demonstrated the positive qualities they brought with them to Canada. During the war rather than denying their ethnicity, Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans sought to divorce German achievements in the arts and sciences from the now-vilified Kaiser and Prussian militarism which they blamed for starting the war.

Shortly after the war began, in August 1914, William Henry Schmalz was interviewed by the Kingston Standard during his visit to the city. In the interview, he was asked how Berlin, Ontario’s Germans felt about the war. In his response, Schmalz made a distinction between the innocent German people and the Prussian warlords who were responsible for starting the war and oppressing their own people. Schmalz stated that the city’s Germans all wished England to win the war and bring to Germany the freedoms enjoyed by those in the British Empire. Germany, he added, had been a leader in many fields such as art and science, however its people were burdened by having to support the military.30

In February 1915, as a sign of support for the country’s citizens of German origins, Prime Minister Robert Borden invited W. G. Weichel, the German-Canadian Member of Parliament for Waterloo North, to deliver the response to the throne speech. After discussing the war, business conditions, and agriculture in Canada, he then turned to the German Canadians. Weichel reiterated the belief that the Germans had been integral to Berlin’s prosperity and that their thrift and frugality made Germans the most desirable citizens. Germans, he argued, should not be made

30 “Sees Germany as a Republic,” Berlin News Record, 21 August 1914.
to forsake their heritage, any more than a person of English, Scottish, Irish, or French descent should be made to forsake theirs. As Schmalz had done, he distinguished between the German people and the war’s Prussian perpetrators. German Canadians, he said, “are proud of the race from which they sprung,” with its great achievements in science, art, music, and literature. They were proud, he stated, to come from the land of Goethe, Schiller, Mozart, and Wagner, but they were not proud of the invasion of Belgium or the atrocities Germany had committed. German immigrants came to Canada to escape from Prussian militarism, and were now eager for “the obliteration of this curse which has been weighing so heavily on Europe for so many years.”

At a recruitment rally in Berlin in December 1915, Minister of Agriculture Martin Burrell spoke of citizenship. All Canadian citizens, he claimed, shared a set of ideals and so they should all feel and act as one in doing their duty and supporting the war effort. Legitimating the place of Germans as Canadian citizens, he stated that they were not at war with the Germany of Beethoven, Schiller, Goethe, or south Germany. Rather, the fight was with Prussia which was corrupt going back to Frederick the Great. Echoing Burrell’s comments, a subsequent speaker added that the Germans in Canada differed from those overseas for one crucial reason: militarism. At a rally during the federal election campaign in 1917, Union candidate W. G. Weichel was forced to defend the Wartime Elections Act which took the right to vote away from many Kitchener residents. Weichel asserted that the Act, which he had supported, was aimed at the Germans in the west whose loyalties were dubious, rather than the stalwart residents of Kitchener. He had in fact helped many Kitchener residents to obtain their citizenship papers. Kitchener’s Germans, he said, were “pioneers” who came “not from the Germany of today, but
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the Germany of Beethoven, Motzart [sic], Goethe, Schiller,” and who laid the foundations of the city’s prosperity and intermarried with the British.  

Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans also alleged that the reason their families had left Germany was to escape the tyranny and oppression of the Prussian warlords. In September 1914, after an article in the Buffalo Express falsely claimed that German Canadians’ homes and assets were being seized by the government, W. G. Weichel defended the liberty of British institutions which guaranteed German Canadians the same rights as English, Scottish, and Irish Canadians. He argued that “the majority of the original German settlers came to Canada to escape the burdens of militarism in their native land and settled in Canada because it offered them better opportunities and guaranteed freedom and constitutional government.” The city’s Germans were thankful for these rights and therefore had no desire to aid the Kaiser. Welcoming Sam Hughes to Berlin in September 1915, Mayor J. E. Hett pointed to the ethnicity of the majority of the city’s citizens, himself included. He said that “their forefathers came to Canada many years ago to escape militarism and to find liberty under the British flag.” Significantly, speakers claimed that coming to Canada specifically was a deliberate choice. The Germans of Berlin/Kitchener chose the freedom offered by British institutions in Canada over oppression in Germany and also above living anywhere else, such as the United States. Arthur Hawkes, a well-known British-born journalist, therefore wrote in the News Record in November 1916 that Waterloo County’s Germans, although “of pure German blood,” were “all-the-way Canadians,” and fully British.

In his letter to the editor opposing the city’s name change, William Henry Breithaupt defiantly declared “We are of German descent, and are not ashamed of it.” After all, Berlin’s
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Germans had not supported the Kaiser but had instead come to Canada seeking freedom. Breithaupt argued that the Germans who came to Berlin were “of the class of Germans who fought for representative government in 1848.” The Citizens’ League likewise argued that Berlin’s Germans were the descendants of the failed revolutionaries of 1848. In a column in the News Record responding to accusations of “Prussianism” by the British League, the Citizens’ League retorted that there was not a single German of Prussian origins in Kitchener. They had all come from other German states such as Hessen and Württemberg. The city’s Germans, the Citizens’ League argued, came to Canada “after the unsuccessful revolution of 1848 because they loved democracy, rather than military despotism, and still more after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 because they objected to the resulting Prussian hegemony in Germany.” Having lived and suffered under Prussian despotism, Berlin’s Germans thus had a greater appreciation for the freedom and liberty of British institutions. As the descendants of the revolutionaries of 1848, they were, in fact, the greatest champions of the cause of liberty.

Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans seemed to be unaware that exalting the post-1848 immigrants as the heart and soul of the community actually contradicted their claim to be Berlin’s charter group and the founders of the city’s prosperity. It also had little basis in historical fact. Germans from Europe began to arrive in Berlin as early as 1819, and by 1848 Berlin already had a significant European German, as opposed to Pennsylvania Dutch, community. Heinz Lehman argues that the political refugees after the failed revolutions, known as “forty-eighters,” overwhelmingly chose to migrate to the United States where they became the intellectual leaders of the German community. Similarly, in his history of German immigration to Canada,
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Jonathan Wagner states that those who did come to Canada after 1848 had economic, “not religious, political, or adventuresome,” motivations for leaving the German states. As for the claim that they chose Canada because they yearned for the liberty of British institutions, Wagner argues that Germans at the time had a “deep-seated ignorance of Canada and things Canadian,” viewing it as a barren, frozen wasteland. Canada therefore only received a small fraction of the migrants who left Germany. Of the German immigrants who landed in Canada, only one third chose to remain there. The majority went on to the United States, the preferred destination for European immigrants. Those who remained in Canada often did so because of sheer happenstance. Some got sick or ran out of money, preventing their travelling onwards. Others simply liked what they found in Canada and chose to stay. These were much more prosaic reasons than high-minded political ideals.40

This disavowal of the German Empire and consequent embrace of the revolutionaries of 1848 was a significant revision of how Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans had previously defined their ethnic identity. The fact that they had previously hailed the Kaiser as an agent of peace and claimed that he embodied the virtues of the German people was seemingly erased from the collective memory of the German community. On January 27, 1915, the Berlin News Record reported that Kaiser Wilhelm II’s birthday was “marked by severe fighting” in Europe. There was no mention that one year previously in Berlin, Ontario the occasion was marked by a lavish banquet.41 Two days later, on January 29, 1915, the Concordia Club held a concert to celebrate the opening of the club’s new quarters. The concert was attended by Mayor Hett, W. G. Weichel, and C. H. Mills, the member of provincial parliament for Waterloo North. Their speeches avoided the war and instead praised the Concordia Club for its progress. The songs they sang,

though German, were romantic and pastoral rather than patriotic, with names such as “On the Beautiful Blue Danube,” and “Whispering Woods.” The evening, of course, still ended dutifully with the singing of “God Save the King,” but there were none of the patriotic German anthems and toasts to the Kaiser that were fixtures at such events prior to the war.\(^42\) The only instance where a defender of the city’s Germans acknowledged their previous celebration of the German Empire was to highlight the absurdity of those who wished to change the city’s name. During an especially acrimonious meeting of the city council discussing the name change issue in April 1916, Alderman J. Reid pointed out that most of the leaders of the name change movement were members of the Board of Trade which before the war had opened its annual banquet with the singing of “Die Wacht am Rhein.” The only response that Alderman Irvin Master, a member of the British League, could muster was to lamely say, “That was two years ago.”\(^43\)

Between 1870 and the outbreak of the First World War, the city’s Germans had never claimed any connection, either ideological or ancestral, with the revolutionaries of 1848. Prior to 1870, the *Berliner Journal* and other German-language newspapers in Berlin were occasionally critical of the oppressive atmosphere in Prussia but this was all quickly forgotten in the excitement, optimism, and confidence that accompanied German unification and the great Peace Festival of May 2, 1871 in Berlin.\(^44\) Berlin’s Germans were by no means alone in this respect. Alison Clark Efford argues that although German immigrants in the United States had been supporters of the 1848 Revolutions, they got swept up in the enthusiasm for German unification and distanced themselves from the liberal nationalism which they previously espoused and which

\(^{42}\) The names of the songs in German were “An der schönen blauen Donau,” and “Waldesflüstern.” “Concordia Hall Opened With Excellent Program,” *Berlin News Record*, 30 January 1915; “Entertainment at Concordia Hall,” *Berlin News Record*, 5 May 1915.

\(^{43}\) “City Council Decides to Make Another Appeal to the Ontario Legislature For Permission to Change Name of the City,” *Berlin Daily Telegraph*, 18 April 1916.

had been used to support black citizenship and enfranchisement in the United States. “Proud of Germany’s manifest might,” she states, “German Americans would toy with a model of national greatness that privileged racial hierarchy over individual rights.”

Prior to the war, they had portrayed Germany as being free from divisions of geography, religion, or politics, but Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans now made a distinction between Germans from Prussia and those coming from other parts of Germany. Furthermore, William Henry Breithaupt argued that although Berlin, Germany, was “the head centre of the forces and influences that began the war,” it was also the centre of the Social Democratic party which desired a more liberal Germany and was steadily increasing in influence and popularity. The discriminatory German electoral system meant that the party’s miniscule representation in the Reichstag belied their actual support. One of the chief reasons that Germany started the war then, Breithaupt claimed, was to staunch the growing discontent being spread by the Social Democrats. Prior to the war, the city’s Germans avoided any association between themselves and socialism or labour unrest. Now, however, the Social Democrats were held as evidence that not all Germans, and perhaps not even all Prussians, were corrupted by militarism.

Prior to the war, Berlin’s Germans reconciled their German ethnicity with Canada’s Anglo-conformist identity by positing that the German and British people were two parts of the same whole, bound together by race and shared ideals. Now, however, these two nations which had been held as pillars of civilization were locked in a savage conflict, which even the Germans of Berlin/Kitchener blamed on the Kaiser. Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans grappled with this uncomfortable fact by portraying the war as an aberration. Germany and Britain did in fact share

---

a special bond. It was only recently that Germany had become corrupted by Prussian militarism and turned its back on its natural ally Britain, perverting the natural order.

Initially, the *Berlin News Record* depicted the break between Germany and Britain as a very recent phenomenon. In its editorial condemning the vandalism of the Kaiser’s bust in August 1914, the *Berlin News Record* stated that the culprits had foolishly vented their anger at the current Kaiser by defacing a statue of his grandfather who was “the friend of Great Britain and Queen Victoria whose son wedded her daughter.” The now toppled statue was meant to remind citizens of the good qualities of Kaiser Wilhelm I which they should strive to emulate.\(^47\)

The militarism that infected the German royal family was therefore a product of the current generation. While the Berlin Public School Board was discussing how best to teach the war and patriotism to students in September 1914, the *Berlin News Record* reprinted an editorial from the *Globe* titled “Canadian Schools and the War.” The editorial argued that schools should not teach students to hate the Germans for the simple fact that “Germans are the natural friends of Britain and Canada.” Furthermore, schools that promoted racial animosity produced bad citizens. The editorial provided the example of the United States where students had been taught to hate Britain, holding back relations between the two nations.\(^48\)

As blame for the war spread from the Kaiser specifically to Prussia more generally, Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans and their defenders traced the genesis of Prussia’s corruption to German unification and sought to establish a connection between Germany and Britain which predated the creation of the Prussian-dominated German Empire. To this end, the Napoleonic Wars which the city’s Germans had touted before the war, took on an increased importance as proof of a special bond between the two nations. At a September, 1914 Canadian Patriotic Fund


\(^{48}\) “The School Board’s Sensible Action,” *Berlin News Record*, 23 September 1914.
rally, W. D. Euler, H. L. Janzen, and George Rumpel all declared that while they were of German ancestry, they were loyal Canadians and British subjects. In a speech reminiscent of that delivered by John Motz at the unveiling of the Kaiser’s bust in 1897, Hugh Guthrie, Member of Parliament from Guelph, argued that everyone should feel something for the land of their ancestors. If they did not, they were not good citizens. Guthrie then reminded those present that England and Germany had been allies at the Battle of Waterloo and placed the blame for the rift between the two on the Kaiser, absolving the German people of any guilt.\textsuperscript{49} At a Berlin Board of Trade picnic in 1915, H. E. Cockin likewise stated that Britain and Germany had been allies in the past and that Germany even regarded Britain as a teacher. Germany, however, became corrupted after unification and its historians re-wrote the past to portray Britain as the villain.\textsuperscript{50}

In his letter to the editor objecting to the name change, William Henry Breithaupt argued that Berlin was not named after the capital of the German Empire because there was no German Empire at the time. When Berlin, Ontario, was given its name, he claimed, “Berlin, Germany, was recovering from the ravages of the Napoleonic wars in which her citizens had fought, and finally conquered, side by side with the British.”\textsuperscript{51} On September 2, 1916, one day after the name of the city was officially changed to Kitchener, William Henry Breithaupt wrote another letter to the editor of the \textit{News Record} to correct an article which had appeared the previous day in the \textit{Daily Telegraph}. The article to which he objected claimed that Berlin was named to honour the settlers who came from Prussia. Breithaupt disagreed and stated that all of Berlin’s settlers came from central and southern German states such as Hessen, Baden, Württemberg, and Alsace.

\textsuperscript{49} “Great Enthusiasm at the Patriotic Fund Meeting at Auditorium,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 28 September 1914.
\textsuperscript{50} The picnic took place in the Victoria Park pavilion which was decorated with Union Jacks and Canadian flags. Those present sang “O Canada,” “The Maple Leaf,” “Rule Britannia,” and “God Save the King.” There was no mention that such events prior to the war included patriotic German songs and symbols. “First Board of Trade Picnic Enjoyable Affair,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 29 July 1915.
Strangely, although he felt the need to distinguish between Germans from Prussia and other states, he insisted that bearing the name of the Prussian capital was nothing to be ashamed of. Alluding to the Napoleonic Wars, he stated that the name Berlin, “was deliberately chosen as being the most distinguished German place name; a name moreover in high favor in England at the time as pertaining to good friends, near relatives of the reigning house, and recent allies.”

His reference to the relationship between the British and German royal families was something which was seldom mentioned during the war.

At the same time that they tried to reconcile their German ethnicity and Canada’s British identity, the city’s Germans also articulated a vision of Canada which saw German and British Canadians together helping to create a new, unique national identity, independent of Britain or any other nation. An editorial in the Berlin News Record shortly after the war began discussed the part that Canada would play in this European war. Highlighting the distinction between Canada and Europe, the News Record claimed that Canadians who had enjoyed a century of peace could not understand why civilized people would choose to go to war. The News Record recognized, however, that Canada would inevitably be dragged into the conflict and so hoped to avoid any of the conflicts which would arise if those who were of British and German descent forgot “that the quarrel in Europe is none of their making.” The editor beseeched readers to remember that they “are Canadians all and happy and progressive under the flag.” The editor also called on those of British origins, “to remember that Canada had invited the peoples of other nations to cast their lots with them and to assist them in making this Dominion a great and prosperous country.”

The harmony and progress produced by this mingling of races in Canada stood in stark contrast to the conflict in Europe. James E. Kerr told the Waterloo Historical Society in

---

52 “A Local Historian Corrected,” News Record (Kitchener), 2 September 1916.
November 1914, that the early history of Waterloo County featured men of British and German origins who “lived together not only without quarreling with one another, but grew to have such mutual respect and friendship that in the course of time they became one people.” During his response to the throne speech, W. G. Weichel acknowledged that the subject of German Canadians was perhaps a “delicate” topic. He felt, however, that he was speaking to “broad-minded men who desire, above everything else, the unification of all races throughout Canada into one harmonious whole,” as opposed to replicating the European war in Canada. Weichel’s subsequent mention of English, Irish, Scottish, and French Canadians as people who, along with German Canadians, were entitled to feel proud of their ancestry, demonstrates that his idea of a harmonious union of “all” races in Canada was limited to white northern Europeans.

Emphasizing that they were now a distinctly Canadian people also helped the Germans to divorce themselves from the Kaiser and Prussian militarism. William Henry Breithaupt asked, “What is it that gives a name character or nationality?” He answered that it was “long association.” Guelph and Hanover, names associated with the British royal family, were initially German but had long become English. Because of its hundred years of history, Berlin, Ontario, he thus claimed, was a Canadian and not a German name. Turning to the city’s residents, he asserted that although they were of German descent, “we are not Germans nor are we German-Canadians or any variety of Germans or part Germans.” Breithaupt declared that they were not hyphenates but Canadians through and through “and yield not an iota, to anyone, in devotion to our country and to the ideals of the British Empire.”

Although Canada was its own nation, it was inspired by, and was the heir to the mantle of, the British Empire.

---

54 “Second Annual Meeting of Waterloo County Historical Society,” Berlin News Record, 14 November 1914.
On March 3, 1916, St. Paul’s Lutheran Church entertained members of the 118th Battalion. Reverend W. C. Böse addressed the troops, and lamented that some people felt that Berlin, and Lutherans in particular, were disloyal. He countered that eighty percent of his congregation was Canadian born. He further stated that ninety percent of his congregation spoke “a language that would be understood in Berlin, Germany as little as in London.” They were, in fact, “so thoroughly Canadian that they do not speak English nor German but a Canadian dialect which is understood only by themselves.”

Barbara Lorenzkowski argues that before the First World War, the ethnic elite in Berlin disparaged the local dialect and instead encouraged a “pure” German which evoked the greatness of the German Empire. During the war, however, Böse celebrated the local dialect which demonstrated distance from the now-hated German Empire.

This tension between seeing Canada as a British nation or something unique in its own right was not limited to Berlin/Kitchener. The First World War may have been a time when Canadians readily jumped to the defence of Britain, but it also gave Canadians a greater sense of pride and independence as a nation. Within Berlin/Kitchener, therefore, this duality also extended to the Anglo-conformists as well. In the spring of 1916, Berlin’s newspapers received countless letters from readers with suggestions for new names for the city. Many of the names nominated highlighted a desire for Canada to remain a British nation. Along with Kitchener, local citizens also suggested Briton, Birmingham, and Cavell after the British nurse who was captured and executed by the Germans. Several readers, however, called for a name that was “purely Canadian.” Many of these suggestions appropriated First Nations names and words. One reader

57 “Ladies of St. Paul’s Church Entertain Boys of Battalion,” Berlin News Record, 4 March 1916.
58 Barbara Lorenzkowski, Sounds of Ethnicity: Listening to German North America, 1850-1914 (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2010), 60, 74-76.
offered Mohawk City as a suitable name. Another proposed Tamakawa. This was apparently the “Indian” word for beaver representing the city’s reputation as an industrial centre.\(^{60}\)

**Doing Their Bit: Publicizing German Contributions to the War Effort**

During the war years, contributing to the immediate crisis was a more important measure of citizenship than contributing to the long-term process of nation building. This message was stressed repeatedly in Berlin’s schools which were responsible for raising the next generation of citizens. On Empire Day, 1915, Reverend J. W. J. Andrew told Berlin’s schoolchildren that “true citizenship means service and sacrifice.”\(^{61}\) The following month, the city’s schools held a major fundraising campaign called “self-sacrifice week.” This campaign, which garnered $80 in donations, was to teach students “a lesson in practical patriotism.”\(^{62}\)

Contributions to the war effort came in the form of general enthusiasm for the cause, in money and material goods for patriotic causes, and, of course, in enlistment. During the Boer War, Berlin’s Germans argued that the enlistment of Herman Quirmbach, his lavish send-off, and the community’s generous contributions to the Red Cross ably demonstrated their worth as citizens. Now, however, the conflict was larger, the stakes higher, and the requisite contribution was therefore much greater. Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans keenly publicized their contributions. They advertised what they were doing far and wide to show their loyalty and to defend their place as citizens by arguing that they were doing their bit to support the war effort.

At the start of the war, Berlin and its residents were criticized for not displaying enough enthusiasm. The *Daily Telegraph* censured the city for not flying the Union Jack over city hall.

---

\(^{60}\) Most of the names submitted fell under three categories: British names, “purely Canadian” names, and newly created words arrived at by rearranging or combining other names and words such as Berlyn (same pronunciation, different spelling), Bercana (Berlin plus Canada), Adanac (Canada spelled backwards). See, for example: “Why A Canadian Berlin?” *Berlin Daily Telegraph*, 2 February 1916; *Berlin News Record*, 23 February 1916; “Suggests Mohawk City,” *Berlin News Record*, 2 March 1916; “Re New Name For Berlin,” *Berlin News Record*, 8 March 1916.


and the post office and for not having a formal send-off for the city’s first wave of recruits.\textsuperscript{63} To avoid incurring further criticism, city council held a special session to plan the send-off for the second contingent and the mayor asked schools and businesses to close for two hours so that they could participate.\textsuperscript{64} Ignoring the fact that the city council had met to plan this event, the \textit{Berlin News Record} described the ensuing celebration as a “spontaneous outpouring of the citizens of Berlin,” who “never [do] things by halves.”\textsuperscript{65} The \textit{News Record} thereby suggested that this celebration was an expression of genuine feeling and not a spectacle orchestrated by the city to sidestep criticism. In September, 1915, prior to a visit to Berlin by Minister of Militia Sam Hughes, the \textit{Berlin News Record} called on “you Mr. Citizen” to ensure he received a proper welcome.\textsuperscript{66} After Hughes’ visit, a satisfied \textit{Berlin Daily Telegraph} reported that the hearty greeting demonstrated the citizenship and loyalty of Berlin and Waterloo County.\textsuperscript{67}

German cultural institutions such as the Concordia Club and German-language churches hosted patriotic gatherings and rallies to demonstrate their support for the war effort. At the same time, many of them scaled back their operations in recognition of the gravity of the crisis. In October, 1915, the Concordia Club hosted a “Sergeant’s Smoker” for the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion. The club had halted operations the previous May but temporarily re-opened for this event.\textsuperscript{68} The Concordia Club portrayed their closing, which was agreed upon by a unanimous vote, as an expression of loyalty to Canada and support for the war effort rather than an admission of guilt.\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{63}“Where are Berlin’s Flags?” \textit{Berlin Daily Telegraph}, 10 August 1914; “What Will Berlin Do for Her Boys?” \textit{Berlin Daily Telegraph}, 17 August 1914.

\textsuperscript{64}“City Council in Special Session,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 26 October 1914.

\textsuperscript{65}“Spontaneous Outpouring of the Citizens of Berlin to Give Soldier Boys Great Send-Off,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 27 October 1914.

\textsuperscript{66}“Arrangements Are Made For Reception,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 16 September 1915.

\textsuperscript{67}“General Sir Sam Hughes, Minister of Militia Predicts Canadian Soldiers Will March Home Triumphant Over the Enemy Within a Year,” \textit{Berlin Daily Telegraph}, 18 September 1915.

\textsuperscript{68}“Sergeant’s Smoker Draws Big Crowd Varied Program,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 29 October 1915.

\textsuperscript{69}In February, 1916, St. Peter’s Lutheran Church held a dinner for the soldiers of the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion. The reverend, Dr. H. A. Sperling spoke, praising the Union Jack, Britain, and freedom. “Concordia Society Voluntarily Closes Its...
At the reception for Hughes in September 1915, W. G. Weichel asked the crowd gathered in Berlin’s auditorium the question: “What is loyalty?” He answered that it was not just flag waving, but concrete action, contributing men and money to the cause.\textsuperscript{70} From the very beginning of the war, Berlin’s Germans were determined to show that their enthusiasm was matched with the action that Weichel stated was a requirement of citizenship. On August 31, 1914, the \textit{Berlin News Record} suggested that the city should raise $20 000 for the Canadian Patriotic Fund and vowed to publish the names of everyone who contributed. The headline to this article, “To Prove the Loyalty of Ontario Teuton,” revealed the intent of the \textit{News Record} in doing so.\textsuperscript{71} In an editorial a few days later, the \textit{News Record} urged readers to contribute and provide “practical proof that Berlin citizens appreciate the freedom, the opportunities and the protection of the flag under which they have lived and prospered.”\textsuperscript{72} On September 4, two hundred citizens gathered to form the Berlin branch of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. The speakers at the meeting stressed that the formation of the Berlin branch was a clear demonstration of the city’s loyalty. The fund’s executive which included seven men of German descent appeared to support these claims.\textsuperscript{73}

Although the primary purpose of the Canadian Patriotic Fund was to raise money for soldiers’ families, from the beginning, it was evident that the leaders of the Berlin branch had a secondary goal of demonstrating the loyalty of the city’s Germans. At an early planning meeting, vice president Louis Jacob Breithaupt declared that he wished to put himself on record “as a loyal British subject of German descent.”\textsuperscript{74} Responding to accusations of disloyalty aimed at the

\textsuperscript{70} “Thousands Gather to Hear General Sir Sam Hughes,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 18 September 1915.
\textsuperscript{71} “To Prove Loyalty of Ontario Teuton,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 31 August 1914.
\textsuperscript{72} “Berlin’s Patriotic Fund,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 3 September 1914.
\textsuperscript{73} The executive included Louis Jacob Breithaupt (vice president), William Henry Schmalz (2\textsuperscript{nd} vice president), George Lang, W. D. Euler, George Rumpel, H. L. Janzen, Dr. J. F. Honsberger; “Magnificent Gathering of Two Hundred Citizens in Behalf of Patriotic Fund,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 5 September 1914.
\textsuperscript{74} “Enthusiastic Meeting of Officers of the Canadian Patriotic Fund,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 9 September 1914.
Germans of his riding, W. G. Weichel pointed to the contributions to the CPF from Berlin which he claimed were proportionally greater than Toronto.\textsuperscript{75} In October, 1914, the Berlin branch even sent a letter to Lord Kitchener, British War Secretary and future namesake of the city, to inform him that this German settlement had raised the impressive sum of $50,627, and to declare, “our German people want German Militarism smashed and the good German people set free to establish a greater and better Germany.”\textsuperscript{76} Such trivial matters were beneath the concern of as high-ranking an official as Lord Kitchener. The intent of the letter, however, was to generate publicity in recognition of the contribution of Berlin’s Germans to the British cause.

The publicity campaign of the Berlin branch also drew attention from outside of Berlin, garnering praise from newspapers in London, England.\textsuperscript{77} While speaking in Berlin, Minister of Trade and Commerce Sir George Foster acknowledged the fulfillment of their duties as citizens in peace and war. He stated that the loyalty and frugality of the German Canadians was already well-known, however their spectacular contributions to the Canadian Patriotic Fund would help to prove any “Doubting Thomases,” wrong.\textsuperscript{78} The Toronto \textit{Globe} also praised the “intensely patriotic” German Canadians in Berlin and printed the names of Berlin’s predominantly German manufacturers who had made large donations to the fund.\textsuperscript{79}

Berlin’s manufacturers also found another way of supporting the war effort. From the start of the war, W. G. Weichel worked to secure government contracts for Berlin’s factories.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{75} “W.G. Weichel Sets His Fellow-Canadians Right,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 30 September 1914.
\textsuperscript{77} “Berlin’s Splendid Subscription Touches John Bull’s Heart,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 9 October 1914.
\textsuperscript{78} “This is Not the Time to Sit Down and Let Things Right Themselves! --- Sir Geo. Foster,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 8 October 1914.
\textsuperscript{79} “Canadian Germans Intensely Patriotic,” \textit{Globe} (Toronto), 6 October 1914.
The *Berlin News Record* praised the riding’s “useful member” for his efforts securing the orders and also distributing them evenly regardless of which political party manufacturers supported. The newspaper claimed that producing items for the war effort was a “practical” display of loyalty. Heading off accusations of profiteering, the *News Record* added that the prices manufacturers were charging were “close to the bone,” so they would not “grow fat” on the orders.81 At a meeting of the Berlin Borden Club, Weichel further boasted that the orders from Berlin’s factories were generally regarded as being the “best filled.”82 Producing goods to fuel the war effort was therefore portrayed as a truly selfless act on the part of the city’s industrialists.

As the conflict dragged on, citizens were required to give more than just money. At a recruiting rally held on January 31, 1916, Lieutenant Stanley N. Dancey from Ottawa’s 207th Battalion warned Berlin’s residents that “The whole of Canada is watching to see if Berlin and North Waterloo are going to prove their patriotism in men and not money. Unless your Battalion is brought to full strength, Canada will judge you as being pro German and not British.”83 For men, enlistment was therefore the most important measure of one’s duty as a citizen. Although patriotic donations were still viewed as vital, they were meaningless unless backed up by enlistment. At a recruiting rally held in Berlin on October 1, 1915, Donald Sutherland, Member of Parliament for South Oxford informed the audience that the war was an opportunity for men to achieve glory. He suggested that service in the war would yield a new class of citizens, claiming that, “the only ones eligible for the aristocracy of the future will be those who shouldered a rifle in this great war.”84

---

81 “A Useful Member,” *Berlin News Record*, 10 November 1914.
82 “First Meeting Was a Grand Success,” *Berlin News Record*, 7 November 1914.
84 “Second Military Rally Held; Rousing Address Given By Sutherland and Morphy,” *Berlin News Record*, 1 October 1915.
Deborah Cowen argues that, in the wake of the Second World War, the idea of entitlement to citizenship being based on service was the basis of the creation of the welfare state.85 During the First World War, however, military service or the ability to serve was the basis for an even more basic right: the right to vote. The Wartime Elections Act gave the right to vote to women who had a husband, brother, or son serving in the armed forces, and disenfranchised persons of enemy alien birth who had been naturalized in the previous fifteen years. The Military Voters Act gave all soldiers the right to vote. Sponsoring the former bill, Arthur Meighen stated that its goal was to make “obligation to war service the basis of war franchise.” The government justified the disenfranchisement of persons of enemy alien birth on the grounds that they may still have relatives in the old country and therefore should not feel compelled to fight against them.86

Lieutenant-Colonel W.M.O. Lochead, the commanding officer of the 118th Battalion, felt that those who did not serve were not entitled to any of the rights or benefits of citizenship. Responding to a member of the International Bible Students’ Association who had filed as a conscientious objector, Lochead condemned the applicant as a coward and claimed that he was not a proper man or Christian. He ended his scathing letter threatening “I think I shall send a piquet to arrest the next man who sends me one of these miserable affidavits. I shall advertise you and your sons and I hope that prosperity will not be yours as you do not deserve it.”87

Orm Øverland argues that stories of suffering and sacrifice were essential components in the “homemaking myths” that immigrants used to claim belonging in the United States. He states that in these stories, “the suffering is made especially noble because it is not only for the glory of

85 Deborah Cowen, Military Workfare: The Soldier and Social Citizenship in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 4-7.
86 “Government War-Time Franchise Bill Introduced,” Daily Telegraph (Kitchener), 7 September 1917; “Naturalized Germans and Austrians of Less Than 15 Years Standing Disenfranchised,” News Record (Kitchener), 7 September 1917.
87 Archives of Ontario (hereafter AO), F1405, Multicultural History Society of Ontario fonds, Series 60: German Canadian Papers (hereafter MHSO), F1405-60-103, Jack Sinkins textual records, MFN243, reel 1, 26 March 1916, letter W.M.O. Lochead to Geo. M. Adamson.
the patria but on behalf of the ethnic group.” Berlin’s Germans likewise held the service, and sacrifice of a few of its members as evidence that the entire community was fulfilling its duties as Canadian citizens just as they had with Herman Quirimbach during the Boer War. On March 29, 1915, Berlin’s newspapers reported that Alexander Ralph Eby was the first Berlin resident to be killed in the war. It did not matter that, although born in Berlin, at the time of enlistment he had resided for several years in Saskatchewan; the Daily Telegraph proclaimed that “his name will go down in history as the first Berlin boy killed in the world’s greatest war.” At a meeting of the Waterloo Historical Society the following week, President William Henry Breithaupt discussed Alexander Eby and traced his heritage back to the 1600s in Switzerland. That he was a descendant of Bishop Benjamin Eby, a prominent early settler and the man who had supposedly given Berlin its name, underscored the German community’s commitment to the cause. This was not the only time that Berlin’s Germans claimed a former resident as their own in order to bolster their claims to having contributed to the war effort. In August of 1914, the Berlin News Record claimed Arthur Shantz, who had been born in Berlin but then moved to Toronto, as “another Berlin boy to the front.”

Under the leadership of William Henry Breithaupt, the Waterloo Historical Society was a prominent voice publicizing German contributions to the war effort. Addressing the society in December 1915, Breithaupt highlighted the contributions Waterloo County’s Germans had made in men, money, and manufacturing. Breithaupt stated that, to this point, 359 men had enlisted from North Waterloo. This apparently impressive recruiting record demonstrated that, “we refuse to stand second in loyalty and sacrifice to any part of this great Empire.” This readiness to do

---

91 “Another Berlin Boy to the Front,” *Berlin News Record*, 31 August 1914.
their duty was also no recent phenomenon. Their entire history, he said, “showed an unbroken loyalty to the world-wide Empire.”

Similarly, two months previously, in October, 1915, the *Berlin News Record* reported that the Waterloo Historical Society had recently received a copy of a local newspaper from 1865 which listed the names of local men who had been drafted into the militia in that year to defend against the Fenian raids. The list included several German names. The *News Record* described the article as “a curious item of timely interest at present.” To contrast with the long-standing loyal service of Berlin’s Germans, the article also noted that an anti-draft riot occurred in Lower Canada in 1865. Breithaupt also made a connection between Berlin’s German pioneers who had turned the city into an industrial centre and those who were fighting on behalf of Canada and the British Empire. In his letter to the editor defending the city’s Germans, Breithaupt listed the names of men who had helped to build up the city. His list included “men like Klotz, a grandson of whom recently gave his life for the honor of Canada.” Breithaupt described these men as “all Germans until they came to Canada and thereafter patriotic Canadians.” As patriotic Canadians, the pioneers and their descendants had done their duty as citizens, each according to the requirements of their age.

In May, 1916, Breithaupt wrote to W.M.O. Lohead requesting a picture of the 118th Battalion as well as a brief history of the battalion including information such as, “what proportion native born, what number other than of English descent, etc.” Aware that service was being held as a prerequisite for full postwar citizenship, he stated that this information, “will in future years be of great interest and the present is the best time to get it.” Breithaupt thanked Lohead upon his receipt of the picture of the battalion and noted that he was pleased to see
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95 University of Waterloo Doris Lewis Rare Book Room (hereafter UW), GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.6, Breithaupt, William Henry Correspondence, 1 May 1916, letter William Henry Breithaupt to Lt. Col. W.M.O. Lohead.
several German names on the roll.\textsuperscript{96} Continuing his mission to document the service of the city’s Germans, in September of 1917, Breithaupt appealed to the City Council for money to aid the Historical Society in the work of gathering money and biographies of Kitchener soldiers who had been killed in action.\textsuperscript{97}

Breithaupt was not alone in his efforts. In an editorial to mark the departure of the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion from Berlin for training in London, Ontario, the \textit{Berlin News Record} proudly noted that 300 of the 711 soldiers who had enlisted were of German descent. More important than the number of Germans in the battalion, was that they were fighting alongside soldiers of British ancestry. The editorial stated that there was no other unit like it, “where Fritz and Tommy marched shoulder to shoulder to uphold British traditions.” Even though they were now fighting against a Germany which had been corrupted by Prussian militarism, the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion demonstrated that, at least in Berlin, Ontario, the Germans and British still worked together to defend humanity and civilization. Continuing with the theme of unity, the editorial noted that of the six Berlin and Waterloo men who had been killed in action to this point, three were of British descent and three were of German descent. The \textit{News Record} hoped that the example of the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion would “knit together every element,” in North Waterloo.\textsuperscript{98} Holding the 118\textsuperscript{th} as an example of unity, however, required a cognitive dissonance which ignored the battalion’s role as a disruptive, divisive force in Berlin.

Berlin’s Germans argued that these contributions of money, manpower, and enthusiasm made them the best class of citizens. In his response to the throne speech, W.G. Weichel stated that it was only natural for British and French Canadians to enlist since they were coming to the

\textsuperscript{96} UW, GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.6, Breithaupt, William Henry Correspondence, 4 December 1916, letter William Henry Breithaupt to Lt. Col. W.M.O. Lochead.

\textsuperscript{97} “Finance Committee in Regular Session,” \textit{News Record} (Kitchener), 28 September 1917.

\textsuperscript{98} “Good-Bye Boys!” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 22 May 1916.
aid of the lands of their ancestors. German Canadians, however, who were fighting against the land of their ancestors, were motivated not by blood, but by higher ideals. For Germans, Weichel maintained, “it is duty that calls and gratitude to the mother country for the many blessings they have enjoyed for so many years in this, the land of their adoption.”

Germans, therefore, were not simply content to enjoy the rights of citizenship in Canada; they held dear the privilege to fulfill its duties as well.

This idea that German Canadians better understood and appreciated their rights as citizens as well as their duty to defend them was repeated throughout the war. At a recruiting rally in November 1915, after Berlin had been granted the 118th Battalion, Weichel stated that he was confident his riding’s Germans would do their part to fill the battalion since they “realize and appreciate the benefits they enjoy,” living under the Union Jack.

When the battalion departed for Europe in 1917, although it was understrength, the News Record proudly boasted that by this point 80 percent of its members were of German descent. This was a testament to “how superior British freedom, fair play and justice is to that of other countries.” That the battalion was understrength was therefore the fault of others who had not experienced oppression and thus did not value British institutions as the Germans did.

Undermining German Ethnicity and Citizenship

The ethnic identity that Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans articulated during the First World War lacked the sophistication and coherence of that which had emerged and evolved during the peace and tranquility of the previous four decades. Reflecting the turbulent period in which it was created, its themes were less developed and more frequently self-contradictory than prior to the war. Despite this, it was still effective in achieving its goal of defending the place of Germans as
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Canadian citizens. The Anglo-conformists who sought to vilify the Germans were unable to make the depravity of the German people an unquestioned truth. Thus, the Anglo-conformists could not simply brand the city’s Germans barbaric Huns and cast them aside. They instead had to engage directly with the ideas articulated, however imperfectly, by men like William Henry Breithaupt and W. G. Weichel in order to try to discredit the version of German ethnic identity which the ethnic elite used to assert members of their ethnic group’s place as Canadian citizens.

The Anglo-conformists attacked the claim that Germans possessed special qualities that made them valuable Canadian citizens. In March 1915, when the Berlin public school board decided to eliminate German language classes from the curriculum, the reasoning the board provided centred on the role of schools in the moulding of good citizens. Trustee Charles Ruby presented a report which claimed that the majority of Berlin’s children would not complete their public school education by the time they reached the official age of school leaving. This was particularly problematic, according to Ruby, because senior fourth was the grade where one “acquires the greatest knowledge of the practical affairs of the world in which he is to spend the rest of his natural life.” As a solution, he proposed condensing the work done in the lowest grades by eliminating “optional subjects” particularly the study of German, since, unlike English, it did not “fit them for becoming useful citizens.”¹⁰² Chairman Arthur Pequegnat and trustee Gustave Albrecht supported Ruby’s report. Pequegnat asserted that Berlin’s schools should provide “a thorough English education,” rather than instruction in a foreign language, while Albrecht voiced the opinion that, although he was of German heritage himself, German should be taught privately in the home, not in public schools.¹⁰³ The board deferred decision on this controversial issue until the next regular meeting; it had become abundantly clear, however, that the pre-war view of

¹⁰² Waterloo Region District School Board (hereafter WRDSB), Minutes of the Berlin/Kitchener Public School Board, 1915-1920, 2 March 1915, 16-17.
German language classes had been largely overturned in favour of a growing consensus that they impeded the formation of good citizenship.

In the intervening weeks, the *Daily Telegraph* published an editorial supporting the elimination of German classes. Referring to conflict over the French school question, this editorial suggested that teaching multiple languages promoted animosity between races. The only way to create a “harmonious whole” was through assimilation.\textsuperscript{104} The *Berliner Journal* responded by insisting that knowledge of multiple languages not only produced more useful citizens, it also helped to promote peace and mutual understanding between peoples.\textsuperscript{105} The *Deutsche Schule Verein* met on March 16 to plan its defence of the classes. Its members defended the understanding of Canadian citizenship which the Anglo-conformists now challenged. Mayor Hett spoke of the great contributions the “thrifty” German race had made to nation building in Canada. All speakers proclaimed their unswerving loyalty to Canada and agreed that knowledge of more than one language was beneficial.\textsuperscript{106}

On March 18, representatives of the *Deutsche Schule Verein* were permitted to address the Public School Board. The speakers urged the board to postpone the decision until after the war and defended the loyalty of Berlin’s Germans. Countering the Anglo-conformist argument, former Mayor W. H. Schmalz asserted that it was not necessary to eliminate the study of German in order to remain true to the British Empire. Mayor Hett and Louis Jacob Breithaupt agreed, and reiterated that knowing many languages was beneficial.\textsuperscript{107} Trustee Bitzer claimed that British officers were hindered by knowing just one language while German officers benefitted from

\textsuperscript{104} “Crowding the Curriculum,” *Berlin Daily Telegraph*, 9 March 1915.
\textsuperscript{105} “Das Deutsche in der Schule,” *Berliner Journal*, 10 March 1915.
\textsuperscript{106} School board trustee A. L. Bitzer, for example, read from old board minutes where the inspector had praised the study of German as being “of great use to children after they leave school.” “Ratepayers Enter Protest Against The Proposed Action Of School Trustees,” *Berlin News Record*, 17 March 1915.
\textsuperscript{107} “Teaching German Language in Berlin’s Public Schools Will Be Eliminated After Present Term,” *Berlin Daily Telegraph*, 19 March 1915.
knowing several. Despite these protestations, the board voted 5-3 to eliminate German-language classes.

Later, the *Berlin News Record* offered a belated defence of the German classes. The *News Record* credited “the splendid traits of its citizens of German lineage,” for Berlin’s success. The editorial ruefully argued that “anything that can be done to perpetuate the industry, thrift and stability of character, the home-making propensities, civic pride and love of song is well worth doing.” The *Berlin Daily Telegraph* lamented the need to discard this tradition but stated that schools should focus on “subjects upon the degree of mastery of which the quality of his equipment for Canadian citizenship depends.” In short, German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship could no longer coexist.

At the original meeting on February 11, 1916 to organize the movement in favour of the name change, Dr. J. J. Walters stated that he was sick of hearing about German contributions to Berlin’s growth. The Germans, he argued, arrived late and then merely borrowed from the accomplishments of other peoples. Furthermore, he claimed that the idea that thrift and industry were intrinsically and specifically German characteristics was a fallacy. On March 1, 1916, W. G. Cleghorn, Chairman of the North Waterloo Recruiting Committee, wrote a rejoinder to William Henry Breithaupt’s defence of the German community. Like Walters, he said that “one grows tired of hearing people continually harp upon what the Germans have done for Berlin and Waterloo County.” Cleghorn described Berlin as a veritable Garden of Eden which required no
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110 Portraying German ethnicity as a quaint and antiquated tradition was a departure from the prewar portrayal of German ethnicity as modern and a valuable component in an industrial capitalist society. “German in the Schools,” *Berlin Daily Telegraph*, 20 March 1915.
special skill to develop. This diverged sharply from the previously accepted portrayal of Berlin as lacking in any natural advantages. Cleghorn therefore questioned, “whether they did not owe as much to Waterloo County as the County owed to them?”\textsuperscript{112}

One of the most commonly cited arguments in favour of changing the name of the city was that people and businesses outside of Berlin refused to purchase goods made in a city that bore the name of the German capital.\textsuperscript{113} The spectre of being labelled pro-German and commercially ostracized was raised in several other instances such as to encourage citizens to support British League candidates in the civic elections of 1917 and the Unionist cause in the federal elections later that year.\textsuperscript{114} This argument suggested that German ethnicity was a hindrance which threatened the city’s prosperity, not the source of the city’s thriving industries. The “Made in Berlin,” stamp proudly emblazoned on goods produced in the city now signified German disloyalty and treachery instead of industriousness.

Despite the frequency of its usage, supporters of the name change were not entirely comfortable with this financial argument. As chair of the meeting organized to change the city’s name, D. B. Detweiler declared that “trade and compulsion were not factors in the advocacy of the proposal.” They wished to change the city’s name out of their own free will to demonstrate their loyalty; patriotism was not a veil to disguise the true motivation of safeguarding their profits.\textsuperscript{115} At another mass meeting in May 1916, several speakers attempted to reconcile the financial and patriotic reasons for the change. The commercial justification was patriotic, they


\textsuperscript{114} “Prominent Furniture Manufacturer Tells of Orders Cancelled,” \textit{News Record} (Kitchener), 7 December 1917; “Future at Stake,” \textit{Daily Telegraph} (Kitchener), 8 December 1917; “No Furniture Made in Kitchener Sold Here,” \textit{News Record} (Kitchener), 14 December 1917; “Situation Laid Bare,” \textit{News Record} (Kitchener), 15 December 1917.

\textsuperscript{115} “Citizens Pass Resolution Recommending Council Change the Name of Berlin,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 12 February 1916.
argued, as the city’s prosperity allowed them to help finance the war. German ethnicity was therefore not only bad for business, it hindered their ability to support the war effort.

In place of the Germans, the Anglo-conformists exalted the virtues of the British people. The Anglo-conformists claimed that British people were the sole source of Berlin/Kitchener’s prosperity and the key agents in the project of nation building in Canada. This message was conveyed in words and symbols during Empire Day in 1915. During the celebrations, Anglican minister J. W. J. Andrew spoke on the meaning of the Union Jack. Addressing students who were largely of German origins, he said that each of the colours in the flag represented “some superior character in the English people.” At a meeting of the British League in December 1916, Stanley N. Dancey lectured the audience on Canada’s British settlers who laid the foundations for freedom and prosperity. Ignoring the contributions of any other group, he categorically declared that “had it not been for the Anglo-Saxon race, Canada would not exist today.” At another British League meeting the following week, Reverend Lang Ford of St. John’s Anglican Church spoke of the British “genius for colonization,” which spread civilization across the globe and helped to uplift other races. The past thousand years of history, he claimed, demonstrated that the British were God’s chosen nation. These speeches, then, relegated Germans to a secondary role in the history of Berlin/Kitchener. Although the majority of the city’s residents were of German origins, it was the influence of the British institutions which they were fortunate to live under, rather than their own labours, which caused the city to flourish. Germans were no longer considered to be partners with the British in spreading progress and civilization. Instead, they were lumped in with the races that benefitted from the uplift provided by British colonization.

116 “Largely Attended Meeting of Citizens at City Hall Last Evening,” Berlin News Record, 3 May 1916.
The Anglo-conformists claimed that the Germans had profited from the British influence in Canada, but still this had not made the Germans into true believers in British freedom and liberty. Instead, Anglo-conformists argued that Germans exploited Canada’s noble British institutions for their own gain and now betrayed them by supporting the Kaiser. A poem submitted to the Berlin News Record in July 1915 addressed “To the Germans in Canada,” described their supposed fickleness. The author scolded the Germans for turning their backs on the land which allowed them to prosper, labelling them all “ungrateful and unjust,” and claiming that “they’d kill their dearest friends; just to prove the Kaiser’s might.” The final stanza offered salvation through assimilation and Anglo-conformity, asking the Germans

And so why not forget the fact
That you come from Germany
Just say you are ‘Canadian’
The word that means you’re free.\textsuperscript{120}

Speaking before the British League, Captain Dancey argued that there were many immigrants who took everything from Canada and gave nothing in return. In Kitchener, he stated, there were many men who made their wealth in Canada, “yet they would stand and sneer at the men who would save Canada.” German thrift and industry were thereby replaced with German selfishness and ingratitude. Like the author of the aforementioned poem, Dancey offered a simple solution to this “conglomerate mass” that plagued Canada: “Be British.” Dancey wished to bar those who refused to assimilate from any of the benefits of Canadian citizenship, claiming that they “have no right to enjoy this Canada of ours.” If the British League accomplished nothing else but preventing these men from voting, he felt that their mission would still be a success.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{120} Berlin News Record, 5 July 1915.
Before the war, Germans in Berlin were considered orderly and law abiding. Any crimes or disturbances were always blamed on outsiders coming to Berlin and stirring up trouble. On October 3, 1916, however, William Henry Schmalz appeared in court facing charges of disturbing a public meeting and violating statutes regarding a public meeting. The incident occurred a few days previously during a meeting of the Women’s Auxiliary of the Citizens’ League. Several women, whose husbands were supporters of the British League showed up at the meeting uninvited. The meeting therefore quickly disbanded. Upon exiting the hall Schmalz turned off the lights, leaving the interlopers to fumble in the darkness. Although Schmalz attempted to apologize, the matter was immediately taken up by the British League which insisted on pressing charges. Ultimately, Magistrate John Weir found Schmalz guilty of only the first charge and fined him one dollar. This severely disappointed the prosecution who wanted him dealt with more harshly for his “mean, dirty, cad’s trick.” The News Record felt that the entire affair was a farce. The newspaper defended Schmalz’s character, calling him “one of the leading and most honored citizens.” The Citizens’ League also released a statement which defended Schmalz’s record of public service as well as his support for the war effort which they claimed outstripped that of the women pressing charges. The Daily Telegraph, conversely, claimed that Schmalz and the Citizens’ League found the presence of these women who were “prominently identified with patriotic work” to be “distasteful.” In another article, the Daily Telegraph described the plaintiffs as being “of strong British sympathies.” The implication was that Schmalz, a Citizens’ League member and defender of the city’s Germans, was not.
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Even worse than being simple disturbers of the peace, Germans were portrayed as constituting a fifth column. On August 31, 1914, the *Daily Telegraph* published an article which claimed that during the Franco-Prussian War, the Germans had thousands of spies throughout France. These spies did not arouse suspicion because they worked regular jobs and blended in with their surroundings. The *Daily Telegraph* therefore preached caution as there could be untold numbers of German spies in Canada.\(^{127}\) This article thereby placed all Germans in Canada under suspicion, even those who appeared to be law abiding and orderly.

In May 1915, with rumours abounding that residents of Berlin secretly celebrated the recent sinking of the *Lusitania*, a group of citizens led by S. J. Williams, Reverend J. W. J. Andrew, and W. M. O. Lochead petitioned the city council to ask the Minister of Justice to establish an office for the registration of enemy aliens in Berlin. Legal provisions for registration had existed since the passage of the *War Measures Act* in August, 1914.\(^{128}\) In an editorial on registration, the *Daily Telegraph* argued that it was not aimed at the majority of Germans who were law abiding. The newspaper added, however, that this precautionary measure was necessary because the language and ethnicity of the city’s residents could potentially make Berlin a “Mecca” for enemy agents who would easily blend into the local population.\(^{129}\) These innocent, law abiding Germans, by resisting assimilation and Anglo-conformity, were unwittingly aiding and abetting the enemy.

The Minister of Justice declined to establish a special office in Berlin for the registration of enemy aliens. He instead called on Magistrate Weir to exercise his authority to register enemy aliens stating that this option was less expensive and also would “not involve unnecessary

---

interference with people whose conduct manifestly calls for no such action.”

Undaunted, the original petitioners continued to lobby for registration. On February 8, 1916 Berlin City Council agreed to forward yet another petition to the Minister of Justice asking for registration. Alderman W. G. Cleghorn claimed that a German army officer had been in Berlin the previous week carrying out seditious work, but nothing could be done to stop him without the wider authority of registration under the auspices of the federal government. After this petition, the Minister of Justice relented and allowed for registration of enemy aliens in Berlin. There was confusion at first. Many people who had been resident in Canada for years, and sometimes decades, and had voted in elections but had not taken out naturalization papers were unaware that they were still not considered citizens and therefore had to register. Prior to the war, they had been citizens in practice. During the war their citizenship was denied because of their ethnicity.

Accusations of spying, sabotage, and sedition continued to be levelled against the German community. Any accident or incident that was remotely suspicious was blamed on the city’s Germans. On March 12, 1916, Berlin’s newspapers reported there had been an attempt to shoot
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the sentry at the 118th Battalion’s barracks. The night watchman at the nearby Williams, Greene
and Rome shirt factory reported that at 11:30 that night, he had chased away two suspicious
seeming men who had been speaking German. At that time, the battalion also had soldiers
stationed in Victoria Park following rumours that an attempt would be made to destroy the statue
of the late queen.\footnote{\textit{Attempt Made to Shoot Sentry At Barracks Last Night}, \textit{Berlin News Record}, 12 March 1916.} When the Victoria Park pavilion burned down two weeks later, Lieutenant-
Colonel W. M. O. Lochead immediately concluded that it was the result of a pro-German plot.\footnote{Lochead claimed that the burning of the pavilion was either because the 118th Battalion bugle band occasionally used the pavilion for practice or retaliation for the destruction of the Kaiser’s bust. \textit{Pavilion at Victoria Park Almost Totally Destroyed By Fire of Incendiary Origin}, \textit{Berlin Daily Telegraph}, 24 March 1916.}

Germans were even faulted for disturbances in which they were the victim, not the
instigator. The day after the raid on the Concordia Club, Lieutenant-Colonel W. M. O. Lochead
stated that the soldiers of the 118th Battalion initially went to the Concordia Club to retrieve the
bust of Kaiser Wilhelm I and put it in the “clink” in the battalion’s barracks. Trouble began, he
claimed, when they returned to the club a second time and found a portrait of King George
draped with the German flag. The soldiers then destroyed the club to avenge this outrage.\footnote{\textit{Soldiers Break Loose and Wreck German Club Rooms in Concordia Hall}, \textit{Berlin News Record}, 16 February 1916.} The
Concordia Club vehemently denied these accusations and maintained that conditions in the club
were exactly as they had been four months prior when it hosted a “Sergeant’s Smoker” for the
118th Battalion.\footnote{\textit{Concordia Singing Society Makes Statement}, \textit{Berlin News Record}, 18 February 1916.} At a recruiting rally on February 20, 1916, Lochead stated that although the
destruction of the Concordia Club was “lamentable,” it had actually produced “good and far-
reaching results.” In the previous week, he had witnessed a noticeably more British spirit in
Berlin.\footnote{\textit{Two Large and Enthusiastic Recruiting Meetings Held in Berlin Theatres Sunday Night}, \textit{Berlin Daily Telegraph}, 21 February 1916.} Similarly, at a meeting of the Berlin Board of Trade on February 25, 1916, George
DeBus stated that since the raid, “the little groups of a few that we used to see gathered here and
there along the streets whispering in German have disappeared,” and the general atmosphere in Berlin was more patriotic.141

A military court of inquiry was held in July and August to investigate the raid on the Concordia Hall as well as the assault of Lutheran Minister, Reverend C. R. Tappert, on March 4, 1916. Testimony differed as to whether most of the damage to the club was done by soldiers or civilians. The report blamed neither. The court’s findings stated “that conditions were allowed to prevail in Berlin that loyal British citizens found impossible to tolerate,” and claimed that the Concordia Club was “an organization to foster and maintain a strong German spirit and love for the fatherland.” The court therefore blamed the Germans whose disloyalty brought this violence upon themselves as well as local authorities for allowing such treasonous conditions to persist.142 The methods may have been regrettable, but the court concluded that the soldiers and civilians who took part in the raid were merely acting as loyal citizens animated by the spirit of patriotism. Lochead, of course, agreed.143

The Anglo-conformists did not distinguish between the German people and Prussian militarism. From the beginning of the war, Berlin’s newspapers, like those across Canada, were full of stories of atrocities supposedly committed by German soldiers.144 Even schoolchildren, had to read them. In February 1915, the Berlin Public School Board approved subscribing to fourteen copies of The Children’s Story of the War, a monthly pamphlet series that described the heroic exploits of the Allies as well as the villainous deeds of the malevolent Germans.145 The pamphlets claimed that German soldiers at the urging of the Kaiser modeled themselves after the
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Huns and tortured young girls and women, and executed defenceless old men. Along with these individual acts of shame, the pamphlets condemned the tactics employed by the Germans as being uncivilized. Of the gas attack at Ypres, the author reported, “The Germans were about to sound the deepest depths of their infamy and try to poison those whom they could not beat in a fair fight.”

In his response to William Henry Breithaupt, W. G. Cleghorn discussed these atrocities. Cleghorn misquoted his adversary as having said, “We are Germans and are proud of it.” Cleghorn wondered how Breithaupt could still say that he was proud to be German in light of “the countless terrible outrages—women ravished, children killed, non-combatants drowned at sea without warning,” which everybody in Berlin could not help but be aware of.

Cleghorn’s misquoting of Breithaupt, whether intentional or not, is significant. Breithaupt emphasized that German descent was nothing to be ashamed of, suggesting a connection to a historic Germany. This was the Germany of great poets and composers. Cleghorn, however, refused to make such a fine distinction. For him, Germany had to be taken as a whole: past and present, artists, peasants, and emperors. To be proud of one was to be proud of the rest. As well, the atrocities which Cleghorn highlighted were not committed by the Kaiser himself or the Prussian warlords, but by average German soldiers who bore just as much guilt for the war and the way it was conducted as their nation’s leaders. One could not be proud, therefore, of the Germany of Goethe, Schiller, and Bach, as it was indistinguishable from the Germany which crucified enemy soldiers and bayonetted defenceless women and children.

Anglo-conformists found the German language and culture so toxic, it was dangerous to merely learn about them. In February 1918, Forbes Godfrey, M.P.P. for West York, introduced a


bill in the provincial legislature to ban the use of German in schools, churches, and any public bodies.\textsuperscript{149} The \textit{News Record} objected to Godfrey’s “narrow minded” bill and argued that while Canadians hated the Kaiser, the German people were leaders in “subjects to which the student ought to have access, if he is to become of real service to Ontario.”\textsuperscript{150} In July 1918, however, the \textit{Daily Telegraph} came out in support of banning the use of German, even once the war was over. The editorial stated that after the war, some students of science and literature may wish to learn German, but it warned that “care should be taken to restrict the teaching of German to those who can be trusted not to use it as a means for encouraging the development of German ideals.” Furthermore, the editorial argued that the only reason the Germans learned multiple languages was because they were bent on world domination and needed to be able to spread their propaganda.\textsuperscript{151}

The juxtaposition of British valour with German barbarity barred reconciliation between German ethnic identity and Canada’s British identity. Retrospection failed to find a suitable connection between Germany and Britain since the Anglo-conformists argued that Germany had always been morally bankrupt. W. G. Cleghorn claimed that it did not matter that there was no German Empire when Berlin was first founded; it was still named after the capital of Prussia, which was responsible for “the most diabolical crimes and atrocities that have marred the pages of history.”\textsuperscript{152} Berlin’s schools similarly attacked the understanding of history which portrayed the Germans and British as historic allies. \textit{The Children’s Story of the War} claimed that, although Frederick the Great had advanced Prussia “he had done it by craft and cunning and violence, and at the cost of untold misery and suffering,” countering the claim that he shared a common set of
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ideals with Britain.\textsuperscript{153} The pamphlets also argued that Germany had long desired to build an empire at Britain’s expense. The two were rivals.\textsuperscript{154}

During the name change debate, one proposed solution which was viewed as an acceptable compromise to many on both sides was amalgamation with Waterloo. Berlin would thereby cast off its unpatriotic German name and unite with a city which bore the name of one of Britain’s greatest victories. Alderman C. C. Hahn, president of the British League, however, vehemently objected to this idea. This was because the name Waterloo represented a victory of the British and Germans, their current enemies, over the French, and was therefore an insult to their current allies.\textsuperscript{155} Hahn could not deny that Britain had been allied with German states in this instance. As this fact conflicted with his world view that Germany had always been corrupt, his response was to claim that any acknowledgement of it was unpatriotic.

During the registration debate, Reverend J. W. J. Andrew claimed that registration would have no adverse impact on “the alien who knows how to behave himself and is courteous to those who are Canadian and Britishers.”\textsuperscript{156} For the Anglo-conformists, it was inconceivable to speak of the Germans and the British as racial cousins, much less as part of the same Anglo-Teutonic race. Andrew’s vision of the proper ordering of society required Germans to show deference to British Canadians; Anglo-conformists now held Germans to be an inferior race. Germany’s downgraded racial status was a self-inflicted wound. The Anglo-conformists argued that Germany had turned its back on civilization in the barbaric manner in which it prosecuted the war, and also in its choice of allies. Cleghorn decried Germany for allying with “the murderous, barbarous
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unspeakable Turk to help it force its ideas of ‘Kultur’ on the whole world and gain ‘a place in the sun.’"¹⁵⁷ Lieutenant-Colonel Lohead, meanwhile, claimed that the German-Turkish alliance demonstrated Germany’s moral bankruptcy. A nation that would willingly ally with this savage race, the enemy of Christendom, had no place alongside Britain at the forefront of civilization.¹⁵⁸

This re-ordering of the racial hierarchy meant that groups previously considered to be lesser were elevated above the Germans to a status nearer, but not equal to, the British who remained at the pinnacle. In September 1917, city council (comprised primarily of Citizens’ League members) voted to give $25 to the Italian Red Cross rather than the $500 which the charity had requested. During the debate on how much should be given, Aldermen Iler, Campbell, and Asmussen stated that it was not long ago that Italians were looked upon as dangerous criminals and called Italy “the land of the stiletto,” an allusion to blood feuds that plagued the country. The Daily Telegraph was aghast at this slur against “a brave ally.” While the Italians were once considered to be among the least desirable of European immigrants, the Daily Telegraph now claimed that “among the most successful and progressive citizens of Kitchener there are natives of Sunny Italy who are loyal and law abiding Canadians.”¹⁵⁹

**Discounting German Contributions**

The Anglo-conformists also challenged the place of Germans as Canadian citizens by discounting German contributions to the war effort. At a recruiting rally in April, 1916, the fiery and aptly-named Sergeant-Major Granville Blood, ringleader of the assault on Reverend Tappert and the raid on the Concordia Club, called on Berlin’s residents “to furnish an account of your citizenship.” After deriding the pro-German element which he said resided in Berlin, he closed
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with the exhortation, “Be British! Do your duty or be despised and ostracized by the whole of the boys of the allies. Be British or be d—d!” In this speech, Blood equated being British with fulfilling the duties of citizenship; the former was a prerequisite for the latter. In The Gender of Breadwinners, Joy Parr contends that during the First World War in Hanover, Ontario, the ethnicity of the town’s German residents forced their manliness, which was linked to loyalty and patriotic service, to be called into question. I argue that in Berlin/Kitchener, the ethnicity of the city’s German residents caused their citizenship, of which manliness, loyalty, and patriotic service were vital components, to be called into question. In the eyes of the Anglo-conformists, the reality of the contributions of the city’s Germans to the war effort did not matter. Whereas before the war, when German ethnicity signified industry and orderliness (sometimes in spite of reality), during the war, the Anglo-conformists portrayed German ethnicity as automatically incompatible with performing the duties of citizenship.

The contributions made by Germans to Canada’s war effort were therefore not enough to prevent accusations of disloyalty. In the spring of 1915, prominent Germans were forced to deny that they had celebrated the sinking of the Lusitania. Individuals who were forced to deny these allegations included George Rumpel and William Henry Schmalz, leaders of patriotic causes such as the Canadian Patriotic Fund. During the heated campaign for the 1917 civic elections, the British League repeatedly accused Citizens’ League candidates of disloyalty. The Daily Telegraph urged citizens to vote for candidates “whose attitude toward the Allies has been whole-hearted and unquestioned.” British League mayoral candidate W. E. Gallagher claimed while the Citizens’ League called for good government, its members had not made a single
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charge against the previous year’s council. According to him, what they objected to was civic contributions to the Canadian Patriotic Fund and Red Cross. Gallagher stated that the Citizens’ League wished to ignore the needs of the Empire and so “in this campaign you are not only fighting for your city but you are fighting for your flag.”

Those who accused Berlin’s Germans of harbouring pro-German sympathies, did not claim that all of the city’s Germans were disloyal, just a small but influential group. While the *Daily Telegraph* denied the claims of outside newspapers that Berlin was a hotbed of pro-German sentiment, the newspaper agreed that a handful of German sympathizers committed disloyal acts. The newspaper therefore urged the government to implement registration to deal with this treasonous minority. Allegedly, this insidious group of German sympathizers used their apparent support of the war effort as a smokescreen to disguise their ulterior motives. In October 1916, manufacturer and British League member, T. H. Rieder wrote a letter to the editor of the *Daily Telegraph* titled “Heart Loyalty, Not ‘Pocket’ Loyalty,” which stated that “to the thoughtful observer, and to the truly loyal patriotic citizen of our Empire, it comes as a distinct shock, if not disgust, to see how some communities make a pretense of liberal sacrifice for the righteous cause of the Allies, while at heart the feeling is not thoroughly loyal and patriotic.” Rieder called for the elimination of pro-German sentiment in Kitchener and warned that “outward profession of loyalty counts for little when the under current is sympathetic to Prussianism.”

Despite being the second vice president of the local branch of the Canadian Patriotic Fund, William Henry Schmalz was a frequent target of accusations of disloyalty. In July 1916, a letter to the editor of the *Daily Telegraph* signed, “A True Britisher,” accused Schmalz of doing
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nothing to help win the war and also not being properly offended by German atrocities. In the wake of his trial for disturbing a public meeting, the British League claimed that Schmalz had encouraged German reservists to return to Germany and serve and had even attempted to aid them in doing so. Although Schmalz denied these allegations, C. C. Hahn of the British League stated that Schmalz’s rebuttal was all lies. According to Hahn, there was no direct evidence of Schmalz’s disloyalty because “there is a limit to the clumsiness as well as to the cleverness of Prussian methods.” A lack of evidence was therefore the most damning evidence. Allegations against Schmalz were even investigated by Canada’s Chief Commissioner of Police. Major F. E. Davis, Assistant Director of Military Intelligence at the Department of Militia and Defence, reported to the commissioner that he had been informed by a militia officer that Schmalz was “very pro-German in his sympathies and activities.” The commissioner responded that while many of the city’s residents felt that Schmalz’s position as second vice president of the CPF was not sincere and was meant to serve as a cover for his actions, a previous investigation had found no hard evidence to show that Schmalz was a “menace.”

In March, 1918, two reporters from Industrial Newspaper Syndicate, a company which represented several western Canadian newspapers, wrote a series of scathing articles attacking Kitchener’s German population and the Lang family in particular. The authors argued that the city’s Germans gave little to war-related causes and claimed that “young Huns” in Kitchener cheered allied defeats and praised the Kaiser’s virtues. They singled out the Langs as profiteers for selling leather to the Canadian government and stated that German industrialists and workers
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in general were keen to profit from the war. Most grievously, the authors accused German and Austrian workers in munitions plants of sabotaging the shells they produced.\footnote{AO, RG23, Ontario Provincial Police Criminal Investigation Records, E-77 Box 1.1, Defamatory Libel Files, Industrial Newspapers Syndicate and case of libel involving the war situation and the city of Kitchener (Berlin), “Camouflaging Berlin,” “Changing the Name—Mr. George Lang Makes Progress with the Citizen’s League,” “Wonders are Worked—The New Name Makes a Great Difference in the Name of Berlin.”} These articles, which resulted in the authors being investigated by the Ontario Provincial Police for defamatory libel, also demonstrate that not everyone who accused the city’s Germans of disloyalty did so out of a sincerely held belief. The authors initially came to Kitchener claiming that they wished to write a fair depiction of the situation in the city to redress what they felt had been unfair criticism directed towards it. They then approached Kitchener’s manufacturers asking for $6 000 to write positive articles on them. When their proposition was rebuffed, they instead chose to write scathing articles, claiming that their investigation of conditions in Kitchener revealed “the very obvious fact that the sins were the sins of the majority of its people.”\footnote{AO, RG23, Ontario Provincial Police Criminal Investigation Records, E-77 Box 1.1, Defamatory Libel Files, Industrial Newspapers Syndicate and case of libel involving the war situation and the city of Kitchener (Berlin), 19 February 1918 letter W. V. Uttley (editor NR) to John Miller, Inspector Provincial Police; 4 May 1918 letter J. H. C. Gainfort (Industrial Newspaper Syndicate) to Ernest J. Chambers, Chief Press Censor for Canada.}

In his response to William Henry Breithaupt, W. G. Cleghorn asked how many of the descendants of the supposedly patriotic Germans had enlisted thus far.\footnote{“Recruiting Committee Replies to Mr. Breithaupt’s Letter,” Berlin News Record, 1 March 1916.} Some Germans, however, had their attempts to enlist denied because of suspicions about their loyalty. In December, 1915, Lieutenant-Colonel W. M. O. Lochead was instructed to take steps to prevent one August Edward Hollander from enlisting as he had already been discharged on suspicion of being a spy.\footnote{AO, MSHO, F1405-60-103, Jack Sinkins textual records, MFN243, reel 3, 27 December 1915 letter A.A.G. 1st Division to W.M.O. Lochead re: Pte August Edward Hollander.} In March and April of 1916, Lochead conducted a background check on Paul Trimm, a man who had been born in Germany but immigrated to Canada four years previously, taken the oath of allegiance, applied for naturalization, and now volunteered to serve in the
Canadian Expeditionary Force. Writing to Trimm’s former employers, Lohead explained that, while he appeared loyal, “I appreciate the necessity of taking every precaution in respect to men who are born in Germany.” While Trimm’s references were all favourable and Lohead even stated that he had been given no reason to be suspicious of him, he cryptically informed Trimm that, “for other reasons I cannot consider your application for joining the 118th Battalion.”

By late 1915, recruiting officers across Canada found volunteers increasingly difficult to come by and so they were forced to be less discriminating. Enlistment was still not enough to shield Germans from accusations of disloyalty. According to James Walker, visible minorities who were accepted for duty “were accompanied overseas by a set of presumptions about their abilities which dictated the role they were to play and which limited the rewards they were to derive.” The same could be said for Germans. Joy Parr states that the Germans from Hanover who enlisted were often barred from taking part in the manly business of fighting and were instead given feminine tasks like cooking. Along with being consigned to less glamorous roles, Germans whose enlistment was accepted were still regarded with suspicion. The assumption that often accompanied Germans overseas was that they were potentially loafers, or, even worse, possibly spies or saboteurs. In January, 1917, a Kitchener woman who identified herself as “a true British mother,” wrote to A. E. Kemp, Minister of Militia, regarding the 118th Battalion. She stated that 90 percent of the battalion was of German ancestry and there was a general feeling that
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several of them were spies while the others would refuse to fight once they arrived at the front.\textsuperscript{180}

The articles printed by the Industrial Newspaper Syndicate also cast aspersions against German-Canadian soldiers. One article stated that the Langs, like many of Berlin’s residents, had family members in both the Canadian and German armies. The author cynically stated that this was not really a problem “because in this way the youthful Langs might exterminate one another.” According to the article, however, this was unfortunately not likely, because the Langs in the Canadian army, like most of those of German descent, avoided doing dangerous work.\textsuperscript{181}

Such accusations against Canadian soldiers of German ancestry were widespread and permeated Canada’s government and military command. In January 1917, when the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion departed for Europe, the Canadian Chief of the General Staff even wrote to the Director of Military Intelligence at the War Office in London, England stating, “The battalion in question is not above suspicion. It has been recruited from a part of Ontario largely settled by Germans and it is feared that some of the men are German in their sympathies.”\textsuperscript{182} Even in the absence of any supporting evidence, Germans were considered potentially disloyal. Volunteering to serve did not demonstrate loyalty but instead placed it in even greater doubt. Instead of privately harbouring pro-German sympathies, German-Canadian soldiers were actively working against the British and Canadian cause.

Berlin had been granted the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion in November 1915, but already by December, recruitment was disappointingly slow. The battalion resorted to press gang tactics, verbally and physically accosting men in the streets and hustling them into recruiting offices, in an attempt to
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bolster their thin ranks. Initially, the *Daily Telegraph* reacted by casting blame generally upon all of Berlin’s citizens, claiming that people did not understand the necessity of filling the battalion. Soon, however, a new culprit was identified. Even though the German defenders, such as the *Berlin News Record* and William Henry Breithaupt, proudly trumpeted the large number of soldiers of German ancestry in the 118th Battalion, the fact that it was not brought up to strength was blamed on the city’s Germans.

The Anglo-conformists argued that Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans remained loyal to the Kaiser and so actively discouraged recruitment and worked against the cause of the allies. In his address at the annual meeting of the Berlin Board of Trade in January 1916, board president W. M. O. Lochead touched on the subject of recruitment. He declared “if the authorities had been firm at the very outset in stifling every sign of sympathy for the cause of our enemies, we would have secured a strong and healthy British sentiment that would not have failed to show itself in every phase of our life and conduct.” At a recruiting rally a few days later, Lieutenant Dancey likewise laid blame upon Berlin’s Germans, claiming, “There is an element here that is a menace to this city and a disgrace to the Country. This element must be weeded out before its rotten influence can do any more harm.” He stated that the rest of Canada viewed the city as a bastion of sympathy for the enemy and so he called upon Berlin’s loyal citizens, “by weeding out the pro-German element, and bringing the 118th Battalion to its full strength, to rectify the impression that is already abroad.” At a recruiting rally in Berlin in March 1916, A. W. Beal of the Department of Education stated that there were five reasons to explain why North Waterloo had not provided more volunteers. The chief reason, he claimed, was pro-Germanism. The other
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reasons which Beal cited—ignorance, pro-partyism, pro-sportism, and pro-boozism—undermined the image of Germans as being sober, thrifty, and industrious, a central facet of their ethnic identity.\footnote{“Strong Appeal Made for Recruits at Grand Theatre Last Night,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 6 March 1916.}

During the name change campaign in 1916, both sides used the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion’s sluggish recruitment to try and garner support. Opponents of the change argued that changing the city’s name was a distraction, and that citizens should focus on filling the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion.\footnote{“Changing the Name of the City,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 14 February 1916; “The Proposal to Change This City’s Name,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 22 April 1916.} The British League and name change supporters, however, maintained that they were the ones who had been doing the most to support the war effort and, despite their claims, Citizens’ League members had done little or nothing. After the Private Bills Committee of the provincial legislature denied a request to change the name of the city without a public vote, S. J. Williams criticized the 900 people who had signed a petition against the name change. He speciously claimed that if they would just enlist, the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion would be filled, ignoring factors such as the age and physical capacity of the signatories.\footnote{“Private Bills Committee Declared Bill Lost,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 4 April 1916.} Prior to the vote, proponents of the name change held a meeting to organize committees to canvass in support of the change. During this meeting, the ever-present Sergeant-Major Blood declared that those who opposed the name change did so because they hoped that Germany would win the war. He even claimed that opponents of the name change “wish[ed] the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion in their graves.”\footnote{“Largely Attended Meeting of Citizens at City Hall Last Evening,” \textit{Berlin News Record}, 3 May 1916.} In July 1916, as the citizens of Berlin waited to see if the provincial government would approve of Kitchener as the city’s name, the \textit{Daily Telegraph} repeatedly censured the leaders of the Citizens’ League for supposedly failing to support the war effort and refusing to allow their sons to enlist.\footnote{Of the men that the \textit{Daily Telegraph} singled out as doing nothing to support the war effort, George Lang, William Henry Schmalz, and H. L. Janzen were on the executive of the CPF. “Will Last Petition Override Will of Electors?”}
While the Germans of Berlin/Kitchener were blamed for the poor recruiting record of the 118th Battalion, historian Nikolas Gardner assigns responsibility to Sam Hughes and the Department of Militia and Defence for their poor decisions and questionable methods, which placed inexperienced men in charge of recruitment.\textsuperscript{192} Gardner notes that this problem was widespread. By late 1915 and early 1916, many communities across Canada experienced difficulty finding recruits.\textsuperscript{193} He states that three quarters of units met the same fate as the 118th Battalion, which was eventually broken up because it was understrength.\textsuperscript{194} Waning enthusiasm for the war across Canada also manifested in declining support for causes such as the Canadian Patriotic Fund. By 1917, residents of Quebec and British Columbia expressed strong opposition to the CPF while residents of Alberta held protest meetings calling for the fund to be supported by taxes rather than private donations.\textsuperscript{195} The national pattern did not seem to matter, however. When war-weariness set in in Berlin, the Anglo-conformists portrayed it as a specifically local problem and a result of the influence of a nefarious pro-German element.

Disputes over who was to blame for sluggish recruitment occasionally appeared as class conflict. The Anglo-conformists, however, always made certain to steer the conflict back in the direction of race/ethnicity. On January 25, 1916, the Twin City (Berlin and Waterloo) Trades and Labor Council passed a resolution condemning the 118th Battalion’s recruiting methods which Lochead euphemistically referred to as a “personal approach.” Local military authorities initially responded by criticizing the Trades and Labor Council as a whole, stating that only 10 of its 600
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members had enlisted this far.\footnote{\textit{What People Are Saying and Doing in Recruiting Work}, \textit{Berlin News Record}, 24 January 1916; \textit{T&L Resolution Regarding 118th Battalion and Officers Comment}, \textit{Berlin News Record}, 26 January 1916.} Lochead quickly interceded, however. Although the council accused Lochead of having a long-standing antipathy to the working class, he stated that he did not believe all of the members of the council agreed with the resolution and so he had no quarrel with them. Lochead instead blamed one of the leaders of the council whom he claimed to be an American Federation of Labor organizer and “very likely an alien of enemy nationality,” who should be interned.\footnote{\textit{Four Letters to the News Record}, \textit{Berlin News Record}, 27 January 1916.} Therefore, rather than representing a genuine class consciousness, Lochead suggested that the resolution of the Trades and Labor Council was the product of German sympathizers or even spies seeking to undermine the war effort. Critics from outside of the city agreed and held the resolution of the Trades and Labor Council as evidence of pro-German sentiment running rampant in Berlin.\footnote{\textit{The London Advertiser, Galt Reporter, Toronto World, St. Thomas Times, and Stratford Herald} all claimed the resolution was evidence of disloyalty and pro-German sentiment. \textit{Stinging Criticism of Berlin Comes From Neighbouring City}, \textit{Berlin Daily Telegraph}, 31 January 1916; \textit{Prompt Action Needed}, \textit{Berlin Daily Telegraph}, 31 January 1916.}

In May 1917, returned soldiers broke up a socialist anti-conscription rally after a member of the crowd was reportedly heard to shout “down with the flag.” In the aftermath, the soldiers vowed to break up any future meeting trying to spread “pro-Germanism or any ‘ism’ not calculated to help win the war,” thereby conflating socialism, anti-conscription sentiment, and pro-German sentiment.\footnote{\textit{Meeting Was Broken Up}, \textit{Daily Telegraph} (Kitchener), 28 May 1917.} The following week, the \textit{Daily Telegraph} published an editorial claiming that socialists and anti-conscriptionists were really just German sympathizers who were attempting to disguise their true intent. The newspaper maintained that “on investigation it has been found that in the majority of cases the membership of the Socialistic camps is made up of Germans who have recently come from the Fatherland and who are thus aiding in the propaganda that has been carried on during the progress of the war to handicap the Allies in their fight against
the Kaiser and the Prussian warlords." In August 1917, the *Daily Telegraph* praised the United States’ government for its swift action after the Industrial Workers of the World headquarters in Spokane, Washington was shut down and its leaders arrested. The *Daily Telegraph* stated that the IWW was rumoured to be subsidized by German spies but even if it was not, “it could hardly serve the purposes of the enemy better than it is doing.” Two days later, the *Daily Telegraph* published an editorial which accused Germany of supporting pacifist, radical women’s suffrage, and anti-capitalist movements in democratic nations and warned that anyone who supported such movements was “misguided or worse.” Prior to the war, members of the ethnic elite had asserted their place as loyal Canadian citizens by distancing the German community from socialism, labour strife, and anything else that could threaten the status quo in Canadian society. Now, however, the Anglo-conformists claimed that Germans, who wished to undermine Canada’s war effort, were responsible for causing any unrest which occurred in Berlin/Kitchener.

**British Values and Prussian Methods: The Meaning of Canadian Citizenship**

The Anglo-conformists and the German defenders also contested the meaning of Canadian citizenship itself. The former argued, unsurprisingly, that Canadian citizenship required strict Anglo-conformity and unswerving, undivided loyalty to the British Empire. The latter maintained that the principle of “British fair play” encouraged tolerance for diversity. Neither group claimed to offer a new or revolutionary understanding of Canadian citizenship. Instead, they each claimed that their interpretation was in the true spirit of the British institutions upon which Canada was founded.

The names of the British League and the Citizens’ League, as well as the mandates they claimed, testify to their differing conceptions of Canadian citizenship. The British League
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articulated an ethnic definition of Canadian citizenship. The league was formed on April 10, 1916, ostensibly to lobby to change the city’s name. Its stated purpose was “to promote British sentiment in this community and to assist in every way possible to encourage patriotic movements in Berlin and vicinity.” When the group adopted a constitution in October 1916, this original mandate was expanded to include ensuring the city retained its “fairly won” British name, opposing anyone who objected to any measures or men “on the ground that they are British or too British,” as well as fighting against “any attempt to realize the stupid boast that this city must be reclaimed by the Germans and must exist as a centre of German influence.”

Despite this emphasis on “being British” as a prerequisite for citizenship, many of the British League’s members were of German descent. The Daily Telegraph explained that being a British Canadian did not necessarily require a person to be of British ancestry, but rather to be “British in national and imperial ideals.” For the city’s Germans, this meant that assimilation was mandatory for acceptance.

The Citizens’ League, meanwhile, articulated a civic understanding of citizenship, based on equality regardless of ethnicity. The Citizens’ League’s charter stated that it was founded “to promote the interests of good Government in Berlin.” This second league’s name and mandate were therefore free from any ethnic identifiers, emphasizing inclusivity. Just as the British League was open to those who were not of British descent, however, there were limits to
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the inclusivity of the Citizens’ League as well as hierarchies among those they accepted. This has been seen, for example, in the Citizens’ League members’ dismissal of Italians as dangerous criminals. Citizens’ League member J. F. McKay furthermore continued to privilege Germans as racial cousins of the British.\textsuperscript{209} Neither group, then, articulated a purely ethnic or purely civic definition of Canadian citizenship; they simply stressed the elements of one over the other.

The conflict between the Anglo-conformists and the German defenders which had been building since the start of the war finally exploded during the name change debate in 1916. Throughout this turbulent year, the Anglo-conformists and the German defenders battled for political supremacy in Berlin/Kitchener. They equated their struggle with the war overseas, with both claiming to be the true representatives of “British values” while accusing their opponents of using “Prussian methods” to achieve their ends. The Anglo-conformists initially hoped that the name change could be accomplished through an act of the provincial legislature without a public vote. They argued that putting the matter to a vote was unpatriotic and “anti-British.” The \textit{Daily Telegraph} listed patriotic decisions made by the government such as the declaration of war which were not put to a vote. Changing the city’s name was similarly patriotic and so citizens should support it unquestioningly.\textsuperscript{210} The German defenders, meanwhile, argued that those who were trying to force a new name on the city were themselves resorting to “Prussian methods.”\textsuperscript{211}

When the Private Bills Committee rejected the initial petition to change the city’s name, the Anglo-conformists protested that their cause was not given a fair hearing and had been
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sabotaged by shady back-room dealings by the German defenders. S. J. Williams accused as distinguished a figure as Adam Beck “and a few of his pro-German friends,” of defeating the bill. A. B. McBride drolly retorted that if Beck and the Kaiser were launching “some mysterious and nefarious plot” against King George, he was unaware. After the legislature consented to changing the city’s name subject to a vote by Berlin’s citizens, the Anglo-conformists acted as though this had been their intent the entire time. Putting the issue to a vote would demonstrate that the city’s residents were truly loyal and not simply trying to impose a change of name to cover up for the disloyalty of the majority. Furthermore, they accused the German defenders who were lobbying to delay the name change until the following year of trying to subvert the will of the people.

The vote, on May 19, 1916, did not conclude the name change saga. The referendum, which passed by a mere 81 votes, still needed to be approved by the City Council and the Provincial Legislature before it could take effect. The German defenders pressed to have the vote overturned or at the very least see the city amalgamate with Waterloo. On July 22, the newly-formed Citizens’ League published a pamphlet titled “The Other Side: An Appeal for British Fair Play.” This document accused the supporters of the name change of using violence and intimidation to ensure their cause was victorious. The Citizens’ League argued that the raid on the Concordia Club and similar actions were meant to stifle any opposition to the name change.
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Opponents of the name change, such as the *Berlin News Record* and William Henry Breithaupt, for example, received threatening letters. The pamphlet claimed that Alderman Cleghorn coerced manufacturers into supporting the name change by stating that he would advertise the names of those businesses which opposed the cause. This inflammatory document also charged that the chief of police had requested the leaders of the opposition leave town on the day of the election as he could not ensure their safety. The intimidation also meant that the opponents were unable to muster enough scrutineers for the polls. As a result, many men who had resided in Berlin sometimes for more than 50 years had their citizenship questioned and were denied the right to vote. The German defenders repeated these accusations in editorials and petitions to the provincial government, demanding British fair play while denouncing the name change and the methods by which it was achieved as “Kaiserism.”

The response of the Anglo-conformists to these accusations was undecided. At times, they denied any charges of violence, intimidation, or other wrongdoing, particularly on the part of the 118th Battalion. In November 1916 the firm of Rittinger and Motz, publishers of the *Berliner Journal*, sent out a letter to customers stating that it would continue to use the name Berlin, “until the ratepayers of this city definitely decide the name issue in a fair election without intimidation or danger of violence.” Aldermen J. A. Hallman, C. C. Hahn, and W. G. Cleghorn, all reacted with outrage. Hahn even called for legal action against Rittinger and Motz. At other times, however, the Anglo-conformists defended their aggressive actions. A letter to the editor of the *Daily Telegraph* in the wake of the raid on the Concordia Club and the assault on Reverend
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Tappert argued that the citizens and members of the 118th Battalion who took part in these actions did the right thing in clearing out the “pro-Germans,” something which should have been done at the start of the war. The writer of this letter concluded that the perpetrators acted like any “true Britisher” should. In August 1916, the *Daily Telegraph* printed an editorial from the *Welland Telegraph* which apparently demonstrated how those outside the city viewed the Citizens’ League. The editorial stated that the appeal to British fair play was absurd coming from men who opposed giving the city a good British name. Turning the tables on the accusers, the author argued the Citizens’ League should be ashamed that any “methods” were necessary to secure the name change. The need to use violence and intimidation was therefore an indictment of the loyalty of the opponents of the name change. In October, 1916, Alderman Cleghorn went so far as to state that he was proud of the actions of the 118th Battalion. He argued that the battalion had “cleaned out a mess when they smashed the Concordia Hall.”

The Anglo-conformists therefore argued that their means were vindicated by their noble ends, upholding the city’s British character. Conversely, they argued that it was the German defenders who employed devious, underhanded methods. Prior to the vote on May 19, Mayor Hett complained to Ottawa about the conduct of the 118th Battalion. Members of the British League such as C. C. Hahn protested that he was attempting to unfairly influence the election. They argued that the mayor had attempted to disenfranchise the soldiers by having the battalion removed prior to the vote. At a victory rally following the election, S. J. Williams decried the

---

219 The *Daily Telegraph* which liked to claim that it had never questioned the loyalty of the city’s Germans often did so by proxy by reprinting accusations and criticisms by other people and newspapers. “‘The Other Side’ As Seen By The Outside Press,” *Berlin Daily Telegraph*, 15 August 1916.
221 “City Council Disagree With Mayor on Recent Investigation,” *Berlin News Record*, 16 May 1916; “Berlin’s Mayor Was Given Public and Humiliating Rebuke; Want of Confidence Resolution,” *Berlin Daily Telegraph*, 16
“gas bombs,” and “submarine methods,” used by the opponents of the name change, a reference to the atrocities committed by the German military. Driving his point home, he declared, “the work of the opposition in this campaign has shown us that there are dirty Huns in this city who are the same as the Prussians whom we detest.” When the German defenders circulated a petition to delay the name change, the Anglo-conformists accused them of forging signatures, pressing men to sign without reading, and utilizing other “Prussian methods” to artificially inflate their apparent support. British League supporters touted the fact that H. M. Bowman, author of the Citizens’ League’s pamphlet “The Other Side” had spent four years studying in Leipzig, Germany. This was held as evidence that the methods and ideals endorsed by the Citizens’ League were corrupted by Prussianism and were thus manifestly un-British. British League supporters also claimed that the Citizens’ League had no membership fees and therefore questioned where their opponent’s funding came from. The insinuation was that it originated from a malicious, foreign source.

The conflict between the two leagues carried over into the civic elections of January 1, 1917. Each league nominated a full slate of candidates for the offices of mayor, city council, light commission, water commission, and public school board. Even before the nominations, however, the leagues battled over the more basic matter of who had the right to vote in the elections. As aforementioned, this battle took place in advance of the Wartime Elections Act of September
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1917 which disenfranchised those of enemy alien ancestry who had been naturalized less than 15 years. From December 15 to 18, 1916, C. C. Hahn and Daniel T. Heisey of the British League and A. L. Bitzer of the Citizens’ League appealed to have hundreds of names either taken off or added to the voters’ list. Bitzer objected to having to defend men whose names had appeared previously on the voters’ list, claiming that the law stipulated that in such instances the burden of proof was on demonstrating that they were not British subjects. His protests, however, were in vain. Many of the men whose citizenship was challenged by the British League were among the city’s oldest residents. Ten of them were able to prove that they had lived in Canada since before Confederation and were granted naturalization after taking the oath of allegiance. The British League also challenged H. M. Bowman on the grounds that he was not a householder, forcing him to produce his lease. Of the 278 appeals by the British League, 113 were sustained, 103 dismissed, and 62 delayed until the Court of General Sessions ruled on a number of applications for naturalization on December 22. Of the 39 appeals issued by the Citizens’ League to have names added to the list, 32 were sustained and 7 dismissed. The Daily Telegraph heralded this as a victory for the British League.²²⁶

²²⁶ The names appealed by the British League included 5 Catholic priests. The News Record reported that several men had their names removed from the list after they missed hearing their name called because they were unable to gain entrance into the over-crowded courtroom or went home after waiting outside for hours in the freezing cold. “Voters’ List Court Being Held This Afternoon,” News Record (Kitchener), 15 December 1916; “Revision Court Hears Voters’ List Appeals,” News Record (Kitchener), 16 December 1916; “Court of Revision On 1917 Voters’ List Deals With Many Appeals Entered By Two Leagues,” Daily Telegraph (Kitchener), 16 December 1916; “Court of Revision Closed Session This Morning,” News Record (Kitchener), 18 December 1916; “Voters’ Lists Are Revised,” Daily Telegraph (Kitchener), 18 December 1916.
years and had even fulfilled their duty as citizens by paying taxes and serving on juries. These men had considered the formal process of becoming naturalized as unnecessary as they were already citizens in practice. Bitzer also pointed out that two of the applicants whom E. W. Clement of the British League had labelled German were from Alsace-Lorraine which was actually a French possession at the time of their birth. In a 2-1 decision, the court ruled that the 93 applicants judged to have come from Germany should not be naturalized on the grounds that they were enemy aliens. The dissenting Judge Hanning stated of those who had sons in uniform, who had come to Canada in infancy, or had resided in Canada for decades, “virtually such men are alien friends—technically they are alien enemies.”

The Daily Telegraph once again lauded this rebuke for the Citizens’ League which it claimed put to rest “the stupid charge made by the Citizens’ League” that the British League disenfranchised qualified electors. The News Record, however, castigated the British League for having “scores” of “old and respected citizens” disenfranchised. Reiterating the value of Germans as Canadian citizens, the News Record claimed that these men chose to live under the British flag because they appreciated the freedom and opportunities it offered. They contributed materially to the war effort and many had sons in uniform. Naturalization was just meant to be a “technical action,” to recognize “in name what they are in deed.” The actions of the British League thus contravened British fair play and the ideals for which the war was being fought.

In the final days before the elections, the Citizens’ League, backed by the News Record, used these reverses to denounce the British League for its betrayal of the British principles upon which Canada was founded. David Gross, the Citizens’ League’s candidate for mayor, castigated
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the British League for denying naturalization to many of Kitchener’s oldest residents and for its constant accusations of disloyalty directed at the city’s Germans. As a “True Britisher,” he vowed that he would not revisit the name issue while the war continued. Above all, he declared that he would restore harmony to Kitchener and ensure British Justice and British Fair Play for all of its citizens.231 An editorial in the News Record claimed that the Citizens’ League was the real British League because it stood for British principles and did not deny fellow Canadians their rights as citizens.232 Another urged readers to “support the Citizens’ League and put an end to Prussianism in our city.”233 Most effective of all, in its final edition before the elections the News Record published on its front page a list of the men, all German, who were disenfranchised. The article also noted how long these men had resided in Canada, all of them over 10 years. The article concluded stating that citizens should resent the treatment of these good men and vote for the Citizens’ League.234

The British League and its supporters, meanwhile, continued to claim that they were the true standard bearers of British values and accused their opponents of disloyalty. The Daily Telegraph accused David Gross of failing to adequately support patriotic causes. The Daily Telegraph also asserted that Gross’s calls for British Fair Play were laughable because he objected to the fair and just ruling of the courts on the voters’ list. The British League was British in sentiment so it followed that anyone who opposed it was un-British.235 Aldermanic candidate Dr. A. E. Rudell similarly argued that there were two elements in Kitchener: the British and the anti-British. He claimed that attempting to change the name of the city back to Berlin was “an

231 “Biggest Slate of Nominations For Municipal Offices in City’s History,” News Record (Kitchener), 26 December 1916; “Candidate For Mayor, 1917,” News Record (Kitchener), 26 December 1916.
overt act of treason.” S. J. Williams agreed and, even though he vowed not to reopen the name issue, Williams proclaimed that Gross should be interned. On December 29, the Daily Telegraph warned that a victory for the Citizens’ League “would brand this city as anti-British and disloyal.” Paradoxically, the British League at the same time softened this previously rigid binary world view and adopted a more conciliatory approach. The British League’s candidate for mayor, W. E. Gallagher claimed David Gross as his friend. Gallagher professed that if a man opposed him, this did not mean that he was an enemy. Gallagher added that he was not anti-German but was instead a friend of the German people “who are good Canadian citizens.” The Daily Telegraph also took great pains to point out that British League president and aldermanic candidate C. C. Hahn was of German ancestry. This proved that German ancestry was not an impediment to membership in the British League and therefore that the British League was not anti-German. This attempt to embrace the city’s German residents was a testament to the effectiveness of the Citizens’ League’s scathing attacks.

On January 1, 1917, after the votes were cast and the ballots counted, the result was a resounding victory for the Citizens’ League. The entire slate of Citizens’ League candidates won with the exception of three school board trusteeships. When the outcome was announced, disgruntled British League supporters and soldiers of the 118th Battalion home on leave rioted, damaging the News Record offices, injuring several aldermen-elect, and forcing the mayor-elect
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into hiding. Order was only restored when Mayor Hett called in the 122\textsuperscript{nd} Battalion from Galt.\textsuperscript{241} At a British League meeting on January 5, C. C. Hahn alleged that on the day of the elections, “pro-Germans” had been planning to attack the British League if they won, and that they had been storing guns and ammunition in a schoolhouse in a nearby village as well as at a house in Kitchener where there were 13 men “all armed to the teeth.” A. P. Sherwood, the Chief Commissioner of Police sent officers from Ottawa to investigate these serious allegations and found them to be baseless.\textsuperscript{242}

The continued antagonism of Hahn notwithstanding, Kitchener’s prominent citizens soon called for an end to the conflicts which had plagued the city in the preceding year. In his inaugural address, Mayor Gross reiterated his vow not to reopen the name change issue and then issued a plea for harmony in Kitchener.\textsuperscript{243} At a British League meeting on January 25, Colonel W. C. McCullough of Hamilton spoke on the very timely subject of national unity. McCullough identified tolerance and harmony as the key to Canada achieving national greatness.\textsuperscript{244} The following day, at a meeting of the Kitchener Board of Trade, new president W. D. Euler called for an end to the strife in the city. He asked the city’s residents to follow the lead of a group of French- and English-Canadian businessmen who, at a recent meeting in Hamilton, had reached a \textit{bonne entente} which declared that “all people of Canada whatever may be their racial origin or creed can meet on the common ground of Canadian citizenship.”\textsuperscript{245}

The Anglo-conformists and German defenders continued to contest the meaning of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship, but their conflict did not return to the sustained fevered pitch that existed in 1916. During the federal election of 1917, Kitchener was divided

\textsuperscript{241}“Soldiers Riot and Damage Property,” \textit{News Record} (Kitchener), 2 January 1917; English and McLaughlin, \textit{Kitchener}, 126-7.
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\textsuperscript{245}“President W. D. Euler of B. of T. Pleads for Unity in City,” \textit{News Record} (Kitchener), 27 January 1917.
primarily by politics and class as opposed to ethnicity. In an ironic twist, one which seemed to be lost on the newspaper’s editor, the traditionally Liberal *Daily Telegraph* opposed the *Wartime Elections Act* which disenfranchised many of Kitchener’s Germans, calling it a “breach of faith,” “an iniquitous measure,” and “Prussianism.” The *Daily Telegraph*, however, eventually came around to supporting the Unionist cause. Citizens’ League members, meanwhile, could be found supporting either the Union or Laurier Liberal candidates. After Prime Minister Borden was shouted down and prevented from speaking during a rally in Kitchener, a bitterly divided city council voted 7-5 against issuing an apology. The following day, the *Daily Telegraph* printed an editorial which denied that the disturbance was the work of a pro-German faction in Kitchener.

In January 1918, the previous year’s mayor and city council ran unopposed and were re-elected by acclamation. After declining the nomination to run for mayor, Louis Jacob Breithaupt called for unity and an end to both leagues. This proposal had already garnered a great deal of support in editorials and letters to the editor.

**A Defeated Enemy?: The Armistice**

On November 11, 1918, news of the armistice brought scenes of jubilation to the streets of Kitchener. According to the *News Record* however, “the spirit of mischief also was abroad,” during the celebrations. Alderman A.L. Bitzer was taken from his office by a crowd of returned soldiers and civilians and brought to city hall where, along with jeweler John Schmidt, he was compelled to kiss the Union Jack. The *Daily Telegraph* reported that both men had made
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disloyal utterances and so the “Britishers” were exacting their revenge. The crowd also sought out Aldermen Bowman and Asmussen but were unable to find them. During a rally in front of city hall, S.J. Williams did not pass up the opportunity “to heap a tirade of abuse upon a number of his fellow-citizens.” For Williams and the mischievous soldiers and civilians, the celebration was about their supposed victory over the local German population as well as the victory over the Germans on the battlefields of Europe.

The destruction of the Kaiser’s bust, the change of the city’s name, and the sacking of the Concordia Club would seem to suggest that during the war years, the Germans of Berlin/Kitchener were vilified, marginalized, and cast aside. A closer examination, however, demonstrates that, although the space for negotiation was narrowed considerably by the exigencies of war, many continued to defend the place of Germans as Canadian citizens, belying the Anglo-conformists’ claims of victory. These “accomplishments” were certainly points won for the Anglo-conformist cause, yet the Anglo-conformists were still unsuccessful in forcing all of the city’s Germans to abandon their ethnic identity and assimilate. The resounding victory of the entire slate of Citizens’ League candidates in the 1917 civic elections demonstrates that, at least at a local level, a vision of Canadian citizenship which tolerated some diversity as well as the place of Germans as loyal, productive citizens was possible, even during a conflict which supposedly required strict adherence to the Anglo-conformist dogma and vilification of all things German.

Chapter 3: Comrades and Conestoga Wagons, 1918-1933

Historians of the interwar years have never ceased asking if the war brought a fundamental break from the past. In *The Great War and Modern Memory*, Paul Fussell argues that the war shattered the romantic belief in history as an upward progression. He traces the modern understanding of the past as “ironic action,” to the attempt to make sense of the unprecedented savagery and slaughter of the war. Critics of Fussell such as Jonathan Vance see the persistence of tradition and conservatism in the memory of the war. Vance argues that Canadians wanted to see the death and destruction of the war as coming in the service of some higher purpose. A more romantic view of history therefore endured in the dominant official memory of the war in Canada. Some Canadians saw it as a just cause, the triumph of civilization over barbarism.

Discussing Canada’s growth from colony to nation, historians C. P. Stacey and James M. Pitsula describe the war as a “coming of age,” the moment when Canada emerged as a nation independent of Britain. Likewise, Carl Berger argues that the First World War killed the appeal of Canadian imperialism. The war, he claims, brought disillusionment with the empire and encouraged Canadians to adopt a North American-centric, isolationist worldview. Contrarily, José E. Igartua argues that many English-speaking Canadians continued to espouse a “British” national identity well after the war, until the 1960s when it was “abruptly discarded.”
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Historians studying Kitchener’s Germans generally argue that the war destroyed the German community. In their history of Kitchener, John English and Kenneth McLaughlin argue that the First World War, which was fought “against ‘Germanness’ as well as against Germany,” forced residents to abandon certain characteristics which had made them distinct within a national community. It was only with the advent of Oktoberfest in the late 1960s some residents once again publicly celebrated their German heritage. In his history of the German Canadians of Waterloo County, Gottlieb Leibbrandt devotes only a brief chapter titled “Dark Times,” to the years 1914 to 1945. He argues that the “hate propaganda” directed against the Germans and their cultural institutions resulted in the German community being “dismantled piecemeal.” The small volume of writing on Kitchener’s Germans in the interwar years reinforces the notion that the German community was non-existent during this period.

I argue, however, that for Kitchener’s Germans, the First World War did not bring a fundamental break with the past. In the interwar years, the leaders of Kitchener’s German community continued to see themselves as distinct from the predominantly Anglo-Canadian population that surrounded them. The specific content of their ethnic identity was necessarily different from the halcyon days of the prewar years when they had praised the might of the German Empire. Its central purpose, however, reconciling their distinctiveness with their claim to be loyal Canadian citizens, as well as many of its leading exponents, remained unchanged by the war. Several of the key themes of their prewar ethnic identity remained intact. Contrary to Fussell’s argument, in Kitchener the war did not destroy belief in humanity’s progress. The ethnic elite continued to portray Germans, initially under the guise of Mennonites, as one of

Canada’s charter people and agents of progress and nation building. One notable difference from the prewar ethnic identity, however, was the greater emphasis on military service as the ultimate measure of citizenship. Jonathan Vance argues that the dominant memory of the war held service as a mark of special distinction, setting those who served apart from the rest of Canada. Together, this “band of brothers,” formed “a privileged body on a different level from the rest of society.”

The soldiers, characterized as young and vigorous in the memory of the war, symbolized Canada as a nation with its boundless possibilities for the future. The ethnic elite therefore demonstrated that the Germans too had played their part in the late conflict in order to stake their claim for membership in the “band of brothers.”

**Sauerkraut Dinners Not Strawberry Socials: The Germans Remain Distinct**

With the outbreak of war in 1914, German immigrants were labelled enemy aliens and barred from entering Canada. This restriction remained until 1923 when it was abolished by Order-in-Council. Germans remained on the list of “non-preferred” immigrants, however this distinction was largely ignored and was eventually lifted in 1927. Despite these initial limitations, more than 100,000 German speaking immigrants came to Canada in the interwar years, the majority settling in western Canada. Between 1923 and 1930, 494 immigrants from Germany as well as several hundred Volksdeutsche, ethnic Germans from nations outside of Germany such as Hungary, Romania (Roumania), Russia, and Yugoslavia (Jugo-Slavia), chose to settle in Kitchener. Immigration slowed substantially during the Depression.
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Leibbrandt and John English and Kenneth McLaughlin credit these new immigrants with preserving the embers of a German community which would be allowed to proudly burn once again in the era of multiculturalism.\footnote{Leibbrandt, \textit{Little Paradise}, 256-260.} I contend, however, that rather than assimilating, the prewar ethnic elite, in conjunction with the new immigrants, preserved the German community and retained its distinctiveness from the rest of Canada. What is more, instead of being dormant or forced underground, the German community was active and visible in public life in Kitchener in the interwar years, if not on quite the same scale as prior to the war.

Leibbrandt argues that by the 1920s, most of the old German community had assimilated into their Anglo-Canadian surroundings. Owing to the war, many had completely abandoned their heritage, choosing to Anglicize their names or claim Dutch or Austrian ancestry.\footnote{English and McLaughlin also argue that during the war, many of Kitchener’s Germans Anglicized their names, turning “Brauns into Browns and Schmidts into Smiths.” Leibbrandt, \textit{Little Paradise}, 256; English and McLaughlin, \textit{Kitchener}, 159-160.} Despite Leibbrandt’s claims, in 1921 the number of Kitchener residents claiming Dutch or Austrian ancestry was only 479. Although this was an increase from the 133 who claimed Dutch or Austrian ancestry in 1911, it is hardly an indication that the city’s Germans were claiming a new ethnicity \textit{en masse}. Furthermore, those claiming German ancestry increased from 10 633 in 1911 to 12 101 in 1921 and 16 345 in 1931. While their numbers as a proportion of the city’s population decreased from 70 percent in 1911 to 56 percent in 1921 and 53 percent in 1931, this is more attributable to the increase in non-German immigration to Kitchener during this period than to Germans abandoning their ethnicity.\footnote{From 1911 to 1921, the number of Germans in Canada as a whole decreased from 393 320 to 294 636. This large decrease could indicate that nation-wide Germans chose to either emigrate or claim a different ethnicity however this trend is not evident in Berlin/Kitchener. \textit{Fifth Census of Canada, 1911 Volume II: Religions, Origins, Birthplace, Citizenship, Literacy and Infirmities, By Provinces, Districts and Sub-Districts} (Ottawa: C. H. Parmelee, 1913), 374; \textit{Sixth Census of Canada, 1921 Volume I—Population, Number, Sex and Distribution—Racial Origins—Religions}.}
In May 1918, while vacationing in California, a man asked Louis Jacob Breithaupt why he did not support his “German brethren in Germany.” Breithaupt responded that he was “too British” to discuss such a matter.\textsuperscript{16} Despite his wartime disavowal of the German Empire and his support of the Canadian war effort, after the war Breithaupt was once again sympathetic to a humbled and redeemed Germany. As he had prior to the war, Breithaupt intently followed news from Germany. In his diary, he castigated France for its harsh treatment of Germany which he believed was “likely to ‘sow the seed’ for future serious trouble.”\textsuperscript{17} Breithaupt also made contributions to charities to relieve suffering in Germany and sent care packages of food, clothing, and money which he recorded in his diary were “much appreciated by relatives and friends in the old land at present.”\textsuperscript{18}

Louis Jacob Breithaupt was not alone. The Kitchener \emph{Daily Record} empathized with the plight of the German people. The newspaper was owned by former publisher of the \emph{Berliner Journal}, W. J. Motz and Member of Parliament, W. D. Euler who purchased the \emph{News Record} in 1919 and the \emph{Daily Telegraph} in 1922.\textsuperscript{19} An editorial from December 1923 reminded readers that, while they were full of Christmas cheer, the people of Germany, especially the children, were starving and suffering. Whatever lingering burden Canadians felt from the war such as higher taxes paled in comparison to the one which was crushing Germany. The editorial closed
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by criticizing Canada’s former ally France for “her policy of suppression” which was strangling Germany.  

It was not just in private thoughts and actions or the occasional editorial that Kitchener’s German community displayed its ethnicity; cultural life in Kitchener continued to have a German inflection. As early as 1920, churches in Kitchener once again began holding services in German, having ceased to do so during the war. For community groups such as the Catholic Women’s League, the YMCA, or the Christian Mothers’ Society, the social gathering of choice was not the typically Anglo-Saxon tea party or strawberry social, but the unmistakably Teutonic sauerkraut dinner. These dinners were large events for the wider community. In February 1921, for example, the Kitchener Manufacturers Association entertained a delegation from the Canadian Manufacturers Association of Toronto with a sauerkraut dinner.

German culture came out of the shadows in other ways too. In November 1924, owing to increasing demand for books in German, the Kitchener public library board ordered 80 new books. The latest Hollywood movies may have been the most popular form of entertainment in postwar Kitchener: however, German plays and concerts were still performed and newspaper reports indicate their popularity. Notably, the resumption of these cultural patterns, which had
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been disrupted by the war, began prior to 1923 when German immigration to Canada was once again permitted.

In March 1933, nearly fifteen years after the war which supposedly destroyed the German community, ministers from Kitchener’s German churches debated in the pages of the *Daily Record* whether or not the German language was dying out in Kitchener. Reverend John Schmieder of St. Matthew’s Lutheran took the fact that only fifteen youths were confirmed that Easter in the city’s German churches as a sign that the language was indeed dying. Reverend H. A. Sperling of St. Peter’s Lutheran, however, disagreed. He said that while his church had no scholars confirmed that year, there were several studying for their confirmation in 1934. He pointed to the fact that many children were still learning German in classes and private lessons as evidence that the language was alive and well in Kitchener.25

**The Trail of the Conestoga: Foregrounding the Mennonites**

On December 1, 1919, Kitchener city council was scheduled to vote upon a petition, signed by 700 citizens calling for the matter of the city’s name to be put to another vote, be granted. The council chambers were packed for this hotly-anticipated meeting. Earlier that day, the *Daily Telegraph* suggested that since the peace had not yet been signed, re-opening the name issue could be construed as an act of treason.26 Although city council voted unanimously to reject the report, the partisan crowd became agitated after noticing that Aldermen A. L. Bitzer and H. M. Bowman were absent for the vote. The crowd soon found the offending aldermen at city hall. Although Alderman Bowman was rescued by the police, the mob brought Bitzer to the Great War Veterans’ Association Hall where he was forced to kiss the Union Jack and subsequently deposited in the frigid waters of Victoria Park Lake. They then proceeded to the home of
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Alderman and Member of Provincial Legislature Nick Asmussen. Asmussen met the mob on his front porch with a revolver in hand. After a brief standoff, he willingly went to the GWVA hall where he kissed the flag and signed a statement declaring his loyalty. The mob then sought out and found Member of Parliament W. D. Euler. Euler, however, refused to comply with their demand that he kiss the flag, claiming that he would do so under normal circumstances but to do so when forced would be to dishonour it. The mob responded to Euler’s intransigence by striking him several times before releasing him. As a final ignominious act, the mob ransacked the offices of the News Record and Ontario Journal.27

In the aftermath of this council meeting cum riot, Alderman Bitzer requested that Attorney General W. E. Raney send a commission of High Court Judges to investigate not only the most recent disturbance but also the name change of 1916 and how it was brought about. An outside investigation was necessary, he stated, as local authorities were sympathetic to the rioters. He even claimed that the local Police Magistrate and Crown Attorney knew about the riots beforehand and made no effort to prevent them.28 The Daily Telegraph, however, editorialized against an investigation, assigning blame to the mayor, councillors, and petitioners who incited public opinion by attempting to re-open the name change.29 When W. D. Euler had the audacity to suggest that it was the Daily Telegraph which had incited the rioters, the newspaper responded by accusing Euler of displaying a “characteristic Prussian spirit.”30 After a cursory and ultimately
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fruitless investigation, Raney declined to probe further, insisting that the law stipulated that investigation and prosecution should be conducted at the local level.\textsuperscript{31}

The effort to change the city’s name back to Berlin testifies to the steadfast refusal of Kitchener’s Germans to forcibly assimilate. The response to this campaign, however, also demonstrates that, in the years immediately following the war, German ethnicity was still a potential liability. In a letter from Kitchener native William Lyon Mackenzie King to William Henry Schmalz in August 1922, the prime minister concurred that the change of name was “unfortunate” and an “embarrassment.” He advised Schmalz, however, that it was still a very sensitive issue and so any attempt to change the name back would need to be approached with extreme caution.\textsuperscript{32}

In order to reconcile their distinctiveness with their claim to be loyal Canadian citizens, the ethnic elite rewrote the history of the city, foregrounding the Mennonites who had been marginalized prior to the war. Previously, the Mennonites were subsumed as Germans and relegated to the background. Now, however, they were the focal point of a safer, more acceptable German ethnic identity which celebrated the Mennonites or Pennsylvania Dutch as Kitchener’s charter people and the source of the city’s prosperity. In his article, “From Berlin to the Trek of the Conestoga,” Geoffrey Hayes provides a narrative of postwar efforts to promote the “Conestoga myth.”\textsuperscript{33} Hayes, however, fails to recognize the remarkable continuity in the myth’s themes and exponents from the prewar years. In these respects, this “new” ethnic identity for
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Kitchener’s German community differed very little from that which was proudly trumpeted in the decades prior to the war.

This Mennonite-centred ethnic identity was promoted in works of popular history and in public commemoration. In 1919, the *Kitchener Daily Telegraph* published a *Peace Souvenir* to commemorate the end of the war. This booklet placed the Mennonites in the foreground of Waterloo County’s history at the expense of the Germans. In it, William Henry Breithaupt stated that during the war Waterloo County’s residents “without distinction of ancestry, whether Pennsylvanian, Scotch, English, Irish, German or other responded freely and immediately to the call to arms.”34 Curiously, Breithaupt, who in 1916 defiantly declared “we are German and not ashamed of it,” relegated the Germans to fifth on this list, while elevating the Pennsylvania Dutch to first. In 1924, Kitchener Public Library librarian Mabel Dunham published *The Trail of the Conestoga*, a work of historical fiction which described the heroic exploits of Waterloo County’s Mennonite settlers as they journeyed from Pennsylvania and established new homes in Canada. In 1931, this founding epic for Waterloo County, a Pennsylvania Dutch *Aeneid*, was translated into a play by students at Waterloo College. In its review, the *Daily Record* praised the performance which ably conveyed “the grandeur of the sacrifice made by the Pennsylvania Mennonites who settled Waterloo County,” many of whose descendants were in the audience.35 The ultimate expression of this version of German ethnic identity came in the Pioneers Memorial Tower, a stately stone structure completed in 1926 overlooking the Grand River from the site of the first farms established by Mennonite settlers in what would become Waterloo County.

Prior to the war, those of Mennonite ancestry were, at times, resentful of being labelled “German” and having their history appropriated. After the war, they were understandably ardent

---

35 “History of County Enacted By Waterloo College Cast,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 10 December 1931.
supporters of the Mennonites’ history which was suddenly in vogue. They were not alone, however. When a meeting was called in July 1923 to organize support for the erection of a monument to the Mennonite pioneers, members of the prewar ethnic elite such as William Henry Breithaupt and William Henry Schmalz were in attendance. The ethnic elite were similarly well-represented among those who donated money for the construction of the Pioneers Memorial Tower. It was in fact William Henry Breithaupt, rather than someone of Mennonite ancestry, who was the most vigorous exponent of Kitchener’s Mennonite heritage. Through his positions with the Waterloo Historical Society and the Ontario Historical Society, Breithaupt encouraged writing on Mennonites, authoring several articles himself. More significant was his contribution to the construction of the Pioneers Memorial Tower. The movement to build the Pioneers Memorial Tower began in 1919 when Breithaupt, was approached by Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank, chair of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, part of the Department of the Interior, asking if there was anything in Waterloo County which was deserving of a national monument. Breithaupt responded that he felt the site of the first farms established in Waterloo County by settlers Joseph Schoerg and Samuel D. Betzner were worthy of commemoration. Although the monument was paid for almost entirely by private subscriptions, it was endorsed by the Monuments Board which provided a bronze tablet with inscription.
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36 Breithaupt, in fact, organized the meeting and was its chair. “Object of First Meeting Reached,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.
37 Kitchener Public Library Grace Schmidt Room (hereafter KPL), MC 113, Waterloo Pioneers Memorial Tower, MC.113.4 –Miscellaneous, “List of Paid Subscriptions to the Waterloo County Pioneer Memorial Association.”
38 William Henry Breithaupt was the founding president of the Waterloo Historical Society from its founding in 1912 and also served as the president of the Ontario Historical Society in 1924 and 1925. In 1924, appealing to Kitchener City Council for funding for the Waterloo Historical Society, Breithaupt highlighted the work the historical society was doing “in placing on record the story of the pioneer settlement of the county.” UW, GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.6 Breithaupt, William Henry Correspondence, 15 November 1924 William Henry to the Honourable Mayor and Council of the City of Kitchener; Hayes, “Trek of the Conestoga,” 137.
39 At the unveiling of the tower in 1926, D. N. Panabaker, president of the Waterloo County Pioneers’ Memorial Association lauded Breithaupt as the driving force behind the monument’s construction. “Unveiling Of Memorial Tower Tribute To County Pioneers,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.
40 Hayes, “Trek of the Conestoga,” 137.
The approval of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board illustrates the negotiation over the place of Germans as Canadian citizens during this period. At the time, the board was primarily concerned with honouring the deeds of the “great men,” particularly the Loyalists, whom they held to be “the basis of much of what was good in contemporary Canadian society.” That these great men were predominantly white and Anglo-Saxon reflected their vision of Canada as a nation and who should be welcomed as Canadian citizens. According to board member James M. Coyne, the Loyalists embodied, “the learning, the piety, the gentle birth, the wealth and citizenship of the British race in America.” The achievements of others who were not welcomed in the mainstream of Canadian society such as First Nations people were considered peripheral to Canadian history and therefore unworthy of commemoration. In order to gain the endorsement of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board, supporters of the Pioneers Memorial needed to demonstrate that Schoerg, Betzner, and other Mennonites were nation builders on par with the Loyalists and other Anglo-Saxon great men who shaped Canada’s history, that their achievements were of national, not just local significance.

William Henry Breithaupt stated his case in a letter to F. H. H. Williamson, the secretary of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board in September 1920. He claimed that the proposed site was:

of National importance for the reason that the local settlement, in the year 1800, which it would commemorate, was the first larger settlement in the interior (away from the border) of Upper Canada and the largest settlement of a class of people, the Mennonites of

---

Pennsylvania, who, in their unobtrusive way, have borne a very considerable part in the settlement and development of Canada.\textsuperscript{42}

The board ultimately agreed with Breithaupt’s argument. The text of the tablet, painstakingly crafted by Breithaupt along with E. A. Cruikshank and James M. Coyne of the Monuments Board, concludes with a reiteration of Breithaupt’s statement of the historical significance of this Mennonite settlement to Canada.\textsuperscript{43} The support of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board for the Pioneers Memorial therefore signalled the approval of the state of the contribution of Germans—under the guise of Mennonites—to Canada’s history and thus the approval of their place as loyal Canadian citizens.

Speeches at the unveiling of the Pioneers Memorial Tower, newspaper stories on the event, as well as articles in the volumes of the Waterloo Historical Society and the Ontario Historical Society on the Mennonites all repeated Breithaupt’s argument that the Mennonites founded the farthest inland settlement in Upper Canada. All were in agreement that Ontario and indeed the whole of Canada owed them a great deal.\textsuperscript{44} At the unveiling of the tower, Minister of Agriculture John S. Martin, on hand as the representative of the provincial government, declared that politicians and statesmen were not the only ones deserving of being called “builders of Canada.” He beseeched the crowd, “let us not forget the men and women who left their homes in

\textsuperscript{42} UW, GA24, Breithaupt Hewetson Clark Collection, Section 2.6 Breithaupt, William Henry Correspondence, 21 September 1920 William Henry to F. H. H. Williamson Esq. Secretary Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada – Dept of the Interior.

\textsuperscript{43} The Waterloo Pioneers Memorial Tower files at the Kitchener Public Library contains a series of correspondence between Breithaupt, Cruikshank, and Coyne discussing the progress of the tower, the content and wording of the tablet, as well as several drafts of the inscription. Breithaupt’s justification of the historical significance of the Mennonites appears to have been part of the inscription from the beginning. KPL, MC 55, Pioneer Memorial Tower, MC.55.1d – Miscellaneous, “Souvenir Programme;” KPL, MC 113, Waterloo Pioneers Memorial Tower, MC.113.1 – Correspondence; KPL, MC 113, Waterloo Pioneers Memorial Tower, MC.113.4 – Tablet.

other lands to come to Canada. They were just as truly entitled to the name ‘builders of Canada.’”\(^{45}\) A.G. Seyfert, former American Consul to Canada, who like many of the Mennonites came from Lancaster Pennsylvania, praised them as nation builders in both Canada and the United States.\(^{46}\)

The great accomplishment of establishing this interior settlement was not simply a matter of occupying empty space; there were hardships and obstacles that had to be conquered first. Accounts of the Mennonite settlers described the interior of Upper Canada as a “forest wilderness,” and “a country of stern and resisting aspect,” where the settlers nevertheless laid “the foundation for the development in the pursuits of commercial and industrial as well as agricultural enterprise, unsurpassed in any country in the world.”\(^{47}\) While such accounts generally left the specific nature of the hardships the pioneers were forced to endure unspoken, Mabel Dunham’s *Trail of the Conestoga* described them in vivid detail, along with the herculean efforts required to overcome them.\(^{48}\)

When confronted by “the hostile elements of this then continuous wilderness,” the Mennonites were not only able to produce the necessities of life, but to prosper thanks to their many virtues, the most commonly attributed being thrift, industry, determination, piety, and stability.\(^{49}\) Prior to the war, qualities such as thrift and industry were ascribed to the Germans. Now, however, they were said to be Pennsylvania Dutch characteristics. In many ways, positioning the Mennonites as nation builders was a simple matter of replacing the Germans in

\(^{45}\) “Unveiling Of Memorial Tower Tribute To County Pioneers,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.

\(^{46}\) “Former U.S. Consul Pays Tribute To Mennonites,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.

\(^{47}\) “Sod Turned For Monument In Memory Of Sturdy Pioneers,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 25 June 1925; “Unveiling Of Memorial Tower Tribute To County Pioneers,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.


\(^{49}\) “Sod Turned For Monument In Memory Of Sturdy Pioneers,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 25 June 1925; “Unveil Tablet at First Church,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 5 August 1925. “Unveiling Of Memorial Tower Tribute To County Pioneers,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 30 August 1926; “Gave Outline Of Pioneer History,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 30 August 1926; Gen. Cruikshank Is Among Guests,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 30 August 1926; Cruikshank, “An Address on turning the first sod,” 90.
prewar narratives of the city’s progress with Mennonites or Pennsylvania Dutch. Most of the same elements were there such as the barren, unproductive landscape made productive by the industrious settlers.

The souvenir program for the unveiling included a picture of David Betzner, son of Samuel D. Betzner, who had the proud distinction of being “the first white child,” to be born in the interior of Upper Canada. Similarly, in his speech at the unveiling, A. G. Seyfert praised the Mennonites for helping to found a white civilization in North America. This tacit acknowledgement of the earlier presence of First Nations people was meant to further underscore the accomplishment of the Mennonites in introducing civilization to this “barbaric” land. At the sod-turning ceremony for the Memorial Tower, D. N. Panabaker pointed to the unmarked headstones which lay next to the nearby graves of the Schoerg and Betzner families. These graves, he claimed, belonged to local First Nations people. Panabaker stated that the Mennonites were on friendly terms with Canada’s First Nations. During the winter, the First Nations people supposedly slept in the settlers’ kitchens which they found to be superior to their own “rude places of abode.” The two were on such good terms that the Mennonites felt no compunction against leaving their property and even their children “in charge of the Indians of the neighbourhood,” when they had to travel away from home to trade or visit friends. The Mennonites therefore tamed the wild people as well as the land. What is more, in contrast to other frontier societies, they accomplished this feat peacefully.

---

50 Since theirs was the farthest inland settlement in Upper Canada at the time, everything that the Mennonites accomplished could potentially be celebrated as a first in the interior of the province. At the unveiling of a commemorative tablet at First Mennonite Church in Kitchener in August 1925, for example, William Henry Breithaupt, in attendance as the president of the Ontario Historical Society, noted that this was the first church north of Dundas. KPL, MC 55, Pioneer Memorial Tower, MC.55.1d – Miscellaneous, “Souvenir Programme;” “Unveil Tablet at First Church,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 5 August 1925.
51 “Former U.S. Consul Pays Tribute To Mennonites,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.
52 “Sod Turned For Monument In Memory Of Sturdy Pioneers,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 25 June 1925.
Their role in nation building, however, was not restricted to opening up the interior of Upper Canada and laying the preconditions for prosperity. In the more than hundred years since their arrival, the Mennonite pioneers and their descendants continued to play an integral role in making Kitchener, Waterloo County, and the rest of Canada prosperous. At the unveiling of the memorial tower, M. G. Sherk of Toronto, a descendant of the Mennonite settlers, claimed that the history of both Canada and the United States was filled with many important names of Pennsylvania Dutch origin. Similarly, in its review of the unveiling, the *Daily Record* stated that the tower was to commemorate the county’s early pioneers and their descendants, many of whom “have become prominent in the national life of Canada.”\(^{53}\) In an article for the *Ontario Historical Society* in 1926, William Henry Breithaupt highlighted some of these prominent men, such as E.W.B. Snider, a manufacturer and Member of Parliament who played an instrumental role in the Niagara power movement. Furthermore, he stated that the Mennonites were not content to play the role of pioneer in Waterloo County alone. Their descendants had spread out across Ontario and the West, “forming everywhere they go, prosperous, thriving communities.”\(^{54}\)

The influence of the Mennonites therefore extended beyond the pioneer period right up to the present day. According to Panabaker, the Pioneers Memorial was meant to provide “wonderful inspiration to purposeful endeavour” in coming generations, ensuring that the Mennonites’ influence carried on into the future as well.\(^{55}\) Clearly the Great War had not shattered the belief that Canada’s history was and continued to be marked by steady upward

\(^{53}\) “Pay Tribute To Early Pioneers,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 28 August 1926; “Gave Outline Of Pioneer History,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.


\(^{55}\) “Sod Turned For Monument In Memory Of Sturdy Pioneers,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 25 June 1925.
progress. J. P. Jaffray of Galt, a member of the Pioneers’ Memorial Association, argued that this progress was towards the creation of a Canadian race that was not British or Pennsylvania Dutch or German, but something new entirely. At the unveiling of the memorial, he asserted that the continued prosperity of Waterloo County was owing to the fact that the sterling qualities of the Mennonite settlers were soon joined by those of the settlers from England, Scotland, Germany, Holland, and Ireland. Each race, he claimed, supplied something that the others lacked, resulting in “a county that is the pride of all Canadians.” Jaffray concluded that “the fusion that has marked these years has given our people the strength to carry on without betraying a sign of weakness, assuring old Waterloo in the future the richest of citizenship.” After the conflicts that marred the war years in Waterloo County, it is perhaps unsurprising that Jaffray, just as Breithaupt had in the Peace Souvenir, identified racial harmony as the key to progress. In what was a recurring theme, these men ignored the tensions of the war. At most, the war years were an aberration which temporarily disrupted Waterloo County’s splendid progress.

If there was one thing in the postwar years which had the potential to threaten this progress, it was the red menace. Prewar fears of immigrants and racial others as a source of social unrest and labour radicalism were heightened in the postwar years by events such as the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917 and the Winnipeg General Strike in 1919. The promoters of the Conestoga myth, however, used the red scare to assert the place of Mennonites as loyal

---

56 In the 1920s, at the end of each December the Daily Record printed a special section reflecting upon the past year. The emphasis every year was on Kitchener’s progress every field imaginable, from industry and population to wealth, public health, infrastructure, and community life.
57 “Dickson Blazed Trail In South,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.
58 Kitchener’s residents generally expressed a desire to return to the harmony and progress of the prewar years. Beginning in the civic elections of 1919, the British League and Citizens’ League were replaced by the Young Men’s Club, a political party as well as service club which vowed to work for “community building” and restore the unity which was disrupted during the war years. In the 1919 elections, three members of the Young Men’s Club were elected to the city council. By 1920, the majority of Kitchener’s city councillors belonged to the Young Men’s Club. “The Young Man’s Time,” News Record (Kitchener), 28 December 1918; “The Municipal Elections,” News Record (Kitchener), 2 January 1919; “Young Men’s Business Club,” News Record (Kitchener), 3 January 1919; “Several Young Business Men Are Returned As Aldermen,” News Record (Kitchener), 2 January 1920.
Canadian citizens. They claimed that the Mennonites had no affinity for the Bolsheviks who had replaced the wartime enemy aliens as the object of Canadians’ fears. In March 1923, The Maple Leaf, the magazine of the Canadian Club, devoted an issue to profiling Waterloo County. An article on the early settlers stated that the Mennonites chose to come to Canada, “to be true and loyal citizens to the country, to be, as Paul advises, subject to the powers that be.” Alongside thrift and industry, many of the qualities attributed to the “unobtrusive” Mennonites such as steadiness, stability of character, and love of peace and order emphasized that they were a conservative force which would uphold, not disrupt, the status quo. Bishop F. Coffman of Vineland, Ontario, even portrayed the Mennonites’ support of the established order as being part of their faith. Speaking at the unveiling of the memorial tower, he asserted that because Britain had granted them the freedom to worship as they chose, when the Thirteen Colonies rose up in rebellion, the Mennonites were “religiously opposed to revolution.”

Unlike the prewar years, the ethnic elite did not establish a racial connection between the Mennonites and the British. Instead, the focus was on their shared history and ideology which had supposedly made the Mennonites the greatest supporters of Britain and British institutions. At the unveiling of the Pioneers Memorial Tower, M. G. Sherk and Bishop Coffman discussed the history of the Mennonites beginning with their persecution in Europe. According to Sherk, in Germany people were treated as little more than slaves. Life was particularly difficult for the Mennonites who were persecuted for their refusal to fight in the wars between the German states because of their strict pacifism. On the invitation of William Penn, the Mennonites came to the

---

60 AO, MHSO, F1405-60-5, William H. E. Schmalz textual records, MFN24, March 1923 The Maple Leaf, “Early Settlers in Waterloo.”
62 “Pioneers From Heroic Stock,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.
American Colonies where they were guaranteed the freedom to practice their religion. These formative experiences imbued the Mennonites with an abiding love and reverence for British institutions and, crucially for the postwar years, meant that they were anything but proud Germans.

After the American Revolution, the Mennonites feared that once again, their freedom of religion was under threat. They chose to come to Canada because of their loyalty to Britain and their belief that only under the British flag could they experience liberty and freedom of religion. This explanation for their coming to Canada is central to the Conestoga myth. At the beginning of The Trail of the Conestoga, Mabel Dunham poetically describes an elderly Christian Eby, father of prominent early settler Benjamin Eby, dreaming of coming to Canada to return to living under the liberty of British institutions. “Canada,” Dunham states, “was the magic word which brought a glow to Christian’s withered face. There the shackles of slaves were broken and there men might live unmolested according to the dictates of their consciences. Englishmen had befriended the Mennonites in the past; would do so again in the future.”

The depth of the Mennonites’ indebtedness and devotion to Britain was so great that often the only suitable way to describe it was in religious terms. In The Trail of the Conestoga,
Christian Eby describes William Penn, “a freedom-loving Englishman” as having “delivered” the Mennonites from their persecution in bringing them from Europe to the American Colonies. Eby therefore daily “thanked God for England and Englishmen.” In 1925, at the unveiling of a commemorative tablet at First Mennonite Church in Kitchener, the pastor, Bishop C. F. Derstine compared his church on the site of the first church built by the Mennonites in Waterloo County to the mound of stones erected by the Israelites to give thanks after crossing the river Jordan. Similarly, at the unveiling of the memorial tower the following year, M. G. Sherk stated that, like the Israelites, in coming to Canada, the Mennonites had reached the Promised Land.

That the Mennonites twice gave up everything and moved to a distant land in order to live under British rule was therefore a testament to their own noble character, as well as that of the British system of government. Exponents of the Conestoga myth argued that in their decision to come to Canada, the Mennonites were motivated by the same lofty ideals as the United Empire Loyalists, Canada’s original model citizens, with whom they drew frequent comparisons. M. G. Sherk, for example, argued that since their primary reason for coming to Canada was to remain loyal British subjects, they too deserved to be called Loyalists. Bishop Coffman, however, claimed that in choosing to come to Canada the Mennonites had acted more nobly than the much-vaunted Loyalists who were motivated by simple worldly matters. Seeking religious freedom, he argued, the Mennonites had “a deeper purpose…which wavers not nor falls because of changing sentiments of political import only.” Writing in the Peace Souvenir, William Henry Breithaupt dispensed with comparisons and simply claimed that the Mennonites were in fact United Empire Loyalists.
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67 Dunham, Trail of the Conestoga, 37.
68 “Unveil Tablet At First Church,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 5 August 1925.
69 “Gave Outline Of Pioneer History,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.
71 “Pioneers From Heroic Stock,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.
Loyalists but had declined to accept the title. In a 1913 paper on the early history of Waterloo County, Breithaupt, made no mention of the Mennonites being Loyalists or being inspired by their example, although he did credit the Mennonites for founding the first interior settlement. Now, however, he dismissed all other arguments for their coming to Canada, such as a desire for inexpensive land. He asserted that their sole motivation was loyalty to Britain. To claim a place for the Mennonites as Canadian citizens, it was unnecessary to place their achievements on par with those of the Loyalists; the Mennonites were Loyalists. The only thing that prevented this from being more widely known was their characteristic modesty.

This Mennonite-centric German ethnic identity had the advantage of being divorced from association with the Kaiser and German Empire, but it was not entirely unproblematic. The Mennonites’ pacifism, the most widely-known tenet of their faith, threatened to brand them as a group as having failed to serve and therefore deficient in their duties as Canadian citizens. According to Jonathan Vance, in the postwar years, cities and towns across Canada competed to demonstrate that their young men had shouldered their burden and were worthy of sharing in the nation’s bright future. The exaltation of the men who served was evident in Kitchener as well. The foreword to the Peace Souvenir stated that its purpose was not only to commemorate the losses suffered during the war, but also “to provide a permanent record of the activities of Waterloo County.” Like the rest of Canadian people described by Vance, the residents of Waterloo County wanted to ensure that their membership in the “band of brothers” was recognized. In his contribution to the Peace Souvenir, William Henry Breithaupt outlined the myriad of ways that Waterloo County supported the war effort, placing special emphasis on enlistment. Just as he had during the war years, Breithaupt highlighted Waterloo County’s

---


73 Vance, Death So Noble, 119-120.
contributions while downplaying or ignoring the tensions and conflicts which had beset the county.\textsuperscript{74} The message conveyed by Breithaupt in facts and figures was rendered simpler through pictures of Waterloo County’s honoured dead and decorated veterans, followed by a list of all the local men who served in the war. The final pages of the \textit{Peace Souvenir} included the service rolls of local businesses such as the Breithaupt Leather Company and the Williams, Greene and Rome Shirt Company, ensuring that these companies’ contributions would not go unnoticed.\textsuperscript{75} When Kitchener welcomed outside luminaries in the postwar years, such as Governor General Julian Byng, First Viscount Byng of Vimy, in April 1922, the veterans supplanted the Germans as the citizens of distinction deserving of their own delegation. In his address in April 1922, Byng lauded the soldiers, as the key to Canada’s future prosperity. He urged Kitchener’s residents to follow the example of these “good men working together for a definite objective,” to help their city and nation achieve its great potential.\textsuperscript{76}

Jonathan Vance argues that despite the promises of the cult of the soldier, service actually granted little of substance to the soldiers themselves; the mythic memory of the war did not match up to reality.\textsuperscript{77} Conversely, the failure to serve stigmatized able-bodied young men.\textsuperscript{78} This was particularly true for racial and ethnic others, whose service was held as a mark of how well

\textsuperscript{74} Breithaupt’s “President’s Address” in 1916 noted that the name of Berlin had been changed to Kitchener but made no mention of why or how it was achieved. His discussion of this seminal moment in the city’s history was limited to a single sentence with no background information or context. In his own address as president in 1928, D. N. Panabaker described how men like himself and Breithaupt viewed the purpose of the Waterloo Historical Society. Their goal, he stated, was to record “the important part which Waterloo County has taken in the Nation building program of Canada.” They therefore had no intent of providing a “warts and all” history of Waterloo County, but rather a hagiography of the county and its residents. W. H. Breithaupt, “President’s Address,” \textit{Waterloo Historical Society Annual Report} vol. 4 (1916): 7; KPL, MC 11, David Norman Panabaker Collection, MC.11.1d – Addresses to WHS by D. N. Panabaker, “President’s Address to WHS dated October 26, 1928.”

\textsuperscript{75} UW, G8672, \textit{Peace Souvenir: Activities of Waterloo County in the Great War, 1914-1918} (Kitchener: Kitchener Daily Telegraph, 1919).

\textsuperscript{76} “Byng Welcome Plans Complete,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 18 April 1922; “Byng Pleased With Welcome,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 19 April 1922.

\textsuperscript{77} Vance, \textit{Death So Noble}, 135.

\textsuperscript{78} Vance states, for example, that William Lyon Mackenzie King was hounded by his opponents with charges that he had failed to do his bit during the war. Vance, \textit{Death So Noble}, 122-125.
they had assimilated. For them, a failure to serve or even a perceived failure to serve could jeopardize acceptance in mainstream Canadian society.\textsuperscript{79} Breaking from the uniformity which characterized the rest of the Conestoga myth, the exponents of the Mennonite-centric ethnic identity chose two divergent approaches to attempt to reconcile the Mennonites’ pacifism with this postwar cult of the soldier.

The first approach claimed that the Mennonites’ laudatory deep devotion to their faith notwithstanding, their devotion to the British Empire and its cherished principles trumped everything else, pacifism included. In her article in the \textit{Peace Souvenir} titled “Canada Enters the War,” Mabel Dunham wrote that the outbreak of war came as a shock to the people of the New World who had “learned to quarrel without bloodshed,” and had thus grown accustomed to peace. This was especially true “among the Pennsylvania Dutch people of North Waterloo,” for whom peace, “was part and parcel of their religion.” Despite their abhorrence of war, when the people of Canada, including the Pennsylvania Dutch, saw that their “great lioness mother” Britain was imperiled, they rushed to her defence “without murmur or complaint.”\textsuperscript{80} According to Dunham, the Mennonites thus epitomized the Canadian people, un-warlike by their nature, who nonetheless voluntarily stood up for Britain and the cause of good. That the Mennonites had to set aside their religious beliefs to do so, meant that their sacrifice and devotion ran even deeper than the average volunteer. Despite Dunham’s lofty rhetoric, during the war many Mennonites chose to adhere to their pacifist beliefs. Although they were not subjected to the same attacks as German Canadians, these staunch pacifists were regarded with suspicion and resentment. The Mennonites, furthermore, were among those disenfranchised by the Wartime Elections Act on the grounds that since they did not fulfil its obligations, they were not entitled to enjoy the rights of

\textsuperscript{80} UW, G8672, “Canada Enters the War,” in \textit{Peace Souvenir: Activities of Waterloo County in the Great War, 1914-1918} (Kitchener: Kitchener Daily Telegraph, 1919).
citizenship.\textsuperscript{81} Such uncomfortable truths, however, were glossed over to demonstrate that the Mennonites as a group were loyal Canadian citizens.

Towards this end, the canonization of Alexander Ralph Eby, which began during the war as an attempt to salvage a distinctly German ethnic identity, continued apace. Exponents of the Conestoga myth venerated this descendant of Bishop Benjamin Eby as the first Waterloo County boy killed in action, just as the defenders of the German community had during the war. Now, however, they emphasized his Pennsylvania Dutch, rather than German ancestry.\textsuperscript{82} The service of men such as Eby demonstrated that the Mennonites were able to claim membership in the “band of brothers” who, like the Loyalists before them, formed the very essence of what made Canada great. Furthermore, according to the exponents of the Conestoga myth, this service was fully in keeping with historical precedent. They argued that although the Mennonites did not take up arms during the War of 1812, they still willingly contributed to the war effort, serving in a non-combat role as teamsters. This was an oft-repeated trope in the history of the Mennonites along with the claim that they founded the farthest inland settlement in Upper Canada. Thus, William Henry Breithaupt felt justified declaring in the \textit{Peace Souvenir} that “the history of Waterloo County is a proud record of the loyalty of its inhabitants to the British government and its institutions.”\textsuperscript{83} The unveiling of the Pioneers Memorial Tower was a rare instance where none of

\textsuperscript{81} In the riding of Waterloo North, 1 500 Mennonites were disenfranchised by the Wartime Elections Act. “Naturalized Germans and Austrians Of Less Than 15 Years Standing Disenfranchised,” \textit{News Record} (Kitchener), 7 September 1917; “Features Of War-Time Election Bill,” \textit{News Record} (Kitchener), 7 September 1917.


\textsuperscript{83} Ross D. Fair argues that during the War of 1812, the British regarded the Mennonites with suspicion, owing to their unwillingness to take up arms and the fact that they were still maintained close ties with friends and relatives in the United States. Therefore, during the War of 1812, the loyalty of the Mennonites was cast into doubt rather than affirmed. AO, MHSO, F1405-60-5, William H. E. Schmalz textual records, MFN24, March 1923 \textit{The Maple Leaf}, “Early Settlers in Waterloo;” UW, G8672, “Waterloo County and the Great War,” in \textit{Peace Souvenir: Activities of Waterloo County in the Great War, 1914-1918} (Kitchener: Kitchener Daily Telegraph, 1919); Breithaupt, “Waterloo County History,” 46.
the exponents of the Conestoga myth made any mention of the Mennonites’ service in the War of 1812. The speakers, however, were perhaps exercising discretion owing to the presence of the former American Consul at the ceremony.

This praise for their willingness to serve reflected an ambivalence to the Mennonite faith which was, paradoxically, a thread which ran throughout the Conestoga myth. The inherent conservatism of the German ethnic identity which shunned radical or non-conformist political beliefs was not always at ease with the Mennonite faith which strayed uncomfortably far from the mainstream. Therefore, while exponents of the Conestoga myth praised the Mennonite settlers for their piety and devotion to their faith, even through years of persecution, they were not troubled by the fact that many of those descended from the Mennonite settlers no longer adhered to the faith of their ancestors. D. N. Panabaker, for example, one of the Conestoga myth’s leading exponents, belonged to the United Church. Even the sainted Alexander Ralph Eby, whose great-great-grandfather was a Mennonite bishop, was a Methodist. According to the census of 1921, only 635 of Kitchener’s 21,763 residents belonged to the Mennonite faith. Furthermore, the Mennonites’ lauded role in helping to make Kitchener a thriving industrial centre conflicted with the core tenets of their religious beliefs.

The second approach to dealing with the Mennonites’ problematic pacifism took the opposite tack, affirming the righteousness of the Mennonites’ beliefs despite the fact that they ran contrary to the cult of the soldier. This approach posited that in their long-standing advocacy of pacifism, the Mennonites were ahead of their time. It was only after the carnage of the Great War that the rest of the world caught up to the Mennonites and realized that peace, not might, was the
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true mark of civilization and advancement. At the unveiling of the Pioneers Memorial Tower, Bishop F. Coffman proudly declared that, while the Mennonites had been persecuted for centuries for their non-resistance, “today the voice of Christendom is decrying the violence of nations and the use of carnal weapons as both futile and unchristian in its purpose and in its methods.”

Similarly, in his presidential address to the Waterloo Historical Society in 1928, D. N. Panabaker claimed that only with the signing of the Briand-Kellogg Pact that year, “did the major part of the thinking element of the world arrive at the place where proper value is given to the sentiment which urges the abolition of war.” The rest of the world at long last embracing the Mennonites’ pacifism was not simple serendipity, however. Panabaker claimed that William Lyon Mackenzie King, Canada’s representative at the negotiations for this pact which renounced the use of war as an instrument of national policy, was inspired by “the traditions of his native County, Waterloo.” The Mennonites therefore played a subtle but crucial role in this monumental achievement in the field of world peace. According to Panabaker, Mackenzie King also shared with the world the Mennonites’ views on the relationship between peace and prosperity. In an address to the League of Nations, Mackenzie King argued that by avoiding war with one another, Canada and the United States had saved public money which was able to be spent towards productive rather than destructive ends. This same sentiment, Panabaker maintained, inspired the Pennsylvania Dutch to come to Waterloo County when it was still wilderness, envisioning in this new land “the Prosperity of Peace.”

While the cult of the soldier heralded the men who served as the source of Canada’s current and future prosperity, this version of the Conestoga myth held that peace was the only true source of progress. In making this argument, Panabaker connected the Mennonites’ pacifism to their role as nation builders in Canada.

86 “Pioneers From Heroic Stock,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 30 August 1926.
87 KPL, MC 11, David Norman Panabaker Collection, MC.11.1d – Addresses to WHS by D. N. Panabaker, “President’s Address to WHS dated October 26, 1928.”
Mabel Dunham’s *The Trail of the Conestoga* offers a hybrid of these two seemingly contradictory approaches to dealing with the Mennonites’ pacifism. After establishing his homestead in Waterloo County, the protagonist of Dunham’s story, Sam Bricker, traveled to York to purchase a cow for his brother. During his time in the province’s capital, Sam befriended a stranger to whom he relayed the entire history of the Mennonite people. The stranger told Sam that he should be proud of his ancestry for “martyr blood of the centuries flows in your veins. That is better than riches and worldly honour. It often takes more character to turn the cheek than to strike the blow.” After learning that his new friend was a soldier, however, Sam was aghast. Soldiers, he remarked, were the lowest form of life, for they caused all wars. The stranger protested that this was not true; soldiers strove to preserve peace and only turned to force as a last resort. He did concede, however, that if there were more people like the Mennonites, there would certainly be fewer wars.\textsuperscript{88} Unbeknownst to Sam Bricker, the soldier was no less of a figure than Isaac Brock. By having this national hero voice his acceptance of the Mennonites and their pacifism, Mabel Dunham argued that the Mennonites were entitled to be welcomed as loyal Canadian citizens, pacifism and all. Brock’s approval aside, when war broke out with the United States in Dunham’s story, the Mennonites dutifully lent their assistance as teamsters.\textsuperscript{89}

*Alte Kameraden: Restoring a Distinctly German Ethnic Identity*

Amidst the myriad of speeches at the unveiling of the Pioneers Memorial Tower, there was one which sounded a discordant note. Surprisingly, it came from the man most responsible for the erection of the monument: William Henry Breithaupt. At the sod turning ceremony for the tower in 1924, D. N. Panabaker expressed a desire for the monument to include tablets engraved

\textsuperscript{88} Dunham, *Trail of the Conestoga*, 132-139.
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with the names of all the settlers who arrived prior to 1823. His choice of cut-off date is significant as this was the point when non-Mennonite immigrants from Germany first began arriving in Waterloo County. Panabaker thus envisioned the tower as a memorial dedicated solely to the early Mennonite settlers. In his speech at the unveiling two years later, however, Breithaupt described the tower as a “dual commemoration,” dedicated to “both the Pennsylvanians who came first and the later comers from Germany.” While Breithaupt praised both the Mennonites and the Germans for “what they have done in the settlement and advancement of their country,” as well as their service during the First World War, the majority of his speech focused on the Germans, particularly the great men such as Reinhold Lang, George Rumpel, and his own father Louis Breithaupt who founded the city’s industries.

By the middle of the 1920s, the wartime tensions had sufficiently subsided that an ethnic identity based on continental German, rather than Pennsylvania Dutch, ancestry as the basis for a claim to Canadian citizenship was again possible. Although they were tentative in doing so at first, by 1930s the ethnic elite felt secure enough to confidently and publicly assert the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. What is more, by granting the German community access to public spaces for the purpose of self-representation and taking part in German celebrations just as they had prior to the war, Anglo-Canadians once again signalled their acceptance. This rehabilitation of the image of Germans was aided by the fact that prior to the war, Germans stood at the top of the racial hierarchy. The war provided a brief disruption to the racial hierarchy, rather than a complete reordering of it; Germans soon regained their previous standing alongside the British and other northern and western Europeans at the pinnacle. This return to the status quo antebellum was also aided by the postwar influx of allegedly undesirable immigrants from
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Southern and Eastern Europe, who made Germans more acceptable in contrast. The Mennonite-centric ethnic identity was a bridge between the early 1920s when the wounds of the war years were still raw, and the 1930s when enough time had passed that Canadians were once more willing to concede the place of Germans as loyal Canadian citizens. At the unveiling of the Pioneers Memorial Tower in 1926, the apex of the Conestoga myth, William Henry Breithaupt already had one eye towards the reestablishment of a specifically German ethnic identity.

The first cautious steps towards re-proclaiming a distinctly German ethnic identity came at the end of 1924. On December 4 of that year, five men, Charles Panhofer, Henry Herzog, Tony Schmitten, Albert Bader, and Joseph Moert came together to found the Deutscher Club Kitchener. The club was officially incorporated under the Ontario Companies Act as “German Club, Kitchener” on February 10, 1925. Membership in this club, which was open to both sexes, was a mixture of new immigrants and members of the prewar German community. Prior to the war, the Concordia Club used events such as the Kaiser’s birthday to revel in the might of the German Empire as a means of asserting the value of Germans as Canadian citizens. In the first years after its formation, however, the social calendar of the German Club, Kitchener was filled with more benign, frivolous events such as masquerade balls, plays, and weekly dances, where fun and conviviality were the order of the day.
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The club is significant, however, in that it was an unmistakably German as opposed to Mennonite or Pennsylvania Dutch association. It was in fact the first German association founded in Kitchener since the war, when venerable institutions such as the Concordia Club had ceased their operations. Furthermore, while the German Club shared with its prewar predecessors the aim of fostering German language and culture in Kitchener, to this it added the objectives of providing mutual assistance to its members and aiding immigrants in becoming acquainted with the ways of their “new fatherland.” The club therefore had the dual goals of helping Germans to retain their distinctiveness, but also aiding them in becoming good Canadian citizens. Aware that in order to be accepted as Canadian citizens, Germans needed to be regarded as law-abiding and respectable, club by-laws forbade discussion of contentious or perhaps even incendiary topics such as politics or religion within the club and allowed for members to be expelled for damaging the club’s “moral character.”

In the middle of the 1920s, two civic celebrations, broke with the immediate postwar precedent by highlighting Kitchener’s German heritage as something of which to be proud, not something to be ignored or masked by the city’s Mennonite heritage. The first was an “Old Boys and Girls Reunion” in August 1925 and the second was the celebration of the sixtieth anniversary of Confederation in 1927. The official program for the 1925 reunion looked back upon the great celebrations of previous decades such as the various Sängерfeste and the Kirmes of 1896. While the program claimed that the celebrations on Armistice Day in 1918 stood as the greatest ever witnessed in Kitchener, the program also held up the Peace Festival of 1871 as the first great
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celebration put on by the city.\footnote{97 “Official Programme Kitchener’s Old Boys Reunion, August 1\textsuperscript{st} to 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1925,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 1 August 1925.} Prior to the war, the Peace Festival was the standard by which all other celebrations were judged. Since 1914, however, the mere mention of this seminal moment for the city’s German community had been strictly verboten. The central attraction of the reunion meanwhile was Kitchener’s auditorium which was renamed the “Hofbrau” for the week’s festivities. Offering patrons food, music, and dancing, Kitchener’s Hofbrau appears to have been patterned after the beer halls of Germany such as the eponymous Hofbräuhaus in Munich, with the notable caveat that, owing to Ontario’s prohibition laws, Kitchener’s Hofbrau was paradoxically a dry beer hall.\footnote{98 “Crowds Enjoy Hofbrau Gayety,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 3 August 1925.}

While the reunion of 1925 permitted Kitchener’s residents to reminisce about the frivolities of previous years, Dominion Day in 1927 provided an opportunity to reflect upon Canada’s progress as a nation in the six decades since Confederation. The first page of the special diamond jubilee pamphlet printed by the \textit{Daily Record} featured a map of Canada with the word “progress” emblazoned across it and promised to provide “a review of the Dominion showing the progress since Confederation with reference particularly to the Twin City of Kitchener and Waterloo.” Tellingly, the Germans were granted a starring, although not solo, role in fostering this progress. In an interview for the pamphlet, William Henry Breithaupt stated that the city’s growth was due to its status as “the German centre of the country.” This was thanks partly to the industry and enterprise of its German entrepreneurs, but also because the large German population transformed the city into “a headquarters to which newcomers from Germany and Scandinavian countries flocked.”\footnote{99 “Industry and Thrift Characteristics Berlin Settlers,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 2 July 1927.} Canada found it difficult to attract immigrants from Britain who were considered the most desirable. Kitchener’s German nucleus, however, was beneficial in
helping to attract the right type of continental European immigrants: sturdy northern and western Europeans, not undesirables from southern and eastern Europe. In a separate interview, manufacturer E. D. Lang credited the “steady and efficient labor” of German workers with helping to win a name for Kitchener as an industrial centre. According to Lang, however, the key ingredient to the city’s prosperity was harmony. This harmony existed between all segments of the community: between classes, between manufacturers who spurred one another on to greater successes, and between races. Emphasizing the harmony between classes in Kitchener helped to distance Germans from immigrants such as Russians, Finns, Jews, Ukrainians, and even Italians whose ranks were supposedly rife with Bolsheviks. Most important, however, was the harmony between races in Kitchener. Just as J. P. Jaffray had at the unveiling of the Pioneers Memorial Tower, Lang praised Kitchener’s mixture of races that with their “diversity of talent in manufacturing,” had made the city the envy of Canada through “the fullness of her manufacturing life.” Whereas in previous years the Germans were credited as the sole agents of progress in Kitchener, they were now seen as one part of a larger whole. Harmony was the key to prosperity in the interwar years. The Germans were valued for their ability to contribute talents and qualities which the other members of Canada’s mosaic lacked. William Henry Breithaupt’s interview for the diamond jubilee pamphlet, however, suggested that who was welcomed in this harmonious mix of races was in reality limited to Britons, Germans, Scandinavians, and other northern and western Europeans.

Buoyed by this renewed pride in the city’s German heritage, the ethnic elite began to more assertively proclaim their ethnicity and the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. In October 1928, Kitchener was visited by a group of 150 tourists from Germany. These members
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of the German Automobile Club of Munich who were touring North America initially had not planned on visiting Kitchener. Eager to assert Kitchener’s status as Canada’s German capital, however, a delegation comprised of Kitchener mayor E. E. Ratz, William Henry Schmalz, William Walter Breithaupt, and N. C. Schneider met the tourists in London and convinced them to alter their itinerary. Upon their arrival, the reluctant tourists were given a civic reception at city hall where they were welcomed by former mayor William Henry Schmalz to “the German centre of Canada.” Schmalz informed the visitors that the city’s first settlers were Germans “who sought and found a new home here and it must be ascribed largely to the fact that German diligence and thrift has built our community.” The Mennonites had evidently served their purpose and were therefore once again subsumed as Germans. Schmalz then abruptly changed course, moving from praising the qualities of the German settlers to praising Canada. “As Canadian citizens,” Schmalz stated, “we live in our beloved Canada with particular advantage over many other countries because we are blessed with a fine and stable government and have everything we need while at the same time we enjoy a complete freedom.” The opportunities which they enjoyed meant that Kitchener’s Germans were unmatched in their loyalty to Canada. Schmalz added that, although they cherished the customs of their fatherland, Kitchener’s Germans lived in harmony with their fellow citizens of other origins. Thanks to their cooperation, Kitchener enjoyed “a steady growth.”

Kitchener’s Germans could no longer point to a strong and prosperous Germany to explain their own prosperity in Canada. Instead, they highlighted a combination of German thrift and Canadian freedoms. The following day, J. M. Schneider took a small group of the visitors on a tour of local farms and the Schneider’s meat packing plant. The *Daily Record* proudly reported that they were in awe of the “progressiveness” and efficiency of the operations as well as the
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inexpensiveness of hydroelectric power for both homes and industries. The newspaper concluded that “it was quite evident to them that Canadian packing plants were ahead of those in Germany.”

Thriving in their Canadian environment, Kitchener’s Germans no longer followed the lead of the old fatherland. They had surpassed it.

This version of German ethnic identity was less chauvinistic than prewar narratives. Kitchener’s Germans had been chastened by the fall of the German Empire and their traumatic wartime experiences. Furthermore, by the 1920s, although they still comprised roughly half of the city’s population, they were no longer the overwhelming majority that they had been in the nineteenth century. Kitchener, more than ever, was a pluralistic city, not an ethnocultural island. The ethnic elite therefore no longer claimed that Germans were the sole agents of progress and modernity in Kitchener. E. D. Lang and William Henry Schmalz portrayed the Germans as part of a mosaic whose prosperity relied on the unique contribution of each of its constituent parts. Schmalz furthermore, gave equal credit to Canada’s system of government for allowing the Germans to thrive. The German community and the rest of Canada thus had a symbiotic relationship; the Germans benefitted from being in Canada as much as Canada benefitted from their presence.

In December 1930, the German Club, Kitchener changed its name to the Concordia Club.104 This move was more than a simple rebranding. With this change of names, the reincarnated Concordia Club claimed ownership of the history of the original club. Henceforth, when the club celebrated its anniversary, it did so counting from the founding of the original Concordia Club in 1873 rather than the founding of the German Club, Kitchener in 1924 or the
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re-naming in 1930.\textsuperscript{105} By appropriating the history of the original club, the ethnic elite claimed that the Germans, as represented by this historic and venerable institution which had existed for nearly as long as Canada itself, were longstanding pillars of the community. Just as they had prior to the war in claiming a connection to the eighteenth-century settlement of Germans in Nova Scotia, they used their apparent longevity and stability to assert the legitimacy of their status as loyal Canadian citizens. Crucially, in drawing an unbroken line between themselves and the original club, this bit of revisionist history glossed over the period of nine years when the citizenship of Germans was called into question and no club existed. Furthermore, the awkward six-year interlude where it existed as the German Club, Kitchener was ignored. Once again the war was an aberration best forgotten.

On January 16, 1932, a group of twelve veterans who had fought on the side of Germany and Austria during the Great War gathered in front of the cenotaph in downtown Kitchener to lay a wreath honouring the fallen soldiers from both sides in the late conflict. Symbolizing the harmony that supposedly existed between former belligerents, the wreath was decorated with two ribbons; one red, white and blue representing the Union Jack, the other red, white, and black representing the flag of Germany.\textsuperscript{106} Tellingly, these German and Austrian veterans were granted uncontested access to this public space which served as a physical symbol of the cult of the soldier in Kitchener. This unusual ceremony, however, was just a prelude to a larger event held at the Concordia Club that evening.

Under the auspices of the \textit{Alte Kameraden} (Old Comrades) Club, the Concordia Club was the venue for a banquet of two hundred Great War veterans from the British, Canadian, German, and Austrian armed forces. Speeches at the banquet by figures both German and non-German,
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such as Dr. J. E. Hett, mayor of Berlin/Kitchener in 1915 and 1916; Reverend Sperling; Colonel D. G. McIntosh, former commanding officer of the Scots Fusiliers of Canada; and William Mansfield, president of the Canadian Legion, stressed that these former foes held no ill will towards one another. They instead emphasized the sense of patriotism and duty that had impelled the veterans of both sides to serve, and the years of suffering and sacrifice that united these men who had stoically endured the worst catastrophe in world history. Just as they had during the war, the ethnic elite divorced German people who had nobly answered the call of duty, from the Kaiser and his cronies who had caused the war. Therefore, according to the *Daily Record*, “no one cared where he sat at the banquet table; he was sure that next to him would be a man as fine as he who had lived through as much and endured as much.” The high point of the evening was the singing of patriotic German and British/Canadian songs such as “It’s a Long Way to Tipperary,” and “Die Wacht Am Rhein.” Accentuating the friendship that now existed between erstwhile enemies, the *Daily Record* stated that, “‘Keep the Home Fires Burning,’ did not blend unpleasantly with ‘Zu Lauterbach.’” The musical portion of the evening culminated with the Canadian and British soldiers honouring their German and Austrian counterparts with the singing of “For They Are Jolly Good Fellows,” while all present linked arms. This touching moment, “the very essence of camaraderie and good fellowship,” apparently even moved the veterans to reminisce fondly about the instances where their opponents had fought particularly valiantly.

In the evening’s keynote speech, M. J. Viewig, vice president of the *Alte Kameraden* Club praised the soldiers of both sides whose service had made them enemies in the past, “comrades under the skin” in the present, and partners in shaping Canada’s future. Viewig quoted Wilfrid Laurier who had said that any newcomer who did not revere the land of his birth could not become a good Canadian citizen, for “loyalty, fidelity, steadiness and strength of character are some of the fundamental qualities which form the basis of a creditable manhood.” These qualities
which had also impelled the German and Austrian veterans to fight for the land of their birth during the war now made them ideal citizens in the land of their adoption. These were also qualities which they shared with their fellow British and Canadian veterans. While he praised Canada’s freedom and “sound, sympathetic government,” Viewig cautioned that the work of building Canada was not yet complete. Although the task would not always be easy, he declared that all the veterans gathered at the Concordia Club, were ready to work together, “to endure hardships and make sacrifices, if necessary, in order to hasten the advent of glory and prosperity in this beloved Canada of ours, and to ensure the happiness of all our compatriots.”

In an editorial appraising the banquet, the Daily Record summarized the prevailing sentiment stating that all those present “no matter where their cradle stood, nor to whom their duty bound them during the Great War, are honestly and sincerely intent on doing their bit to make Canada a happy and prosperous place.” By highlighting the common values, experiences, and goals that united the British, Canadian, German, and Austrian veterans, the Alte Kameraden banquet welcomed the former soldiers of the Central Powers into Canada’s “band of brothers.” The German and Austrian veterans’ willingness to stand up, suffer, and sacrifice themselves for their nation, made them Canadian citizens of the first order. It did not matter that they had actually fought against Canada. These noble qualities which they had demonstrated in the land of their birth they now brought with them to Canada. Through their participation in the banquet representatives of the Anglo-Canadian population signalled their approval of the message it conveyed. Furthermore, the presence of members of the prewar ethnic elite such as Reverend Sperling, Dr. Hett, and W. D. Euler demonstrated that the service of this handful of
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veterans stood in for the entire German community; all were entitled to membership in the “band of brothers.”

Conclusion

In the interwar years, Kitchener’s German community refused to assimilate into an Anglo-Canadian milieu and instead sought to retain its distinctiveness while claiming to be loyal Canadian citizens. The Mennonite-centred ethnic identity based on the Conestoga myth and the distinctively German ethnic identity which supplanted it were the attempt by the ethnic elite to reconcile its difference with contemporary understandings of Canadian citizenship. These definitions of German ethnicity were not a radical new departure, but rather a natural evolution of the prewar ethnic identity. Key themes from the prewar ethnic identity such as the claim that Germans were agents of progress and prosperity were simply repackaged to suit a changed world where it was no longer appropriate or possible to revel in the success of the German Empire. The most significant new feature was the attempt to fit Kitchener’s Germans into the cult of the soldier which heralded the men who served in the Great War as the epitome of Canadian citizenship. The well-known pacifism of the Mennonite faith and the fact that many of Kitchener’s postwar German immigrants had actually fought against Canada rendered this task difficult albeit not impossible.

The Alte Kameraden banquet was the apogee of the postwar distinctly German ethnic identity. Soon afterward, the rise of Hitler and the Nazi Party in Germany called into doubt the notion that the values Germans held dear and were willing to fight for were the same as the rest of Canada and therefore once again challenged the place of Germans as loyal Canadian citizens. For the next twenty years, Kitchener’s Germans grappled with the uncomfortable questions raised by the rise of Hitler, the Second World War, and its aftermath.
Chapter 4: Hitler, 1933-1952

After Adolf Hitler became Chancellor of Germany on January 30, 1933, the ethnic elite spent two decades attempting to reconcile their claim to be loyal Canadian citizens with their ethnic identity and the uncomfortable questions raised by Hitler’s rise to power, the Second World War, and its aftermath. They were remarkably successful; between 1933 and 1952, Kitchener’s Germans were not vilified and persecuted as they had been during the First World War. Geoffrey Hayes argues that during the Second World War there was little in the way of ethnic tensions in Kitchener as the city’s Germans had adopted an “innocuous,” Mennonite-centred ethnic identity.¹ John English and Kenneth McLaughlin and Gottlieb Leibbrandt, meanwhile, argue that the largely assimilated Germans of Kitchener had no sympathy for the Nazi cause and early on had repudiated any connection to Hitler’s Germany.²

The reality was not so simple. Between 1934 and 1938, Kitchener played host to three Ontario Deutsche Tage or German Day celebrations, events that attracted more than 4 000 participants.³ Ostensibly a celebration of German culture, the abundance of swastika flags and speeches praising Hitler belied the stated intent of these events which was organized and controlled by the pro-Nazi Deutsche Arbeitsgemeinschaft Ontario.⁴ The Deutsche Tage celebrations of the 1930s demonstrate that Kitchener’s Germans did not immediately repudiate any connection to Nazi Germany, nor were they living under an assumed Mennonite identity. Historians, however, have been reticent to acknowledge that sympathy for Hitler was quite
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common in the mainstream of Kitchener’s German community in the prewar years. They have simply whitewashed this period in the community’s history, rather than seeking to understand why this did not make Kitchener’s Germans the object of persecution when war broke out.

I argue that until Canadian public opinion turned decisively against Nazi Germany in 1938, the leaders of Kitchener’s German community were openly supportive of Hitler and the Nazis. For most of Kitchener’s Germans, this support stopped well short of advocating a National Socialist revolution in Canada or any sort of treasonous activity, however, it was sufficiently visible to have risked branding the entire community as suspect when war broke out. In his study of ethnic relations in Alberta during the Second World War, Howard Palmer argues that the discrimination a group faced during the war was related to its status prior to the war, and not whether their country of origins was one of Canada’s enemies.5 Similarly, Carmela Patrias argues that the persistence of prewar patterns of discrimination in employment during the Second World War shows that discrimination was based less on who were allies and enemies internationally, and more on “longstanding associations between ‘race’ and suitability for different types of employment and for citizenship in Canada.”6 In Kitchener, it was Germans’ well-established standing as loyal and valuable citizens which saved them from being vilified and persecuted during the war. In every facet of their ethnic identity, such as their status as a white Northern European race and their support for the established order, Kitchener’s Germans adhered more closely to the Anglo-Canadian mainstream than other groups who experienced discrimination during the war years. Anglo-Canadians therefore willingly ignored the ethnic elite’s earlier support for Hitler and the Nazis and readily accepted their claims to be loyal Canadian citizens.

A Bulwark Against the Further Spread of Bolshevism: Prewar Support for Hitler

In the spring of 1933, a group of tourists from Kitchener embarked upon a long tour of Europe. Among the ranks of the “Kitchener Pilgrims” was W. J. Motz, the managing editor and co-owner of the *Kitchener Daily Record*. Throughout, Motz sent home letters detailing the travellers’ impressions which were duly printed by the *Daily Record*. Writing from Germany, he described the Nazi officials as polite, courteous, and unobtrusive. Upon his return to Kitchener, Motz provided a more detailed report on the “actual” conditions in Germany. In it, Motz argued that the assaults and murders perpetrated by the communists on their political rivals had ceased after Hitler “took heroic measures to end all disorder.” Any contrary reports in the European press were simply communist propaganda. Even Germans who were not supporters of the Nazis, he claimed, acknowledged that Hitler “saved the country from Bolshevism.” Motz then went a step farther, declaring that “this one achievement alone entitles him to recognition by the people of all nations who are convinced that Communism means destruction, and not the salvation of all mankind.” He conceded that the Nazi government’s treatment of Jews was “unfair and unjust,” however Motz tempered this criticism claiming that “stories of extreme violence and killings are not justified by the facts.” In what would become a common defense of the Nazis, he suggested that Canadians should not throw stones since during the Great War, local Germans were stripped of their rights as citizens. Besides, he claimed, Jews whose families had resided in Germany for generations and had proudly served in the war were not being persecuted; only those who came to Germany recently to profit from the turmoil were subject to persecution. He closed with the hope that Hitler’s Germany would prosper as Hitler’s success meant communism’s failure.
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In his study of National Socialism in Canada, Jonathan F. Wagner provides a demographic overview of the membership of the *Deutscher Bund*, the largest of several pro-Nazi groups in Canada and in Kitchener. Members were generally young men under the age of 45. They were new or first generation immigrants, and were farmers, artisans, and members of the lower middle class who had been severely affected by the Depression. These characteristics help to explain the appeal of Nazi ideology and why members joined the *Deutscher Bund*. “Young and unassimilated,” Wagner explains, “they had no vested interest in Canadian society, and the problems of economic adjustment ordinarily faced by immigrants were compounded by the Depression.” Conversely, those whose families had arrived in Canada decades previously “knew little of, and cared less about, the social and economic conditions which made Hitler’s Reich possible.” Wagner concludes that ultimately, National Socialism failed to attract many adherents in Canada because the majority of Canada’s Germans were too assimilated into Canadian society. The Nazi programme of “ravings against the Jews and the communists” as well as “incessant calls for Volk unity,” was simply “too abstract and too unrelated to Canadian social and economic realities,” and thus had little resonance with the German-Canadian community. John English and Kenneth McLaughlin similarly argue that support for the Nazis “came only from a fringe group, made up largely of recent immigrants, most of whom had left by 1939.”

The young, disaffected, recently immigrated men who comprised the membership rolls of the *Deutscher Bund* were not the only supporters of Hitler and the Nazis in Canada. W. J. Motz was not a member of the *Deutscher Bund*. Sixty-three years old, Canadian born, owner of a successful business, and well-connected to the Canadian political establishment, he did not fit the profile of a prototypical *Bund* member or Nazi supporter described by Wagner and English and
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McLaughlin. His editorials, however, show that support for Hitler and the Nazis existed in the mainstream of Kitchener’s German community, not just on its fringes. It existed outside of the ranks of militantly pro-Nazi groups, to which Jonathan Wagner limits his study. The majority of Kitchener’s Germans indeed were not responsive to the Deutscher Bund’s calls for the creation of a racially exclusive volksgemeinschaft or people’s community in Canada. The local branch of the Bund therefore never counted more than a few dozen members.\(^{12}\) Despite the fact that the majority declined to actually join groups such as the Bund, many of Kitchener’s Germans attended, enthusiastically took part in, and even organized their own events which were explicitly pro-Nazi in nature. Although Kitchener’s Germans were removed from social and political currents in Germany, some aspects of Nazi ideology, particularly its opposition to communism, still resonated strongly in Canada. While they stopped short of advocating National Socialism for Canada, the ethnic elite expressed support and admiration for Hitler, arguing that he had saved Germany and possibly even the world from communism.

This support for the Nazis did not mean that Kitchener’s Germans had abandoned their claim to be loyal Canadian citizens. Rather, their strident anti-communism demonstrated that they could be counted on to support the established order and oppose radicalism. The ethnic elite, many of whom had lived through the difficult years of the First World War, were also keenly aware that how Germany was viewed by Canadians had a significant bearing on how German Canadians were viewed, no matter how far removed they were from the old Fatherland. They therefore looked favourably upon the fact that Hitler had apparently returned Germany to a position of respectability on the international stage, called for better relations between Germany
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\(^{12}\) Jonathan Wagner claims that at the height of the Bund’s popularity in 1937-8, membership did not exceed 2 000 people nationwide. The Bund was most active in the west, however the largest branch was in Montreal which claimed 170 members. John Offenbeck states that in 1937, the Kitchener-Waterloo branch claimed 70 members, but he cautions that there was a tendency to exaggerate and so even this number may be inflated. Wagner, Brothers Beyond the Sea, 68; John Offenbeck, “The Nazi Movement and German-Canadians, 1933-1939,” (MA Thesis: University of Western Ontario, 1970), 65.
and Canada, and decried what they believed to be unfair criticism of Hitler and Germany. In this way, their support for the Nazis was consistent with their previous claims to be loyal Canadian citizens. Looking only at the membership of pro-Nazi groups thus ignores the broader, albeit less ardent, support for the Nazis in Kitchener’s German community.

Sympathy for Nazi Germany did not run afoul of Canadian sensibilities because, until the late 1930s, Canadians generally saw communism as a much graver threat to the established order than Nazism and fascism. During the Depression, many Canadians turned to radical right- and left-wing politics as a potential solution to their problems. Across the country, fascist groups sprang up, often in response to a surge in popularity of left-wing and communist groups. The communists were met with repression. In August, 1931, for example, ten of the Communist Party of Canada’s leaders were arrested and charged with seditious conspiracy, and hundreds of foreign-born members were deported. Conversely, fascists did not come up against the same level of hostility, although they were opposed by groups such as the Communists, the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, and the Canadian Jewish Congress. Historian Martin Robin states that “until Hitler’s arc of conquest jolted local opinion, Canada’s native, and ethnic, Fascists had a pretty smooth run of it. There were no hostile press campaigns, no large public clamours for repression…no entertainment of repression by governments, provincial or federal.”
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13 Angelo Principe states that initially many Italians in Canada likewise expressed patriotic pride in the accomplishments of Mussolini’s Italy. Their sentiments were also echoed by members of the Anglo-Canadian elite such as the president of the University of Toronto, Canon Henry John Cody, who “praised the disciplined, patriotic, and orderly country where the ‘trains arrived on time.’” Angelo Principe, “A Tangled Knot: Prelude to 10 June 1940,” in *Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad* eds. Franca Iacovetta, Roberto Perin, and Angelo Principe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 31-2.
the communists did, in some quarters they even found support. Robin states that in the early 1930s, Canadian elites joined Italian Canadians in praising Mussolini.\textsuperscript{17}

Closely related to this anti-communism and tolerance of fascism was anti-Semitism which was then endemic in Canada. At the time, Canadian media and public opinion linked immigrants and refugees to radicalism, particularly connecting Jews to communism.\textsuperscript{18} Even William Lyon Mackenzie King associated Jews with communism and feared their influence spreading in North America. His was an example of what Alan Mendelson terms “genteel anti-Semitism” which was prevalent among the Anglo-Canadian elite. This variant did not condone violence against Jews, but still was not benign as the discrimination that it did countenance an atmosphere which encouraged and tolerated violence against Jews.\textsuperscript{19} As a result of this anti-Semitism, Canada had a poor record for accepting Jewish refugees prior to the Second World War.\textsuperscript{20}

Despite their abhorrence of communism and admiration for Hitler’s accomplishments, the first attempt to found a pro-Nazi group in Kitchener was an abject failure, vehemently rejected by the German community. On August 14, 1933, German immigrant Otto Becker called a meeting to found a Swastika Club in Kitchener. Even before the meeting, confusion reigned supreme. Two of the scheduled speakers representing the Toronto Swastika Club claimed to know nothing about their apparent engagement in Kitchener. Kitchener’s mayor, meanwhile, stated that police would be present at the meeting and vowed that he would not permit disorder.\textsuperscript{21} Unsurprisingly, the meeting itself was a farce. Becker began by asking all Jews present to leave, threatening to

\textsuperscript{17} In Quebec, \textit{Le Devoir} “compared Fascism to an organized police force and communism to an organized band of criminals.” Robin, \textit{Shades of Right}, 173, 212.
\textsuperscript{18} Avery, \textit{Reluctant Host}, 122-3.
\textsuperscript{20} Prior to the Second World War, Canada accepted less than 5 000 Jewish refugees, compared to the United States which took in more than 200 000, Britain which took in 70 000, Argentina which accepted 50 000, and Bolivia and Chile which took in 14 000 each. Irving Abella and Harold Troper, \textit{None is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe, 1933-1948} (Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys Limited, 1982), x-xi.
\textsuperscript{21} “Authorities Here Not Worried Over Organization Plan,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 14 August 1933.
“get busy” on those who refused. He blamed the Jewish media for making up stories of atrocities in Germany and claimed that Hitler had gotten rid of parasites that “had made a good living for 18 years on Christian bones.” The Daily Record described the affair as a comedy as most of the 250 people present came to jeer the hapless, would-be Führer. The meeting lasted for a mere half hour after which it was broken up by Police Chief Hodgson when the crowd became unruly.22 Afterwards, Becker claimed that the disruption was proof of how strong was communist influence in Canada. Chief Hodgson declared that he would not permit further meetings.23

From the beginning, Kitchener’s Germans universally disavowed any connection to Becker and his club. Prior to the meeting, Walter Pannicke, vice president of the Concordia Club, denounced Becker’s Swastika movement and declared that Becker would not be permitted to use the club’s rooms for his meetings. His condemnation was qualified, however, as he stated that “any movement along Swastika lines in Canada should be sponsored and supported by Canadians,” as opposed to an unnaturalised foreigner such as Becker.24 Thus Kitchener’s Germans did not object to the creation of a pro-Nazi group per se, but rather to its self-appointed leader. Becker was an erratic and pugnacious figure. Two months before his ill-advised meeting, he actually circulated a petition protesting Hitler’s treatment of German Jews, but claimed to have changed his beliefs after he found that stories of atrocities were untrue. Unemployed and on relief, he conformed to the worst Canadian stereotype of an unemployed immigrant radical who posed a serious threat to the social order. For the ethnic elite, Becker was not a respectable public

22 “Swastika Meeting Suddenly Stopped at Hint of Chief,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 15 August 1933; “An Unexpected Comedy,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 16 August 1933.
23 “Changed His Views On Hitler Policy, Becker Admission,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 15 August 1933.
24 “Authorities Here Not Worried Over Organization Plan,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 14 August 1933.
face to represent the German community to the rest of Canada.\textsuperscript{25} They dismissed him as a rabble-rouser from outside their community.

Gustav Lueck, president of the \textit{Alte Kameraden} Club, spoke out against Becker’s club. Lueck stated, “Our people, we German citizens of this city, know in our minds what system is needed in the old land.” Like Pannicke, he added “if the time ever comes when we feel some such system might serve in Canada, we certainly would look for some man other than Becker to lead it.” Lueck therefore emphasized that Becker was not a Canadian citizen and so, despite his ethnicity, he was not a part of “our people.”\textsuperscript{26} Similarly, an editorial in the \textit{Daily Record} criticizing Becker declared that “the people of Kitchener have no use for agitators against race and creed,” particularly one who was not even a Canadian citizen. Like Pannicke and Lueck, however, this editorial did not condemn or even make any mention of Nazism specifically.\textsuperscript{27} W. J. Motz therefore felt no sense of conflict when, two months later, his newspaper printed an editorial defending Hitler’s rearmament in violation of the Versailles Treaty, calling Germany “a bulwark against the further spread of Bolshevism.” The editorial praised Hitler’s “sound reasoning” as he pursued Germany’s rearmament. To those who criticized the way the Nazis conducted elections, the editorial stated that “perhaps when we consider the conditions under which the Canadian election of 1917 was held, we should not be too critical of what is happening in other countries.”\textsuperscript{28} Becker’s brief moment of fame, meanwhile, ended in ignominy. He was deported along with his family less than two weeks after his aborted meeting.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{25} “Authorities Here Not Worried Over Organization Plan,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 14 August 1933; “Changed His Views On Hitler Policy, Becker Admission,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 15 August 1933; “Swastika Leader Charges Assault,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 16 August 1933; Avery, \textit{Reluctant Host}, 108-11.
\textsuperscript{26} “Changed His Views On Hitler Policy, Becker Admission,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 15 August 1933.
\textsuperscript{27} “Not Wanted Here,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 15 August 1933.
\textsuperscript{28} “Hitler Stirs Europe,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 16 October 1933.
\textsuperscript{29} “Becker Goes Tuesday, Gets Rid of Furniture,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 21 August 1933.
On January 1, 1934, five months after Becker’s removal, Waterloo residents Ernst Kopf, Otto Geisler, Georg Messer, Paul Lechscheidt, and Karl Gerhard founded the *Deutscher Bund Canada*. Thanks to the work of Gerhard, who travelled across Canada founding local branches called *Ortsgruppen* or *Stützpunkte*, the *Bund* soon became a nationwide organization. Jonathan Wagner states that in order to avoid being shut down by the government, a fate which had befallen the Friends of the New Germany in the United States, the leaders of the *Bund* publicly projected a more moderate image. The *Bund* thus claimed to be an apolitical, cultural organization that eschewed violence against Jews and Communists.\(^{30}\) This moderated approach was also necessary to avoid provoking opposition from the mainstream of the German community as Becker had.\(^{31}\) In Kitchener, the ethnic elite had always cultivated an image as orderly and respectable to assert their place as Canadian citizens. They therefore avoided any association with the type of disorder that occurred at Becker’s meeting or, worse still, the brawl at Christie Pits in Toronto between Hitler supporters and Jewish residents two days later.\(^{32}\)

The *Deutscher Bund* was the largest of several pro-Nazi groups which maintained a presence in Kitchener in the 1930s. Other prominent groups were the Nazi Party (NSDAP); the *Deutsche Arbeitsfront*, a feeder organization for the Nazi Party; and the *Deutsche Arbeitsgemeinschaft Ontario* (DAGO), a pro-Nazi umbrella group which sought to unify the German clubs and societies in the province.\(^{33}\) In June, 1935, Bernhard Bott, press officer for the western district of the *Deutscher Bund* founded the *Deutsche Zeitung für Canada*, a weekly newspaper, printed in Winnipeg and distributed nationwide.\(^{34}\) While historians such as Jonathan Wagner have made extensive use of the *Deutsche Zeitung* as a primary source, it has never been
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\(^{30}\) Wagner, *Brothers Beyond the Sea*, 65-6, 74-5, 80.

\(^{31}\) Wagner, *Brothers Beyond the Sea*, 74-5.


\(^{33}\) Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Quebec each had their own *Arbeitsgemeinschaften*, while in Manitoba the umbrella group was called the *Deutsch-kanadischer Bund von Manitoba*. Wagner, *Brothers Beyond the Sea*, 85-6.

\(^{34}\) Wagner, *Brothers Beyond the Sea*, 83-4.
studied in the context of Kitchener’s German community. Although the newspaper was in essence the organ of the *Deutscher Bund*, it reported on all pro-Nazi activities across Canada, including those which took place independent of the *Bund*. As such, it provides an excellent record of the level of support for the Nazis in Kitchener even among non-members of the *Bund*.

Karl Gerhard moved the headquarters of the *Bund* from Waterloo to Montreal soon after its founding, but this was not an indication that the Kitchener-Waterloo *Ortsgruppe* was moribund. More likely, the move was motivated by Gerhard’s attempt to position himself as the leader of all of Canada’s Germans.\(^{35}\) Reports in the *Deutsche Zeitung für Canada* indicate that the Kitchener-Waterloo *Ortsgruppe* was, in fact, one of the *Bund’s* more active branches. The content of the branch’s activities contradicted the *Deutscher Bund’s* claims to be a strictly cultural organization, unaffiliated with National Socialism. The *Ortsgruppe* celebrated dates of importance on the National Socialist calendar, such as May Day, the *Führer’s* birthday, the anniversary of Hitler being made chancellor, and German pagan festivals such as the Solstice.\(^{36}\)

The *Ortsgruppe*, also held lectures on topics such as “Marxism and National Socialism,” “Type and Character Differences of Each Race,” and *Ortsgruppe* leader Ernst Wölfle’s trip to Germany during which he attended the Berlin Olympics, and a Nazi Party rally in Nürnberg.\(^{37}\) During one wide-ranging lecture, Wölfle declared that National Socialism stood in opposition to worldwide socialism and Marxism. Wölfle talked about the successes of National Socialism in every area
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\(^{35}\) Wagner, *Brothers Beyond the Sea*, 80-1.


from economy and industry to education. These were all areas, he claimed, where the previously popular Social Democratic Party had failed. He then turned to the “blood question” and outlined the difference between Germans and Jews. The former, he said, were “soldierly, heroic, ideal, and fit for society,” while the latter were “un-soldierly, cowardly, materialistic and parasitic.” Understanding the blood question, he stated, was the key to understanding the world.38

The largest event sponsored by the Bund was the annual Deutscher Tag celebration. Although the Tage were held under the auspices of the Deutsche Arbeitsgemeinschaft Ontario, Jonathan Wagner states that the organization of the Tage was controlled by the Deutscher Bund and Nazi Party members.39 Most of the Bund’s activities were conducted within the confines of the club rooms and were closed affairs attended by members.40 The Deutsche Tage, however, were held in public and attracted thousands of participants, most of whom were non-members, as well as the attention of the mainstream media. These celebrations interspersed frivolous activities such as concerts, dances, and athletic contests, with speeches which praised Hitler and the Nazis publicly and unabashedly. Similar to Motz’s editorials and the Bund’s lectures, the speeches accented the Nazi opposition to communism, and Hitler’s triumph over communism and disorder.

In his keynote address during the 1935 Deutscher Tag held in Kitchener, General Consul Ludwig Kempff described the chaos and unrest that existed in Germany from the end of the Great War to 1933. Upon coming to power, Hitler’s first great accomplishment was putting an end to class struggle and street fighting. Moreover, he did so with the mildest force possible. No revolution in world history, Kempff boasted, was as bloodless as the Nazi revolution. Kempff

39 Deutscher Tag was first celebrated in Alberta and Manitoba in 1928 and in Saskatchewan in 1930. Jonathan Wagner states that because this predated the creation of the Deutscher Bund and the Arbeitsgemeinschaften, pro-Nazi forces had to gradually assert their control over the celebrations. In Ontario and Quebec, however, where the Tage were first held in 1934 and 1936 respectively, they were controlled by pro-Nazi forces from the beginning. Wagner, Brothers Beyond the Sea, 94-6, 100.
40 Wagner, Brothers Beyond the Sea, 72-4.
then enumerated Hitler’s many achievements in two and a half years of rule. Turning to Germany’s standing internationally, he stated that the recently concluded Seventh Congress of Communists in Moscow identified German fascism and National Socialism as the greatest threat to communism. This fact, Kempff said, should be evidence to the rest of the world that Germany was on the right path. Kempff then concluded his address with three “Sieg Heil” to Germany and its Führer.\textsuperscript{41} At the 1937 Deutscher Tag in Kitchener, Consul Hans-Ulrich Granow described Hitler in messianic terms. Prior to 1933, Granow stated, Germany was a nation being torn apart by class struggle. There was one man, however, who saw that the workers were not meant to fight against other classes, but rather stand together with them. He gave the German people hope, and restored the nation’s honour. Hitler, he said, was “sent by God” in Germany’s time of great need. Like Kempff had two years previously, Granow closed his speech calling for three “Sieg Heil” to “the German people, their Führer Adolf Hitler and their glorious future.”\textsuperscript{42} 

In case the ubiquitous swastika flags had not made it clear, such speeches rendered the message of the Deutsche Tage celebrations unmistakable. John English and Kenneth McLaughlin claim that beginning in 1935, the Concordia Club, uncomfortable with this pro-Nazi slant, boycotted the Deutsche Tage.\textsuperscript{43} From 1934 to 1937, however, the Concordia Club, along with the recently founded Sachsen und Schwaben Club and several other smaller local clubs were, in fact, enthusiastic participants. In September, 1934, members of the Concordia Club board of directors attended Deutscher Tag in Toronto. They were excited by what they witnessed and thus decided that the club should join the DAGO to take part in the organization of the next Deutscher Tag in

\textsuperscript{41} “Das Ontario-Deutschum auf dem Marsche,” Deutsche Zeitung für Canada (Winnipeg), 11 September 1935.
\textsuperscript{42} Granow also described Hitler’s ascension as “an act of divine providence.” “Vierter Deutscher Tag für Ontario,” Deutsche Zeitung für Canada (Winnipeg), 4 August 1937.
\textsuperscript{43} English and McLaughlin, Kitchener, 163.
Kitchener the following summer.\textsuperscript{44} Along with the Concordia Club and the \textit{Sachsen und Schwaben Club}, the \textit{Daily Record} listed six clubs from Kitchener as participants in the 1935 \textit{Deutscher Tag}.\textsuperscript{45} When the celebration returned to Toronto in 1936, the Concordia Club offered to pay 75 percent of the travel costs for all participants to ensure that the club made a good showing.\textsuperscript{46} The Concordia Club’s members were disappointed when, in 1937, the club was merely invited to attend that year’s \textit{Deutscher Tag} taking place in Kitchener, rather than assist with its planning and execution. This snub may have been the reason for the club’s decision to withdraw from the DAGO, however it did not sour them on the \textit{Deutscher Tag} itself. The club nonetheless offered to help wherever possible and held its own events while still participating in the main celebration.\textsuperscript{47} According to the \textit{Daily Record}, the \textit{Sachsen und Schwaben Club} hosted the official proceedings, while the city’s other “various German clubs” also participated.\textsuperscript{48}

The city’s Germans were granted access to public spaces for these celebrations. In 1935, revellers were permitted to hold parades through the city’s streets to events at Victoria Park and the Queen Street Auditorium.\textsuperscript{49} The participation of local politicians offered a further
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demonstration of the official approval of the Tage. Kitchener Mayor J. Albert Smith spoke at the 1935 and 1937 Deutsche Tage and lauded the role of Germans in the growth of the city and its industries. Mayor G. Wenige of London, Ontario, and the band of the Scots Fusiliers, the local Canadian army regiment, also took part in the 1935 celebration. W. D. Euler, Member of Parliament for Waterloo North in 1935 and by 1937 Minister of Trade and Commerce as well, attended and spoke at both of the Kitchener Tage. At the latter, Euler welcomed celebrants on behalf of Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King and the Dominion government. In his 1937 address, Euler condemned that section of the Canadian press which he claimed was “poisoning public opinion and stirring up racial hatred,” by spreading lies about conditions in Germany. Euler stated that during his trip to Germany in 1936 to negotiate a trade agreement between Germany and Canada, he met with Hitler, Rudolph Hess, and Herman Göring and came away impressed and optimistic. Mackenzie King’s recent visit had left the prime minister with the same impression. Both men were convinced that nobody in Germany wanted war.50

For the Deutscher Bund, the Tage also served as an opportunity to attempt to recruit fellow Volksgenossen (people's comrades) to their cause. Speaking at the 1937 Deutscher Tag, Otto Thierbach, the Bund’s national leader, castigated those who felt that they could be a good German without joining the Deutscher Bund. “Whoever is German,” he said, “must profess unconditional support for Germandom and our world view.”51 Despite such entreaties, Kitchener’s Germans by and large refused to join the Deutscher Bund, much to the chagrin of the Bund’s leaders. This did not mean, however, that the ethnic elite maintained no involvement with the Bund or the Nazi Party outside of the Tage. Kitchener’s various German clubs, for example,

51 “Der Deutsche Bund, Canada und seine Aufgabe,” Deutsche Zeitung für Canada (Winnipeg), 18 August 1937.
regularly sent reports of their activities to be printed in the *Deutsche Zeitung für Canada*.\(^{52}\) Furthermore, in April, 1936, the Concordia Club’s board of directors decided to send the *Deutsche Zeitung* for free to each of the club’s members at a cost of $12 per month to the club, a not insignificant sum during the lean years of the Depression.\(^{53}\) When the *Deutscher Bund* held a celebration to inaugurate its new club rooms in April, 1937, the presidents of the *Sachsen und Schwaben* and Concordia Clubs were present to offer their congratulations as well as wishes for greater co-operation between their organizations for the benefit of the *Volksgemeinschaft*.\(^{54}\)

In the ensuing months, Kitchener’s German clubs displayed this co-operative spirit which their presidents had encouraged. In November, 1937, the *Deutscher Bund*, Concordia Club, *Sachsen und Schwaben Club*, and *Siebenburger Deutscher Kranken Unterstützungs-Verein* jointly hosted a charity party in the Concordia Club’s rooms to benefit German drought victims in the Prairie Provinces.\(^{55}\) On April 20, 1938, the local members of the Nazi Party hosted a celebration to honour their *Führer’s* birthday. Ten days later, Nazi Party members hosted a May Day celebration which was attended by dignitaries such as Consul Kropp. The local party members, lacking facilities of their own, rented rooms in the Concordia Club to hold their activities. More than simply providing a venue, however, the Concordia Club participated in both
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\(^{54}\) “Eröffnung des Bundesheims der Ortsgruppe Kitchener,” *Deutsche Zeitung für Canada* (Winnipeg), 14 April 1937.

celebrations, with its men’s choir furnishing the musical entertainment. In July, 1938, the local Nazi Party members hosted a special evening to play a recording of a rally for the Nazi Party’s second four year plan. Those present were reportedly filled with joy to hear speeches by such luminaries as Joseph Goebbels, and Rudolf Hess. As was the case at previous local Nazi Party events, the Concordia Club’s musical group “beautified the evening.”

Thus, the ethnic elite were not sufficiently troubled by the Deutscher Bund and Nazi Party’s politics to reject involvement, although their relationship may have been more at arm’s length than the Bund’s leaders desired. The ethnic elite also displayed support for Hitler independent of the Bund and Nazi Party. In December, 1936, the Concordia Club began holding semi-monthly “culture evenings.” These evenings consisted of lectures meant to educate members and local Germans in cultural matters as well as the problems facing the Third Reich. In the first instalment, speaker Günther Benedict lectured on the topic “Germany’s Contribution to World Peace,” during which he read selections from author and Nazi supporter Hans Grimm’s novel Volk ohne Raum. Afterwards, club secretary Arthur Brehme stressed that the book should be read by all Germans as it perfectly explained the current situation. Prior to another lecture titled “From the First to Third Reich,” Brehme promised that Benedict would tell the truth about the growth of the Third Reich. Although these lectures would have been at home on the social calendar of the Deutscher Bund, they were held entirely on the initiative of the Concordia Club.

At the culture evening on March 10, 1937, Benedict delivered a lecture responding to the film Land of Promise which was presented by the Herzl Zionists at Kitchener’s Lyric theatre on

57 “Kitchener, Ont.,” Deutsche Zeitung für Canada (Winnipeg), 13 July 1938.
59 “Kitchener, Ont.,” Deutsche Zeitung für Canada (Winnipeg), 3 February 1937.
February 14. The film documented the transformation of Palestine by Jewish settlers over the previous 15 years from a barren desert to a bountiful garden. According to the *Daily Record*, interest in the film was so great that, although it was only scheduled to be shown once, it was played twice, selling out both times. Benedict dismissed the film as Zionist propaganda. He refuted its claim that Jews were initially farmers and had been forced into trade and finance because of discrimination. Benedict also accused Canada’s Jews of supporting Soviet Russia and railed against Kitchener’s Zionists who he said were spreading lies about Germany. He attempted to close in a “conciliatory spirit,” stating that God had a place for every man and therefore even the Jews had their purpose. Wherever it was that they belonged, however, clearly it was not in civilized society.

In addition to W. J. Motz and Ernst Wölfle, several of Kitchener’s Germans traveled to Germany during the 1930s and upon their return spoke in glowing terms about what they found. In September, 1936, Walter Strahl, described by the *Daily Record* as a “wellknown [sic] Kitchener music retailer,” returned to Canada convinced “that the day is not far distant when Great Britain and Germany will stand shoulder to shoulder against a common foe—Communism.” Notably, Strahl claimed that the only soldiers he saw were on Germany’s eastern border facing Russia, rather than in the west facing France. This suggested that Germany’s rearmament was to defend against Communist aggression, rather than to start another war.
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Templin stated that during her five month trip, she did not find “a rebellious nation under the boot of a hated autocrat,” but instead social progress under their beloved Führer.\textsuperscript{63}

Kitchener’s Germans, of course, were not unified in supporting the Nazis. From the beginning, there were those who objected, however, their voices are muted in the historical record. According to the minutes of the Concordia Club, at a general meeting held on June 25, 1935, the subject of the club’s membership in the DAGO produced a lengthy discussion and debate. Although the club eventually resolved to remain members of the DAGO, the minutes suggest that this decision was far from unanimous.\textsuperscript{64} In April, 1938, when the local members of the Nazi Party sent a request to the Concordia Club asking to make use of the club’s rooms, the matter was put to a vote, carrying 28-8. Significantly, this is one of only two instances in the prewar years where the club’s minutes record the specific result of a vote, rather than simply noting whether a resolution carried or fell. The other instance was a vote on July 12, 1938, on an invitation to re-join the DAGO the result of which was 4 for, 15 against, and 1 abstaining. In both cases, the minutes also state specifically that the vote was conducted by secret ballot, suggesting that the matter may have been controversial.\textsuperscript{65}

These minutes demonstrate disagreement over the Concordia Club’s involvement with the DAGO and the Nazi Party, but they do not state the nature of this disagreement. Historically, the ethnic elite sought to subsume any divisions within the German community, lest they be seen as a potential source of disruption which could jeopardize their acceptance in Canadian society. The

\textsuperscript{63} Templin also complained that the world press had been unfairly critical of Germany. She found no evidence of the religious persecution which was reported in the Canadian press and hoped for better understanding between Canada and Germany in the future. Für besseres Verständnis Canadas für Deutschland,” Deutsche Zeitung für Canada (Winnipeg), 10 November 1937.
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Cursing Hitler Up Hill and Down Dale in Fluent German: Turning Against the Nazis

The year 1938 was a turning point for Canadian attitudes towards Nazi Germany. The annexation of Austria (March 1938) and the Sudeten crisis (February 1938) laid bare Hitler’s expansionist ambitions, while the violence of Kristallnacht (November 1938) made the oppression of Germany’s Jewish people impossible to ignore. Public opinion thus turned decisively against Nazi Germany as well as fascist and pro-Nazi groups in Canada.\(^6\) In Kitchener, the ethnic elite followed suit, albeit slowly at first. When they finally did denounce the Nazis, the ethnic elite did so by restating their claims to Canadian citizenship. They highlighted the historic contributions of Germans to Canada’s development, emphasized that Germans were a source of social stability, and blamed any disloyalty or disruption on outsiders. Despite the ethnic elite’s earlier displays of support for, and subsequent delay in denouncing the Nazis, non-Germans mostly accepted their claims to Canadian citizenship. Even once Canada declared war on Germany, Anglo Canadians displayed a far greater degree of concern over the presence of communists, Japanese, and Jehovah’s Witnesses, groups who supposedly presented a far greater threat to the established order.

An early indication of growing Canadian opposition to the Nazis came in November, 1937, when the *Globe and Mail* published a series of investigative reports which detailed the efforts of the *Deutscher Bund* to spread Nazi propaganda in Kitchener as well as nationally. Despite his accusations of pro-Nazi activity, the reporter, Ken W. McTaggart, was careful not to impugn the loyalty of Kitchener’s Germans generally, and in fact affirmed it. In his first article, published under the headline “Nazism Is Anathema To German-Canadians,” McTaggart stressed that “the people of this predominantly Germanic area of Canada want no part in any strutting, race antagonizing movement.” Kitchener’s Germans, he said, were fine Canadian citizens, “hard-working, honest and persevering.”\(^67\) McTaggart highlighted the difference between Canadian citizens and those who were still aliens. McTaggart stated that the majority of Kitchener’s Germans were British subjects by birth or naturalization. They belonged to such clubs as the Concordia Club and the *Sachsen und Schwaben* which were strictly social and non-political. Only the unnaturalised minority belonged to the *Deutscher Bund*.\(^68\) Finally, McTaggart claimed that the “thousands of good Canadian citizens in this district, descendants of the stalwart, solid pioneers who made this section of Ontario,” were unaware of the Nazi propagandists in their midst whose nefarious activities were jeopardizing the reputation of their community.\(^69\)

Kitchener’s Germans had attained such a level of acceptance that these accusations of pro-Nazi activity against them necessarily began with the caveat that the majority were loyal. Even still, W. J. Motz’s *Daily Record* reacted with outrage at McTaggart’s apparent insinuation that Kitchener was the centre of Nazi activity in Canada. In an editorial responding to McTaggart’s articles, the *Daily Record* blamed any disturbances in the city on “unsolicited
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\(^{67}\) “Nazism Is Anathema To German-Canadians,” *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 25 November 1937.


\(^{69}\) “Deutsche Bund Pushes Spread of Propaganda,” *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 27 November 1937.
interference by outsiders.” The editorial claimed that Winnipeg, where the Deutsche Zeitung für Canada was published, was the real centre of Nazi activity in Canada and also suggested that the Globe should investigate Nazi activities in their own city first before casting wanton aspersions on others.70 Kitchener City Council likewise condemned the Globe’s “misleading” articles and passed a resolution calling upon the newspaper to correct the false impression that the Deutscher Bund was a large and influential organization in Kitchener. The mover of the resolution, Alderman F. F. Mullins, declared that “There are no more peace-loving and law-abiding citizens anywhere in the Dominion than constitute the citizenry of this city.” He claimed that four years previously, “a gang of Nazi propagandists,” from Toronto came to Kitchener to found a Nazi club, however their meeting was quickly shut down by the police.71 This selective memory of Otto Becker’s ill-fated attempt to found a Swastika Club placed blame for the episode entirely on outsiders rather than Kitchener residents.

The outrage in Kitchener was so great that the Globe was forced to print an apology. This mea culpa, in common with McTaggart’s articles, touched on the leading tropes of German ethnic identity long articulated by the ethnic elite. The Globe stated that the city had won its position, prosperity, and reputation on “enterprise and thrift”. Furthermore, it maintained that the people of Kitchener “are among the least concerned about revolutionary doctrines. They are engaged in more essential affairs and thus contribute in no small measure to the progress of the Province.”72 McTaggart’s final article began with a disclaimer stating that throughout his series, “there has been no inference that any racial group is especially susceptible to or responsible for anti-democratic propaganda uncovered in these investigations. Indeed the writer has specifically referred to the ultra-resistant qualities of the German-Canadians.” Even more than in previous
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articles, in this final edition, McTaggart went out of his way to absolve Kitchener’s Germans. He claimed the pro-Nazi literature which emanated from Germany, as opposed to sources within Canada, failed to convince “the solid, stable German-Canadians.” This propaganda only made headway in places such as Quebec which was “remote from the centres of pre-dominant German population, such as Kitchener.” One week later, the Daily Record delighted in the news that in the recent municipal elections, Toronto had elected two Communist aldermen while another Communist came within 254 votes of a seat on the Board of Control. Toronto’s “‘red’-hot problem” demonstrated that the Globe should look closer to home for evidence of disloyalty.

Despite signs that support for the Nazis was becoming less acceptable and could potentially jeopardize the acceptance of Germans as Canadian citizens, the ethnic elite did not immediately and unreservedly repudiate the Nazis. In the course of his investigations, McTaggart found that, although Kitchener’s Germans denied that they were Nazi supporters, they still felt that Hitler had “done much to save Germany,” and had “cleaned up a dirty mess.” Furthermore, the Concordia Club board of directors’ decision to rent rooms to the local Nazi Party was made on April 12, 1938, exactly one month after German troops crossed the border to annex Austria.

The tipping point locally was the 1938 Deutscher Tag which was held in Kitchener from September 3 to 5. In light of the growing anti-Nazi sentiment nationwide, the city’s Anglo-Canadian population declined to grant the endorsement which they had given to previous Tage. On September 1, Police Chief William Hodgson banned the celebrants from displaying the Swastika emblem in public. While they were still permitted to fly the Swastika flag in the auditorium, the parade which was to be part of the weekend’s festivities had to be free of any
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Nazi symbols.\footnote{77 “Will Not Flaunt Nazi Swastika,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 1 September 1938.} Just before the celebration began, Hodgson extended his embargo, banning the parade entirely. This annual event which had previously enjoyed uncontested access to the city’s public spaces was now confined to the auditorium. Furthermore, at the last minute, Mayor George W. Gordon declared that he would boycott the event although he had previously accepted an invitation to attend the opening ceremonies and give the customary address of welcome on behalf of the city. All but two of the city councillors who were also scheduled to be in attendance backed out as well.\footnote{78 “City Police Ban Parade,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 6 September 1938.} Afterwards, the mayor sheepishly claimed that the two who still attended, Joseph Meinzinger and Clarence Selbert, had been misinformed as to the true intent of the celebration.\footnote{79 “Nazi Stigma Said Unwanted,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 7 September 1938.}

At this time, the ethnic elite saw the writing on the wall and began to distance itself from the Nazis. Prior to the event, the \textit{Daily Record} reported that about 1 000 people were expected to attend, a mere quarter of the number who took part in 1935.\footnote{80 “Will Not Flaunt Swastika,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 1 September 1938; “Das Ontario-Deutschtum auf dem Marsche,” \textit{Deutsche Zeitung für Canada} (Winnipeg), 11 September 1935.} The Concordia Club, a hitherto enthusiastic participant, was now conspicuously absent. The ethnic elite also spoke out publicly in opposition to Nazism. German Canadians, they claimed, were ardent supporters of the democratic institutions of their adopted land and therefore held no affinity for the ideals of Nazism.\footnote{81 “Deplores Nazi Propaganda,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 6 September 1938; “Board Will Discuss Nazis,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 7 September 1938; “Sentiment Not That Of City,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 9 September 1938.} Burnishing their credentials as defenders of democracy, a poster printed by a group calling themselves the German-Canadian People’s Society, claimed that they “should be proud of the fact that some of the earliest settlers of Kitchener-Waterloo region were of German descent and assisted in the struggles for democracy against the Family Compact.”\footnote{82 “Disavow Fealty To Hitlerism,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 3 September 1938.} Although the ethnic elite had long claimed that Germans were pioneers who had played an integral role in the
development of Canada, this was the first attempt to establish a connection with the rebels of 1837. Several of the city’s German residents also claimed that they had received threats against themselves and their relatives still in Germany unless they supported the Nazis. The ethnic elite now claimed that they were victims rather than supporters of Nazism. Furthermore, they proposed that from the time of the Upper Canada Rebellion to the present, German Canadians were martyrs for democracy and British freedom.

The ethnic elite thus glossed over their support for the Nazis, intimating that in previous years *Deutscher Tag* was apolitical and simply offered an opportunity for German Canadians “to recall our cultural heritage, to renew our acquaintances with one another and to rededicate ourselves as a group to the aspirations of our native Canadian brethren.” It was only in 1938 that the celebration had been taken over by Nazi supporters who sought to use it for their own “sinister purposes.” The agitators who hijacked the celebration were, of course, described as outsiders. The *Daily Record* claimed that its reporters had tried but failed to find anyone from Kitchener in charge of organizing the celebration, and concluded that the men responsible came from Toronto. One letter to the editor even argued that three quarters of the participants were in fact Hungarian or Rumanian and not German; the name *Deutscher Tag* was thus a misnomer.

The maligned “outsider” was therefore a malleable term which could mean anything from the small number of unnaturalised Germans in Kitchener, to Germans from outside of the city (most often from Toronto), or even other European immigrants posing as Germans. No matter how the
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term was defined, however, the salient point remained the same: those responsible for the apparently sudden pro-Nazi shift in the Deutscher Tag program were not part of Kitchener’s German community.

The ethnic elite’s disavowal of Nazism was not necessarily out of a newfound feeling of repugnance. At the Concordia Club’s quarterly meeting on October 11, 1938, those present expressed their approval of President Siegfried Hennig’s unilateral decision to cancel the club’s agreement to rent rooms to the local Nazi Party. According to the minutes of the meeting, they felt “that the situation was so tense that this step was absolutely necessary.” Thus, their actions were at least in part a response to the increasingly anti-Nazi atmosphere in Canada. Considering the fact that the previous Tage had been distinctly pro-Nazi affairs, the ethnic elite’s claims that they boycotted the celebration after it had been suddenly hijacked by outside forces were disingenuous. This repudiation of Nazism was also by no means universal. Although the Concordia Club elected to cancel its rental agreement with the Nazi Party, at the very same meeting, it was decided that Nazi Party members could still be accepted into the Concordia Club, albeit as passive members only. The club maintained a “black list” of members who were expelled for offenses such as “damaging the club’s moral character.” As late as October, 1938, however, being a member of the Nazi Party was not sufficient grounds for inclusion on this list. The Sachsen und Schwaben Club, Kitchener’s second-largest German club, not only took part in the 1938 Deutscher Tag, but maintained an active relationship with the Deutscher Bund and Nazi supporters well into 1939.
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Regardless of the motivation, sincerity, or universality of the ethnic elite in denouncing the Nazis, non-Germans readily granted them the benefit of the doubt and accepted their claims to be loyal Canadian citizens. On September 7, Mayor Gordon released a statement claiming that in choosing not to attend *Deutscher Tag*, he had in mind “the good Germans citizens whose roots go back to the foundation of this community.” These people, he said, “recognize no patriotism but that which surrounds the upholding of liberty and justice as represented by Canadian institutions.” The local chapters of the Army and Navy Veterans and the Canadian Legion commended the 90 percent of local Germans who they felt were loyal yet now suffered because of the actions of a small minority as well as a group of outsiders. Newspapers from outside Kitchener likewise concurred with the claims of the ethnic elite. Naturally, the *Daily Record* reprinted these editorials. The *London Free Press* stated that in the past, *Deutscher Tag* was a harmless social gathering like St. Patrick’s Day or St. George’s Day. The newspaper lauded the city’s Germans for recognizing that this year the celebration had been hijacked by outside forces and responding accordingly, adding “this country has no finer or more industrious citizens than those of German birth. They have made a real contribution to the development of this country. We believe the great mass are thoroughly loyal to this country and to our institutions.” Even the *Globe and Mail* now praised Kitchener’s Germans and held them as an example for other immigrants who came to Canada to enjoy freedom and escape from strife.

As Canadian public opinion swung against Nazi Germany, the German-Canadian People’s Society sought to position itself as the official voice of the German community both locally and nationally. Although this organization had been in existence since 1934, until the
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latter half of 1938, it had very few members and toiled in relative anonymity. By 1939, however, the organization, which had been renamed the German-Canadian League, counted 1,800 members nationwide, roughly equal to the membership of the *Deutscher Bund* at its height. The Society, which maintained branches across Canada, operated as a sort of counterweight to the *Bund*. Like the *Bund*, the German-Canadian People’s Society established schools to inculcate its ideals in German Canadians, particularly their children. Rather than teaching Nazi racial theories, the Society taught the “true German culture” and sought to “enable the German children to become true Canadian citizens.”

The Society’s most important function was publicity. In November, 1938, the local branch of the Society asked Kitchener City Council for permission to use the city hall assembly room for a meeting to denounce *Kristallnacht*. The petition, which city council granted, stated “we wish to make it clear to the community and to the whole Dominion that we are in no way associated with but are entirely opposed to the present wave of bestiality sweeping Germany at the expense of innocent Catholics and Jews.” The purpose of the gathering was therefore to proclaim to the rest of Canada the loyalty of its citizens of German ancestry. During the meeting, the Society passed a resolution calling for an embargo on all imports from Germany. While speakers denounced Nazism, as well as Communism, they defended the German people who they claimed were also victims of Hitler’s oppression. One speaker, Paul Bender, claimed that German Canadians “have a right to feel proud of the contributions to the arts and science that the German people have made in the past,” even if they could not be proud of the present Germany. Bender maintained, however, that if the people of Germany were not “muzzled” they too would protest against the Nazi barbarism. Bender closed calling upon all German Canadians to unite with their
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fellow Canadian citizens, regardless of their race, religion, or politics, and root out any Nazi activity in Canada. The program included several non-German speakers. In an affirmation of the society’s core message, H. Brown of the British Israel Federation praised those present for demonstrating “the highest type of Germanic manhood in Canada.”

After the initial outrage over Deutscher Tag and Kristallnacht had passed, concern about Nazi activity in Kitchener simmered below the surface for several months until a series of incidents in March, 1939 brought the issue to the forefront. On March 16, the Daily Record reported that four children of local man George Esau were moving to Germany after receiving financial inducements from a Nazi agent. Esau, who openly supported Hitler, denied that his children had been given any form of inducement and claimed that they left because they had no future in Canada. Although an investigation by Ontario’s Attorney General Gordon Conant found no evidence of wrongdoing, public outrage deepened when it was revealed that the Esau family had been on relief for 10 of the previous 11 years and had received $4 000 in assistance. As further evidence of Nazi activity in Kitchener, the Daily Record reported that several men who wished to remain anonymous had come forward claiming that they had been threatened and intimidated by Nazi agents. An investigation by Attorney General Conant into these claims once again found nothing.

Indignation over the Esau affair had not yet subsided when John Conrad, former secretary of the Sachsen und Schwaben Club, told the Daily Record that he had been kicked out for exposing Nazi activities within the club. Conrad stated that Nazi agents had been attempting to gain control of the club, however he maintained that of the club’s 200 members, only 10 or so
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were active Nazi supporters.\textsuperscript{101} Representatives of the club dismissed Conrad’s allegations, branding him a communist.\textsuperscript{102} Conrad countered that anyone who spoke up against the Nazis was labelled a communist or a tool of the Jews. He repeated his accusation and claimed that the \textit{Deutscher Bund} was attempting to dominate the club. The \textit{Bund}, he maintained, had given the \textit{Sachsen und Schwaben Club} a Swastika flag which hung on its wall and was only taken down when public opinion turned against the Nazis.\textsuperscript{103} The day after Conrad’s initial bombshell accusation, a soldier from the Scots Fusiliers claimed that a few months previously, while escorting his sister from an event at the \textit{Deutscher Bund}, he was assaulted after inquiring if “God Save the King” had been sung yet.\textsuperscript{104} The president of the Kitchener-Waterloo \textit{Ortsgruppe}, Rudolph Böge, countered that the soldier in question was drunk and belligerent at the time of the alleged assault. He insisted that the \textit{Deutscher Bund} was not a pro-Nazi organization and “stoutly denied that he had ever heard of Nazi activity of any kind, inside the club or out.”\textsuperscript{105}

In the wake of these incidents, Kitchener City Council considered a resolution requesting that the city’s German clubs disband as a demonstration of their loyalty. The \textit{Daily Record} reported that the resolution was meant to counteract the negative publicity the city had received as a result of the recent allegations of Nazi activity. The mover of the resolution, Alderman Gordon Honsberger, stated that the impression that Kitchener was a hotbed of Nazi activity was an injustice to all of the city’s German clubs, save one (the \textit{Deutscher Bund}). Suggesting that the small number of Nazi supporters in the city were primarily newcomers, he declared “our old
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pioneers certainly are not Nazis. They hate naziism [sic] in all its forms.” He cited Kitchener’s record of service in the Great War as evidence of their loyalty and professed that those who had taken out naturalization papers were glad to be British subjects so that they could enjoy justice and freedom. Despite this defense of the loyalty of the majority of the German community, Honsberger’s resolution suggested that German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship were incompatible. It stated that the purpose of the city’s clubs, namely preserving German culture, “while not contrary to existing statutes, is undesirable under the present circumstances particularly,” and resolved that the clubs should disband to demonstrate their loyalty. Alderman A. W. Boos raised the lone voice of dissent. Asking the clubs to disband, he asserted, unfairly branded them all as disloyal, violating the British principle that one is innocent until proven guilty. Boos suggested deferring any decision to allow the clubs an opportunity to issue their own declarations of loyalty. This plan would defend the city against accusations that it was a pro-Nazi hotbed, and also retain a place for Germans as loyal Canadian citizens. Boos’ compromise ultimately carried the day. City council agreed to delay voting on the resolution for two weeks. 106

Within days, both the Sachsen und Schwaben and Concordia Clubs passed resolutions declaring their loyalty to Canada and the British Empire which were then forwarded to Kitchener City Council. The Sachsen und Schwaben Club’s resolution claimed that the majority of its members came not from Germany but from Rumania, Hungary, and Yugo-Slavia and thus held no affinity for Nazism. The Concordia resolution, meanwhile, highlighted the fact that the club was 65 years old and that its membership included “some of Kitchener’s oldest and most respected citizens.” The resolution boasted that “in some respects it is more Canadian in its outlook and from the standpoint of members enrolled than many other clubs that do not bear German names.” At the end of every meeting, for example, club members sang “God Save the
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“King” in full, as opposed to many other clubs claiming to be pro-British which only sang two lines. Furthermore, of the club’s 392 members, 65 came to Canada prior to 1914, 93 since 1914, and 234 were born in Canada. The club was therefore more than an immigrant fraternity; it was a venerable Canadian institution.107

In May, the German-Canadian League held a three-day convention in Kitchener. Much of the discussion focused on the relationship between German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship. A resolution which was adopted unanimously by the convention declared that “it was quite possible to be a good German and a good Canadian at the same time but absolutely impossible to be a good Nazi and a good Canadian.” A delegate from Kitchener, George Imhof, informed the convention that the city’s German clubs had recently given oaths of allegiance to Canada and the Empire. He warned, however, that these words needed to be backed up with action. He stated that there was “unquestionably” Nazi activity in Kitchener, but also many good Germans who needed to take back control of their clubs.108

Imhof’s allegations notwithstanding, in the final months before the outbreak of the war, the majority of the remaining Nazi supporters saw their position as untenable and recanted their earlier beliefs. Others returned to Germany. Thus, over the summer of 1939, reports on Nazi activities in Kitchener in the Deutsche Zeitung für Canada simply dried up. On August 25, after the signing of the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact, the Daily Record interviewed two local Communists who praised the agreement as a great bit of statesmanship on the part of Joseph Stalin. The newspaper was unable, however, to find anyone willing to speak on behalf of the Nazis.109 That same day, Mayor Gordon informed the Globe and Mail that, in the previous months, 90 percent of the city’s Nazi supporters had left to return to Germany. An unnamed

107 “German Clubs Avow Loyalty,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 21 April 1939.
source corroborated the mayor’s statement, claiming that 50 men and their families had departed in the previous two months, while 20 more were preparing to go.¹¹⁰

On September 4, in the wake of the German invasion of Poland, the Sachsen und Schwaben and Concordia Clubs suspended their activities at the request of the city police in order to avoid any potential trouble. The Deutscher Bund had reportedly been closed for several days already, demonstrating that the last remaining Nazi supporters had finally abandoned their cause.¹¹¹ On September 11, the day after Canada declared war on Germany, the Crown Attorney, W. P. Clement, announced that all enemy aliens were required to register with authorities, however they would still be allowed to go about their lives as long as they registered on time and remained peaceful.¹¹² The following day, city council advised the Sachsen und Schwaben and Concordia Clubs that it would be best if they stayed closed for the remainder of the war. The manager of the Sachsen und Schwaben Club, Philip Bettendorf, appeared before the council and, pointing out that the club was also a sick benefit society, asked permission to hold a sick benefit meeting once per month. Although council denied his request, Alderman Honsberger opined that this was still a testament to British freedom. In Germany, he claimed, if British people wished to maintain a club, they would not even receive a hearing.¹¹³

In this tense atmosphere, the ethnic elite immediately set to work to ensure that there was not a recurrence of the events of the First World War. They wished to make certain that the city’s Germans would not have their loyalty called into question or their rights as citizens challenged. On September 15, the Daily Record printed an editorial condemning the “malicious gossip” directed against “some reputable Canadians, whose loyalty to King and country is unquestioned.”

¹¹¹ “Three Kitchener German Social Clubs Are Closed,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 4 September 1939.
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¹¹³ “City Council Advises German Clubs to Stay Closed,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 12 September 1939.
The editorial stated that many of the rumours were directed against people whose families had been in Canada for longer than their accusers. These pioneers had helped to build Canada and had absolutely no sympathy for Hitler. Furthermore, they had demonstrated their loyalty in the previous war and could be counted upon to do so again.\textsuperscript{114} The president of the Kitchener Board of Trade, Louis Orville Breithaupt, appealed to Canada’s Chief Censor, Walter P. Thompson, to protect the city from “malicious and unfavourable publicity.” Thompson promised his full cooperation and the \textit{Daily Record} praised Breithaupt for his “timely action” to prevent the sort of rumours that had plagued the city during the First World War.\textsuperscript{115} One month into the war, the \textit{Daily Record} interviewed several businessmen of German ancestry who claimed that that the German language which had “always been in so much evidence in this city,” was now seldom heard. All of the men interviewed stressed that despite their knowledge and previous use of the language of their ancestors, they “have remained as loyal and as British as the first man who never spoke a word of German in his life.” One man even declared “I’ve heard many a good German-speaking Canadian damn Hitler up hill and down dale in fluent German.”\textsuperscript{116} The small number of men from Kitchener who were arrested and interned on suspicion of Nazi sympathies apparently vindicated these protestations of loyalty. On September 30, the \textit{Daily Record} reported that “only” seven men from Kitchener had been interned. This rather modest number compared favourably to the 23 and 120 men from Winnipeg and Montreal respectively which the \textit{Record} reported as having been interned.\textsuperscript{117}

Although the \textit{Daily Record} boasted about the small number of local Germans arrested, nationally, the government exercised restraint in dealing with potential subversives, or at least
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those of German origins. On August 31, 1939, a committee appointed by Minister of Justice Ernest Lapointe met to draw up a list of those who were to be arrested at the outbreak of war with Germany. At the top of the list were all members of the Nazi Party as well as the Deutsche Arbeitsfront, who were considered to be “instruments of the German state—ready to do the bidding of German command.” When it came to members of the Deutscher Bund, the committee chose to arrest only those seen as “organizers of disaffection and potential leaders of sabotage work in wartime.” In Ontario, only 8 of the Bund’s roughly 125 remaining members were arrested. By the end of the war, the total number of Germans arrested was 840, roughly one tenth of the number of Germans and Austrians arrested and interned during the First World War.¹¹⁸

The ethnic elite went out of its way to demonstrate that Kitchener’s Germans had fulfilled their duties as citizens and were therefore unquestionably loyal. Just as in the previous war, the duties of citizenship came in the form of contributions of money, manpower, and enthusiasm to the war effort. In June, 1940, more than 50 000 people turned out to watch a tank parade through the streets of Kitchener as part of the “Buy-A-Tank” fundraising campaign. The Daily Record noted that the tank’s commander, Colonel F. F. Worthington, praised the city’s loyalty and stated that the order of 300 tanks to be built in Canada was a direct result of the Kitchener-Waterloo campaign.¹¹⁹ The following week, the newspaper proudly announced that the district had surpassed its goal of $25 000 by a whopping $12 000 and had proportionally out-subscribed Toronto. This showed that Kitchener was “patriotic to the core.”¹²⁰ In August, 1940, R. L. Thaler, a German from Kitchener, wrote a letter to the Globe and Mail defending his city and its German community. He cited their contributions to patriotic causes, all of which surpassed their targets, as evidence of loyalty. “Any one [sic] who has knowledge of these facts,” he asserted, “must

¹¹⁸ Wagner, Brothers Beyond the Sea, 132-4.
¹¹⁹ “50,000 Watch Tank Parade,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 10 June 1940.
¹²⁰ “Splendid Community Effort,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 17 June 1940.
surely realize that Kitchener cannot possibly be pro-German as it is sometimes claimed.” Even as the war dragged on, contributions to patriotic causes remained strong. The *Daily Record* credited this to the local foreign-born population. A German-born man interviewed by the *Record* on this topic in April, 1944, stated that those who were born in Canada did not appreciate this “wonderful country” as much as those who had come to escape hardship and suffering. The foreign-born were not a potential source of subversion, but instead could be counted among Canada’s greatest defenders. Thus, this man claimed that he not only bought all the Victory Bonds that he was able to, he maintained that if he was allowed to, he would enlist.122

The ethnic elite were determined to see that the German community could not be accused of lacking in the all-important contribution of manpower to the war effort. Even before Canada declared war on Germany, the *Daily Record* reported that many German Canadians had already stated their intent to enlist in the Canadian forces if and when Canada joined the conflict. One man interviewed by the *Record* applied to join the RCMP rather than the armed forces. He explained that he still had relatives in Germany and so did not want to fight against them yet he felt a duty to Canada and so wanted to serve in some capacity.123 In November, 1939, an editorial in the *Daily Record* claimed that the number of volunteers from Kitchener and Waterloo proved the cities’ loyalty, adding that this was merely demonstrating something which should have been common knowledge already.124 Therefore, far from struggling to find recruits, the *Record* reported the following spring that the recruiting offices for Waterloo County’s Highland Light Infantry actually had to turn men away after they received a surplus of volunteers.125

121 “Kitchener Defended,” *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 29 August 1940.
122 “Foreign-Born Spur Sales in Victory Bond Campaign,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 27 April 1944.
123 “Sympathizers Not Returning,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 2 September 1939.
125 “Recruiting Office Closes After 350 Men ‘Sign Up,’” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 27 June 1940.
Throughout the war, the Daily Record avidly followed the exploits of Waterloo County’s boys in uniform and regularly printed their names and photographs on the front of the local section. Although they were not highlighted specifically, those of German ancestry would have been easily identifiable by their names. The most prominent of Kitchener’s German Canadian enlistees were Milt Schmidt, Bobby Bauer, and Woody Dumart who together comprised the Boston Bruins’ illustrious “Kraut Line.” In February, 1942, these three men put their hockey careers on hold to join the Royal Canadian Air Force. Louis Orville Breithaupt, now Member of Parliament for Waterloo North, suggested to city council that Kitchener should hold a banquet to honour the line prior to their departure for training. Ever concerned with safeguarding the image of Kitchener and its German community, his intent, he stated, was to “re-establish’ that this is their home town.” They were the most popular hockey players in Canada, Breithaupt claimed, and he wanted to make sure everyone knew where they came from.  

Unsurprisingly, the ethnic elite supported conscription wholeheartedly. The Globe and Mail praised the Daily Record for its support for conscription. Because the men who directed the Daily Record, Motz and Euler, were both of German ancestry, the Globe contended that this provided an indication of the sentiment of the German community. These “German-Canadian patriots,” understood the value of British freedom and had no sympathy for the “unprincipled gangsters” who ruled Germany. An editorial in the Daily Record just prior to the conscription plebiscite in April, 1942 informed readers that the Waterloo North riding had special reason to vote “yes.” Since the riding’s residents were largely of German descent, the editorial asked, could they “afford to tell the rest of Canada that they are not in favor of overseas conscription?”

---

127 “German-Canadian Patriots,” Globe and Mail (Toronto), 23 October 1941; “German-Canadian Patriots,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 27 October 1941.
128 “‘Yes’ Vote Needed Here,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 25 April 1942.
Afterwards, a relieved *Daily Record* reported that Waterloo North had voted “yes” at a rate one percent above the national average. The riding was marching “in step” with the rest of Canada and thus could not be singled out as failing to support the war.\(^{129}\)

For the most part, Anglo-Canadians accepted this evidence that the city’s Germans had fulfilled their duties and were thus loyal Canadian citizens. In Kitchener, there was no return to the violence and chaos of the First World War, or even the comparatively minor hysteria of March, 1939. The closest it came was the spring of 1940 when the fall of Norway, the Netherlands, and France in quick succession stoked fears of fifth column activities in Canada.\(^{130}\)

From the end of April to the beginning of June, 1940, the pages of the *Daily Record* were filled with talk of the fifth columnists who had supposedly aided the Nazis in their conquest. Editorials implored authorities to take action to guard against this “Trojan horse” in Canada, even if this required “setting aside the cumbersome procedure of the Criminal Code.”\(^{131}\) Veterans’ groups were the most prominent advocates of radical, xenophobic solutions to the “problem” of fifth columnists in Kitchener. At the national convention of the Canadian Legion in May, 1940, the Kitchener-Waterloo branch endorsed a resolution calling upon the federal government to “check up” on all enemy aliens, even those who had been naturalized. Notably, this resolution included naturalized Canadian citizens of German birth under the heading of “enemy aliens.” Legion members sought to strip them of their rights, claiming that they were “taking advantage of the fact that they are naturalized” to conceal their subversive activities.\(^{132}\) The K-W Imperial Unit, Army and Navy Veterans in Canada and the veterans of the 118\(^{th}\) Battalion went a step farther.

Both sent resolutions to the Prime Minister urging the government not just to monitor, but to...

---

\(^{129}\) “Waterloo North in Step,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 28 April 1942.


\(^{131}\) “Guard Against Trojan Horse,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 23 April 1940; “New Low In Nazi Deceit,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 17 May 1940; “Fifth Column Activity,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 24 May 1940.

\(^{132}\) “Want Check-Up On Enemy Aliens,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 13 May 1940.
intern all enemy aliens, including those who had been naturalized in the past five years. Although the reason for interning these enemy aliens was supposedly to prevent subversion, the Army and Navy Veterans’ resolution stated that it was “disgraceful” that enemy aliens were able to walk free and take jobs vacated by those who enlisted.\textsuperscript{133}

Most of the veterans’ grievances addressed unemployment, but were ‘repackaged’ in terms of national security. In March, 1940, Gordon C. Thompson, president of the local branch of the Canadian Legion protested to city council that there were unnaturalised Germans who held jobs while veterans, “patriotic Britishers,” were unemployed. In this instance, Thompson complained specifically about a man employed by the city. Alderman H. W. Sturm, chairman of the board of works, informed Thompson that the man in question came to Canada more than 30 years previously at the age of four. His father died shortly after their arrival and he was unaware that he was not naturalized but had recently taken steps to become so. Thompson, however, held firm and complained that many jobs were being taken by “foreigners” who “have nothing in common with us,” even if they had taken out naturalization papers.\textsuperscript{134} For these veterans, the right to work was to be circumscribed based upon ethnic origins as well as military service, even if this conflicted with the strict legal definition of citizenship.\textsuperscript{135}

Thankfully, rational thinking prevailed and authorities rebuffed these attempts to relegate Germans to second class citizenship. On May 20, Daniel Maguire, a representative of the local branch of the Canadian Legion, appeared before Kitchener city council begging them to do something about the Nazi sympathizers who he claimed were rife in the city. Maguire stated that he had previously approached the chief of police and Crown Attorney claiming he knew that

\textsuperscript{133} “Favour Strong Vets’ Corps,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 17 May 1940; “Would Intern ‘All’ Enemies,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 20 May 1940.

\textsuperscript{134} “Protest Is Made Against Unnaturalized Workmen,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 4 March 1940.

\textsuperscript{135} Alice Kessler-Harris describes the right to work as being part of “economic citizenship.” Alice Kessler-Harris, \textit{In Pursuit of Equity: Women, Men, and the Quest for Economic Citizenship in 20\textsuperscript{th} Century America} (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2001), 10-1.
there were men in Kitchener who celebrated German victories although he could furnish no proof. The chief of police and Crown Attorney informed him that there was nothing they could do. He also asked the Ontario Provincial Police for permission to install a recording device in a house where he claimed these victories were celebrated. His request was denied. Maguire stated ominously that although the Legion did not want a repetition of the violence of the First World War in Kitchener, if something was not done the executive of the Legion could not be held responsible for any trouble. Although Mayor Joseph Meinzinger agreed to appoint a committee to work with the local branch of the Legion in investigating the activities of enemy aliens, this toothless investigation was a far cry from what Maguire and the Legion presumably desired. On June 4, a grand jury reported to Judge R. L. McKinnon that they found no evidence of fifth column activity in Waterloo County. After receiving the report, McKinnon called on anyone with evidence of fifth column activities to come forward, but he also cautioned residents to avoid persecuting innocent people; this contravened British fair play. By this point, however, the public fear had largely subsided. The subject of fifth column activity quickly faded from the headlines and the violence that Maguire had threatened failed to materialize. Furthermore, the booming wartime economy soon ended unemployment in Kitchener and created a labour shortage, rendering veterans’ complaints over jobs null and void.

Outside of this brief panic, Kitchener’s Germans as a group did not have their loyalty called into question, nor were their rights as citizens challenged. When men classified enemy aliens failed to report on time, they were charged by police but the public barely batted an eye.
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There was no hysteria when Jacob Schmidt was charged under the Defence of Canada Regulations with sabotage at the factory where he worked. In September, 1941, after vandals desecrated a Jewish cemetery near Kitchener, the city’s populace reacted with outrage, but refrained from casting blame upon the German community. The culprits were eventually identified as Michael Conway and Irvin Lamka, who had been drinking in the cemetery. The few instances where men were legitimately convicted of spreading pro-Nazi sentiment were treated as isolated incidents, and not as a sign of an organized movement in Kitchener.

There was thus no lack of potential flashpoints which may have brought accusations of disloyalty against Kitchener’s German community. Throughout the war, however, citizens and authorities in Kitchener were more concerned about other, less desirable groups who seemed to pose a greater threat to the established order. Canadians generally believed that Japanese Canadians and Communists in particular posed a greater internal threat than German Canadians. The 804 German Canadians interned during the war, for example, paled in comparison to the 22,000 Japanese Canadians who were not only interned but had their property seized and sold. Notably, after the first wave of arrests at the beginning of the war, police officers were required to follow proper investigative procedures and collect evidence before arresting suspected Nazi

\[140\] Schmidt was initially convicted of sabotage and given a one year sentence, but was eventually acquitted after being granted a new trial. “Magistrate Suggests ‘Sabotage’ May Be Carelessness,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 10 April 1941; “Says Sabotage Charge Proved,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 23 April 1941; “Schmidt Granted New Court Trial,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 13 May 1941; “Schmidt Acquitted On Sabotage Charge On Second Trial,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 31 July 1941.

\[141\] “Vandals Desecrate Jewish Cemetery Near Kitchener,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 2 September 1941; “New Low in Vandalism,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 3 September 1941; “Charge Pair With $3,000 Damage to Jewish Cemetery,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 8 September 1941; “2 Alleged Grave Vandals Remanded Week For Trial,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 10 September 1941.

\[142\] In July, 1940, Albert Hagler, the laundryman at St. Jerome’s College was charged under the Defence of Canada Regulations and found guilty after he praised Hitler and disparaged Canada to priesthood students, telling them they should refer to Hitler as “his excellency.” In May, 1941, Fritz Nemetschke was convicted of possessing a document likely to cause disaffection. The document in question was reportedly a poem written by himself and another man who returned to Germany just prior to the war. “Admiration of Hitler Lands Man In Court,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 10 July 1940; “Man Convicted Under War Act,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 24 July 1940; “Convict German In Police Court,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 2 May 1941.
supporters. In an unfortunate attempt to explain and even justify the internment of Japanese Canadians en masse, J. L. Granatstein and Gregory A. Johnson state that the RCMP and armed forces lacked men with a knowledge of Japanese and so were unable to infiltrate the Japanese Canadian community to ascertain their sympathies. They also cite the widespread support within the Japanese Canadian community of Japan’s war with China prior to 1941 as well as the credible, although minimal military threat posed by Japan to the North American mainland as justification for the Japanese internment. Crucially, this meant that while German Canadians were assumed to be loyal, for Japanese Canadians, a “lesser” race, the burden of proof lay on demonstrating their loyalty.143

As a fellow white European “race,” albeit one which stood lower on the racial hierarchy than those of German origins, the treatment of Italians in Canada during the Second World War was more in line with the treatment of Germans than the treatment of Japanese, whose lowly standing on the racial hierarchy offered them no protection. Thus, Luigi Bruti Liberati acknowledges that the actions of Canadian authorities against Italian Canadians were motivated at least in part by nativism and racism. He argues, however, that it is a mischaracterization to describe the government’s actions as that of a police state and that “most Italian Canadians were not subjected to arbitrary arrests and internment.” Likewise Franca Iacovetta and Roberto Perin argue that internment “was not part of many Italian Canadians’ everyday reality. For most Italian Canadians, the war provided a material security unknown since the advent of the Depression.”

Iacovetta and Perin add that “Italians certainly encountered widespread xenophobia in Canada, but we should bear in mind that they were never victims of its worst excesses.”

During the war, the RCMP utilized the powers granted to it under the Defence of Canada Regulations to monitor and suppress not only Communists, but individuals and groups whose politics veered even slightly to the left. According to Reg Whitaker this repression of communism was a continuing theme in Canadian history which began at the end of the First World War and continued into the Cold War. Communists were among the first to be interned when the Defence of Canada Regulations were enacted on September 3, 1939. Although Canada was not at war with the Soviet Union, an October, 1939 RCMP Intelligence Bulletin declared “we are of the opinion that there is more to fear from acts of espionage and sabotage on the part of the Communist Party than from Nazi or Fascist organizations and adherents.” On May 15, 1940, at the height of the panic over German fifth column activity, the Ontario Supreme Court upheld the conviction of three men charged with distributing anti-war literature for the Communist Party which was then declared an illegal organization. On June 4, an order-in-council by the federal government confirmed this decision and banned the Communist Party as well as several other potentially subversive organizations. While the list of groups banned included the Deutscher Bund, the Canadian Union of Fascists, and the fascist National Unity Party, the majority of the groups listed were banned for communist ties. This included the Young Communist League of Canada, the Canadian Labour Defence League, the League for Peace and Democracy, the Ukrainian Labour Farmer Temple Association, the Finnish Organization of Canada, and the Russian Workers and Farmers Committee. When the Soviet Union joined the

144 Franca Iacovetta and Roberto Perin, “Italians and Wartime Internment: Comparative Perspectives on Public Policy, Historical Memory, and Daily Life,” in Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad eds. Franca Iacovetta, Roberto Perin, and Angelo Principe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 7-12; Luigi Bruti Liberati, “The Internment of Italian Canadians,” trans. Gabriele Scardellato in Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad eds. Franca Iacovetta, Roberto Perin, and Angelo Principe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 93-5.
Allies in fighting against Nazi Germany, the Canadian government waited a year before releasing the Communist internees and then did so reluctantly. The ban on the Communist Party, however, remained. As Whitaker and Gregory Kealey state, “the Communists remained once and future threats, despite the wartime alliance with the USSR.”

In Kitchener, this heightened concern over the activities of non-German subversives was abetted by the ethnic elite, which was more than happy to shift focus away from the German community. In September, 1939, just after Canada declared war on Germany Alderman Joseph Meinzinger repeatedly queried Mayor George Gordon as to whether anything was being done about the local Communist Party. Communism, he claimed, was as abhorrent as Nazism, and he therefore requested that city council order the local party headquarters closed. Gordon assured Meinzinger that the communists were being dealt with, albeit quietly as he did not wish to raise negative publicity for the city. On March 21, 1940, the Daily Record reported that local police were searching for the persons responsible for distributing Communist literature to several Kitchener neighbourhoods the previous night. The literature called on residents to vote for Communist candidates and get Canada out of the war. Immediately after the Ontario Supreme Court ruled that the Communist Party was illegal, Meinzinger, now mayor, ordered city police to round up all local communists. Meinzinger expressed his desire for all communists to be disenfranchised and locked up for the rest of the war and perhaps longer. Much to his dismay,
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the following day, the Police Chief reported that they made no arrests and had no plans to do so. Their raids yielded literature which was only “mildly Communistic,” and nothing in the Russian language.\footnote{“No Arrests Made By City Police In Communist Raids,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 16 May 1940.} Although these raids came up disappointingly empty, this did not stop the \textit{Daily Record} and authorities in Kitchener from continuing to raise the spectre of the red menace.\footnote{“Communist Paper Publishers Object of Police Search,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 29 January 1941; “Kitchener Communist Paper Makes Another Appearance,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 19 March 1941; “Vigilance Needed,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 29 March 1941.} On June 13, 1941, just prior to the German invasion of the Soviet Union, the \textit{Daily Record} published an editorial warning readers to be vigilant as there were still “Reds” active in the city even though the Communist Party was banned.\footnote{“Reds’ Still Active,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 13 June 1941.} Although Communist fear-mongering did subside after the Soviet Union joined the Allies, city council still denied repeated requests by the Community Party for the use of Market Hall to hold a meeting, stating that the Canadian government continued to see the Communist Party as an illegal organization.\footnote{“City Council Refuses Use Of Hall Again,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 18 August 1942.}

As the Communist boogeyman receded, a new threat quickly rose to take its place. In October, 1942, to encourage subscriptions to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Victory Loan Campaign, the \textit{Daily Record} published a fake front page, replete with pictures, which described Kitchener-Waterloo as being devastated by a surprise air raid originating from a Japanese aircraft carrier in Hudson Bay.\footnote{“Enemy Bombs Twin City; Damage Severe, Many Die,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 20 October 1942.} Following the declaration of war on Japan, the \textit{Daily Record} published numerous editorials on the subject of the “Jap Problem in Canada.” In March, 1942, the \textit{Daily Record} called on farmers in Ontario to take on Canadian-born Japanese as labourers to help ease British Columbia’s burden. The editorial opined that the Canadian born were unlikely to become Japanese agents as long as they were kept away from those born in Japan.\footnote{“Jap Problem in Canada,” \textit{Daily Record} (Kitchener), 19 March 1942.} In January, 1945, with victory in sight, the \textit{Daily Record} began wondering what to do with Canada’s Japanese population postwar. For
non-citizens, the solution was simple: deport them back to Japan. For those who were Canadian citizens, the Daily Record supported forcibly distributing across Canada to prevent them once again concentrating on the West coast.\textsuperscript{155} There were no corresponding editorials defining the presence of German Canadians as a problem or wondering what to do with their population postwar, let alone editorials advocating controlling the movements of other Canadian citizens in peacetime.

Even the Jehovah’s Witnesses, another group banned under the Defence of Canada Regulations, came under greater fire than Kitchener’s Germans, supposedly on account of their pacifist beliefs. On September 18, 1939, a group of 30 Jehovah’s Witnesses in Kitchener were arrested after they held a demonstration which drew the ire of Kitchener residents and had to be broken up by police when the scene threatened to boil over into violence.\textsuperscript{156} It was an incident in one of Kitchener’s public schools, however, that best demonstrates the difference between how Kitchener’s Germans and this marginalized group were viewed and treated during the war. In December, 1939, the Kitchener Public School Board issued a circular which forbade students from bullying or picking on their German classmates. The school inspector, Dr. H. J. Prueter, explained to the Daily Record that since they opened in September, schools had been working to teach students that they were all Canadian and should forget “all other racial and national affiliations.” The most important qualities were patriotism and loyalty to Canada.\textsuperscript{157} The following September, three children were suspended from school and their parents, Jehovah’s Witnesses, were charged with causing disaffection with His Majesty after telling their children not to salute the flag or sing “God Save the King” at school.\textsuperscript{158} The parents were eventually

\textsuperscript{155} “Jap Problem in Canada,” Daily Record (Kitchener), 2 January 1945.
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\textsuperscript{158} “Father Charged as Children Refuse to Sing ‘The King,’” Daily Record (Kitchener), 14 September 1940.
released when it was found that there was no law which compelled people to salute the flag. Still, the Public School Board held firm, insisting that students must salute the flag and sing the national anthem. Mayor Meinzinger concurred, stating that he wished to deport anyone who did not salute, declaring “this is no time for anyone to be at large whose loyalty and patriotism may be open to question.”

In spite of what Meinzinger and the Public School Board claimed, it was not simply a matter of loyalty and patriotism which separated Kitchener’s Germans from groups such as the Japanese, communists, and Jehovah’s Witnesses who were persecuted during the war. After all, while the city’s Germans were not Nazi agents with orders from Berlin for sabotage and subversion, prior to the war, they were openly supportive of Hitler and Nazi Germany. Nevertheless, the Anglo-Canadian population granted them the benefit of the doubt and readily conceded the ethnic elite’s claims that Germans were loyal Canadian citizens. How these groups were viewed and treated during the war had more to do with their status prewar than their perceived loyalty or disloyalty during the war itself. The Japanese, communists, and Jehovah’s Witnesses were marginalized outsiders. Their race, politics, and religion strayed too far from the mainstream of white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, capitalist Canada. The Germans, as a fellow white, Northern European race, who deliberately cultivated an image as being stable, unobtrusive, supporters of the established order, found acceptance. Even their previous support of the Nazis could be excused as this was something which they shared with many Canadians. Besides, it was preferable to supporting communism. This strident anti-Communism, long a facet of their ethnic identity, would prove particularly useful in the return to peace and the beginning of the Cold War.

**Consummate Cold Warriors: Rehabilitating the Image of Germany Postwar**

---

159 “Won’t Likely Change Rule,” *Daily Record* (Kitchener), 12 October 1940.
Although Kitchener’s Germans managed to shed any association with Nazism during the war, the Germans of Europe were not so fortunate. Even the *Daily Record*, a staunch defender of Kitchener’s German community, published several editorials in the closing months of the war criticizing the people of Germany and questioning their place in the postwar world. One such editorial from January, 1945 stated, “It is easy to feel contempt for such a sheep-like tribe of humanity. It is less easy to feel much hope for them, or for their contribution to a postwar world of free men intent upon enhancing the decency and dignity of their race.”\(^\text{160}\) This was problematic for the ethnic elite who had traditionally looked to Germany to help furnish their ethnic identity. As German immigrants gradually began to arrive in Kitchener in the postwar years, they too threatened to taint the German community with the stain of Nazism. In June, 1948, workmen tearing down the building that had previously served as the headquarters of the local branch of the *Deutscher Bund* found two portraits of Hitler hidden between the ceiling and the rafters. This served as an uncomfortable reminder of the German community’s previous attitude towards Hitler, one which the ethnic elite had worked so hard to expunge from the public memory.\(^\text{161}\) Thus, even in the postwar years, the threat of being branded Nazis and therefore disloyal Canadian citizens hung over the heads of Kitchener’s Germans.

According to Gottlieb Leibbrandt, in the postwar years, “through hard work and dependability, [Kitchener’s Germans] raised the word ‘German’ to a position of respect again.”\(^\text{162}\) The ethnic elite, however, actively worked to fashion a new ethnic identity, one which rehabilitated the image of the German people in the eyes of Canadians and cemented the place of Kitchener’s Germans as loyal Canadian citizens. They portrayed the German people as victims,

\(^{161}\) “Hitler’s Pictures In Kitchener Ruins,” *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 9 June 1948.
\(^{162}\) Leibbrandt, *Little Paradise*, 297.
first of Nazi oppression, and then of the Allies who had sold them out to the Communists at the close of the war. The Germans, however, were not simply helpless victims. Recollecting the years of Nazi oppression, the ethnic elite emphasized the German resistance movement, claiming that it was emblematic of the true spirit of the German people. Furthermore, they portrayed Germany as the front line in the struggle against communism. The heroic qualities which the Germans displayed first in resisting the Nazis, and then in standing up as the consummate Cold Warriors made them ideal Canadian citizens.

In January, 1947, the *Sachsen und Schwaben Club* re-formed after a hiatus of nearly 8 years.\(^{163}\) The Concordia Club followed suit two years later, re-forming in May, 1949.\(^{164}\) These prewar institutions were joined by several newcomers, chief among them being the Canadian Society for German Relief (CSGR). The CSGR was founded in Kitchener on December 1, 1946.\(^{165}\) Members worked to expand their membership beyond Kitchener and soon established branches in Toronto, Hamilton, and even as far afield as Vancouver. According to its June 1947 charter, the CSGR’s purpose was “to alleviate, by collection of money and supplies, human suffering among the German people, especially among the sick, the children and the expelled or displaced persons.”\(^{166}\) The branches held activities such as concerts and bingos to raise money for relief. More than 700 people attended the Kitchener branch’s first concert on December 22, 1946.

Organizers reported that the concert raised enough money to give a cup of hot chocolate per day

---
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\(^{166}\) Library and Archives Canada (hereafter LAC), MG30 C132, Emil Kutscha fonds, vol. 1, Canadian Society for German Relief, letter of incorporation.
for one month to students at a school in the hardest hit part of Germany. The following May, the Kitchener branch boasted that its fundraising efforts were so successful that it was able to feed 200 German children daily.

The activities of the CSGR quickly expanded. The society lobbied the Canadian government to allow German immigrants to come to Canada. In December, 1948, the society sent a delegation to meet with Minister of Resources J. A. MacKinnon to discuss German immigration. When the government once again permitted German immigrants, the CSGR and the city’s other German organizations provided assistance to those wishing to come to Canada. They also worked with Anglo-Canadian organizations to provide citizenship training for new immigrants. At the Concordia Club’s annual meeting in January, 1950, for example, members voted to provide assistance to German immigrants “by teaching them the customs of this country and the English language, through lectures and other means.” Four months later, the Concordia Club and the Kitchener Council of Friendship held a “New Canadian Night.” During the evening, W. P. Clement of the Council of Friendship, translated by Dr. Albert Hess, informed the immigrants of the many services available to them to assist their becoming established in Canada. According to the *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, “the speaker stressed that with co-operation between the council and the club the newcomer is not only warmly welcomed but he soon learns
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169 In his history of the Canadian Society for German Relief, Gottlieb Leibbrandt argues that the government’s decision to permit German immigrants was partly due to the efforts of the society. “German Relief Body Kept Busy,” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 18 February 1949; Leibbrandt, 25 Jahre, 32.
170 The city’s other German organizations also made contributions to the CSGR for relief in Europe. LAC, MG28 V28, Canadian Society for German Relief fonds, vol. 2, Kitchener-Waterloo Branch, *Canadian Society for German Relief, Inc. Monthly Bulletin*, vol. 1 no. 12, September 1948, “Immigration Department,” UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4; Concordia Club, Series 1.6: Organization and Administration: Annual and General Meetings, File 132 Protokoll Buch des Concordia Club Ltd. Kitchener (Ont.) (Minute Book) 1931-1959, Vorstandssitzung 27 November 1949.
the customs of his new home.” On December 24, 1951, the Concordia Club, the CSGR, and the Council of Friendship held a Christmas Eve dinner for 220 new German immigrants. Between enjoying the food which was donated by local businesses and singing German Christmas carols, Henry Kern, president of the Concordia Club, addressed the assembly. Kern implored the new immigrants “to become good Canadians and to appreciate the benevolence of the government which has made their arrival in Canada possible and also to appreciate the freedom of a great country.”

The ethnic elite therefore functioned as what Franca Iacovetta calls “gatekeepers,” working to ensure that new immigrants conformed to the ideals of Canadian citizenship. At the same time, however, the ethnic elite sought to shape Canadian public opinion towards Germans so that they would be more readily accepted as citizens. This is best demonstrated by the Canadian Society for German Relief’s monthly bulletin. Although it was initially printed entirely in German, in 1948, the society began printing its bulletin primarily in English with some articles in German. The March 1948 bulletin explained the reasoning behind this decision. The bulletin, it explained, was not simply for communicating with the society’s members. Rather, it was intended to carry “the truth on the real conditions in Germany to truth-seeking readers outside our membership and try to foster understanding and friendship with a new peace-loving democratic

173 Iacovetta defines this category broadly to include all those responsible for shaping immigrants’ lives and enforcing the Cold war consensus, such as: Canadian overseas relief workers, journalists, embassy staff, ship chaperones, train escorts, teachers, government officials, the National Film Board, men’s and women’s service clubs, ethnic organizations, and professional and semi-professional social workers. Franca Iacovetta, Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2006), xii, 3-14.
Germany.” The CSGR therefore used the monthly bulletin to reach out to Anglo-Canadians to rehabilitate their image of the German people.

Towards this end, the bulletin portrayed the German people as victims of the Nazis and celebrated those who stood up to the Nazis. The March 1948 issue included an interview with Pastor Martin Niemöller who was imprisoned by the Nazis from 1938 to 1945. In it, Niemöller expressed joy at finding that a relief society had been formed in Canada. In the previous 14 years, he claimed, the German people’s minds had been warped by Nazi hatred. Those who helped provide relief to the German people, however, were undoing the damage wrought by years of Nazi oppression by helping the German people to “rediscover the existence of human kindness” and learn that they need not “despair of mankind.” The February 1950 issue was dedicated to the memory of Count Helmuth James von Moltke who “died a Christian martyr’s death when he was executed by the Nazis in January, 1945, for his part in the resistance movement against Nazi tyranny.” According to the CSGR, it was those who resisted, rather than those who supported the Nazis who represented the true spirit of the German people. This issue stated that “in men like Moltke, Delp, Goerder, Leuschner, Beck, Stauffenberg and Albrecht Haushofer who paid with their lives for their defense of human decency, Germany contributed its finest sons to the defense of Western civilization against Nazi tyranny as thousands today are giving their lives in the struggle against Communist tyranny.” The bulletin was even so bold as to describe these

men as “the real heroes of World War II,” rather than the Allied leaders who sold out the people of Germany to the Communists “for the sake of cynical opportunism at Yalta and Potsdam.”

The Canadian Society for German Relief was extremely and somewhat shockingly critical of the Allies for the way the war concluded. The bulletin criticized the western Allies for permitting the Soviets “to indulge in an orgy of vengeance which surpassed every precedent without ever uttering one word of protest or disapproval.” Thus, the German people, whom the CSGR claimed should be counted among the victims of the war, were also victims of the peace. Previously, the ethnic elite had focused on the adult male citizen to articulate their ethnic identity. Women and children, viewed as innocent, featured much more prominently in describing the victimhood of the German people. Nearly every issue of the bulletin devoted some space to describing the horrors perpetrated by the Soviets in the Soviet sector of Germany and later in the German Democratic Republic [DDR, 1949]. They described German men, women, and children working as slaves, given meagre rations, imprisoned, tortured, raped, and executed. Most sensationalist was the February-March, 1952 issue which claimed that the Soviets were aiming at nothing less than the “biological undermining of Europe” by importing millions of Chinese men into East Germany to take German women as their wives. Since the Middle Ages, the article claimed, Germany had guarded the west from Asian invasions. Roosevelt’s blunder at Yalta,

however, meant that “the wildest dreams of Genghis Kahn are coming true.” The Allies had not only imperilled the west to Communist incursion, but to barbarian hordes from Asia.

There were, however, heroes to be found amidst the chaos and suffering of postwar Germany. In the December, 1949 issue of the bulletin, Dr. Frank Schofield of Guelph gave an account of his travels through Germany the previous summer. He told the story of George-Irwin von Cardinal, the brother of the bulletin’s editor, who led a group of men, women, and children fleeing to western Germany at the close of the war. Along the way, they endured disease, the elements, and violence at the hands of Russian soldiers. The heroism of the German people was displayed in more mundane circumstances as well as these dramatic events. Schofield described conditions in a refugee camp barracks. While conditions were rough and modest, and families had but a few treasured possessions, he stated that “one could see that there was a genuine pride of possession, and all was neat and clean and tidy in good old German tradition.” Even though they were refugees without a home, the German people were still clean, proud, and industrious. In October, 1950, the bulletin printed a letter from a teacher in Eastern Germany. In it, he asked for newspapers and magazines so that he could teach his students about freedom in the west, untainted by Soviet propaganda. Before the letter, the CSGR characteristically included an introduction condemning the “Yalta and Potsdam betrayals” which had handed over this noble teacher and the rest of the people of Eastern Germany “to their present tyrants.”

In November, 1950, the CSGR sounded a hopeful note, claiming that Canadian leaders were finally beginning to realize that Germany could serve as a bulwark against the spread of communism. What is more, they realized that this could only be accomplished “through fair

economic and political principles,” and not “repression and exploitation.” The society welcomed any signs of better relations between Canada and Germany. The 800 families in Hanover who volunteered to take in Canadian soldiers over Christmas in 1951 were surely a sign of a growing German-Canadian friendship. According to the CSGR, many of these families were refugees who, although they had little themselves, wished to share it with the Canadian soldiers. They were brought together in the face of communist aggression, “realizing that the blunders of the past must now be forgotten in order to save the freedom of all.” The CSGR therefore claimed that greater cooperation between Canada and Germany on the international stage would result in mutual prosperity and, most importantly, security. It followed naturally that the acceptance of Germans as Canadian citizens would lead to prosperity and guard against communist subversion at home. In February, 1950, the bulletin published an article appealing for an end to all restrictions on German immigration. It argued that Germans were valuable citizens. The fact that a Northern Ontario mining company was trying to bring German scientific experts to Canada to help their operations proved that Germans were a boon to the Canadian economy. The role that Germans had historically played in Canada’s settlement and development supported this claim. Furthermore the stoic endurance of the people of Berlin during the Berlin airlift demonstrated conclusively that the German people were on the side of democracy. Among their many desirable traits, the heroism displayed by the German people standing up to the Nazis and the Communists, and persevering in the difficult postwar years made them ideal candidates for Canadian citizenship.

183 UW, FC 106.G3G4, Canadian Society for German Relief, Inc. Monthly Bulletin, vol. 5 no. 2 February-March 1952, “German-Canadian Friendship: Canadian Soldiers Receive Warm Welcome in Hanover.”
Canadian attitudes towards Germans rebounded relatively quickly in the postwar years. Already in October, 1946, a Gallup poll showed that only 34% of Canadians viewed German immigrants as undesirable. By comparison, 60% of Canadians saw Japanese immigrants as undesirable, while 49% of Canadians saw Jewish immigrants as undesirable. According to Donald Avery, by 1948, German immigrants were being trumpeted as “responsible, hard-working and industrious” in the Canadian press and even in the House of Commons. Orders-in-council in March and September, 1950 decreed that German nationals were no longer considered enemy aliens. German nationals were therefore once again permitted to immigrate to Canada, except for those who joined the SS prior to January 1, 1943 as well as higher-ups in the Nazi party or German military. The rehabilitation of the German people was aided by the advent of the Cold War. As the ethnic elite recognized, Canadians soon regarded their erstwhile ally the Soviet Union as the gravest threat to their way of life and saw Germany and the German people as essential for stemming the communist tide. In 1946, Britain began pressuring the Canadian government to accept German scientists, even though they were still considered enemy aliens. According to Norman Robertson, the Canadian High commissioner in London, Britain urged Canada to accept the scientists even when there was not a specific need for their expertise in order to prevent their falling into the hands of the Soviets. When the first scientists began arriving in Canada in May, 1947, it did not elicit the same controversy that it had previously in the United States. Donald Avery states that by this point Canadians were more concerned about keeping out communist subversives than Nazi collaborators.
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185 Avery, Reluctant Host, 158.
186 Those who joined the SS after January 1, 1943 were considered conscripts and so accepted as immigrants. Avery, Reluctant Host, 159-60.
187 Avery, Reluctant Host, 162-4.
Locally, in July 1951, a picnic organized by the Concordia Club for the German clubs of Kitchener-Waterloo, Hamilton, London, and Delhi symbolized the acceptance as Canadian citizens which Kitchener’s Germans attained in the postwar years. Crucially, this event was the first since the war which was attended by local members of parliament and the provincial legislature and city councillors. There were other guests of note whose presence demonstrated the renewed spirit of cooperation between Canada and Germany. Helmut Keune, the final German prisoner of war remaining in Canada, was one of the guests of honour. He was paralyzed in 1946 while working in a lumber camp and was allowed to remain in Canada after several German clubs collected money to ensure that he would not become a ward of the state. The consul general of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Werner Dankwart was also in attendance. He told the revellers that he looked forward to the day when Canada and Germany established normal diplomatic relations and re-established full economic relations. Edgar E. Gerwin, the press attaché for the consular office, informed the new immigrants of the valuable role that people of German descent had played in Canada’s development. He expressed confidence that “the energy and industriousness of the new immigrants would make another real contribution to Canada.”

Of course, not everyone was ready to accept the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. In March, 1952, shortly after Louis Orville Breithaupt was appointed as the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, a letter to the editor of a Toronto newspaper objected to bestowing this honour upon a “German from Kitchener,” calling it “a slight upon the people of Ontario.” The London Free Press, however, leapt to the defense of Breithaupt and the German community in an editorial subsequently reprinted in several Ontario newspapers. The editorial stated that a Breithaupt was present at Dieppe and he had continued to fight and inflict damage upon the Germans long after

---

188 UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds (Accrual 1), Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 8: Scrapbooks, letter to club members from das Picknick Kommittee, July, 1951; “Paralyzed Prisoner of War Attends Picnic,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 16 July 1951.
others had given up, until he was finally forced to surrender. At the time, he had two brothers waiting in England to fight, along with hundreds of other men of German ancestry. Fred Breithaupt wrote a letter thanking the Free Press for defending his family and his community. He pointed out that there were, in fact, 8 Breithaupts who served in the Second World War, including one, William Ransom Breithaupt, who died. Significantly, neither Fred Breithaupt, nor the Free Press editorial denied the German ancestry of the Breithaupt family. Instead, they highlighted the contributions of the Breithaupts and other Germans as Canadian citizens, contributions which often exceeded those of non-Germans.  
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Conclusion

In January, 1956, the annual general meeting of the national body of the Canadian Society for German Relief voted to change the name of their organization to the Canadian German Society. As the economic situation in Europe had improved and relief activities were no longer necessary, the society also decided to chart a new course, working for “mutual understanding and cultural exchange, both in Europe and Canada as well as consciousness of a particular German-Canadian past and future.” Henceforth, the monthly bulletin, which in 1954 had been renamed The German-Canadian Review, focused more on German-Canadian culture and history, and less on discussing current events in Europe.  

190 This reflected the fact that by the middle of the 1950s, the ethnic elite felt more secure as Canadian citizens. Although they continued to burnish their credentials as Cold Warriors, they did so less frequently and with less urgency. Concomitantly, they began to search for a new basis for their ethnic identity. Even in the early 1950s, the rough outlines of this new ethnic identity were beginning to take shape. At the Christmas Eve dinner held for newly arrived German immigrants on December 24, 1951, Concordia Club President  


190 Leibbrandt, 25 Jahre, 18, 41-2.
Henry Kern beseeched those gathered not to forget their heritage which “puts them in a position to make a fine contribution to Canada’s greatness.” Although many of the ethnic elite in previous decades had expressed the same sentiments, the specific contribution which he felt Germans were uniquely suited to make was novel. He proclaimed that from the folk songs which these immigrants brought with them “may some day come a Canadian symphony, while from the folk tales may come a Canadian saga.”

Rather than bringing with them the traits which allowed Canada to prosper as a modern industrial nation, Germans enriched Canada culturally. To find the source of these traits, the ethnic elite articulated a connection to Germany which reached farther back than they ever had previously, before the Nazis and the German Empire, to a simpler time. In doing so, they transformed Germans from a modern, industrious people, to jovial peasants.

Chapter 5: “A Strong Thread in the Fabric of our Canadian Unity,” 1950s-1970s

On July 5, 1952, more than 4,000 people, including representatives of the local, provincial, and federal governments, gathered at the Waterloo County Fish and Game Association grounds to celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of the arrival of what were said to be the first German settlers in Canada at Lunenburg, Nova Scotia in 1752.¹ The Lunenburg Germans, whose existence the ethnic elite had scarcely acknowledged previously, were suddenly heralded as founding fathers of Kitchener’s, and Canada’s, German community. In celebrating this imagined connection to the Lunenburg settlers, the ethnic elite claimed a place for Germans as Canadian citizens based on their deep roots in Canada, while also distancing themselves from the Germany of the twentieth century which had made German ethnicity problematic. Aside from resurrecting the memory of these long-forgotten German settlers, however, this celebration signaled a significant new departure in how the ethnic elite conceived of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship.

Speaking at the Fish and Game Association grounds, Professor Herman Boeschenstein of Toronto proudly stated that Germans had given to the world great contributions in music, philosophy, art, and science. He lamented, however, that when Germans came to Canada, “these things were too often forgotten in the rush for material things.” He implored his fellow German Canadians to reclaim this great cultural heritage. In doing so, they could teach Canadians “the art of enjoying leisure time without resorting to the ‘canned’ methods of entertainment.”² In the festschrift for the Lunenburg bicentennial, Anna K. Hess listed the contributions that German

¹ The celebration in Waterloo County was one of several which took place across Canada. Representatives of Kitchener’s German community were present at the main national celebration which took place in Winnipeg. “Political Alliance Out For Canada Germans,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 7 July 1952; Archives of Ontario (hereafter AO), F1405, Multicultural History Society of Ontario fonds, Series 60: German Canadian Papers (hereafter MHSO), F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 1, newspaper article from Winnipeg, July 1952, “C.G.A. Resolution Bars Reds Joining.”
² “Political Alliance Out For Canada Germans,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 7 July 1952.
immigrants and their descendants had made to Canada. She began with the artists who were founders and members of the Canadian Academy of Fine Arts, such as Wilhelm von Boll-Merczy and Otto Reinhold Jacobi who served as the president of the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts from 1890 to 1893. These men, all men, were followed by a parade of great German-Canadian musicians, scientists, and politicians. The final and shortest paragraph described the men who had contributed to Canada’s industrial development. These men, such as Adam Beck, once lauded as the heart and soul of the community, were now almost an afterthought.

The version of German ethnicity expressed by the ethnic elite in the postwar decades was based upon celebrating German culture, as opposed to celebrating racial attributes such as thrift and industry as in previous decades. By the mid-1950s, the stigma of the Second World War had largely faded. Kitchener’s Germans felt secure enough in their place as Canadian citizens that they no longer felt the need to assert their status as the consummate Cold Warriors. The ethnic elite therefore claimed a place for Germans as Canadian citizens by trumpeting their contributions to Canada’s cultural development. The contributions to material prosperity which they had previously celebrated were hollow unless Germans also were recognized for contributions to Canada’s cultural and spiritual prosperity. Germans, however, were not the sole agents of Canada’s cultural development. An article in the Canadian Society for German Relief, Inc. Monthly Bulletin on the Lunenburg bicentennial stated that Germans “have helped to make this ‘Canadian mosaic’ richer, this thrilling mosaic to which with all other ethnic groups the Germans have added and are still adding their share—the cherished cultural heritage of their homeland, their religious beliefs, their skills and their industry.”

In stark contrast to previous
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4 University of Waterloo Doris Lewis Rare Book Room (hereafter UW), FC 106.G3G4, Canadian Society for German Relief, Inc. Monthly Bulletin, vol. 5 no. 4 Summer 1952, “The two hundred years and what they meant.”
 decades when the ethnic elite only sought to make room for Germans as Canadian citizens, the ethnic elite now emphasized the cultural contributions of Germans alongside other ethnic groups. They once again reformulated their ethnicity and contribution as Canadian citizens to fit a newly emerging national identity.

Historians have portrayed the postwar decades as a time when the hegemonic understanding of Canadian identity which stressed Anglo-conformity came under increasing fire and eventually collapsed. George Richardson, for example, argues that in the years 1945 to 1970, schools in English Canada sought to preserve a Canadian identity based on a nostalgic connection to the British Empire in the face of forces such as the growing influence of the United States, ethnic pluralism, and Quebec nationalism which threatened to undermine it. José E. Igartua, meanwhile, contends that English Canada retained a British identity until the 1960s when it was “abruptly discarded” as evidenced by developments such as the adoption of Canada’s maple leaf flag.

Bryan Palmer argues that, as a result of the upheaval of the 1960s, Canada’s British identity was replaced with uncertainty as to what it meant to be Canadian. More commonly, however, historians argue that Canada’s British identity was replaced by one which accepted and even celebrated ethnic pluralism. They cite several factors which changed the attitudes of both Anglo-Canadians and non-British, non-French ethnic groups, accounting for the emergence of a pluralistic identity in the postwar decades. The horrors of the war allegedly made racialism and
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6 C. P. Champion, argues that embracing ethnic pluralism was a fulfillment, rather than a rejection, of one version of Britishness which emphasized principles such as the “liberal empire,” fair play, broadmindedness, and diversity. José E. Igartua, The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71 (Toronto: UBC Press, 2006), 4-5; C. P. Champion, The Strange Demise of British Canada: The Liberals and Canadian Nationalism, 1964-1968 (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2010), 9-10, 138-9, 231.
racial discrimination unacceptable in public life. As well, the Cold War era underscored the importance of democracy which “lay the groundwork for an emphasis on equality, tolerance, and anti-authoritarianism.” These developments helped to change the attitude of Anglo-Canadians to non-British, non-French ethnic groups and challenged the hitherto dominant belief in Anglo-conformity and superiority in Canada. Turning to the ethnic groups themselves, historians argue that in the postwar decades they increasingly “began to demand that they be recognized, in all of their distinctiveness, in the public life of their country.” This was, in part, a result of decolonization movements, as well as Communist regimes in Europe “obliterating national cultures,” inspiring ethnic groups to preserve their cultures in Canada. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, which initially ignored the contribution of non-British, non-French ethnic groups to Canadian life, provoked leaders of ethnic groups to challenge the two nations idea, resulting in the declaration of the federal policy of multiculturalism in 1971.

John English and Kenneth McLaughlin suggest that Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest emerged suddenly at the end of the 1960s, when the rise of multiculturalism made the public expression of German ethnicity acceptable again. However, rather than simply responding to the rise of multiculturalism Kitchener’s Germans played a role in making it the basis of Canada’s identity. The Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians (TCA), an umbrella organization unifying German Canadians and their clubs and organizations across Canada, founded in Kitchener

---


in 1951, contributed to multiculturalism as state policy through lobbying the Canadian government to end discrimination and make laws more receptive to the needs of immigrants and ethnic communities, taking part in government-sponsored conferences on citizenship and immigration, and testifying before the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.\textsuperscript{11}

At the local level, Kitchener’s Germans contributed to the emergence of a Canadian citizenship and identity which was multicultural in practice long before the official policy. Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest therefore did not emerge as a response to multiculturalism. It was the highest expression of a multicultural vision of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship which the ethnic elite had proclaimed since the mid-1950s.

\textbf{From a Modern, Industrious People to Jovial Peasants}

In 1953, Professor Clive H. Cardinal of the University of Manitoba wrote an article in the \textit{Canadian Society for German Relief, Inc. Monthly Bulletin} imploring German Canadians to follow their Ukrainian-Canadian fellow citizens in preserving their language and folk traditions.

In previous decades, Ukrainians had been seen as inferior to Germans. Cardinal, however, praised Ukrainians, stating that they did an excellent job of passing a knowledge of and reverence for their folk culture from generation to generation. By contrast, Germans were too often indifferent or even hostile to their own culture. Maintaining folk traditions, however, was not just for the sake of the ethnic group. According to Cardinal, it was vital for Canada’s development; various

\textsuperscript{11} The TCA was founded on November 30, 1951 and received its letters patent on September 25, 1952. Library and Archives Canada (hereafter LAC), MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, “Memorandum of Agreement,” 30 November 1951, Kitchener; Letters Patent, 25 September 1952; “Statutes of the Canadian-German Alliance;” “National Citizenship Seminar—Minaki, Ont. August 24-28\textsuperscript{th}, Programme;” “Report to the annual convention of the Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians in Kitchener, Ontario on November 15 1958;” “Report to the Annual Convention of the Trans-Canada Alliance of German-Canadians, held at Kitchener, Ont. on November 14/15 1959; “Brief Submitted To The Royal Commission On Bilingualism and Biculturalism By The Trans-Canada Alliance of German-Canadians,” 28 June 1964; letter Michael K. Oliver, Director of Research, Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to Karl Heeb, 28 October 1965; see also, correspondence between Herbert Eckhusen, Chairman, Immigration Policy Committee, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians and Department of Citizenship and Immigration.
ethnic groups were working together to build Canada into a great nation. He cited other intellectuals who shared the notion that Canada’s spiritual strength lay in its diverse ethnic traditions.\footnote{The intellectuals Cardinal cited were: former Quebec Premier Adélard Godbout; J. M. Gibbon, author of “Canadian Mosaic;” Dr. Frank Foulds, director of the Citizenship Bureau in Ottawa; and Dr. Watson Kirkconnell, President of Acadia University. Although Cardinal cited these men as supporters of pluralism, Carmela Patrias notes that they still maintained Eurocentric, “contradictory” attitudes towards race. She states that their efforts to combat discrimination largely ignored non-Europeans, while Kirkconnell even espoused a belief in the superiority of some groups, such as Anglo-Saxons, over others. AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 4, Canadian Society for German Relief, Inc. Monthly Bulletin, vol. 6 no. 2, Summer 1953, “Das kulturelle Leben der Kanadier deutscher und ukrainischer Herkunft;” Carmela Patrias, Jobs and Justice: Fighting Discrimination in Wartime Canada, 1939-1945 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 113-31.}

The melting pot, with its soulless, homogenized, modern mass culture, was the antithesis of the multicultural mosaic, comprised of folk cultures. In The Quest of the Folk, Ian McKay states that the idea of the “Folk” required an antithesis which was defined as “‘unnatural,’ cosmopolitan, uprooted, and unwholesome.” Commonly, Jews were derided as the anti-Folk.\footnote{Ian McKay, The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1994), 13.} In this instance, it was the United States, home of the melting pot, fountainhead of modern mass culture. Cardinal argued that the preservation of folk traditions was urgent in the face of the corrupting forces of the modern world, which threatened to stunt Canada’s spiritual and cultural growth. A homogenization of culture would lead to “cultural bankruptcy.” Cardinal decried the “empty materialism” and “dime store and bargain basement mentality” of mass culture. Youth in particular, who were constantly being assaulted by magazines, comics, and pop music, needed to be taught to value folk culture and traditions.\footnote{Articles such as these demonstrate that, even though the Bulletin had yet to be rebranded as The German-Canadian Review, the publication was already shifting from focusing on current events in Europe to discussing German-Canadian culture and history. AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 4, Canadian Society for German Relief, Inc. Monthly Bulletin, vol. 6 no. 2, Summer 1953, “Das kulturelle Leben der Kanadier deutscher und ukrainischer Herkunft.”} That Cardinal identified Ukrainians as a group to emulate is unsurprising. Historians such as Aya Fujiwara and Gary R. Miedema state that in the
postwar decades, Ukrainian Canadians spearheaded the multiculturalism movement.\textsuperscript{15} Cardinal urged German Canadians to join Ukrainians in preserving their folk traditions and contributing to the formation of a multicultural identity. Demonstrating his belief in multiculturalism as the basis of Canadian identity, Cardinal claimed that this shallow, homogenized mass culture ran counter to “the true spirit of Canadianism which can only thrive in an atmosphere of unity in diversity.”\textsuperscript{16}

This attempt by the ethnic elite to promote German folk culture resonated with the ambivalence Canadians felt towards modernity in the postwar decades as well as the emerging understanding of Canadian identity based on cultural pluralism. In \textit{Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition, and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939-1970}, Philip Massolin studies a small group of social and moral critics including Harold Innis, Donald Creighton, Vincent Massey, and George P. Grant, unified by their conservatism based in Canadian toryism, and “their concerns over the dire effects of modernity and their desires to attune Canadians to the realities of the modern age.” They lamented the erosion of traditional values and the attendant rise of consumerism, materialism, and mass culture.\textsuperscript{17} In \textit{A Great Duty: Canadian Responses to Modern Life and Mass Culture, 1939-1967}, L. B. Kuffert examines a much broader group of cultural critics who, while drawn from across the political spectrum, “saw their visions of the desirable society and its culture as victims of what had become, by the 1940s, the modern status quo.” Rather than trying to force high culture upon the masses, however, they sought to offer a middlebrow alternative to mass culture.\textsuperscript{18} Although anti-modernism was not exclusively a

\textsuperscript{15} Fujiwara, \textit{Ethnic Elites and Canadian Identity}, 17, 156, 173, 181-2; Miedema, \textit{For Canada’s Sake}, 32.
\textsuperscript{16} AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 4, \textit{The German-Canadian Review}, Autumn 1954, “The Ukrainian Heritage in Canada and the Growth of Canadian Nationhood.”
\textsuperscript{17} Philip Massolin, \textit{Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition, and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939-1970} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 4-9.
Canadian phenomenon, anti-Americanism was prominent in its Canadian variant.¹⁹ The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, better known as the Massey Commission, decried the “homogenizing, and indeed stultifying, mass cultural influences emanating from the United States.”²⁰

Unease with the effects of modernity was not limited to the realm of culture, nor were those concerned restricted to the Canadian elite. Lara Campbell and Dominique Clément contend that in the 1960s, many Canadians struggled to come to grips with the conditions of modernity, such as “the ambiguous effect of progress, ambivalence towards scientific ‘expert’ authority, and alienation from a rationalized and bureaucratic welfare state and labour accord.”²¹ Ian McKay argues that the fascination of urban, middle class Nova Scotians with the countryside in the middle decades of the twentieth century, and the creation of “the Folk” by urban, middle class cultural producers represented a critique of modernity. The Folk, he says, were constructed as “the romantic antithesis of everything they disliked about modern urban and industrial life.”²² While Cardinal criticized the German community for forsaking its culture, the situation was not dire. He noted opportunities for the revival of German folk culture in Canada, praising Waterloo, Perth, and Wellington Counties as places where German folk traditions had endured into the twentieth century.²³ In another article from the *German-Canadian Review*, author J. William
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¹⁹ See, for example, Meredith Veldman, *Fantasy, the Bomb, and the Greening of Britain: Romantic Protest, 1945-1980* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

²⁰ Kuffert argues that historically, Canadian cultural critics did not believe that British culture was so debased, and rather viewed the United States as the source of degraded mass culture. Massolin, *Canadian Intellectuals*, 10; Kuffert, *A Great Duty*, 21-3.


²² McKay, *Quest of the Folk*, 4, 9.

Braun described some folk superstitions from Waterloo County, supporting Cardinal’s characterization of the region\textsuperscript{24}

Although Kitchener’s ethnic elite did promote German folk culture in the postwar decades, counter to what Cardinal claimed, this was a recent development. In previous decades, although they had frequently discussed the necessity of preserving German culture, the ethnic elite had never sought to preserve German folk culture specifically. Often, the ethnic elite’s efforts to preserve German culture blended contemporary, folk, popular, and high culture, making no distinction among them. The \textit{Sängerfeste}, of the nineteenth century, for example, combined the highbrow works of great composers with folk songs and patriotic and religious hymns. Moreover, despite the presence of folk elements, the \textit{Sängerfeste} and the \textit{Kirmes} of the nineteenth century celebrated the strength and accomplishments of modern Germany, not an ancient German folk culture. As well, the activities of the German clubs often had little to do with German culture and instead sought to preserve the German community and a sense of identity through social activities such as dances and banquets. During the 1952 Lunenburg bicentennial, when the ethnic elite first articulated an understanding of German ethnicity based on cultural, rather than racial attributes, the exact definition of culture remained ambiguous. Very soon, however, the ethnic elite began to focus on promoting and preserving German folk culture specifically. For them, folk culture embodied the timeless, authentic spirit of an ethnic group, untainted by mass culture. This primordial essence of Germanness, was also distant from the conflicts of the twentieth century\textsuperscript{25}.

Despite claims that the traditions which they introduced were authentic, the “revival” of German folk culture in Kitchener was an invention. A substantial portion of Kitchener’s Germans

\textsuperscript{24} AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 4, \textit{The German-Canadian Review}, Autumn 1954, “Waterloo County Superstitions.”
\textsuperscript{25} Ian McKay cites as one of the characteristics of the Folk “formula” a preoccupation “with essence—-with locating the genuine wisdom, the true and original ballads, the cultural bloodstream uncontaminated by the virus of modernity, the fixed and final forms of culture.” McKay, \textit{Quest of the Folk}, 275.
came from families which had resided in Canada for a generation or more. For them, the folk traditions which the ethnic elite resurrected had been lost and forgotten for decades. Furthermore, many traditions were regional. Kitchener’s Germans, however, did not hail predominantly from any specific region. They came from all over Germany as well as ethnic German enclaves across Europe. While the Concordia Club was open to all persons of German ancestry as well as non-Germans who supported the preservation of German culture, the other three major clubs, the Transylvania Club, the Schwaben Club, and the Alpine Club, all sustained regional identities.  

The Transylvania Club was comprised of Siebenbürger Sachsen Germans whose ancestors settled in Transylvania in present-day Romanian and Hungary in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The Schwaben Club was founded by Donauschwaben Germans whose ancestors settled in the Danube River valley in the eighteenth century. Members of the Alpine Club traced their origins to the Gottschee region of present-day Slovenia. A Siebenbürger Sachsen German thus had as much connection to the Bavarian Oktoberfest as an Anglo Ontarian did to Quebec’s Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day.

By mixing and blending all of these regional traditions together, the ethnic elite attempted to fabricate a single German folk culture. Richard J. F. Day states that after the Second World War, when it was no longer acceptable to define groups according to race, the Canadian government ceased using this offending term, replacing it with the more acceptable “ethnicity.” Thus, in 1955, a table compiled by the Immigration Branch labeled “Racial Origin of Immigrants

---

26 The Schwaben Club’s 1947 constitution required that the majority of its members be Donauschwaben, however up to one third of members could be other Germans. UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 1.1 Organization and Administration: Incorporation and Constitution, File 2 Satzungen (By-Laws), 4 May 1958; AO, MHSO, Series 60: German-Canadian Papers, John Mettler textual records, F1405-60-44, container MU9485, File 13, “Konstitution der Canadisch-Schwäbischen Kranken-Unterstützungs-Vereinigung von Kitchener, Ontario.”

by Nationality” was changed to “Ethnic Origin of Immigrants by Citizenship.” Apart from the title, however, the table remained the same. “As if by magic,” Day wryly states, “forty-six racial designations from Albanian to Ukrainian, became ethnicities.” In a similar manner, the ethnic elite replaced the racial attributes which they had previously ascribed to Germans with pan-German cultural attributes. Therefore, instead of bringing the Old World the values of thrift and industry, Germans brought charming songs, colourful dances, and boisterous festivals.

In the postwar decades, Kitchener’s German clubs founded groups to promote folk song and dance. By the early 1950s, the Transylvania Club already had several Kulturgruppen or “culture groups.” In May, 1951, even before the club was officially incorporated, its choir held its first “folk song evening.” In subsequent years, the choir, dance group, and brass band held regular performances at St. Peter’s Lutheran Church and took part in Kitchener’s celebration of the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II in 1953 and the centennial of the city’s incorporation the following year. The Kitchener branch of the Canadian Society for German Relief listed among its activities in 1954 a performance of the Bavarian/Alpine folk dance called the Schuhplattler, accompanied by Austrian and Bavarian folk songs. The performance apparently received a “raucous applause” from a sold out audience. At the national conference of the society the following year, the Kitchener and Toronto branches were lauded for their promotion of drama, folk dance, and musical evenings. In 1961, the Concordia Club founded its own Schuhplattler dance group known as the Almrausch-Schuhplattler (Alpine Delirium Schuhplattler). The club

31 AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 1, “Landestagung der Canadian Society for German Relief in Kitchener.”
founded a more general folk dance group in 1966, followed by the formation of a brass band in 1967.32

In 1953, the Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians held its first Sommerfest (Summerfest), an annual reunion which brought together Germans from across Ontario and occasionally farther afield. Also known as the Tag der Deutsch-Kanadier (Day of German Canadians), this festival was initially held in a different city each year. Its most frequent host, and eventually its permanent home, however, was Kitchener. In addition to holding sporting competitions and providing an opportunity for socializing and merriment, the festival was a showcase for Kulturgruppen from clubs across the province.33 One feature of the Sommerfeste and other performances by the Kulturgruppen which stood out to observers from the Record was the performers’ “colorful attire”.34 Participants in the Sängerfeste and Deutsche Tage of past decades had always worn their own contemporary clothing.35 Traditional costumes were only brought out for events such as the Kirmes, where the intent was to re-create the village life of bygone days. Now, however, Tracht was worn for every celebration and performance to show that folk traditions were still alive and well, not a relic. The Concordia Club’s folk dance group, for example, had costumes consisting of a blue dirndl with a white blouse and apron for women, and grey lederhosen, a white shirt, gold vest, and a green embroidered tie for men.36 The

35 See, for example, Leibbrandt, 100 Jahre Concordia, 8, 12, 42.
36 Leibbrandt, 100 Jahre Concordia, 66.
proliferation of *Tracht* even spawned a local cottage industry producing traditional German clothing.  

In the 1960s, the city’s German clubs broadened their repertoire beyond songs and dances to include other folk traditions. The clubs began celebrating what is now the most iconic of German folk festivals: Oktoberfest. The Oktoberfeste of the early 1960s were held sporadically, organized by an individual club, and typically lasted for one or two days, rather than ten. In 1962 the Schwaben Club held its own “October Fest” in the Kitchener Auditorium. To demonstrate the authenticity of their festival, the club advertised that it would include a shooting booth, the Alpine Club *Schuhplattlers*, and Joseph Spitzl and his Edelweiss Band “in costume.” The Transylvania Club followed suit, hosting an Oktoberfest in 1964.

In 1966, members of the Concordia Club organized the *Erste Karnevalsgesellschaft-Narrenzunft Concordia* (Concordia Mardi Gras Society), modeled after the Mardi Gras societies of the Rhineland region. The Concordia Club traced *Karneval* back more than one thousand years to the Roman occupation of the Rhineland. Although the original purpose of the pagan *Karneval* had long disappeared, the club claimed “this ancient worship has been maintained to the present day in the customs of the folk.” In 1969, the president of the *Erste Karnevalsgesellschaft-Narrenzunft Concordia*, Heinz Dienert, stated that their society’s intent was not to strictly copy the *Karneval* of Mainz or Cologne but to create a *Karneval* tradition in Kitchener.

---

37 In the 1970s, for example, the Transylvania Club’s monthly newsletter contained advertisements for a business which made traditional clothing for women. In October, 1971, the *Record* interviewed local retailers who stated that they had sold hundreds of lederhosen and dirndls which were either imported or made locally. AO, MHSO, Series 60: German-Canadian Papers, F1405-60-106, Transylvania Club textual records, MFN306, reel 44, “Transsylvanien-Klub Nachrichten;” “Is K-W’s beerfest becoming more German than Munich’s?” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 13 October 1971.


Karneval therefore drew on regional variants of the German Karneval. Every year, beginning in November and continuing until the start of Lent, the society held a series of whimsical events such as a city hall takeover and several balls including a masquerade ball. The program for the 1968-69 Karneval season promised to combat all “Philistines and killjoys” with “humour and gaiety.” The humorous songs, poems, and sayings which filled the program reinforced the message that the purpose of Karneval was silliness, not seriousness, frivolity, not industry.41

The German clubs also introduced more quaint traditions in addition to the raucous Oktoberfest and Karneval celebrations. On July 22, 1972, the Concordia Club held a Richtfest or topping out celebration at the club’s half-constructed new headquarters. The club’s former headquarters had been destroyed by a fire the previous November. This ceremony, which dated from the middle ages, involved raising a tree draped with streamers to the rafters of the building to signal that the frame of the building had been completed and it had reached its full height. The Record praised the ceremony as “a living link with a historic past” which demonstrated that the German community retained a “still-fruitful cultural vigor.”42 That September, the club also introduced the German practice of presenting students with Schultüten on their first day of school. These decorated cardboard horns filled with sweets and school supplies were given to all students entering the German Language School Concordia. An advertisement for the school


described the mythic origins of this practice.\footnote{The advertisement explained that centuries previously, in the mountains of southern Germany lived a magician. All of the local parents wanted their children to become his students so that they could gain access to the treasures of knowledge. On the joyous occasion when a boy was accepted, he was presented with a horn filled with fruits, sweets, and all of the tools required for learning, to symbolize his bright future. “Schulfest: The Magician’s Apprentice,” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 5 September 1972; Leibbrandt, *100 Jahre Concordia*, 71; Russ, *German Festivals and Customs*, 137-9; Schönfeldt, *Feste & Bräuche*, 403.} The school taught students about German culture. At one point, it organized a folk dance group and even put on a theatrical production of the Grimm fairy tale “Schneewittchen” (Snow White).\footnote{UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 3.1: Special Events and Projects: German Language School Concordia, File 148, *Festschrift 10 Jahre, 1981*.}

Franca Iacovetta argues that for postwar Southern Italian immigrants, holding onto aspects of their culture helped to mediate the transition from peasants to industrial workers.\footnote{Franca Iacovetta, *Such Hardworking People: Italian Immigrants in Postwar Toronto* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1992), xxiii-xxv.} By “reviving” their folk traditions, Kitchener’s Germans traversed this same path in reverse, at least symbolically. The performance of folk songs and dances, and the celebration of Oktoberfest and Karneval transformed Kitchener’s Germans from a modern, industrious people into jovial peasants. In the speeches and programs which accompanied their festivals and celebrations, the ethnic elite articulated a version of Canadian identity and citizenship which accommodated this new definition of German ethnicity. They also invited local, provincial, and federal politicians to take part in the German community’s festivals and celebrations.\footnote{In May, 1960, for example, in preparation for the upcoming Sommerfest in Kitchener, organizers sent a letter to O. W. Weichel, Member of Parliament for Waterloo North, asking for advice on which cabinet minister to invite to speak at the festival. In 1973, the Concordia Club even invited the Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Philip, to visit the club during its centennial year while on his royal tour of Canada. The invitation was unfortunately declined. LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, letter to O.W. Weichel, MP, 4 May 1960; UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 1.3: Organization and Administration: General Office Files, File 62: General Correspondence and Miscellaneous, letter from Buckingham Palace, Commander W. B. Willett, OBE, MUO, DSC, RN, 1 February 1973.} By inviting these dignitaries to take part the ethnic elite sought approval for their version of Canadian citizenship and identity. Through their speeches and messages of greeting which parroted the rhetoric of the ethnic elite, these representatives of mainstream Canadian society signaled their approval.
In April, 1966, Dr. Fritz Genzel, Director of the Goethe House in Montreal, delivered a lecture to the Kitchener branch of the Canadian-German Society on the topic “The German Contribution to Canadian Life.”\(^{47}\) In the past, the ethnic elite had claimed a place for Germans as Canadian citizens by showing “German” and “British” to be two parts of the same whole, and by touting their contributions to Canada in terms of fostering industries, supporting Canada’s war effort, or warding off communism. In the postwar decades, they continued to stress that Germans were loyal Canadian citizens, however now, the ethnic elite held enriching Canada culturally as the highest contribution which a citizen could make to the nation. Furthermore, the ethnic elite did not seek to claim a special place for Germans as Canadian citizens by reconciling their ethnicity with a hegemonic Anglo-Canadian identity. The Anglo-conformist understanding of Canadian identity had been largely discarded. Emerging in its place was ethnic pluralism. The ethnic elite contributed to the creation of this identity arguing that it was their difference, not their sameness, which enabled Kitchener’s Germans to fulfill their duties as citizens. In the program for Sommerfest in 1960 and again in 1961, TCA president Josef Strung thus declared that German Canadians had a duty to share their culture with the rest of Canada so that “through mutual exchange they make Canadian life richer and better for all.”\(^{48}\) Throughout the postwar decades, the mayors of Kitchener and Waterloo, members of the provincial and federal governments, and even Canada’s Prime Ministers praised Germans for their contribution to Canada’s “way of life.” In the program for the Concordia Club’s 1968-1969 Karneval season, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau declared that “Canada is a richer country for the effective role Canadians of German origin have played in her development. Our cultural diversity has been enhanced by your customs

---

\(^{47}\) AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 5, “To Members and Friends of the Canadian-German Society.”

and traditions.” He closed wishing for the Concordia Club and the Karnevalsgesellschaft to “continue to build on this foundation and remain a strong thread in the fabric of our Canadian unity.”

The program for the 1970 Sommerfest contained a retrospective on the accomplishments of the TCA since its creation in 1951. The list of accomplishments stressed the TCA’s cultural activities which the alliance maintained “contribute towards the enrichment of the whole Canadian nation and its ethnic mosaic.” It was not just in the postwar decades, however, that Kitchener’s Germans had helped to enrich Canada’s culture. The ethnic elite argued that this was a role which the Germans had in fact played since their first arrival. They therefore rewrote the history of Kitchener’s German community to be one of great cultural, rather than industrial, achievements. The program, for Sommerfest 1960, for example, claimed that the Sängerfeste of the nineteenth century had made Berlin renowned far and wide as a “centre for music” rather than for its industries. In this same program, Ellen Fairclough, federal Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, stated that the TCA’s annual Sommerfest continued “the ancient tradition of ‘Saengerfeste,’ of choir music, brass bands and merrymaking which was brought to Canada by your forebears more than a century ago.” These traditions, she maintained, “lent colour and gave pleasure to a period of hard and rather austere pioneer life, even as to-day they create a measure of goodwill and stimulate an appreciation of the many cultural facets of the Canadian nation.”


50 UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 4: Biographical, Historical, Topical Files, File 214: Local History: German-Canadian Day, German-Canadian Heritage Fest, “tag der deutsch kanadier 1970.”
For Fairclough, merrymaking rather than hard work stood out as the most notable trait of the
German settlers.\textsuperscript{51} Similarly, in 1969, Ontario Premier John Robarts stated that “festivals by
people of German heritage have been an invigorating part of life in Canada since the beginning of
European settlement in what is now the Province of Ontario.”\textsuperscript{52}

Crucially, the ethnic elite did not claim that Germans were uniquely or superiorly suited
to contribute to Canada’s cultural development. In his speech during \textit{Sommerfest} in 1969, TCA
President Henry Weisbach declared that Germans wished to preserve their culture as “part of the
Canadian Cultural Mosaic.”\textsuperscript{53} The following year, Weisbach stated that Canada’s culture was
made up of the “gifts” which different ethnic groups had brought with them to Canada. By
preserving their culture, Germans contributed their gift alongside those of other ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{54}

Historically, the ethnic elite had only sought to make room for Germans as Canadian citizens. In
the early interwar years, they had occasionally expressed the ideal of harmony between all races.
This, however, was a result of lingering tensions from the First World War and a need to be
delicate in asserting the place of Germans as Canadian citizens, rather than a genuine
commitment to ethnic pluralism. In the postwar decades, the ethnic elite claimed that Germans
contributed equally with all other ethnic groups to Canada’s cultural development and expressed
a truly multicultural concept of citizenship and identity. They began to do so in advance of the

\textsuperscript{51} Despite these claims, \textit{Sängerfeste} were not held in Berlin until the latter half of the nineteenth century, several
decades after the pioneer period. Furthermore, the Berlin of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was not
renowned for its cultural accomplishments, but as a burgeoning industrial centre. Events such as the \textit{Sängerfeste} or \textit{Kirmes} were, in part, used to promote the town’s industries. LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German

\textsuperscript{52} Robarts added that these festivals were “a colourful and welcome part of the many contributions made to the life
of the people of Ontario by those of German heritage.” LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German

\textsuperscript{53} LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, “Remarks of Henry E. Weisbach, President,
Trans Canada Alliance of German Canadians at the Annual Banquet of the Trans Canada Alliance in Kitchener,
Ontario, July 5\textsuperscript{th}, 1969.”

\textsuperscript{54} UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4; Concordia Club, Series 4: Biographical, Historical, Topical
Files, File 214: Local History: German-Canadian Day, German-Canadian Heritage Fest, “tag der deutsch kanadier
1970.”
The ethnic elite sought participation from more than just a handful of luminaries in their celebrations and cultural events. The ethnic elite advertised its events widely in the hopes of attracting the participation of the non-Germans. The ethnic elite’s turn to a fabricated folkish past did not impede its embrace of television to spread its faux-folk message. A commercial for Sommerfest 1961, for example, promised “sports, music, folk-dancing and colourful ceremonies,” urging viewers “Don’t miss it!”\textsuperscript{56} In some instances, non-Germans were even invited to participate actively, not just as spectators. In 1961, for example, the Fergus Junior Farmers square dance group performed at Sommerfest alongside German groups performing the Schuhplattler and other folk dances.\textsuperscript{57} With events such as a masquerade ball, Karneval provided an easy opportunity for non-Germans to take active part in a German celebration. For those unfamiliar with the German Karneval tradition, the program for the 1968-1969 season contained a list of key terms with English translations.\textsuperscript{58} This Karneval dictionary encouraged outside participation by introducing the uninitiated to some of the basic elements of the Karneval tradition. This ensured that the celebration was colourful but still accessible, not foreign. In 1972, the \textit{Record} reported...
that 550 people, many of whom were non-German, attended the masquerade ball at the Concordia Club.\footnote{UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 2: Concordia Sub-Groups, File 145, “500 whoop it up at masked ball,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 14 February 1972.}

By encouraging Canadians to take active part in their events, the ethnic elite blurred the lines between the German community and the rest of Canada, transforming ethnic German celebrations into Canadian celebrations. More than just seeking approval from mainstream Canadian society, the ethnic elite pitched their part of the mosaic into the cultural mainstream. At \textit{Sommerfest} in 1969, TCA President Henry Weisbach stated that the festival was “an invitation to all Canadians, new and old, to join us in preserving the great traditions on which this country has been built.” \textit{Sommerfest}, he hoped, would “become a traditional opportunity for all of us to join hands in our common endeavor to build the Canadian Mosaic into a meaningful community for all of us.”\footnote{LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, “Remarks of Henry E. Wesibach, President, Trans Canada Alliance of German Canadians at the Annual Banquet of the Trans Canada Alliance in Kitchener, Ontario, July 5th, 1969.”} These events were not just a site of cultural contact; they were a site of cultural synthesis, helping to forge a multicultural Canadian identity.

Demonstrating this multicultural identity in action, the ethnic elite even invited non-German participants to contribute their own unique traditions. In 1963, Julius Rauchfuss, President of the German-Canadian Choir Association, announced his intent to hold a \textit{Sängерfest} in Kitchener in 1966, reviving the tradition which dated back almost a century. Unlike the \textit{Sängerfeste} of the nineteenth century, however, Rauchfuss stated that he intended to include representatives of every ethnic group in Canada.\footnote{“International Saengerfest Planned for K-W in 1966,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 21 May 1963.} When the \textit{Sängerfeste} were incorporated into \textit{Sommerfest}, they continued to include performances from other ethnic groups.\footnote{“B.C. Choir Tops At Saengerfest,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 6 July 1970.} In 1973, TCA executive secretary Karl Heeb stated that the Alliance planned to expand the folklore program...
which had been recently added to the Sommerfest itinerary to include other ethnic groups. In recognition of the increasingly multicultural content of the festival, the TCA proclaimed its new slogan to be “Togetherness in diversified cultures.”

**Gemütlichkeit**

Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest did not emerge suddenly at the end of the 1960s in response to the rise of multiculturalism as John English and Kenneth McLaughlin suggest. It was, in fact, the highest expression of postwar German ethnicity, which had contributed to the formation of Canada’s new multicultural identity. Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest placed a greater emphasis on encouraging the participation of non-Germans than any other event put on by Kitchener’s German community in the postwar decades. As a result, Oktoberfest was massively popular, making it the most visible expression of German ethnicity in the postwar decades. This visibility extended across Canada. Oktoberfest’s popularity, furthermore, entrenched this ethnic German festival in the mainstream of Canadian culture. What began as an obscure local ethnic celebration was transformed into a Canadian festival recognized across the country, on par with other renowned festivals such as the Calgary Stampede and the Quebec City Winter Carnival.

Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest began in 1967 as a centennial project of the Concordia Club, although the first city-wide celebration did not take place until 1969. Gary R. Miedema argues that organizers of Canada’s centennial celebrations and Expo ’67 aimed to use the celebrations as “part of a larger effort to reimagine Canada as a pluralistic country, yet one united in its diversity.” This aim was evident in Kitchener where the weeklong festivities leading up to July 1, 1967 included a daily “ethnic concert and food fair” in Victoria Park. The “ethnic week” performances climaxed with a cast of 600 comprised of representatives of Kitchener’s different

---

64 Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake*, xvii-xviii, xix, 65, 114.
ethnic groups singing “This Land is Your Land” accompanied by folk dancers in traditional costumes. As early as 1964, the Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians, Canadian German Society, and Kitchener’s various German clubs began planning their own independent projects and celebrations for Canada’s Centennial year to demonstrate their commitment to a pluralistic Canada and their willingness to fulfill their duties as citizens. One of several projects undertaken by the Concordia Club was a “truly traditional ‘Oktoberfest.’” This four-day affair which included brass bands, folk dancing, a shooting booth, and, of course, plenty of German beer and food, generated a profit of $3207.44 which was donated to the K-W Big Brothers Association and the K-W Multiple Sclerosis Society. In light of the success, the Concordia Club decided to hold another Oktoberfest the following year. The second time around it was even more popular. On the final night, the Concordia Club Hall and beer tents were filled to capacity;


66 The local branch of the Canadian German Society planned to build a concert hall in Kitchener to emphasize the German contribution to Canadian life, however this proposal eventually fell apart. The TCA encouraged its member organizations to organize their own Centennial projects and sent out forms to each organization to gather information on their projects and help coordinate and support their efforts. Projects undertaken by the Transylvania Club included a Centennial Opening Ball, a “Folk Costume Festivity,” a theatre evening, and a Mother’s Day Honterus Festival. Those undertaken by the Schwaben Club included a day commemorating the first Donauschwaben settlers in Canada, an open house, and a children’s arts day. “67 Project Planned By German Society,” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 16 April 1964; AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 5, copy of letter sent by J. A. Surerus of Canadian German Society to heads of Kitchener-Waterloo German clubs, 1 June 1964; AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 9, “Minutes of Canadian German Society,” 10 June 1964, 26 October 1965; LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, Karl Heeb introductory speech at TCA annual meeting 17 September 1966; “Centennial Project Information;” “Trans-Canada Alliance of German-Canadians, Inc. and all affiliated organizations and clubs—Centennial Project Informations.”

would-be revelers had to be turned away. Once again, the profits were donated to charity, this time to the Canadian Cancer Society and the Kitchener Crippled Children Fund.⁶⁸

At this point, the Kitchener and Waterloo Chambers of Commerce took notice. They had been trying for more than a decade to cultivate tourism. While the area’s large German population seemed to offer a potential attraction, all previous attempts to market Kitchener-Waterloo’s German heritage, such as the vaguely Germanic “Winterfeste,” with its stout snowman mascot named “Schnickelfritz,” fell flat. Now they believed that the Concordia Club had hit upon a winning idea.⁶⁹ In July, 1969, the Concordia Club’s board of directors accepted the invitation of the city of Kitchener to hold its festival in conjunction with the city and the other German clubs.⁷⁰ Oktoberfest grew to become a citywide celebration, a joint undertaking of Kitchener-Waterloo’s German and non-German populations.

Like Sommerfest or Karneval, Oktoberfest was an expression of the ethnic elite’s conception of German ethnicity and Canadian identity. Promotional materials for Oktoberfest stressed that this local version of an Old World festival had “all the atmosphere and flavor of the original Munich Oktoberfest,” replete with folk dancers, brassy oom-pah bands, and traditional


⁶⁹ In 1957, the city of Kitchener adopted the slogan “Kitchener, the Unique City,” encouraged stores to place signs in their windows saying “Wie Gehts” in Gothic script, and also placed posters around the city with “Pennsylvania Dutch motifs.” In August, 1968, representatives of the two Chambers of Commerce even travelled to Hershey, Pennsylvania to study the city’s successful “Pennsylvania Dutch Days” festival. “Kitchener, Unique City’ Slogan Is Stamped on All C of C Mail,” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 8 April 1957; “Tours, Tourists Profitable to City,” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 4 July 1959; “Hershey’s Dutch Show Fires Up K-W Group,” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 26 August 1968; Kitchener Public Library, Grace Schmidt Room (hereafter KPL), MC 30, Ice-O-Rama (Winterfeste), press release, Owen H. Lackenbauer, Publicity Chairman-Winterfeste; UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 6.6 Sound Recordings: Sound Cassettes, Tapes 15, 16, Owen Lackenbauer, interview conducted by Frances Hoffman.

German food.\footnote{UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1970, “Fun For Everybody at Oktoberfest;” 1975, “The Pride of K-W—A Rich Cultural Heritage;” UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 3.1 Ephemera, File 1969 Brochures, “1969 Oktoberfest Kitchener-Waterloo;” File 1975 Brochures, “Canada’s Great Bavarian Festival.”} Traditional clothing, which became popular during the postwar decades, was ubiquitous during Oktoberfest. The official “Festival Hall Operators Manual” required that all employees “should be dressed in Dirndls, Lederhosen, Bavarian or ethnic costumes and Oktoberfest hats should be worn while on duty.” While stipulating that entertainment should be traditional, the manual allowed for some modern music “to suit the situation.”\footnote{Similarly, the Concordia Club required that bands playing during Oktoberfest had to wear “Bavarian type dress, that is, ‘lederhosen’ and white shirt for men, ‘dirndl’ dress for girls.” UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 3.2.1: Special Events and Projects: Oktoberfest: Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest, Inc., File 177 Seminar Reports, 1978, “Festival Hall Operators Manual (Revised May 18, 1976);” UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 1.2 Organization and Administration: Board of Directors, File 57 Board of Directors Standing Committees: Oktoberfest Committee, “Amendment to Agreement between Concordia Club and (band),” 1977.} Oktoberfest posters changed annually, but they generally contained the same elements which underscored the festival’s folk credentials, namely, men and women in lederhosen and dirndls, often holding large, ornate beer steins.\footnote{See, for example, UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 3.3 Posters, 1969; 1970; 1971; 1972; 1973; 1974; 1975; 1976; 1977; 1978.} In their zeal to recreate German folk traditions in Kitchener-Waterloo, Oktoberfest organizers occasionally introduced elements which were incongruent with the Munich event. In 1970, for example, they invited the man who played the Pied Piper of Hamelin for tourists in Hamelin, Germany to take part in Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest and serve as the parade marshal, blending traditions from different German regions.\footnote{The Piper arrived at Toronto International Airport in full costume and was greeted by 90 children from Kitchener-Waterloo singing “der Rattenfanger ist da” (the rat catcher is here). “Germany’s Pied Piper Coming,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 19 September 1970; “Pied Piper Greeted by 90 Children,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 8 October 1970.}

Brochures and programs for Oktoberfest proclaimed that the festival created “an atmosphere of comradeship and goodwill,” through its “warmth, charm and frivolity.” Oktoberfest, furthermore, was described as rollicking, yet also cozy, quaint, and intimate, harkening back to a time when fun was wholesome, unlike modern forms of entertainment. These
qualities, which embodied the “spirit of Oktoberfest,” could also be applied to the postwar understanding of German ethnicity itself.\textsuperscript{75} In the 1971 Oktoberfest program, Concordia Club president Ernst Bretschneider stated that German festivals and celebrations has been a central feature of life in Kitchener from the beginning. “To the Saengerfests of yester-year,” Bretschneider maintained, “the Concordia Club has introduced Mardi Gras festivities and Oktoberfest.”\textsuperscript{76} By claiming that Oktoberfest was a continuation of a tradition nearly a century old, Bretschneider portrayed the postwar understanding of German ethnic identity as timeless, ignoring any previous versions.

The entire ethos of Oktoberfest, and indeed the postwar concept of German ethnicity, could be summed up with a single word which served as the unofficial motto of the festival: \textit{Gemütlichkeit}, an abstract noun which translates roughly to coziness, amiability, or belonging. This word was omnipresent during Oktoberfest, appearing on posters and souvenirs and in brochures and programs.\textsuperscript{77} Since it had no direct translation from German to English, brochures and programs offered assorted definitions. Each revolved around the same concept. The program for 1970, for example, stated that during Oktoberfest, “hospitality is pronounced ‘Gemuetlichkeit,’ a German word meaning everything from ‘warm fellowship’ to ‘eat, drink and enjoy!’”\textsuperscript{78} The 1974 brochure asserted that “In Waterloo County we call this conviviality,


\textsuperscript{76} UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1971, “Greetings from Concordia Club President Ernie Bretschneider.”


\textsuperscript{78} UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1970, “Fun For Everybody at Oktoberfest.”
dancing and indulging ‘Gemütlichkeit’ [sic] – a German word for ‘good cheer’ and friendliness.”

In 1974, Oktoberfest organizers introduced a mascot named Onkel Hans, a rotund, mustachioed man wearing green lederhosen and a red Tyrolean hat, holding a sausage roll in one hand and a beer stein in the other. The following year, Hans was given a female counterpart named Tante Frieda, outfitted in traditional Bavarian clothing, a green dirndl with a lacy white apron. In December, 1975, the Oktoberfest board of directors made Hans and Frieda permanent fixtures. The two mascots, particularly Onkel Hans, became the festival’s most popular and enduring symbols, appearing on posters, programs, brochures, and souvenirs. The program for Oktoberfest 1974 which introduced Onkel Hans to the public stated that “The jolly little Bavarian…symbolizes the good times to be had everywhere during Oktoberfest.” Hans also, however, symbolized the ethnic identity which Kitchener’s Germans claimed in the postwar decades. Onkel Hans’s traditional clothing and jolly appearance evoked the folk customs and boisterous festivals which were central facets of the postwar identity. He was Gemütlichkeit personified. As a prominent, public representation of German ethnicity, Onkel Hans was a successor to the stern bust of Kaiser Wilhelm I which symbolized the thrift and industry of

---

79 This difficult to pronounce, difficult to translate word was used so commonly that it became part of the local lexicon, used even by non-Germans to describe the spirit of Kitchener-Waterloo generally, not just the German community. In 1971, Keith Hymmen, Member of Parliament for Waterloo North, stated that his intent in holding a pre-Oktoberfest party in the West block of the Parliament buildings in Ottawa was to show his fellow parliamentarians “a little Twin Cities gemütlichkeit [sic].” Similarly, in her welcome for Oktoberfest 1975, mayor Edith MacIntosh described Gemütlichkeit as representing the “true spirit” of the citizenry of Kitchener. UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 3.1 Ephemera, File 1974 Brochures, “Canada’s Great Bavarian Festival;” “MPs to get Oktoberfest taste,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 4 October 1971; UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1975, “Proclamation.”

80 UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1974, “A new symbol is born!”


84 UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1974, “A new symbol is born!”
Germans in the years prior to the First World War, and the Pioneers Memorial Tower which symbolized the benign, Mennonite-centric German identity of the interwar years.

Paradoxically, at the same time that they claimed Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest was a faithful recreation of the original Munich festival, Oktoberfest organizers also stressed that theirs was a distinctly Canadian celebration. The brochure from 1969 proclaimed that Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest was a “MADE IN CANADA version of a traditional German beer festival.”\(^{85}\) Similarly, beginning in 1970, the annual promotional poster billed Oktoberfest as “Canada’s great beer festival,” or, after 1973, “Canada’s great Bavarian festival.”\(^{86}\) Amid the oom-pah bands and folk dancers, organizers included elements which testified to the fact that Oktoberfest was distinctly Canadian. In 1969, Bobby Gimby, who wrote the song “Ca-na-da” for Canada’s Centennial in 1967, was the parade marshal for the first Oktoberfest parade. In 1970, Gimby was once again marshal, this time alongside the Pied Piper of Hamelin.\(^{87}\) The most explicit injection of Canadian content into Oktoberfest came in 1971. On the Tuesday of Oktoberfest that year, a citizenship court was held in the Concordia Club where 21 German immigrants were granted Canadian citizenship. An amused reporter from the Record observed that after Judge Alice McKeown called the court to order, those present continued to sip beer and smoke cigarettes. This was not the breakdown of authority, “but rather what the judge termed, ‘an effort to bring the Canadian citizenship court to the people.’” During the ceremony, the sight of McKeown and her RCMP colour guard against the backdrop of a beerhall bedecked in

---


Oktoberfest decorations reinforced the message that this festival was both a traditional German celebration and also distinctly Canadian.\textsuperscript{88}

The citizenship ceremony transformed 21 German immigrants from foreigners to Canadians. In emphasizing the Canadianness of their festival, the ethnic elite likewise sought to make Oktoberfest part of the mainstream culture, rather than a foreign custom. As Oktoberfest drew to a close in 1969, the \textit{Record} published an editorial which discussed the importance of this new festival. Traditions such as Oktoberfest, the editorial maintained, were not only meant to preserve the “lively culture” of the different ethnic groups who came to Canada, they were also meant to contribute to the formation of a Canadian identity. The author asserted that Oktoberfest “could become one of the building blocks in the reinforcement of the Canadian identity.”\textsuperscript{89}

At the citizenship court in 1971, Member of Parliament for Waterloo North Keith Hymmen, spoke about the duty of citizens to contribute to Canada’s multicultural development. He continued, stating that German immigrants had brought much of value from the Old World. Rather than qualities such as thrift and industry, however, it was their culture and traditions which Hymmen referred to and implored Kitchener’s Germans to use for Canada’s betterment.\textsuperscript{90}

Oktoberfest organizers therefore celebrated the role of the festival in promoting multiculturalism. The program for 1975 boasted that Oktoberfest gave Kitchener-Waterloo “an opportunity to show off its many talents which have evolved from a rich ethnic heritage.” In an appeal to those who preferred the superficial pleasures of modern mass culture, the program asserted that

\textsuperscript{88} The idea for the citizenship court apparently came from Richard Kemp, an employee at CKKW, a local TV station. The idea was then presented to and approved by the office of the court of citizenship and the Concordia Club board of directors. UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 1.2 Organization and Administration: Board of Directors, File 15 Meetings: Board Decisions 1971, 9 September 1971; “Oktoberfest means citizenship for 20,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 6 October 1971; “21 made citizens in beer hall,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 13 October 1971.

\textsuperscript{89} “Identity Found at Oktoberfest,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 18 October 1969.

\textsuperscript{90} “21 made citizens in beer hall,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 13 October 1971.
festivals such as Oktoberfest “prove that tradition and ethnic heritage can also be a lot of fun.”

By 1978, the Oktoberfest board of directors had even created an “Ethnic Development Committee.” This committee organized events such as “Trachtenfest” which brought together dance groups from various ethnic backgrounds to display “their finest native costumes while performing dances typical of their homeland.” The stated aim of Trachtenfest was to promote Waterloo Region’s multicultural heritage, rather than just the region’s German heritage.

Just as they had for events such as Sommerfest, the ethnic elite invited representatives of the mainstream society to take part and demonstrate their acceptance of the festival and the message it conveyed. In 1970, Governor General Roland Michener paid a visit. The following year, Ontario Premier William Davis attended, while in 1972, both Prime Minister Trudeau and Robert Stanfield attended. The mayors of Kitchener and Waterloo routinely took part in the festivities and organizers also sent complimentary tickets to local notables. To make Oktoberfest part of the mainstream of Canadian culture, however, organizers encouraged Canadians generally to take part in the festival, rather than just elites. The program for 1974 thus

proclaimed that Oktoberfest had “something for everyone. For the young and the young at heart; for every race, creed or colour.”

In 1967, the Record announced that the Concordia Club would be giving the city a “taste of old Bavaria” by throwing an “Oktoberfest,” putting the name of the festival in quotation marks. A poster for the Concordia Club’s Oktoberfest in 1968 announced that the club was hosting an “Octoberfestival.” Placing the name of the festival in quotation marks or Anglicizing the name suggested that Oktoberfest was still a foreign concept to most Canadians. To encourage participation in Oktoberfest, organizers first needed to make the festival familiar and intelligible to non-Germans. Just as with Karneval, it needed to be colourful but still accessible, not foreign. Promotional materials and newspaper articles defined important terms such as Gemütlichkeit and Ein Prosit! (cheers!). To strike a balance between “colourful” and “foreign,” promotional materials used a combination of English words and well-known Germans words, such as the article “die,” and German-English cognates, such as “Bier.” The poster from 1969, for example, proclaimed “K-W Oktoberfest ist wunderbar,” and “Don’t miss die Gemuetlichkeit.” Although the word Gemütlichkeit still would have been unfamiliar to most Canadians at this point, the rest of the poster, which included a smiling man wearing lederhosen and carrying a large stein, provided enough context that they could guess its meaning. Promotional materials also used German-sounding, but entirely fabricated words. A brochure for an Oktoberfest party hosted by Schneider Foods, for example, advertised that the event would include “Bier Schlopping,

96 “Twin Cities to Get A Taste of Bavaria,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 10 October 1967.
97 LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, “Kitchener Octoberfestival.”
Sausage Schmecking, Wine Zipping…[and] Zing Zongs.\textsuperscript{100} The intended meaning of these nonsensical words was easy to grasp. The brochure from 1969 explained a game where participants paid one dollar and were granted honourary “titles” based on how much of a stein of beer they could drink in one breath. These titles used a combination of familiar German words, German-English cognates, and made up, German-sounding words. Those who were able to drink an entire stein of beer earned the title of “Bier Doktor,” while those who could only drink half were called “Burp Meisters.” Those who drank less than half earned the unfortunate title of “Small Schlupper.” “Small Schluppers,” the brochure warned, “are very rare in Waterloo County and are regarded with suspicion by local Bier Doktors.”\textsuperscript{101} By explaining the origins and purpose of Oktoberfest, defining key terms, and utilizing familiar German words, German-English cognates, and made up German-sounding words, Oktoberfest organizers made the festival familiar, empowering non-Germans to participate.

Organizers encouraged Canadians to participate actively, alongside Germans, embracing German culture, and trying to look German. The program from 1974 urged newcomers to Oktoberfest to purchase a Tyrolean hat and beer stein immediately “so that you can’t be distinguished from the resident Bier Doktors.”\textsuperscript{102} Traditional German clothing, or \textit{Tracht}, was a must for everyone taking part in Oktoberfest. Accordingly, the Concordia Club offered lederhosen for purchase or rental for the night.\textsuperscript{103} Souvenir booths inside beerhalls also allowed patrons to purchase traditional German apparel and accessories such a Tyrolean hats, beer steins, cowbells, horns, and t-shirts which read “Kiss Me I’m German.” While not traditional, like

\textsuperscript{100} In another example of balancing “colourful” and “foreign,” the poster used a Gothic-style script, as opposed to the true Fraktur script which would be difficult for most Canadians to understand. UW, GA134, Schneider Family Collection, Series 14.07 Schneider, Norman C. (Norman Christoph), 1888-1985: Photographs, File 176 Schneider, Norman C. and Ethel: Oktoberfest: Host and Hostess of Schneider’s Oktoberfest Party Oct. 16, 1971, brochure.


\textsuperscript{102} UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1974, “Many souvenirs available during Oktoberfest.”

\textsuperscript{103} UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 1.2 Organization and Administration: Board of Directors, File 14 Meetings: Board Decisions 1970, 1 October 1970.
Tracht the latter still emphasized the insider status of the wearer.\textsuperscript{104} Pierre Trudeau, during his visit to Oktoberfest in 1972, was outfitted with a Tyrolean hat and a large beer stein. As a gift, the prime minister was also given a pair of boy’s lederhosen and a Tyrolean hat for his son, Justin.\textsuperscript{105} By making it available to everyone, Tracht was no longer a signifier of difference between the German community and the rest of Canada. Instead, it demonstrated the introduction of different ethnic groups in mainstream of society as part of Canada’s mosaic.

It was not enough for participants to look the part. To make Oktoberfest part of the mainstream, they needed to act the part as well. The brochure for 1969 therefore offered a primer on procedure. Along with explaining the “Bier Doktor” awards, it informed newcomers that they were supposed to take a drink of beer whenever the band played “Ein Prosit.” To emphasize the message that all participants were insiders, the brochure also included a card which made the holder an honourary member of the city’s four German clubs for the duration of Oktoberfest.\textsuperscript{106} Oktoberfest organizers annually distributed song sheets to encourage everyone to sing along with the lively drinking songs. In 1972, the Record printed 190 000 song sheets for distribution to patrons at 30 beerhalls and accredited drinking establishments. The song sheet was also included in the Oktoberfest program. It informed readers that Oktoberfest was most fun if they joined in. Typically, the majority of the selections listed on these song sheets were in German. The sheets, however, also included translations of classic German songs such as “Lili Marlene,” as well as some English-language songs including “It’s a Long, Long Way to Tipperary,” “This Land is Your Land,” and Bobby Gimby’s “Ca-na-da.” These non-traditional songs were included “For those revelers not of Teutonic ancestry and whose late evening tongues may have difficulty with

\textsuperscript{104} UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 7.1 Audiovisual: Photographs, File 293 Oktoberfest (year unknown), GA114-293:0070.
\textsuperscript{105} UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 7.1 Audiovisual: Photographs, File 302 Trudeau, Pierre Elliot, the Prime Minister at the Opening of the New Concordia Club—Oct. 6, 1972, GA114-302:0002; GA114-302:0005; “Trudeau has fun, ignores vote pitch,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 7 October 1972.
the more delicate syllables.” The 1973 song sheet even included phonetical transcriptions of German songs. “In München steht ein Hofbrau Haus” therefore became “In Moon-shen State Eyn Hof-Broi-House.” These song sheets made sure that there was “little excuse for not joining in.”

Along with the German-English cognates and well-known or fabricated German words used in promotional materials, they helped remove language as a barrier and signifier of difference between the German community and other Canadians.

Along with music, German food and beer were a starring attraction. The headline for a Record article previewing Oktoberfest in 1969 thus declared, “Oktoberfest a Time for Feasting.” The accompanying article described the myriad of German as well as Austrian, Hungarian, and Waterloo County specialties available throughout the festival. Similarly, the program for Oktoberfest 1970 proclaimed that “Everyplace in Canada has some attraction to which its residents point with pride.” In Waterloo County, it was food. Providing a critique of modern mass culture, the article added that “In the year of the fast snack and the corner take-out service, Sunday dinner at a Waterloo county [sic] home is still a memorable occasion.”

Franca Iacovetta and Valerie J. Korinek argue that food served as a site of contact between immigrants and the receiving society in which the food traditions of both were transformed through a dialectical, albeit unequal, relationship. At Oktoberfest, food was another venue through which Oktoberfest organizers sought to bring German culture into the Canadian mainstream. To make German cuisine part of the culinary mainstream, Oktoberfest organizers encouraged Canadians to

---


enjoy it year-round and in their own homes, not just within the confines of the beer hall and the 10-day festival. Towards that end, in 1970, they introduced cooking classes and demonstrations to the Oktoberfest schedule. The following year, they also created a special Oktoberfest cookbook. The book hailed sauerkraut, made “from dull and ordinary cabbage,” as “possibly the greatest gastronomical achievement credited to the Germans.” In another subtle jab at the superficiality of modern culture, the book stated that it was intended “for hearty appetites,” cautioning that it may not be good for “the increasing number of calorie counters.” To make German food more accessible to Canadians, the 95-page cookbook printed both the English and German names for dishes and also included a glossary of German culinary terms. The cookbook, which was included as a free insert in the Record, was popular enough that it sold an additional 2200 copies.

Oktoberfest organizers were remarkably successful in their efforts to encourage participation. The estimated attendance at the first citywide Oktoberfest in 1969, which lasted five days, was roughly 20,000. The following year, organizers expanded the festival to ten days and attendance skyrocketed to an estimated 175,000. Attendance climbed to 280,000 in 1971, and then again to 320,000 in 1972. In Kitchener-Waterloo, Oktoberfest became part of the fabric of local life. Local businesses got in on the act, advertising Oktoberfest sales, while restaurants and taverns offered Oktoberfest-themed menus and events. Service clubs and

---

114 “Festival a ‘Unifying Spirit,’” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 19 October 1970.
115 “Festival crowds top 280,000—best yet,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 18 October 1971; “Munich concedes we’re No. 2,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 16 October 1972.
116 Sometimes, the connection which businesses and restaurants had to Oktoberfest was tenuous as best. In 1970, the Prince of Wales Hotel in St. Agatha re-named its lounge the “Hofbrau Room.” In 1976, one restaurant advertised an
professional associations and even elementary schools threw their own Oktoberfest-themed parties. The latter, of course, were alcohol-free. In 1970, the Record reported that many downtown merchants came to work dressed in lederhosen and dirndls. Oktoberfest director Richard Hermansen commented that “Everyone has to turn up looking like a German even if his name is O’Brien.”

Oktoberfest’s renown, however, spread far beyond Kitchener-Waterloo. According to the Canadian census, the population of Waterloo County as a whole in 1971 was 254,037. A great number of those who took part in the festival therefore came from out of town. In 1970, many of these out-of-town visitors were forced to seek accommodations in Stratford, Guelph, and Galt as hotels in Kitchener-Waterloo were completely booked. The Record claimed that, “In just one year, Oktoberfest has changed from an obscure local celebration to an event of province-wide fame.” Oktoberfest in fact drew media attention from across Canada and the United States, not just Ontario. By 1972, CBC, NBC, Time magazine, and Life magazine had all written or broadcast stories on the festival. The National Film Board of Canada, making a film on festivals across Canada, came to Kitchener-Waterloo to document Oktoberfest. In 1976, CTV began


“Festival a ‘Unifying Spirit,’” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 19 October 1970.


“Lodging Almost All Taken,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 7 October 1970.

“Festival Fame, Agenda Grow,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 8 October 1970.

airing the Oktoberfest parade nationally. Oktoberfest organizers also entered floats in several out-of-town parades such as the annual Grey Cup parade, while contestants for the Miss Oktoberfest pageant came from all over Canada and the United States. Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest had developed a national presence. Cities across Canada, such as London, Toronto, and Calgary copied Kitchener-Waterloo and began holding their own Oktoberfeste. This German festival had thus become firmly entrenched in the mainstream of Canadian culture.

The Opponents of Multiculturalism

Despite its apparent popularity, Canadians did not universally embrace multiculturalism as the basis of their citizenship and identity. There were many who resisted the creation of a more open, inclusive Canadian identity and wished for a return to the old, exclusive identity. While Canadian immigration policy was dramatically reformed between 1952 and 1980 to get rid of racist and Eurocentric provisions, Donald Avery states that many Canadians were uncomfortable with the increasing number of immigrants from Asia, the Caribbean, Africa, and Latin America, and called for their numbers to be curtailed.

As will be shown, even after the federal and provincial governments adopted policies which supported a multicultural concept of Canadian

citizenship and identity, the actual practice of citizenship at the ground level occasionally fell short of this ideal. Thus, despite the support and participation of non-Germans in their activities, the place of Germans, and other ethnic groups, as Canadian citizens, was not always universally accepted.

In his editorial column in the *Kitchener-Waterloo Record* in August 1965, Sandy Baird noted that there were many people who objected to flying the German flag at the Kitchener and Waterloo city halls during the German-Canadian Day celebrations. One such person, identified only as a Kitchener housewife opined that “It’s no wonder nobody knows what a Canadian is. We don’t know ourselves. We have too little respect for her or her flag.” Sarcastically, she mused that Kitchener may actually be pioneering and that “perhaps each city and town can replace the Maple Leaf flag with their own choice, making sure our Canadian flag touches the ground so they can walk on it.” She concluded that ethnic groups need to “realize they are Canadians” and assimilate. This woman’s objection therefore was not to Germans specifically, but rather multiculturalism. Baird agreed with her sentiments. He argued that there were too many ethnic groups who “continue to carve Canada into assorted camps.”

In the opinion of Baird and this unnamed woman, a pluralistic Canadian identity was impractical, leading only to confusion and division. In spite of their objections, however, the German flag continued to be flown during the German-Canadian Day celebrations. Similarly, in October, 1970, a “Fed-Up Housewife” wrote a letter to the editor of the *Record* complaining about the posters which advertised Oktoberfest as “Canada’s great beer festival.” Oktoberfest, she stated, “is Germany’s beer festival, not Canada’s,” adding “I like to think I live in a Canadian city, not a ‘little Germany.’”

---

128 In 1973, the German flag flew next to the Canadian flag at city hall for 11 days in honour of the Concordia Club’s centennial. “City hall to fly flag of Germany,” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 4 July 1973.
Demonstrating her objection to a multicultural Canadian citizenship and identity, she argued that Kitchener-Waterloo should hold a festival with a Canadian identity, rather than a foreign one.\textsuperscript{129}

In defending their place as Canadian citizens, the ethnic elite did not employ such outmoded ideas as British “fair play” or the racial/familial relationship between Germany and Britain. Nor did they cite their community’s record of military service or their role in founding and supporting Kitchener’s industries. Instead, they pointed to the cultural contributions of Germans in Canada and reaffirmed their support for multiculturalism as the basis for Canadian citizenship and identity. Beginning in 1957, the Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians engaged in a protracted protest against the showing of “anti-German” films on television. The films in question were generally from or about the Second World War. In June, 1958, TCA Secretary Bernhard Stopp of Kitchener sent letters to the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company and the Proctor and Gamble Company of Canada, advertising sponsors during the showing of the 1941 drama “They Dare Not Love” on the CBC affiliate in Montreal. Stopp hinted at a potential boycott of their products and declared that the TCA’s only interest was seeing “our Canadian way of life be free of discrimination toward any class, race, or creed.”\textsuperscript{130} The TCA even pursued the matter as far as the federal Department of Citizenship and Immigration. On November 15, 1958, Herbert Eckhusen, chairman of the TCA Immigration Policy Committee, informed the alliance’s annual convention in Kitchener that the TCA and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration had reached an agreement upon “the necessity of avoiding, in a young country like Canada, things that do harm to national unity or which work against a particular ethnic group in Canada.


\textsuperscript{130} LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, 7 June 1958 letter Bernhard Stopp to The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company of Canada, Limited, c/o Mr. C. J. Coon Public Relation Dept.; 7 June 1958 letter Bernhard Stopp to The Proctor & Gamble Company of Canada Ltd., General Offices.
Controversy erupted again less than two weeks later, however, with the showing of the 1943 film “The Moon is Down” on CKCO-TV in Kitchener. On December 1, Stopp sent a letter to the station objecting to airing this film which he described as “detrimental to the social welfare and unity of this country.”

Significantly, these protests did not mention Germans specifically. Instead of singling out Germans as being deserving of protection, the ethnic elite appealed to a more inclusive idea of Canadian citizenship and identity, based on the belief that all racial, ethnic, and religious groups in Canada should enjoy equal status, free from discrimination. In January, 1960, TCA President Josef Strung wrote a letter to the Council of Christians and Jews. Just as they had invited other ethnic groups to take part in their cultural events, the ethnic elite also sought an alliance in combatting discrimination. In his letter, Strung deplored recent outbreaks of anti-Semitism in Canada and worldwide, calling on the federal government to punish those responsible for “inciting racial hatred.” He noted, however, that Jewish Canadians were not alone in experiencing discrimination as, for several years, films had been shown in theatres and on television “which have had the effect of inciting hatred against various ethnic groups in this country.” Strung therefore proposed a meeting with the Council of Christians and Jews “and

---

131 LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, “Report to the annual convention of the Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians in Kitchener, Ontario on November 15 1958.”
132 LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, 1 December 1958 letter Bernhard Stopp to Station CKCO-TV.
133 LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, 1 December 1958 letter Bernhard Stopp to John Wintermeyer, M.P.P.
other ethnic groups who have been affected, so that a united front may be presented against those elements that degrade and libel the minority groups for ulterior purposes.”

Among a shrinking, but vocal, segment of Canada’s population, the centrality of beer in the jovial postwar German identity was still something which jeopardized Germans’ acceptance as Canadian citizens. Craig Heron states that between the 1930s and the 1970s, Canadians generally adopted a more permissive attitude towards alcohol. Drinking, he says, “was once again a respectable part of the mainstream of Canadian social life.” Nevertheless, strident anti-booze crusaders remained an influential force in Canadian politics and society. Temperance advocates had helped to defeat Ontario premier George Drew in his own riding in the 1948 elections, despite the overall victory of his Progressive Conservative Party. In Kitchener, in a referendum held on May 30, 1957, voters narrowly approved the licensing of dining lounges but rejected the licensing of cocktail bars. This conflicted attitude towards drinking was reflected in the government’s treatment of drinking establishments. In the postwar decades, beer parlours were granted greater leeway and were permitted to serve snacks and play recorded music while lounges were allowed to offer live entertainment, let men and women drink together, and serve meals as well as spirits in addition to wine and beer. The regulation of such establishments, however, “was as rigid as ever.” According to Heron, applications to open a drinking establishment were “scrutinized rigorously” and the number granted were kept to a minimum. Women were not allowed to serve alcohol and liquor board inspectors were even given the authority to assess “the moral content of live performances.”

134 LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, January 1960 letter Josef Strung to Council of Christians and Jews (draft).
135 Craig Heron, Booze: A Distilled History (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2003), 299.
136 Heron, Booze, 320.
137 On both questions, the vote was within one percent of the 60 percent required for approval. “‘Wets’ May Request Cocktail Bar Recount,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 31 May 1957.
138 Heron, Booze, 321.
As the German cultural event most associated with the consumption of alcohol, Oktoberfest became a lightning rod for those who opposed alcohol. In the early years of the festival, the *Record* was inundated every October with letters to the editor condemning Oktoberfest as immoral, sinful, and counter to Canadian values. One author who claimed to represent thousands of people in Kitchener-Waterloo who were opposed to Oktoberfest, called alcohol “our worst scourge” and questioned how many Kitchener-Waterloo residents truly wished for this festival to be their claim to fame.\(^{139}\) Letters such as this rejected Oktoberfest a proud marker of group identity. The starkest rejection of Oktoberfest as something fundamentally un-Canadian came from the Women’s Christian Temperance Union. In 1970, Mrs. Edward Bush, president of the Kitchener branch, patronizingly professed that Oktoberfest “can be a wonderful thing for foreign people who have been used to it, and we love them, God bless them. But we’re against it.”\(^{140}\) To critics such as the WCTU, Oktoberfest was a foreign practice which had no place in Canadian society.

Although the ethnic elite chose not to engage with these individual critics, they could not take the same attitude in dealing with Ontario’s liquor authorities. In order to practice their culture, the ethnic elite had to provide justification to the Liquor License Board of Ontario (LLBO). In a letter to the LLBO in September, 1974 requesting permission to serve alcohol on Sundays, Heinz Temmel, manager of the Concordia Club, argued, as the ethnic elite had done in the past, that the way Germans drank promoted proper family values rather than undermining them. Being allowed to serve alcohol on Sundays, he suggested, would encourage families to come to the club to share a meal together. He claimed that “it is our intention to emphasize the

---

\(^{139}\) Another letter sarcastically declared “don’t worry about it if we’re known as beer-guzzling Germans or the drunken city of Canada, who cares what we’re known as, as long as we are having fun.” “Letters: The Oktoberfest image,” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 15 October 1971; “Letters: Oktoberfest renamed Oktoberfarce,” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 9 October 1971.

\(^{140}\) “Oktoberfest ‘Excuse For Getting Drunk,’” *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, 5 October 1970.
German feeling for family-life—and Sunday is ‘The’ family day.” ¹⁴¹ More commonly in the postwar decades, the ethnic elite appealed by stressing the cultural contribution that Germans made to Canada’s mosaic. In applying for a permit to operate a beer garden during Sommerfest, for example, TCA Executive Secretary Karl Heeb described, at length, the role of the TCA and the celebration which it sponsored in supporting German culture “in all spheres of Canadian life.” ¹⁴² In July 1974, Heinz Temmel asked for permission to entertain 80 French-Canadian exchange students, who were not of drinking age, in the downstairs lounge and dining room of the Concordia Club where alcohol was served, rather than in the great hall. Temmel reasoned that entertaining the students in the cavernous hall, which had a capacity of 400, would deny them the opportunity to experience “the atmosphere of hospitality and ‘Gemütlichkeit’ we Germans are famous for.” ¹⁴³ The ethnic elite also sought support from non-Germans in asserting their place as Canadian citizens to the liquor authorities. In 1974, prior to a hearing with the LLBO, which ultimately resulted in the Concordia Club having its liquor license suspended for one week, several prominent citizens wrote letters coming to the defense of the club. These letters from figures such as Fire Chief E. A. Johnston, Mayor Sid McLennan, MPP James R. Breithaupt, and former Mayor and MP Keith Hymmen, generally spoke of the club’s role in enriching the cultural life of the city. ¹⁴⁴

¹⁴² LAC, MG28 V4, Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians fonds, 12 May 1969 letter Karl Heeb to G. Gertley, c/o LCBO.
Despite the efforts of the ethnic elite to negotiate an accommodation between their culture and Canadians’ social mores regarding drinking, the German clubs came in frequent conflict with the province’s liquor authorities, particularly during Oktoberfest. On September 30, 1970, the LLBO banned the official Oktoberfest promotional poster. The poster, which depicted a young woman in a dirndl carrying six steins full of beer with the caption “Canada’s great beer festival,” apparently violated a law which banned the outdoor advertising of alcoholic beverages. LLBO chairman James Mackey later stated that the offending poster could be shown within licensed establishments, however the word “beer” still needed to be removed. The LLBO also declared that it would deny liquor licenses to operate beer tents, however Mackey backtracked on this decision somewhat as well. He stated that the Concordia Club, which had planned to operate two tents, would not need a license since the tents could be considered an extension of the club. Any freestanding tents, or those attached to non-licensed buildings, however, would find their applications denied.\footnote{Critics of the ban charged that Mackey was attempting to defend public morals by banning the poster on the grounds that it depicted a woman in a low-cut dress holding beer. Provincial Secretary Robert Welch denied this accusation. “Oktoberfest Beer Posters Banned,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 30 September 1970; “Beer Poster Ban Called Ridiculous,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 1 October 1970; “‘Stupid’ Poster Ban May Bring Changes,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 7 October 1970.} While Oktoberfest officials initially attempted to tread lightly, stating that they accepted the ruling, Kitchener Mayor Sid McLennan blasted the decision.\footnote{“Beer Poster Ban Called Ridiculous,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 1 October 1970.} Provincial Secretary Robert Welch offered to meet with McLennan to discuss the province’s liquor laws in light of the mayor’s protestations. Welch added that the government was willing to consider possible accommodations for “foreign customs.”\footnote{“Welch, Mayor Will Discuss Liquor Law,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 2 October 1970.} This telling statement by Welch showed that, in the eyes of the province’s liquor authorities, Oktoberfest was still a foreign custom.

Newspapers across Ontario, meanwhile, took notice of the ban and roundly castigated Mackey and the LLBO. The \textit{Globe and Mail} reasoned that denying licenses to operate beer tents
made sense since “canvas walls are incapable of keeping out evil spirits.” Allowing the offending posters to hang in bars was also logical since any people in there were already depraved beyond redemption.\textsuperscript{148} Although there were initially concerns that the poster ban would hinder the ability of Oktoberfest organizers to advertise the festival, the controversy it generated had the opposite effect. The \textit{Stratford Beacon-Herald} opined that the city of Kitchener should actually thank Mackey and the LLBO for bringing such great publicity to its festival. “Oktoberfest,” the newspaper claimed, “thanks to the board, is no longer a quaint word used only by those beer-drinking, fun loving people of Kitchener.”\textsuperscript{149} In its zeal to defend Canadians’ morals against destructive foreign influences, the LLBO had inadvertently helped to bring this local ethnic festival into the mainstream.\textsuperscript{150} The poster ban, however, was simply the first salvo in a long conflict.

The nadir of this conflict came at Oktoberfest 1973. Prior to the festival that year, James Mackey called a meeting with Oktoberfest officials. In order to comply with the Liquor License Act, Mackey banned the “Bier Doktor” awards, the games of chance which had been used to raise money for charity, and the use of the word “beerhall,” forcing organizers to switch to the more neutral “festhall.” Mackey also warned that hall operators would lose their license if they were found to be in violation of any part of the Liquor License Act. Oktoberfest organizers


\textsuperscript{149} “Top Oktoberfest Publicity,” \textit{Kitchener-Waterloo Record}, 5 October 1970.

accepted Mackey’s decisions and described the meeting as amicable. Both sides also promised better dialogue to prevent future “misunderstandings.” An incident on the first night at the Kitchener Auditorium Annex, however, resulted in the Transylvania Club, which operated the hall at this location, having its license for the venue revoked. Adding insult to injury, the LLBO prevented the workers at the hall from seeking employment at another venue for the duration of the festival and would not let the Transylvania Club sell its excess food to another hall. The club was also stuck paying for the rental of the hall and refunding hundreds of tickets.

Accounts of what actually occurred during this “incident” varied considerably. They ranged from that of the Transylvania Club which claimed that only eight people had been arrested that night: one for fighting, five for drinking outside the designated area, and two for drunkenness, to the Record which reported that fights had taken place in the parking lot, to Mackey who described the affair as a brawl involving an unruly mob of 200-300 people. This confusion was made worse when Mackey initially did not provide an explanation as to why the club had lost its license. Unsurprisingly, Transylvania Club and Oktoberfest officials felt aggrieved. An article in the Transylvania Club’s monthly newsletter titled “The truth about Oktoberfest 1973,” described the LLBO’s actions as “absolutely arbitrary” and in violation of all legal principles. It added that Mackey was a well-known opponent of ethnic clubs who interpreted the law according to his own wishes. He wanted to make an example in Kitchener and

he chose the Transylvania Club without any justification. Similarly, an unnamed festhall operator complained to the *Record* that Mackey was “trying his best to kill every ethnic festival in the province.” Hall operators and patrons also complained about abuse and harassment by overbearing liquor inspectors who were killing the spirit of the festival. Even liquor inspector Jim Gilliland felt that the Transylvania Club was dealt with harshly. Although he was also critical of Oktoberfest officials, in an interview conducted in 1994, he described the Transylvania Club’s punishment as a “raw deal.”

Kitchener’s German clubs chafed under the province’s stringent liquor laws outside of Oktoberfest as well. These laws treated ethnic clubs the same as social clubs, only allowing entry to members and guests, and preventing guests from purchasing drinks. This discouraged non-members from patronizing ethnic clubs and taking part in their events. The business of non-members was an important source of revenue for the German clubs. Therefore, along with encouraging the segregation of ethnic groups from the rest of Canada, Ontario’s liquor laws undermined the financial viability of ethnic clubs. Although Kitchener’s German clubs certainly were not without blame in their relationship with the province’s liquor authorities, the

---

156 Gilliland also admitted that there were occasionally problems with liquor license inspectors abusing their privileges. UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 6.6 Sound Recordings: Sound Cassettes, Tapes 37, 38, Jim Gilliland, interview conducted by Frances Hoffman, 18 April 1994.
apparently heavy-handed actions of the LLBO made the clubs feel as though they were being unfairly singled out, giving the impression that Germans and their customs were unwelcome and foreign.

Craig Heron argues that in the late 1960s and early 1970s, when movements such as women’s liberation stood up against authoritarianism and inequality, and Canadians’ attitudes towards social matters such as divorce and homosexuality became more liberal, the moralizing, authoritarian laws regarding alcohol came to be seen as increasingly outmoded. The ethnic elite gladly joined in attacking what they considered to be unjust laws. The province’s liquor laws, they argued, threatened the very existence of their ethnic clubs and hence the ability of Germans to practice and maintain their cherished culture. The ethnic elite therefore contended that Ontario’s archaic liquor laws “defeated” multiculturalism. In February, 1975, Concordia Club President Utz Aysslinger complained to the Toronto Star that ethnic groups “are being told constantly by the federal and provincial governments that it is important to share our culture, our hospitality, our traditions with the rest of the community,” yet the provincial government’s own laws prevented it. According to the Star, the leaders of other local ethnic clubs, who declined to go on record, agreed that changing the law would help them to “play the role that they have been told is theirs in a multicultural society.”

The ethnic elite repeatedly petitioned the federal and provincial governments, pointing out this apparent failing of their multiculturalism policies. Following the debacle of Oktoberfest 1973, the German-Canadian Business and Professional Men’s Association sent a letter to the provincial Minister of Consumer Affairs and Consumer Relations, John Clement. The letter

---

158 Heron, Booze, 332-3.
began by stating the contribution that Germans and their Oktoberfest celebration made “to the federal and provincial multicultural program to weld a people of varied origin into a democratic nation.” Members of the association were therefore “perplexed, irritated, and deeply troubled” that the LLBO “tried everything possible to destroy the aim of this great festival.” Aside from preventing Kitchener’s Germans from practicing their culture, this letter also asserted that in preventing those who worked at the Auditorium Annex from working at another hall, Mackey had “arbitrarily revoked the work permit for an entire ethnic group.” This violated the Canadian Bill of Rights and the Ontario Human Rights Code, denying Germans their rights as Canadian citizens.160 Prior to the 1974 federal election, Concordia Club manager Heinz Temmel sent telegrams to Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau and Conservative leader Robert Stanfield asking what they planned to do “regarding Ontarios [sic] ridiculous liquor laws which seriously jeopardize multicultural development by providing civil servants with opportunity to harass and discriminate at their whim.”161 In October of that year, the Concordia Club sent to every member of provincial parliament a copy of the club’s history, produced for its centennial the previous year. The accompanying letter prompted parliamentarians to “note the pervading theme of the contribution to the community and multi-cultural development of our Canada.” It also stressed the characteristic German spirit of *Gemütlichkeit* and hospitality, stating, “to us as to most ethnic clubs of European background an attitude of exclusiveness is essentially foreign.” The club was not meant solely for Canadians of German ancestry. Rather, it was a “manifestation of our willingness to share our blessings and to extend our friendship to our fellow-Canadians

regardless of their ethnic backgrounds.” The Concordia Club therefore urged members of parliament to change the province’s liquor laws which hurt Canada’s multicultural development by discouraging non-members from participating in ethnic celebrations.162

In July, 1975, provincial parliament passed a new Liquor License Act. Later that year, James Mackey resigned as chairman of the Liquor License Board.163 The TCA, however, complained that the new Act still did not address the concerns of the German community. In a brief submitted to the Ontario Liquor Advisory Council, the TCA stated that “the new Liquor License Act and its regulations do not appear to provide a way that ethnic groups can give their contribution on a wide range to the general cultural development.”164 The province’s liquor laws, therefore, still conflicted with the ethnic elite’s conception of their place within a multicultural Canada. Despite this, the relationship between the German community and the province’s liquor authorities slowly improved. The ethnic elite, for their part, actively worked to create an accommodation between the two parties. In 1976, in an effort to heal past wounds, the Schwaben Club invited a local liquor inspector to officially open the club’s Oktoberfest celebrations.165 Jim Gilliland was also made a member of an Oktoberfest advisory committee to help resolve any problems regarding drinking. According to Gilliland, over the years, Oktoberfest organizers gradually “cleaned up their act.”166 In seeking a détente with the province’s liquor authorities, the

163 “Mackey to quit as liquor license head,” Globe and Mail (Toronto), 31 October 1975.
164 AO, MHSO, Series 60: German-Canadian Papers, F1405-60-22, Elizabeth Ruge textual records, MFN30, “T.C.A. Ontario-Branch, 1st Draft of Brief for submission to The Ontario Liquor Advisory Council.”
The Limits and Contradictions of Multiculturalism

In July, 1952, at the national celebration of the bicentennial of the Lunenburg Germans in Winnipeg, those present, which included representatives of Kitchener’s German community, passed a resolution which barred communists from joining the Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians. This resolution was at odds with the professed belief in an inclusive Canadian identity which was central to the postwar concept of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship and identity. It demonstrates, however, that even among supporters of multiculturalism, there were limits or conditions to the inclusiveness which they were willing to accept. Gary R. Miedema argues that, in trying to make state-sponsored public religion inclusive to all religions, public officials excluded groups who refused to downplay aspects of their faith which divided rather than unified Canadians. He states that, paradoxically, in their effort to eliminate religious discrimination, “federal state officials in fact continued to use religious discrimination as an essential tool for that task.”

Multiculturalism, furthermore, is not a monolithic concept. The understanding of multiculturalism and what it entailed could vary from region to region, ethnic group to ethnic group, and even within a group. Embracing one version of multiculturalism often entailed the suppression of other versions. Aya Fujiwara argues that Japanese, Ukrainian nationalists, and Ukrainian communists each developed their own understanding of

---

167 According to former Oktoberfest chairman Jack Bishop money was the great equalizer. In an interview conducted in 1992, he stated that after a few years, opposition to Oktoberfest died down as people saw the benefits which it brought to the community in terms of profits for local businesses and also donations to charity. He also credited the improved relationship between Oktoberfest and the LLBO to Oktoberfest organizers becoming more careful and conscientious with regards to alcohol and also to LLBO regulations gradually evolving. UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 6.6 Sound Recordings: Sound Cassettes, Tapes 17, 18, 19, Jack Bishop, interview conducted by Frances Hoffman, 3 August 1992.

168 AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 1, newspaper article from Winnipeg July 1952, “C.G.A. Resolution Bars Reds Joining.”

169 Miedema, For Canada’s Sake, 204.
multiculturalism which was responsive to the needs to their specific community. It was the Ukrainian nationalist version, however, which came to dominate in the multiculturalism movement and was reflected in the official policy of multiculturalism. \(170\)

Multiculturalism could also have the unintended consequence of promoting conflict between ethnic groups rather than harmony. In *Old Wounds*, Harold Troper and Morton Weinfeld examine the “dark underbelly of multiculturalism” which allows ethnic groups to transplant conflicts from the Old World to the New World. Multiculturalism, they state, encourages groups to retain their sense of shared identity and history. When two groups have competing understandings of history, it produces conflict. In the case which Troper and Weinfeld study, the conflict was over a perceived history of wrongs suffered by Ukrainians and Jews at the hands of one another stretching back centuries. This conflict, the authors argue, becomes a major dilemma of policy making in a society which is multicultural both in ethnic diversity and in ideological commitment. \(171\)

Chris Kostov, meanwhile, examines conflict over Macedonian identity in Canada to show that even the definition of who belonged to an ethnic group could be contested terrain. On the one hand, he states, were left-wing, pro-Yugoslavia ethnic Macedonians who argued that Macedonian was a distinct ethnic identity. On the other were right-wing Bulgarian nationalists who saw Macedonia as a Bulgarian region, and immigrants from Greek Macedonia who saw themselves as Greeks. The latter two groups sought to block any recognition of

\(170\) Royden Loewen and Gerald Friesen argue that in postwar Winnipeg, immigrants developed their own “Winnipeg variant of Canadian pluralism.” In *Nationalism from the Margins*, Patricia K. Wood distinguishes between multiculturalism as the lived experience of Italian immigrants in western Canada, the vision of Canada articulated by these immigrants, and the official policy of multiculturalism. She argues that Italians in the west “were already operating with a strong sense of their ethnic heritage and within a multicultural discourse, long before they were acknowledged by Ottawa.” Fujiwara, *Ethnic Elites and Canadian Identity*, 155-6, 173, 181-2; Royden Loewen and Gerald Friesen, *Immigrants in Prairie Cities: Ethnic Diversity in Twentieth-Century Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 97; Patricia K. Wood, *Nationalism from the Margins: Italians in Alberta and British Columbia* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002), 79-80, 98.

Macedonian as a distinct ethnic identity. Kostov shows that, in Canada, the battle for state recognition as a distinct group within the Canadian mosaic and over access to resources for multicultural development has allowed this conflict not just to survive, but to flourish.\textsuperscript{172}

Finally, a commitment to multiculturalism did not necessarily mean an end to inequality. Himani Bannerji for example, contends that multiculturalism as an official policy contains “an element of racialized ethnicization” which whitens those of European descent and darkens others. Bannerji adds that multiculturalism fractures people along the lines of ethnicity and thus prevents the formation of class or gender consciousness to address other (interrelated) forms of inequality. Finally, Bannerji argues that multiculturalism perpetuates inequality by transforming structural and ideological causes of inequality into “immutable differences of ethnic cultures.”\textsuperscript{173} Miedema, additionally, states that, while the Canadian Interfaith Conference was meant to encourage religious pluralism, the positions of power within it were all held by Roman Catholics and mainline Protestants, members of the old guard.\textsuperscript{174} Multiculturalism, like other versions of Canadian identity and citizenship, had its own limitations and contradictions. Despite their rhetoric of inclusion and equality, the concept of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship expressed by the ethnic elite in the postwar decades was still exclusionary. The ethnic elite excluded anyone, such as the aforementioned communists, who threatened to disturb the status quo in Canada and thus jeopardized the acceptance of Germans as Canadian citizens. They also papered over divisions within the German community, suppressing any alternate versions of German ethnicity.


\textsuperscript{173} Himani Bannerji, \textit{The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender} (Toronto: Canadian Scholars’ Press Inc., 2000), 6-9.

\textsuperscript{174} Miedema, \textit{For Canada’s Sake}, 206.
There were many members of the German community who opposed the postwar ethnic identity which highlighted the cultural contributions that jovial Germans made to the Canadian mosaic. Among the letters to the editor of the Record protesting against Oktoberfest were several by persons of German ancestry. In one such letter, the author expressed disgust that the names of pioneers such as Weber, Schneider, Erb, and Eby were mentioned in the Oktoberfest cookbook “as the founders of our modern day Sodom and Gomorrah.” This writer objected to associating German ethnicity with the debauchery of Oktoberfest. Rather, he espoused support for an older version of German ethnicity which emphasized the thrift and industry of the German people. “Never,” he stated, “did these hard-working, law-abiding, God-fearing pioneers envision this type of idolatry.” Waterloo County, he maintained, was indebted to these hardy pioneers who founded their prosperous industries and farms.175

There were others who objected, not to celebrating Oktoberfest, but to the close involvement of non-Germans in the organization, planning, and execution of the event. According to Günter Jessat, president of the Concordia Club from 1973 to 1974, these critics believed that Oktoberfest was something which the Germans had brought with them to Canada and so it should remain theirs. They accused the ethnic elite of “[giving] Oktoberfest away to the Canadians.” Contrasting with this isolationist view of the relationship between the German community and the rest of Canada, Jessat willingly embraced cooperation with non-Germans. Non-Germans, he stated, were better connected to businesses and to the government and so helped the festival to grow and navigate challenges such as those with the LLBO. Cooperation

with non-Germans therefore helped to integrate Oktoberfest, and the German community, into Canadian society, making them, in Jessat’s words, “a little block in the mosaic of the country.”\(^{176}\)

One of the most prominent fault lines dividing the German community, which the ethnic elite were forced to contend with, was according to the region from which individuals or their ancestors had come.\(^{177}\) The Transylvania, Alpine, and Schwaben clubs all proudly asserted their own distinct regional identities. They held celebrations, for example, in honour of important figures in their own local history such as Johannes Honter, a Siebenbürger Sachsen humanist and reformer.\(^{178}\) In June, 1960, the Transylvania Club hosted the first Siebenbürger Heimattreffen. This reunion, which became an annual tradition, brought together Siebenbürger Sachsen from across Canada and the United States with the goal of preserving their unique customs and traditions.\(^{179}\) Similarly, in the 1960s, the Schwaben Club began hosting and taking part in an annual Donau-Schwaben Sommerfest.\(^{180}\) In November, 1969, the Transylvania and Schwaben Clubs together held a “musical remembrance” to commemorate their expulsion from their respective homelands 25 years previously. The songs performed on this occasion such as


\(^{177}\) There were other divisions within the German community. In an interview from 2002, Wilfred Hornung, president of the Concordia Club in 1958, stated that in the 1950s, there were conflicts between prewar immigrants and new immigrants over the leadership of the club. UW, GA114, Concordia Club Fonds (Accrual 4), Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 7.4: Sound Recordings: Audio Cassettes, File 28 Hornung, Wilfred, president 1958, interviewed 13 September 2002.


\(^{180}\) AO, MHSO, Series 60: German-Canadian Papers, F1405-60-44, John Mettler textual records, container MU9485, File 12, 1962 Donau-Schwaben Sommerfest poster; File 14, 1970 Tag der donauschwaben program.
“Donauschwäbische Volkshymne” (the Donauschwaben Anthem), demonstrated their distinct regional identities.¹⁸¹

Identification as Donauschwaben, Siebenbürger Sachsen, or any other regional identity, however, did not preclude identification as part of a larger pan-German community. As has been shown, these clubs willingly participated in events such as Sommerfest and Oktoberfest and embraced the concept of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship which they conveyed. They were also all members of the Trans-Canada Alliance of German Canadians. The Transylvania Club boasted that, after the Second World War, when animosity towards Germans in Canada had receded, they immediately and enthusiastically answered the call to join the TCA and unify Canada’s Germans.¹⁸² As well, alongside their celebrations of their own regional figures, the German clubs held celebrations in honour of pan-German idols such as Schiller and Mozart.¹⁸³ The city’s German clubs even considered the idea of merging into a single body. Members of the Transylvania Club, for example, twice voted in favour of proposals to merge with the Concordia Club. In both instances, however, nothing came from this initial burst of support.¹⁸⁴ In 1971, after the Concordia Club was destroyed by a fire, there was consideration of building a common facility for the city’s clubs, yet once again the proposal fell by the wayside.¹⁸⁵

The fact that these discussions of merging never came to fruition demonstrates that there were limits to the willingness of the clubs to work together. Moreover, there were tensions,

¹⁸¹ AO, MHSO, Series 60: German-Canadian Papers, F1405-60-106, Transylvania Club textual records, MFN 306, reel 31, “Heimat im herzen.”
¹⁸⁴ In 1955, club members voted 16-10 in favour of merging with the Concordia Club. In 1961, the vote was 12 for, 6 abstaining; AO, MHSO, Series 60: German-Canadian Papers, F1405-60-106, Transylvania Club textual records, MFN306, reel 44, “Transsylvania-Klub Nachrichten,” July 1971; September 1971.
jealousies, and rivalries between them. In 1970, Oktoberfest organizers chose Yvonne Thomas of Hamilton as the model for their soon-to-be-infamous promotional poster. Although Thomas was of Dutch rather than German ancestry, she was selected because organizers did not want to create animosity by choosing a model from one of the city’s German clubs over the others.\textsuperscript{186} To preserve the unity of the German community, the ethnic elite therefore selected a non-German outsider to serve as one of their most visible symbols. This was not the only instance where they were forced to navigate the, at times, difficult relationship between the German clubs. In an interview conducted in 1992, former Oktoberfest director Jonas Bingeman stated that it was important that Oktoberfest was not solely in the hands of the German clubs. Much like the Germans of Europe, he claimed, they did not get along.\textsuperscript{187} The rivalry between the clubs was on clear display in the brochure printed by the Concordia Club for Oktoberfest 1975. In it, the Concordia Club asserted its preeminence over the city’s other German clubs, claiming to be “The genuine German Center in North America” and the originator of K-W Oktoberfest. The brochure vowed “we never copy—we originate.” The Concordia Club was therefore the only venue which could offer visitors an experience which was “genuine, true and real.”\textsuperscript{188}

This brochure is a rare example of the divisions between the clubs boiling over into the view of the public. The ethnic elite generally did not permit any alternate conceptions of German ethnicity in the official script of their events such as Oktoberfest. The ethnic elite therefore sought to suppress regional divisions within the German community. They did not, however, deny the existence of regional German identities. Instead, the ethnic elite celebrated the unique contribution each group made to German ethnic identity and emphasized their harmonious

coexistence. The 1970 Oktoberfest souvenir program, for example, asserted that the Transylvania Club was known for its pretty women and food such as goulash, cabbage rolls, and stuffed peppers. The Schwaben Club was renowned for its schnitzel, sauerbraten, and strudel, while the Alpine Club’s claim to fame was its dance groups. Lacking a distinct regional identity, the Concordia Club was simply known for having the largest facilities and for holding the first local Oktoberfest in 1967. In 1972, Oktoberfest organizers purchased 200 custom screen printed banners to decorate the streets of Kitchener and Waterloo during the festival. These banners contained heraldic symbols drawn from across Germany, such as the Berlin bear, the Munich monk, the Nuremberg eagle, the Hamelin rat, the blue and white of Bavaria, and the German eagle. Although the original Oktoberfest is a strictly Bavarian festival, the comingling of these regional symbols demonstrated the diversity and harmony of Kitchener’s German community.

The ethnic elite also once again claimed Mennonites as Germans. They did not completely subsume the Mennonites as Germans, however, as they had in the decades prior to the First World War. Instead, the Mennonites retained some of their distinctiveness and existed alongside the different regional identities as a component part of German ethnicity. The Oktoberfest cookbook thus contained several dishes identified as Pennsylvania Dutch delicacies. Programs also urged tourists to visit “Mennonite country” which formed “an important part of [Waterloo] Oktoberfest.”

190 In 1971, Oktoberfest director Owen Lackenbauer travelled to Munich to study the original festival and ensure that this Canadian offshoot remained “authentic.” He quickly noticed, however, that differences between Canada and Germany in matters such as “liquor laws, eating habits and personal tastes” had required some changes and adaptations. These differences were not a weakness, however. Rather, they had ensured that the festival “blended very well into our North American way of life.” Therefore, while Kitchener’s Germans came from all over Europe, not just Bavaria, and made their own unique contributions to the local Oktoberfest, particularly in terms of food, this was a strength which distinguished Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest from the original and identified it as a German-Canadian festival. “Ja! Oktoberfest ist festier mit all der eye-popen German banners,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 4 October 1972; UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1971, “Will Success Spoil K-W Oktoberfest?”
County’s character and charm.” In celebrating the diversity and harmony of the German community, the ethnic elite suggested that German ethnicity itself was a multicultural mosaic.

Controlling the image of Oktoberfest and preserving its supposed authenticity was an overriding concern for Oktoberfest organizers. The ethnic elite claimed a monopoly on authenticity. In so doing, the ethnic elite left no room for any alternate versions of German ethnicity, implying that they were inauthentic and therefore lacked legitimacy. In 1970, Oktoberfest chairman Darwin Clay warned that there was “a definite danger of fragmentation, opportunism, and confusion” which threatened to turn Oktoberfest into a tourist trap. Organizers therefore incorporated Oktoberfest as a permanent, non-profit organization to administer and coordinate the festival. At a board meeting for the newly created K-W Oktoberfest, Inc. in January, 1971, directors discussed the fact that several local establishments capitalized on the success of Oktoberfest by holding their own events independent of the official festival. They resigned to the fact that “Oktoberfest” was too general of a term and so there was little they could legally do to stop these unauthorized events. Their solution was to create official decals which could only be displayed at venues which were affiliated with K-W Oktoberfest, Inc. To govern this official licensing, the board of directors created an accreditation committee. The stated purpose of this committee was to “Regulate the use of the K-W Oktoberfest trademarks,

---

191 A story from the 1971 souvenir program demonstrated that, despite their distinctive religious beliefs, the Mennonites were able to harmoniously coexist with other religious denominations. The story claimed that after a fire destroyed the barn of a local farmer, a group of Mennonites led a barn-raising to build him a new barn, even though he was a Catholic. As well, although the barn-raising was led by Mennonites, it was “a bit of an ecumenical effort” with members of local Catholic, Lutheran, and United Church congregations taking part. UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.4 Other Publications, “Oktoberfest Cook Book,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 5 October 1971; UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1970, “Make the Most of Your Visit to K-W During Oktoberfest;” 1971, “Good Mennonite Neighbors, Your Best Fire Insurance;” “An Unchanging Way of Life;” 1975, “Food that Really Schmecks.”


associated services and products” and also to “Establish and maintain the quality of K-W Oktoberfest products, services and reputation; to reflect fair value and genuine tradition.”

It was not just festhalls and restaurants which needed to be accredited. Hotels, motels, stores, and organizations such as the Legion or the local minor soccer association all needed to apply for accreditation if they wished to participate in the official Oktoberfest. In seeking to control what business and organizations took part in the official festival, the accreditation committee, in part, sought to control who profited off Oktoberfest. The accreditation committee also sought to safeguard the image of the festival and make sure that it continued to offer “authentic” Gemütlichkeit and restrict any alternate, unauthorized versions of German ethnicity. Therefore, among the criteria for accreditation were the requirements that “services and products must be genuine or resemble genuine German ethnic traditions” and that all employees must wear “appropriate Oktoberfest costume.” Venues were also required to submit all programs, menus, and charges to the accreditation committee “for the purpose of encouraging genuineness, value and prevention of misleading advertising and complaints.” The official accreditation decal, meanwhile, informed visitors that it designated “A Genuine K-W Oktoberfest Hospitality Centre,” and promised “Here you will find friendly hosts, happy guests and a true Gemütlichkeit [sic].”

The 1971 program included a list of accredited establishments. It told visitors to look for the accreditation decal at each venue they visited as it was their “protection and assurance of high quality, fair prices and Gemütlichkeit.” In answer to the question “Will success spoil K-W Oktoberfest?” the program assured visitors that organizers had established a committee to ensure

---

that no changes would take place that would violate the spirit of the event and detract from its authenticity. As an added safeguard, all proposed changes were “studied and reviewed by the area German clubs,” the most qualified arbiters of what constituted “authentic.”\textsuperscript{198} The accreditation process therefore marked the boundary of German ethnicity, excluding anyone who did not adhere to the definition of authentic German culture and \textit{Gemütlichkeit} as articulated by the ethnic elite.

Along with controlling who profited off of Oktoberfest, the accreditation committee also regulated how much they could profit, by controlling the prices which venues could charge patrons. The repeated emphasis which the committee placed on offering patrons “fair value” was also crucial to ensuring that the festival retained its authenticity. Although Oktoberfest organizers wished to grow the festival and increase the amount of money it brought into the local economy, this desire needed to be tempered so that generating profits did not become, or be seen to become, the central goal of the festival. Otherwise, Oktoberfest could become a tourist trap, where patrons were gouged by purveyors of a soulless mass culture, the very antithesis of what German culture was supposed to be. The accreditation committee therefore sought to guard against the “exploitation and greedy promoters” who had apparently destroyed other folk festivals.\textsuperscript{199} The committee warned applicants for accreditation that “an excessive degree of commercialism will seriously detract from the charm, friendliness and \textit{Gemütlichkeit} of the festival and its ultimate success.”\textsuperscript{200} As Oktoberfest grew and became big business, organizers still sought to maintain a balance between real commercialism and faux authenticity. An article in the 1975 Oktoberfest program titled “Oktoberfest Visitors Spend Millions” lauded the boost which the festival

provided to the local economy. Still, the festival’s greatest contribution was in furthering the goal of promoting multiculturalism by allowing visitors to experience German customs and traditions. The article closed stating “In this way, Oktoberfest helps to retain and preserve our differences in customs and create a better understanding of different ethnic communities.”

Somewhat paradoxically for what was essentially a beer festival, the forward to the accreditation plan drafted in 1971 stated that the festival “reflects to the visitor and the citizen, the value of the well-founded ethics of hard work, respect for the law and orderliness and simple honesty.” It added that “Although Kitchener-Waterloo and surrounding areas are sober communities, Oktoberfest is our more frivolous side.” Finally, the festival was not meant to bring the community fame and fortune, but rather to promote “stability, cleanliness, friendliness and Gemuetlichkeit.”

Ian McKay shows that, despite her claims of authenticity, the image of the Nova Scotia fisherfolk created by folklorist Helen Creighton was sanitized to reflect her Victorian middle-class values, ignoring poverty and class conflict, omitting bawdy folksongs, and marginalizing blacks and First Nations. The portrayal of German ethnicity was similarly sanitized to project middle class respectability. The ethnic elite claimed that the Gemütlichkeit of events such as Oktoberfest entailed orderly rather than rowdy fun. Furthermore, despite the greater emphasis which postwar German ethnicity placed on fun and frivolity, Germans still retained the values of hard work and thrift. Greeting visitors to Oktoberfest in 1970, Kitchener mayor Sid McLennan praised the city’s German residents who “lead the way in showing others how to play hard as well as work hard.” The early years of the festival also included special nights to honour local industries. In 1969, Oktoberfest saluted the local rubber, shoe, and

---

203 McKay, Quest of the Folk, 110-9.
furniture industries. These nights included displays at festhalls depicting the history of the industries and samples of wares produced locally. In 1970, a special ceremony was held to present leaders in the food industry with citizenship medallions and Oktoberfest plaques.

The ethnic elite even managed to reconcile German industriousness and frivolity, showing the two to be symbiotic. In 1971, Oktoberfest chairman Darwin Clay asserted that the festival could help to attract new industries to Waterloo County. Many of the visitors to the festival, he claimed, were industrialists. They wanted to locate their industries in “lively communities” where employees had something to occupy them in their spare time. “Inactivity” Clay maintained, “breeds discontent and starts riots.” Hard work needed to be balanced with fun. At the same time, fun could not exist without hard work. The 1972 program stated that every year “the industry and imagination of the Germans of Waterloo county is put to the test to supply fun and frolic for an entire week to more than a quarter-of-a-million fun-seeking guests.”

Although a growing segment of the Canadian population in the postwar decades saw the consumption of alcohol as socially acceptable, many recognized that alcohol could lead to social problems. What differed from previous decades was that these problems were blamed on individual drinkers and not on the universally corrupting nature of alcohol itself. The centrality of beer in German culture, particularly in Oktoberfest, was therefore potentially problematic. To maintain the image of Germans as respectable, the ethnic elite needed to demonstrate that Germans drank responsibly and that their festivals did not enable or encourage problem drinkers.

---

206 These leaders in the food industry were Emory Zehr of Zehrs Markets, Melvin S. Snyder of Maple Lane Dairy, Gordon Hamblin of Smiles ‘n Chuckles, Raymond Gibney of Raymond Snack Foods, Carl Dare of Dare Foods, and N.C. Schneider of J.M. Schneiders. “Oktoberfest Honors 7 In Food Business,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 16 October 1970.
207 “$3.5 million spent locally by Oktoberfest visitors,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 18 October 1971.
209 Heron, Booze, 351.
Accordingly, the problem of rowdiness and how to control or eliminate it was a frequent topic of discussion at Oktoberfest board and committee meetings.\footnote{UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 1.1 Oktoberfest Administrative Records.} Belying these private concerns, Oktoberfest organizers publicly declared that all was well. Promotional materials for the festival claimed that one thing which stood out to Canadian visitors to Munich’s Oktoberfest was that, despite the consumption of beer, there was no rowdiness or drunkenness, “just happiness.”\footnote{“Oktoberfest Brewed in 1810,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 15 October 1969; UW, GA83, K-W Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1970, “Fun For Everybody at Oktoberfest.”} This same atmosphere was replicated in Waterloo County. After Oktoberfest in 1969, publicity chairman Owen Lackenbauer informed the Record that police had reported no alcohol-related incidents during the festival, “everybody was in a real gay, festive mood.”\footnote{“Oktoberfest ‘Could Match’ Calgary Stampede,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 20 October 1969.} Similarly, in 1971, Oktoberfest officials told the newspaper that “festival-goers were so busy eating and drinking that they didn’t have any time to get into trouble.” Darwin Clay praised the police for their restraint in dealing with the large crowds, however he noted as well that there were no problems because patrons all acted “in a mature and adult fashion.”\footnote{“Oktoberfest fun draws 105,000,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 12 October 1971; “Festival crowds top 280,000—best yet,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 18 October 1971.} According to Craig Heron, in the postwar decades, Canadians recognized that alcoholism could afflict people from all walks of life; it was not just a scourge of the poor and the working class.\footnote{Heron, Booze, 352.} In their efforts to dissociate Oktoberfest from the social problems related to alcohol, however, the ethnic elite displayed a class bias. The official “Festival Hall Operators Manual” stipulated that persons wearing blue jeans, shorts, and tank tops were to be denied entry. Patrons were required to be “respectably” dressed in order to keep out “an undesirable element.”\footnote{UW, GA114, Concordia Club fonds, Sousfonds 4: Concordia Club, Series 3.2.1: Special Events and Projects: Oktoberfest: Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest, Inc., File 177 Seminar Reports, 1978, “Festival Hall Operators Manual (Revised May 18, 1976).”} In the wake of the incident in 1973 at the Kitchener Auditorium Annex, Transylvania Club officials
place the blame on this undesirable element. Club officials claimed that they had asked for
permission to deny entrance to people they thought to be potential disturbers of the peace
however this request was turned down on the grounds that it constituted discrimination. This
placed all responsibility for maintaining order on the already overburdened staff working inside
the hall.216 Craig Heron states that in the postwar decades, beer was regarded as a drink of the
working class. In 1972, the Oktoberfest program included a history of beer. This history claimed
that ancient Egyptian aristocrats had consumed beer in golden goblets and described the
patronage which European kings had bestowed upon brewers. By expounding upon the “long
and honourable history” of beer, the ethnic elite attempted to show that beer, and by extension
Oktoberfest, were not just for the working class.217 The following year, organizers included a
concert series by the Kitchener-Waterloo Symphony Orchestra on the Oktoberfest schedule.
Rather than gulping beer, those in attendance were served German wine and cheese. The Record
stated that this concert series fulfilled a promise which festival organizers had made to offer
“something for those who prefer Brahms to beer, or Strauss to sausage,” an indication of their
intent to attract a more refined crowd to the festival.218

By 1972, even as they publicly declared that the vast quantities of alcohol consumed
during the festival was not a problem, Oktoberfest organizers quietly began to transform the
festival into “more of a cultural and ethnic event rather than just Canada’s Great Beer Festival.”

---

216 After the Ontario drinking age was lowered from 21 to 18 in 1971, youths were also blamed for any incidents
which occurred at Oktoberfest. According to Craig Heron, in the postwar decades, young men of high school and
university age, as well as Aboriginal men, “loomed large” in discussions about social problems related to alcohol.
AO, MHSO, Series 60: German-Canadian Papers, F1405-60-106, Transylvania Club textual records, MFS306, reel
a little too spirited,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 16 October 1972; “Oktoberfest off to a sudsy start,” Kitchener-
Waterloo Record, 6 October 1973; Heron, Booze, 333, 351.
217 Craig Heron states that working-class men and women generally drank “cheap, mass produced beer” while
middle and upper class drinkers consumed spirits, wine, mixed drinks, and specialty drinks. UW, GA83, K-W
Oktoberfest, Inc., 4.1 Souvenir Annuals, 1972, “Beer: a favourite of fun lovers for centuries;” Heron, Booze, 323,
348.
218 “Cultural events part of effort to give Oktoberfest new image,” Kitchener-Waterloo Record, 6 October 1973.
That year, the corporation applied for a $43,000 grant from the Department of Citizenship for the “promotion of cultural and ethnic events.” In 1973, organizers spent $12,000 more on cultural and sporting events than in 1972 as part of this effort “to de-emphasize ‘beer’ and provide a wider range of activities.” The concert series was therefore not the only event in 1973 to eschew beer. The schedule that year also included a fashion show, art exhibitions, an antique show, a Kirmes, sporting events, and a performance of “Cabaret” in the Victoria Park Pavilion by the Kitchener-Waterloo Little Theatre. Organizers even printed a special “Family Program” to advertise these alcohol-free activities.221 The main program that year declared “The Great Beer Festival Shifts Emphasis.” Visitors were assured that the festival still retained the spirit of Gemütlichkeit, however it had been given a slightly different meaning. To the traditional definition of Gemütlichkeit as meaning “good cheer” was added “a harmony of tolerance and freedom and well-being.” The major difference between the Munich and Kitchener-Waterloo festivals, the program declared, “is that the Canadian version has blossomed into an awesome, multicultural, multi-recreational series of events.”222 This shift in emphasis therefore was not an admission that the consumption of beer was problematic, but rather a fulfillment of the festival’s mission to promote multiculturalism. By 1976, the diverse array of “cultural” events taking place under the official Oktoberfest banner also included a German shepherd dog show, a motocross race, handball, hockey, boxing, and golf tournaments, and a science-fiction convention.223

---

Transylvania Club President Herb Schneider said to the *Record*, “culture is the main thing; that’s what will keep Oktoberfest alive.” Nevertheless, after a typically boisterous first night, according to the *Record*, many revelers still testified that beer was the festival’s star attraction.\(^{224}\)

In January, 1973, Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest, Inc. made headlines by appointing Betty Thompson, a CKCO-TV personality, as its first female director.\(^{225}\) She then formed a women’s committee to devise events which catered specifically to women.\(^{226}\) Historically, the ideal German-Canadian citizen had been gendered male, although this was often based on an unspoken assumption. By the 1970s, however, women had begun to play a more prominent role as leaders within the German community. In 1955, for example, Mary Lau of Kitchener was elected as treasurer of the Canadian Society for German Relief at the society’s national conference.\(^{227}\) In 1960, Gertrude Mehnert, longtime president of the Concordia Club women’s group, became the club’s first female board member. In 1970, she was awarded a silver platter for ten years of service on the board.\(^{228}\) Still, few women held positions of power. In an interview conducted years after her appointment, Thompson commented that for a long time, she felt that her position on the Board of Directors was simply a token.\(^{229}\) The events created by the Oktoberfest women’s committee also demonstrated that the status of women in the German community had only advanced so far. Not only were they separate from and subordinate to the mainstream events, which were gendered male, the actual content of the women’s events, such as cooking classes, reinforced traditional gender roles. The fact that children’s events also fell under


\(^{227}\) AO, MHSO, F1405-60-27, Dr. Klaus Bongart textual records, MFN295 reel 1, “Landestagung der Canadian Society for German Relief in Kitchener.”

\(^{228}\) Leibbrandt, *100 Jahre Concordia*, 91, 100-1.

the mandate of the women’s committee supported the belief that the proper role for women was as mothers and homemakers.\textsuperscript{230} The ubiquity of Oktoberfest mascot Onkel Hans and the relative obscurity of his counterpart Tante Frieda symbolized the subordinate position of women within the German community.

**Conclusion**

Franca Iacovetta and Valerie J. Korinek argue that multiculturalism could have “uneven and contradictory results” as ethnic groups were often reduced to “colourful folk figures bearing exotic foods and quaint customs.”\textsuperscript{231} Although the multicultural version of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship undoubtedly reduced Kitchener’s Germans to a set of colourful cultural attributes, this was not unique to the postwar decades. The postwar understanding of German ethnicity was no more of a reduction or simplification than defining German ethnicity based upon the Conestoga myth or racial qualities such as thrift and industry. Furthermore, the *Sängerfeste* and *Kirmes* of the nineteenth century and the Pioneers Memorial Tower of the interwar years were invented traditions just like Oktoberfest. The former, like Oktoberfest, were used to promote the city’s industries, only then it was manufacturing rather than tourism. The ethnic elite were complicit, and indeed instrumental in this process. For over a century, Kitchener’s Germans changed and adapted how they defined their ethnicity to remain acceptable as Canadian citizens. The image of Germans as jovial peasants was simply the latest iteration of this process.


\textsuperscript{231} Iacovetta and Korinek, “Jell-O Salads, One-Stop Shopping, and Maria the Homemaker,” 218.
Conclusion

In the journey from Wilhelm to Hans, the desire to belong as Canadian citizens—without completely embracing Anglo-conformity—was the central factor which shaped how the German ethnic elite in Berlin/Kitchener, Ontario defined German ethnicity. Beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, the ethnic elite articulated an understanding of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship which attempted to reconcile their ethnicity with the hegemonic understanding of Canada as a British nation. The ethnic elite argued that Germany and Britain were bound by the blood relationship between their royal families, their common racial ancestry, and their shared civilized ideals. They also celebrated the role of the industrious Germans who, alongside the British, were transforming the newly created Canada into a prosperous and powerful nation, just as they had built Germany and Britain into the world’s two greatest empires. Until the advent of the First World War, Berlin’s Anglo-Canadian population and even provincial and national Anglo-Canadian leaders generally accepted the ethnic elite’s claims and welcomed Germans as loyal and upstanding Canadian citizens.

During the First World War, the city was divided into two warring factions who offered starkly contrasting definitions of Canadian citizenship. On the one side were the Anglo-conformists who vilified all things German and argued that Canadian citizenship required strict Anglo-conformity and unswerving loyalty to Britain. On the other side were the German defenders who argued that in addition to support for the war effort, the principle of British fair play which encouraged tolerance for diversity was the basis for Canadian citizenship. They also publicized what the city’s Germans had done to support the Canadian war effort, which was now the ultimate measure of citizenship. These groups vigorously debated the definition of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship in newspaper editorials, in political speeches and debates, in courtrooms, and even physically in the streets. The Anglo-conformists won a symbolic victory in
successfully changing the city’s name from Berlin to Kitchener. Their effort to make Anglo-conformity the basis of Canadian citizenship and force the city’s Germans to abandon their ethnicity and assimilate into an Anglo-Canadian milieu, however, was ultimately a failure.

For Kitchener’s German community, therefore, the First World War did not bring about a fundamental break with the past. The ethnic elite continued to espouse a version of Canadian citizenship which included ethnic Germans. In the initial postwar years, the ethnic elite did so by emphasizing the city’s Mennonite heritage as a “safe” version of German ethnicity. Many of the prewar themes of their ethnic identity, however, which the ethnic elite employed to justify their claim to Canadian citizenship, remained intact. The ethnic elite thus celebrated the Mennonite settlers as the founders of the city’s thriving industries which were doing so much to contribute to Canada’s prosperity. As they had during the war, the ethnic elite celebrated German Canadians’ military service as a measure of citizenship. The ethnic elite argued that the pacifist Mennonites’ devotion to Canada was so deep that they willingly set aside their beliefs to come to its defence. By the mid-1920s, however, the ethnic elite had already begun to abandon this Mennonite-centric ethnic identity in favour of a distinctly European-German ethnic identity once again. In the remarkable Alte Kameraden banquet, celebrated in Kitchener in 1932, the ethnic elite brought together veterans who had fought for Germany with those who had fought for Canada in the First World War. These men were all ideal Canadian citizens, the ethnic elite argued, regardless of which uniform they had worn, because they had demonstrated that they were ready and willing to answer the call of duty.

Beginning in 1933, the ethnic elite grappled with the questions raised by the rise of Adolf Hitler, the Second World War, and its aftermath. Initially, member of the ethnic elite were openly supportive of Hitler and the Nazis, particularly the Nazis’ strident anti-communism as well as their anti-Semitism. This did not jeopardize the ethnic elite’s claims to Canadian citizenship
because anti-radicalism and the exclusion of non-British, non-German people had long been facets of their definition of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship. Furthermore, many Canadians at the time shared the ethnic elite’s sympathies. The ethnic elite began to distance themselves from Hitler beginning in 1938 when Canadian public opinion turned decisively against Nazi Germany, threatening the acceptance of ethnic Germans as Canadian citizens. Upon the outbreak of the Second World War, the ethnic elite asserted their steadfast loyalty to Canada and regularly touted all that they were doing to support the war effort. During the war, Kitchener’s Germans’ longstanding status as loyal Canadian citizens of white, Northern European ancestry, as well as the presence of more marginalized groups such as the Japanese, the communists, or the Jehovah’s Witnesses meant that the city’s Germans were not vilified and persecuted as they had been during the First World War. Aside from a brief and relatively minor outbreak of anti-German hysteria in the spring of 1940, Anglo-Canadians generally accepted the ethnic elite’s claims that Germans were loyal Canadian citizens. After the war, the ethnic elite continued to distance themselves from the Nazis. They argued that the German people were the real victims of the war, first at the hands of the Nazis, and then at the hands of the Allies who abandoned East Germany to Soviet domination at the close of the war. The ethnic elite argued that by standing up, first against Nazi oppression, then as the consummate Cold Warriors, Kitchener’s German people demonstrated that they were the ideal Canadian citizens.

Starting in the 1950s, the ethnic elite articulated a version of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship which celebrated the cultural contributions of Germans, alongside other ethnic groups, to Canada’s multicultural mosaic. During this period, the memory of the horrors of the Second World War meant that racism was no longer acceptable in Canadian public life. Furthermore, factors such as the decline of Canada’s hegemonic Anglo-conformist identity; an increased emphasis on equality, tolerance, and democracy owing to the Cold War; and worldwide
decolonization movements resulted in previously marginalized ethnic groups asserting their place as Canadian citizens. Through their newly-founded *Kulturgruppen* and their celebrations which even sought the participation of non-German, non-British ethnic groups, the ethnic elite contributed to the emergence of multiculturalism as the basis for Canadian citizenship and identity. The annual celebration of Kitchener-Waterloo Oktoberfest which began in 1969 was the fulfillment of this multicultural version of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship. In Oktoberfest, the ethnic elite blended traditional German and uniquely Canadian elements and encouraged all participants to become German, if only for the day. In doing so, they made German ethnicity part of the mainstream of Canadian culture.

Throughout the century under study, the definition of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship was in a constant state of negotiation, contestation, and reformulation. This process usually did not make front page news. Rather, it simmered in the background of Canadian public life. Statements of the meaning of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship were made in public celebrations, political debates, and even in commercial advertisements. Most commonly, these statements were made indirectly through symbols, allusion, and inference. There were other periods, however, when the definition of German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship exploded to the forefront of national consciousness. During these periods, the topic of who belonged as a Canadian citizen was the explicit subject of vigorous debate.

In the present day, the topic of citizenship has once again returned to the forefront of public discussion and debate, not only in Canada, but across the Western world. Figures such as Geert Wilders in the Netherlands, Marine Le Pen in France, and Donald Trump in the United States have attempted to appeal to disaffected voters, in part, through rhetoric and policies which would create a more restrictive definition of citizenship for their respective nations. In Canada, Conservative Party leadership hopeful, Kellie Leitch has staked her campaign on the creation of
an “anti-Canadian values” test to screen immigrants and refugees to Canada.\(^{1069}\) In the 2015 federal election campaign, Leitch also advocated for a tip line to report “barbaric cultural practices” to the RCMP.\(^{1070}\) The intense debate surrounding Leitch’s proposals as well as issues such as accepting Syrian refugees, the wearing of a niqab during citizenship ceremonies, and even a non-binding motion condemning Islamophobia all revolve around the fundamental question of who belongs as a Canadian citizen.\(^{1071}\) Although Leitch has defended her “anti-Canadian values” test, stating that it is intended to promote tolerance, in effect, it singles out Muslims, signaling that they are not welcome and do not belong as Canadian citizens.\(^{1072}\)

Studying the Germans of Berlin/Kitchener, Ontario and how the ethnic elite defined German ethnicity and Canadian citizenship offers valuable lessons for this current period of renewed focus on defining Canadian citizenship. Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans demonstrate that multicultural citizenship is not the inevitable result of the nation’s experience of immigration and diversity. The multicultural era was not the first time that non-British, non-French ethnic groups were accepted as Canadian citizens. In previous decades, Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans found acceptance as Canadian citizens. This acceptance, however, was premised on the exclusion of others and on the Germans’ allegedly superior position in the racist hierarchy that was prevalent for so many decades. The ethnic elite did not advocate for a multicultural vision of Canadian citizenship but instead only advocated for the inclusion of Germans alongside the British as Canadian citizens. At various times during the century I study, the ethnic elite excluded or


marginalized women, communists, the working class, Jews, Japanese, and other religious and ethnic groups, all as part of their quest to seek belonging for Germans as Canadian citizens.

The acceptance which Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans attained, ultimately proved to be fragile. During the First World War, and to a lesser extent the Second World War as well, the city’s Germans went from being lauded as Canadian citizens *par excellence* to being vilified and having their loyalty and citizenship called into question on account of their ethnicity. Even during periods when the majority of Canadians accepted Germans as Canadian citizens, there was a small and occasionally vocal minority who objected. The ethnic elite recognized the fragility of their position and thus never completely shed their defensive tone in asserting the place of Germans as Canadian citizens. The violence and disfranchisement which the city’s Germans experienced during the First World War are also a stark reminder that the debate over the definition of Canadian citizenship and who is included or excluded brings with it material consequences.

In these respects, multicultural citizenship is no different from the ethnic elite’s earlier definitions of Canadian citizenship. Despite its lofty inclusive ideals, there are still many groups who find themselves excluded from enjoying the full benefits of multicultural citizenship. When the ethnic elite in Kitchener eventually did embrace a multicultural vision of Canadian citizenship, for example, it was still premised on adhering to a strict middle-class definition of respectable ethnicity. Furthermore, recent efforts to create a more restrictive Canadian citizenship lay bare the fact that multiculturalism is not set in stone as the basis for Canadian citizenship and identity. When former Prime Minister Stephen Harper referred to “old-stock Canadians” during a debate on Syrian refugees, he was evoking a mythical time when British Canadians alone
occupied the top tier of citizenship. Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans show that even those groups who may consider themselves to be “old-stock” Canadians and who have not been subjected to marginalization or discrimination in recent memory should not consider themselves to be safe or immune from attempts to create a more restrictive definition of Canadian citizenship. Berlin/Kitchener’s Germans demonstrate that multiculturalism is not an endpoint or the fulfillment of a steady march towards equality and inclusion. It is simply the latest iteration of Canadian citizenship, one which, like its predecessors, remains flawed, exclusionary, and fragile.

Historians should continue to study ethnicity through the lens of citizenship. Historians should study how other ethnic groups in communities across Canada have sought belonging as Canadian citizens. Such studies will reveal the instances when an ethnic group’s claims to citizenship were accepted, contested, or rejected; who was included or excluded from the ethnic group’s definition of Canadian citizenship; and finally, how multiculturalism became the hegemonic definition of Canadian citizenship. In so doing, these studies will help us recognize the flaws, contradictions, and ultimate fragility of multicultural citizenship. This is a necessary first step if we are to improve upon Canadian citizenship by broadening who is included, reducing inequality, and also defending Canadian citizenship against those who seek to make it more restrictive.

---
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