UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

"THE CITY THAT KNOWS HOW":

SAN FRANCISCO, THE GREAT WAR, AND URBAN IDENTITY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

HEATHER A. CLEMMER
Norman, Oklahoma
2008

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/319019

“THE CITY THAT KNOWS HOW”:
SAN FRANCISCO, THE GREAT WAR, AND URBAN IDENTITY

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY

Dr. Donald J. Pisani, Chair

Dr. Robert L. Griswold

Dr. Albert L. Hurtado

Dr. R. Warren Metcalf

Dr. Zev Trachtenberg

©Copyright by HEATHER A. CLEMMER 2008
All Rights Reserved.

To Jason and Jonathan

Acknowledgements

The process of researching and writing a dissertation is a long, arduous journey, but mercifully not one made alone. At each stop along the way (and some of my stops were longer than others), I received tremendous support and encouragement from mentors, scholars, friends, and family. I would like to start by thanking my advisor, Donald Pisani, for his guidance through this process. I genuinely appreciate his ability to maintain a good humor, despite my many delays, while providing advice and insight that kept me motivated. I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee – Robert Griswold, Albert Hurtado, Warren Metcalf, and Zev Trachtenberg – for their willingness to read this work and provide valuable comments and suggestions. While each member of my committee has contributed to making this a better dissertation, those errors still imbedded in this work are solely my responsibility. I would be remiss here at the end of my graduate experience if I did not also take a moment to thank Steve Gillon. Working as Steve's research assistant for five years allowed me the unique opportunity to learn important research, writing, and editing skills from a master craftsman.

During the three summers I spent in the San Francisco Bay Area engaged in research for this dissertation I incurred many debts, and mercifully, not much of that debt was financial. I owe a big thank you to the Philanthropic Educational Organization International whose Educational Loan Fund provides low-interest loans to women graduate students in need of financial assistance. Without the help of the local P.E.O.

chapter in Hutchinson, Kansas (who sponsored by loan request) I would have been unable to spend as much time in the Bay Area working on this project. I was also fortunate to find friendly and knowledgeable staff at each of the following archival repositories: the Hoover Institution Library and Archives and Stanford University, the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, the California Historical Society in San Francisco, and the San Francisco History Center at the San Francisco Public Library. Thanks to the San Francisco Theological Seminary for allowing me to stay in their dorms during one of my trips and to Johann Anderson for serving as my chauffeur and a friendly face in the neighborhood. I cannot express my gratitude to Jim and Betty Cooper, and their congregation at The Point, and Dave and Allison Puglosi. The Coopers and the Puglosis enthusiastically welcomed me into their homes. They helped me acclimate to life in the Bay, fed me, and above all else, encouraged me to get up every morning and go back to work. Doing research thousands of miles away from home for extended periods of time is tough and isolating. Thank you to everyone I met in the Bay Area who made sure I did not feel alone. Many blessings to you all.

Finally, I must thank my friends and family who kept up their cheerleading efforts even when I thought it was a lost cause. To Dennis Williams and Bob Lively, thank you for serving as mentors, colleagues, and friends. The moments of wisdom and absurdity we have shared prevented me from taking myself too seriously and frequently encouraged me to go back into my office and write. To "the Sisterhood" – Sarah Janda, Linda English, Holly Fletcher, and Jana Vogt – thank you for your constant words of encouragement and support on every aspect of this dissertation, as well as more personal

projects. Though academia has scattered us across the country, your presence is always felt. To my family, particularly my parents, stepparents, and in-laws, thank you for believing I would finish and doing your best not to ask when I would finish. Never did any of you question why I abandoned music for a life as a historian, or why I needed to get a Ph.D. to fulfill my dreams; you simply asked what you could do to help. I hope I can carry on such parental patience! That brings me to my son, Jonathan. When you were born on the centennial of the San Francisco earthquake, I knew you would change my identity as much as the earthquake and fire transformed the city. I hope one day you will read this work and recognize the passion your mom has for her profession and find that for yourself. Finally, I would never have started this dissertation without the love and support of my husband, Jason. The commitment we made to each other almost sixteen years ago did not include a dissertation, but you accepted it as par for the course. I will probably never fully understand the level of devotion and the measure of sacrifice you have made to see this thing through, but I am forever grateful.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....iv

Table of Contents.....vii

Abstract.....viii

Introduction.....1

Chapter One:
"It is in San Francisco because she knows how":
The Panama Pacific International Exposition and
the Struggle for an Urban Identity.....24

Chapter Two:
"Oh if the Germans would only quit":
The Soldiers in San Francisco.....56

Chapter Three:
"Mayor of All the People":
James Rolph and Municipal Governance.....100

Chapter Four:
"You have not invested till it hurts":
City Businessmen and the Chamber of Commerce.....139

Chapter Five:
"Labor's voice must be heard and heeded":
San Francisco's Organized Labor.....180

Chapter Six:
"There is no longer a hyphen. . .":
Living in a City of Immigrants.....224

Conclusion:
"Keep alive the memory of sacrifices":
San Francisco's New Identity.....272

Bibliography.....307

Abstract

This dissertation examines the identity crisis that the city of San Francisco experienced in the decade following the 1906 earthquake and fire and how the Great War intensified the debate over what urban characteristics should define the city in the future. The dual disasters of 1906, coupled with the economic and demographic growth of other cities along the Pacific Coast, compelled San Franciscans to search for ways to maintain their status as residents of the central metropolis of the Far West. However, by the time the United States declared war in April 1917 it was apparent that no city on the West Coast could reign supreme. As San Franciscans created a public image of patriotism and support for the Great War, they also continued to battle with each other over how to develop a modern metropolis that paid homage to its storied past while promoting future progress. The diversity of the San Francisco populace, the cornerstone of the city's development and identity since the Gold Rush days, fostered ideological conflict as individuals sought to define themselves, in part, by the city in which they lived. While labeling individual residents as members of a particular subset based on categories such as occupation, political party, neighborhood, or religion is impossible, this dissertation seeks to explain the divergent thoughts within the populace regarding urban identity by focusing on key institutions and groups whose views stood in starkest contrast. The Great War created an opportunity for residents to promote San Francisco as the "City that Knows How," but the war also exposed fears that, beyond helping the nation win a war, San Franciscans did not know what else their city could do.

Introduction

When it came time to select a topic for my dissertation, I knew I wanted to examine the effects of World War I on the American people. In searching through resources for my master's thesis on masculine rhetoric and the Great War, I came across the diary of an Oklahoman, Harry Brill, who enlisted in the army in 1917. In his journal, he detailed the months he spent at a training camp in Louisiana, particularly the monotony of camp life and the entertainment found in the nearby town of Alexandria.[1] When I began thinking about my dissertation, my thoughts returned to Brill's experience in Louisiana and the wartime intersection of civilian life and military expansion. Many of Brill's contemporaries suggested, and at times bemoaned the fact, that their peers paid scant attention to the war in Europe. However, it seems unlikely that residents living near military encampments could ignore the war. On any given day of the week, such communities would have witnessed men dressed in military uniforms parading through their streets or mingling among them in public spaces, like stores and theaters. Residents brought these men into their homes, engaged them in wholesome activities, and hosted farewell festivities before they were shipped to the front.

As the United States entered World War I, residents of American cities grappled with their nation's entrance into the war, yet most American histories of the Great War focus on federal, military, and international issues. While these topics warrant such attention, this federal focus neglects the impact of the war on the average citizen or

[1] Harry Elmore Brill Collection, Box 1, Oklahoma Historical Society, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

implies that Americans only felt the effects of the war through federal agencies and federal legislation. The most oft-cited work on American involvement in the Great War is David Kennedy's *Over Here*. In it, Kennedy detailed the efforts by the Wilson administration to mold (or coerce through the Espionage and Sedition Acts) civilian support for the war, to mobilize industries and consumers, to foster greater production, and to conscript a military for wartime service. Kennedy's title suggests an examination of the American homefront, but the work is limited to a few anecdotal examples of ways in which federal decisions affected certain people in certain places. Robert Zieger's recent study of the war provides a clearer understanding of how Americans lived during the war years, but he examines them through the lens of national progressivism and the development of a "National Security State." Approaching a discussion of the war as an event dictated by national leadership denies the real importance of the war to residents of various states, cities, and rural counties. Such analysis of America during the Great War leaves readers with the impression that the war was simply too short to inflict any appreciable social, economic or political burdens on the average citizen.[2]

A few historians have rejected the above approach and have emphasized the ways in which the war compelled changes on the homefront. Neil Wynn's *From Progressivism*

---

[2]David M. Kennedy, *Over Here: The First World War and American Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980); Robert H. Zieger's *America's Great War: World War I and the American Experience* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2000). For other works that take a federalist approach to their survey of the war see Meirion and Susie Harries, *The Last Days of Innocence: America at War, 1917-1918* (New York: Random House, 1997); Edward Ellis, *Echoes of Distant Thunder: Life in the United States, 1914-1918* (New York: Coward, McCann, and Geoghegan, 1975); Nancy K. Bristow, *Making Men Moral: Social Engineering during the Great War* (New York: New York University Press, 1996); Stephen Vaughn, *Holding Fast the Inner Lines: Democracy, Nationalism, and the Committee on Public Information* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980); W. J. Breen, *Uncle Sam at Home: Civilian Mobilization, Wartime Federalism and the Council of National Defense, 1917-1919* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984).

to Prosperity examines minority groups who became a part of the mainstream by participating in the national war effort. In examining the stories of groups previously analyzed in separate case studies, Wynn concluded that "there can be little doubt that the war *did* bring change to the United States, some permanent, some temporary, but all of consequence." Wynn created a synthesis that expands on Kennedy's assessment of the war's impact on American society. However, like Kennedy before him, Wynn produced a study of the Great War that provides far more generalities than specific illustrations.[3]

Western historians also overlook the Great War, preferring to focus on the region-altering effect World War II had on the American West. In their rush to explain the explosion of industry, urbanization, and the resulting contests between racial and ethnic communities during the Second World War, they have neglected the impact of World War I on the early twentieth-century West. Western historians have looked at the intensification of labor unrest, hostility toward immigrants, and the Spanish flu epidemic during the war, but other areas more vital to a complete interpretation of the role of Western peoples remain virtually untouched.[4] As with the works of Kennedy, Zieger, and

---

[3]Neil A. Wynn, *From Progressivism to Prosperity: World War I and American Society* (New York: Homes and Meier, 1986), xiv-xix.

[4]For examples of the discussion of labor in the West during the war see James Byrkit, *Forging the Copper Collar: Arizona's Labor Management War of 1901-1921* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1982), 325-328; Richard Melzer, "Exiled in the Desert: The Bisbee Deportees' Reception in Mexico, 1917," *New Mexico Historical Review*, 67 (July 1992), 269-284; Arnon Gutfeld, *Montana's Agony: Years of War and Hysteria, 1917-1921* (Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1979). For attacks on immigrant communities see David Emmons, *The Butte Irish: Class and Ethnicity in an American Mining Town, 1875-1925* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 347-383; Allan Powell, "Our Cradles Were in Germany: Utah's German American Community and World War I," *Utah Historical Quarterly*, 58 (Fall 1990), 371-387; Rex Myers, "An Immigrant Heritage: South Dakota's Foreign Born in the Era of Assimilation," *South Dakota History*, 19 (summer 1989), 134-155. For the flu epidemic see Alfred Crosby, *Epidemic and Peace, 1918* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1976); Leonard Arrington, "The Influenza Epidemic of 1918-19 in Utah," *Utah Historical Quarterly*, 58 (Spring 1990), 183-200; Judith Johnson, "Kansas in the 'Grippe': The Spanish Influenza Epidemic of 1918," *Kansas History*, 15 (Spring 1992), 44-

Wynn, historians studying the West have provided little more than generalizations about the war's impact on the American people. Michael Malone and Richard Etulain believed the era of the Great War saw a continuation of Eastern colonialism and little lasting economic change in the West. In contrast, Gerald Nash saw significant economic growth in the West during World War I, leading to new sources of prosperity and a corresponding decrease in dependency. Nash went so far as to claim that the war had a profound impact on the region, yet few have tested the validity of Nash's assertion.[5]

Nash's assessment led me to focus my attention on developing a case study of a western community. Since I also wanted to examine a place tied to one of the nation's thirty-three military cantonments, the choices for study were limited. There were only four military encampments west of the Great Plains. These four camps, and the communities in their geographic proximity, demonstrate the varied atmosphere experienced by men training for war. Deming, New Mexico, home to Camp Cody, had a population of only 1,864 in 1910 and there were no communities larger than that for more than fifty miles in any direction. Government officials placed Camp Kearny in San Diego, a city stifled by the growing power of Los Angeles and home to only 39,578 residents in 1910. Seattle, a young but growing city, was forty-three miles from Camp Lewis and boasted a population of 237,194. Despite Seattle's rapid growth since the turn of the century, I decided that San Francisco, located 32 miles from Camp Fremont, would

---

55.

[5] Michael Malone and Richard Etulain, *The American West: A Twentieth-Century History* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 46-78; Gerald Nash, *The American West in the Twentieth Century: A Short History of an Urban Oasis*, 2nd ed. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1977), 63-71.

be the optimal case study. San Francisco was the only city in the Far West ranked in the top fifteen largest urban places in the nation.[6] The large and diversified population of San Francisco made it the perfect place for me to examine the intersection of urban life and military expansion.

For decades, San Francisco had been developing institutions that, I believe, ultimately gave it a unique perspective when it came time to expand the military's presence in the West.[7] Besides its size, a number of other factors made San Francisco an appealing choice for a case study of the impact of World War I on a city and its residents. The Spanish had established the Presidio on the site of what became San Francisco because of its position at the opening of a large, natural harbor. With the gold rush, it became known as the City by the Golden Gate, the gateway to Pacific trade, servicing an entire region with the goods that came in and out of its harbor. The wealth amassed in this trade, and the subsequent investments in real estate, led the city to be home to many of the West Coast's most influential investors and financial centers. When the government created the Federal Reserve system in 1913, San Francisco became home to the Twelfth Federal Reserve District, the fourth largest in the country by 1930.[8] The War

---

[6]Willis J. Abbot, *The United States in the Great War* (New York: Leslie-Judge Co., 1919), 42; United States, Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1912-1914).

[7]In his analysis of city and regional development in the United States, Carl Abbott could have easily been describing San Francisco specifically when he stated that, "city people and city-based institutions have spear-headed successive frontiers, organized production, centralized rural resources, linked local to the national or international economic system, channeled flows of information, and provided focal points for regional culture and identity." Carl Abbott, "Frontiers and Sections: Cities and Regions in American Growth," in *American Urbanism: A Historiographical Review*, ed. Howard Gillette, Jr. and Zane L. Miller (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 271.

[8]Lewis Francis Byington and Oscar Lewis, eds., *The History of San Francisco* (Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1931), 522.

Department maintained the Presidio, which became the embarkation point for men stationed in the Phillippines during and after the Spanish American War. The city also served as the Pacific, or Western Division headquarters of the army, overseeing military bases in ten western states and territories.[9] Beyond its economic and military importance, San Francisco was a more heterogenous city than others in the Far West. As late as 1930 those with foreign parents made up over half the city's population and more people defined themselves as Catholic than any other religious tradition. Tolerance of this diversity and the fluidity of economic progress empowered the city's laborers to organize. These unions successfully dominated important industries such as construction and the waterfront trades and used their strength to win political office for themselves and their supporters.[10]

Although histories of San Francisco frequently point out the unique elements of the city's past, they rarely, if ever, mention the Great War. Lewis Byington and Oscar Lewis dedicated one page to the war in their voluminous *The History of San Francisco*, even though the authors had lived through the war just a decade earlier. Byington and Lewis did little more than note the large number of soldiers on the city's streets, the flu epidemic, and the celebration commemorating the end of the war. They mentioned nothing about how the war affected the community. They, like several others, focused more of their study on the events that occurred around the time of the war, such as the

---

[9]Erwin N. Thompson and Sally B. Woodbridge, *Special History Study: Presidio of San Francisco: An Outline of Its Evolution as a U.S. Army Post, 1847-1990* (Denver: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1992).

[10]William Issel and Robert W. Cherny, S*an Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).

construction of the Civic Center complex, the Panama Pacific International Exposition, and Hetch Hetchy. Generally, when authors included the Great War in their histories of the city they did little more than blame it for disrupting the flow of visitors to the PPIE or causing a reduction in civic projects.[11] They interpreted the war as an event that did little more than delay urban progress and, therefore, did not warrant intense analysis.

William Issel and Robert Cherny argued that the wartime event that had the most significant impact on the city's residents occurred before the United States declared war in April 1917. The debate over preparedness had encouraged supporters to organize a parade down Market Street on July 22, 1916. A bomb exploded on Steuart Street, near the parade route, killing nine and inuring forty. This bombing, and the subsequent birth of the Chamber of Commerce's Law and Order Committee (that insisted the bombing was the work of unionists), reopened class divisions and political conflicts that had remained relatively in check since the election of Mayor James Rolph in 1911. The bombing helped the Chamber of Commerce organize the business community behind the common goal of weakening the economic and political strength of the city's labor unions. The actions of San Franciscans during the war were little more than a passing thought as Issel and Cherny traced the constant clashes between labor and business that resulted in a "paralysis of city government" in the 1920s. The two historians argued that in the decade

---

[11] Lewis Francis Byington and Oscar Lewis, eds., *The History of San Francisco* (Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1931), 463. Other histories of San Francisco that briefly refer to the war are Charles Caldwell Dobie, *San Francisco: A Pageant* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1939); Mel Scott, *The San Francisco Bay Area*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985); Gray Brechin, *Imperial San Francisco: Urban Power, Earthly Ruin* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); John Bernard McGloin, S.J., *San Francisco: The Story of a City* (San Frafael: Presidio Press, 1978).

after the Great War this inability to create compromises generally "produced outcomes acceptable to the business community" by giving them the opportunity to set an agenda relatively unconstrained by other interest groups. For Issel and Cherny the preparedness day bombing, and not the war, initiated a new era in San Francisco, one in which the city's businessmen increased their political strength in a traditionally pluralistic political environment.[12]

The 1920s not only signaled political changes in San Francisco. Roger Lotchin, in studying the connections between the military and western cities in the interwar years, noted a shift in the way urban Californians perceived their cities after the Great War. The postwar labor conflicts in the region, combined with the fear of radicalism, and economic disruption, compelled coastal communities to intensify efforts to accumulate as much of the military-industrial complex for their city as possible. Being able to identify their city as the military headquarters of the Pacific would mean steady revenue for municipal government, low unemployment for residents, increased economic investments, and a boost in tourism.[13] While they do not agree on what caused the change, Issel, Cherny, and Lotchin concluded that San Francisco in the inter-war years was not the same city it had been at the turn of the century. While the dynamics of all cities change over time, how the Great War affected this transition in San Francisco is the focus of the current study.

My research demonstrates that San Francisco was going through a transitional

---

[12]Issel and Cherny, S*an Francisco, 1865-1932*, 177-178; 200-212.

[13]Roger W. Lotchin, *Fortress California, 1910-1961: From Warfare to Welfare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), xiii-xviii.

phase during the 1910s that was, on the one hand, common to cities across the nation and, on the other, unique to San Francisco and the development of the West Coast. Several historians have noted a general trend among urban residents at this time to reevaluate what it meant to live in an American city. Alan Marcus believed prewar urbanites saw their city as a social system, consisting of diverse groups that each had proper, hierarchical tasks. The city was run efficiently when all its groups did their part correctly. Marcus concluded that after 1920 residents defined their cities as concentric communities, each equally responsible for the success or failure of the city. Rather than identifying the city as a corrupting influence that required the middle class to push for more social and/or moral control to prevent competing thoughts and practices, urban Americans began to see their city, and the diversity it harbored, as having positive attributes. If they could channel diverse opinions into common goals, the city would succeed.[14]

Gunther Barth also recognized a shift in the way people defined themselves and their city by the 1920s. While Marcus focused on political and social structures, Barth concentrated on the elements that comprised urban culture. He argued that by the 1910s what residents perceived as "modern" city culture – based on apartment house living, the dissemination of common ideas in local papers, consumption in department stores, and public entertainment venues like ball parks and vaudeville houses – had begun to decrease in significance. These unifying institutions had previously "answered the

[14] Alan I. Marcus, "Back to the Present: Historians' Treatment of the City as a Social System During the Reign of the Idea of Community," in *American Urbanism: A Historiographical Review*, ed. Howard Gillette, Jr. and Zane L. Miller (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 16-20.

mounting need of diverse people for a common urban identity that also left enough room for each individual's dreams and aspirations." Barth concluded that the new urban culture – based on the automobile, tabloids, shopping centers and movies – compelled changes in urban identity throughout the nation by the 1920s.[15] In most cities, traditional cultural icons slowly failed to satisfy individual and communal needs, but San Francisco experienced an almost instantaneous collapse of cultural institutions. The earthquake and fire in April 1906 disrupted the balance between self and community as treasured establishments went up in flames. While residents quickly rebuilt their homes and business, the new buildings could not simply replicate the old urban culture. San Franciscans, like their counterparts in other America cities, searched for new ways to define their City by the Golden Gate as they moved through the 1910s and 1920s. The destruction in 1906 left the city with fewer architectural reminders of its past from which to construct the new urban culture.

San Francisco faced another unique crisis as it struggled to rebuild after the 1906 disasters – loss of its position as the premiere city of the West Coast. Since the Gold Rush it had been the city through which trade flowed. Trade had led to its dominance as the West's financial center and its population was not only the largest on the coast but ranked among the top ten in the nation from 1870-1900.[16] The 1906 earthquake and fire, however, made San Franciscans more aware that their supremacy in these areas was not

---

[15] Gunther Barth, *City People: The Rise of Modern City Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 229-234.

[16] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Division, *U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population of the 100 Largest Urban Places in the United States: 1790-1990* (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1998).

permanently secure. There is ample evidence that San Franciscans were well aware of the rapid growth of their Pacific Coast urban competitors before the beginning of WWI. To the north, Portland and Seattle had been competing with each other for economic control of the Pacific Northwest since the 1880s. Like San Francisco, Seattle had a good, natural harbor. As a result of the Alaskan gold rush in the 1890s, and the completion of the Great Northern Railroad in 1893, Seattle began developing a variety of small industries to meet regional demands, thus creating relative economic stability and a subsequent population explosion. By 1910, Seattle boasted a population of more than 237,000 – 30,000 more than its regional rival, Portland.[17]

The Alaskan gold rush also infused life into the economy of Portland thanks to the Northern Pacific. The railroad linked the city to markets in the interior a full decade earlier than Seattle. Portland provided all the needs of prospective miners: food crops from the Willamette Valley, lumber, mining supplies and tents. Portland experienced massive growth between 1905 and 1912 as shown in the 150 percent increase in banking transactions and the 400 percent rise in building permits. By 1912, 20 percent of the nation's timber supply came from the Cascade Mountains, adding to the wealth in Portland's trade and financial sectors. The growth of Seattle and Portland in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century meant the Pacific Northwest could claim economic independence from San Francisco, which had provided the manufactured goods and crop

[17] Mansel G. Blackford, *The Lost Dream: Business and City Planning on the Pacific Coast, 1890-1920* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993), 14-25; Roger Sale, *Seattle: Past to Present* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976), 50-86; Gerald B. Nelson, *Seattle: The Life and Times of an American City* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977), 28-29.

markets for the region before the additional transcontinental lines. Such independence not only thwarted previous economic advantages for San Francisco, it also meant the City by the Golden Gate would in the future have to compete for regional and possible international markets with these two cities.[18]

Seattle and Portland were not the only coastal cities that grew to become San Francisco's rivals for natural resources, financial investments, new residents, and international commerce. Los Angles, long dependent on the Southern Pacific Railroad, was also a developing threat. In 1876, Los Angeles voters elected to give Southern Pacific a $602,000 bond subsidy and much of the public land around San Pedro Harbor. As long as the San Francisco-based Big Five controlled Los Angeles, San Francisco's dominance prevailed.[19] However, in the early twentieth century, members of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce began efforts to whittle away at Southern Pacific's power base. Through bond elections and court litigation, Los Angeles won control of its water system in 1902 from the privately-owned Los Angeles City Water Company (a political ally of SP). Four years later the Chamber successfully campaigned to remove the SP machine from local politics, winning seventeen of twenty-three offices. In 1911, Los Angeles and Oakland pressured the state legislature to pass the Tidelands Trust Act,

---

[18]Blackford, *The Lost Dream*, 14-25; Jewel Lansing, *Portland: People, Politics, and Power, 1851-2001* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2003), 225-266; Carl Abbott, *Portland: Planning, Politics, and Growth in a Twentieth-Century City* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), 35-52.

[19]Los Angeles' deals with Southern Pacific prevented San Diego from establishing a similar deal with the company, hampering the development of San Diego as a major urban center until the 1920s. San Diego did not make the U.S. Census Bureau's top 100 cities list until 1920 when it ranked ninety-third with 74,683 residents. For more on San Diego's early history see the seven volumes of Richard Pourade's *The History of San Diego* written between 1960 and 1977, published by Union-Tribune Publishing Company.

giving California cities control of their harbors. After the city consolidated San Pedro into the greater city of Los Angeles, the Chamber initiated bond elections that, by 1932, netted $30 million in local funds for harbor improvements. Los Angeles was thus able to dredge its harbor, widen the channel, and increase the size of the protective breakwater. While most of the harbor's prewar traffic was in domestic imports, the harbor improvements prepared the way for greater exportation of natural resources in the decades to come. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce combined these political actions with one of the most wide-reaching advertising campaigns of the time. They sent produce from the farms around Los Angeles to expositions across the country, distributed Los Angeles newspapers to every region, and advertised the warm climate and suburban-like environment of their sprawling city. The result was a massive increase in the number of migrants, many retiring farmers from the Midwest. By 1910, Los Angeles was the seventeenth largest city in the nation – only six spots behind San Francisco.[20]

The 1910 census noted more than San Francisco's inability to keep up with the previous decade's national urban growth. It also marked the U.S. Census Bureau's creation of twenty-five "metropolitan districts." For the first time, the U.S. Census Bureau examined the population of the largest American cities not just by the number of people living within the city proper, but also those inhabitants of what the Bureau called the "adjacent territory." Behind this change was a belief in the growing "importance of

---

[20]Robert M. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850-1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 43-78; Steven P. Erie, *Globalizing Los Angeles: Trade, Infrastructure, and Regional Development* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 45-63; Blackford, *The Lost Dream*, 14-25.

the suburbs of great cities." In creating the metropolitan district for the Bay Area, Census Bureau officials determined that there was not one central city, but two – San Francisco and Oakland. Thanks in part to the 1906 disasters, San Francisco's population had increased by approximately 22 percent (to 416,912), while Oakland had grown by 124 percent (to 150,174). Census officials considered the increase to be significant enough to create a co-metropolitan district for the Bay Area.[21] Urban sociologists considered the Census's creation of the metropolitan district system a strong indicator that Americans were beginning to accept the economic, political, and cultural control of the central city on the growing suburbs surrounding it. However, the opposite appears to be the case in San Francisco. The Census Bureau, in perceiving San Francisco to be part of a metropolitan district that included a second influential city, denoted in charts rather than words that no one city dominated the Bay. Meanwhile, the lack of co-central cities for Los Angeles, Seattle, or Portland meant they did not face significant competition for metropolitan dominance. They were, therefore, able to develop control over their districts while San Francisco had to worry about fending off the political and economic encroachment of neighboring communities. San Francisco Bay cities, unwilling to support consolidation with San Francisco, became its competitors, providing potential residents and businesses less expensive and crowded housing conditions and land for industrial development.[22]

---

[21] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census of the United States*, volume 1, (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1913), 74-76.

[22] For more on the growth of cities and their influence on the metropolitan district from 1910-1950 see J. John Palen, *The Urban World*, 7th ed. (New York: Paradigm Publishers, 2004), 87-93. An overview of San Francisco's attempts to develop Greater San Francisco, which would have incorporated much of the

For San Franciscans, the rising competition from other west coast cities threatened the economic viability of their community and in part the way they defined themselves. According to Sharon Zukin, urban residents create new public spaces that reflect their vision of a city when traditional institutions fail to provide meaningful expressions of identity. For San Franciscans, the old city of political bosses, limited law and order, and a frontier town of single, transient men looking to get rich quick had been purged by the fire. By the 1910s residents were searching for ways to define the city that they claimed as their home in a way that reflected their personal values and visions of the future.[23] During a lecture on the city of Boston in the early 1990s, David McCullough stated that "What face to put on one's city . . . has been a great concern to town and city leaders since before the American Revolution. Particularly in trying economic times or moments of social unrest, leaders and everyday people alike have wondered aloud about what the future held and what their role in it would be."[24] In 1917, San Francisco was a city facing a whole host of potential future problems. The start of the war in Europe had led to rising inflation, resulting in labor unrest in 1916. Meanwhile, many residents were increasingly aware of the growing trade, population, and business competition they faced from other cities on the coast. Then, the war itself drafted men and resources away from the city. The question became, what would San Francisco look like in the future? How would its

---

Bay area, is found in Mel Scott, *The San Francisco Bay Area*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 133-148; 183.

[23]Sharon Zukin, *The Cultures of Cities* (Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 1995), 3-7.

[24]Daniel J. Monti, Jr., *The American City: A Social and Cultural History* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 12.

residents define the city, and by extension, themselves?

In making the argument that urban residents actively construct an identity based in part on their perceived connections to the larger community, I am following the contention made by urban sociologists who emphasize the importance of agency rather than structure. These social theorists reject the general tenets of the Chicago School of sociologists, who argued that residents of urban environments react to, rather than choose to define their lives by, the attributes of the city. According to these sociologists, residents seek out bonds, both real and perceived, with other urbanites, leading each to a personal identification with the city.[25] War-related functions, like bond drives, became intertwined with routine daily associations, such as club functions and business transactions, to give San Franciscans multiple opportunities for social interaction. These interpersonal associations strengthened community identification, and in turn personal attachments to San Francisco. These residents jockeyed with each other for their share of the urban power structure, even as they fought to maintain San Francisco's identity as the economic, political, and cultural supremacy on the West Coast. The war led to additional federal support from government shipbuilding contracts and military bases. This significant infusion of federal dollars showed San Franciscans that one way to secure the city's economic future was to keep the military in San Francisco after the war. Even if they were unable to maintain dominance in regional or Pacific rim trade, the strong presence of the military in the decades to come would enable residents to redefine their

---

[25] David A. Karp, Gregory P. Stone and William C. Yoels, *Being Urban: A Sociology of City Life*, 2nd ed. (New York: Praeger, 1991), 49-61; Gordon Marshall, ed., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 7.

city. Instead of being residents of the Jewel of the Pacific, they could help to make their city the Defender of the Pacific.[26]

As historians Robert Fairbanks and Patricia Mooney-Melvin explain, residents of any city have at any given time some basic, shared assumptions that serve as the basis for debate on current issues.[27] During the 1910s, San Franciscans shared the conviction that their city should defend its economic supremacy on the West Coast. The war gave residents the opportunity to prove to the entire nation that San Francisco knew how to win a war. Through patriotic efforts, San Franciscans hoped to win federal recognition for their abilities, recognition that would in turn lead to military contracts, attract new businesses and residents, and lure visitors from across the nation to see for themselves why San Francisco was special. In San Francisco this shared, urban goal could also stir up conflict as various groups contributed their interpretations about how to meet the city's goal of showing the nation that they were "The City That Knows How."

In times of great crisis or change, civic pride brought residents together to work for a common cause, such as rebuilding after the 1906 earthquake and fire, winning and hosting the PPIE, and patriotically serving their nation's needs in the Great War. These goals, and the civic unity they evoked, masked underlying tensions within the city. While

---

[26] In his study of urban American from 1915-1945 William H. Wilson points out the significant federal benefits reaped by many cities, including San Francisco, during World War I. He considers this the first of three phases of growing federal involvement in American cities, culminating with the Great Depression and World War II. William H. Wilson, *Coming of Age: Urban America, 1915-1945* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1974), 162-170.

[27] Robert B. Fairbanks and Patricia Mooney-Melvin, ed., *Making Sense of the City: Local Government, Civic Culture, and Community Life in Urban America* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2001), 1-5.

residents in part identified themselves as members of the greater San Francisco community, there were many other ways they chose to define themselves. Mark Abrahamson noted in his work on urban enclaves that "most people occupy numerous roles, are involved in many different relationships, and have multiple identities." They might identify themselves at various times and in different situations within such categories as kinship networks, occupational roles, religious beliefs, or political views. In a large city like San Francisco, people did not feel pressured to choose a dominant identity but could combine multiple characteristics into a pluralistic identity.[28] A single individual could, for example, define himself as a resident of San Francisco, a member of the Building Trades Union, a member of the Board of Supervisors, and an ethnic Irishman. Such pluralism makes it nearly impossible to explain how all residents felt on any specific issue during the Great War. Though no one person might fall into any one category, I decided that the best way to organize the dissertation was to have the chapters focus on some of the most dominant, and potentially conflicting, characteristics – local politicians, members of the Chamber of Commerce, labor unionists, and European immigrants. While residents might identify themselves as members of several of these groups, one can examine some of the most significant conflicts that appeared in San Francisco during the Great War with such categorizations.

Before one can explain the crisis of identity facing San Francisco by the time of the Great War, one must explain how San Franciscans had previously defined their city.

---

[28]Mark Abrahamson, *Urban Enclaves: Identity and Place in America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 5-8.

Chapter One contains a brief history of the city before the war. It examines the growth of San Francisco after the Gold Rush and how the earthquake and fire in 1906 destroyed the last vestiges of the city's frontier origins. How residents chose to rebuild after the twin disasters and the importance of hosting the Panama International Exposition help explain the developing identity of the new San Francisco. With the closing of the PPIE, residents struggled to find another common goal to unify the city's disparate parts just as the United States entered World War I.

The Great War provided San Franciscans with an opportunity to show their devotion to the cause of democracy as they demonstrated the values of the "City That Knows How." Chapter Two examines the ways in which soldiers and sailors preparing for imminent deployment commingled with civilians in greater numbers than San Franciscans had seen since the Philippine Insurrection. It also analyzes how the expansion of military installations in the Bay Area altered the activities of the city's residents and affected temporary military residents. An evening or weekend furlough brought soldiers from the Presidio, and later Camp Fremont, into contact with civilians who treated each man as potential future residents (or at the very least frequent visitors). Defensive bases, like Fort Baker, and the soldiers stationed at Fort McDowell added to the martial spirit that permeated the city. Contingents of new recruits like Charles Swope, the central figure in Chapter Two, marched down Market Street alongside shoppers, workers, and businessmen. City residents could not ignore the fact that the United States was at war, nor could they afford to waste the opportunity to win favor with military leaders who might be able to grant the city government contracts in the future.

Such constant reminders of the war prevented San Franciscans from conducting business as usual and provided new opportunities to prove one's patriotism and civic zeal. Leading most of these public displays of patriotism was Mayor James Rolph, and Chapter Three studies the important role of municipal government in fighting the war. Mayor Rolph spent the war publicizing the city's efforts and promoting the advantages the city offered to the military and others entering the city due to wartime endeavors, while also uniting the citizenry in public displays of loyalty and unity. Local political leaders oversaw state and national defense edicts that, if ignored, could jeopardize the city's reputation and future economic gains.

The growing economic strength of other Pacific Coast cities particularly worried San Francisco's businessmen who, during the war, looked anxiously to the future. While the PPIE had shown that the city could rebound from the fiery ashes, its position as the preeminent Pacific Coast city was no longer certain. The astounding growth of Los Angeles, the boosterism of San Diego, and the expansion of international trade with the Pacific Northwest prompted San Francisco to compete for federal attention, international recognition, and tourism. The efforts of the Chamber of Commerce to promote San Francisco as the premier city of the Pacific Coast and the efforts of individual businessmen to win the war, and profit from it, are the crux of Chapter Four. The war gave San Francisco businessmen the opportunity to advertise the best their city had to offer – wrapped in an American flag. At the same time, the war provided the city's organized laborers the chance to thwart the Chamber of Commerce's prewar attempts to reduce union power. The unions consistently emphasized the loyalty of their actions,

whether by strategic use of strikes, supporting the defendants in the bombing trials, or contributing to wartime drives. Chapter Five addresses the ways in which the city's labor unions invoked patriotic rhetoric while fighting for workers' rights. It also examines labor's vision of San Francisco's identity, one in which, as in the past, labor had access to political power. Combining civic pride, patriotism, and personal advancement, San Francisco's labor unions and ethnic groups showed the nation that the "City that Knows How" could not only rebuild a city but help to win a war.

San Francisco's diverse urban populace serves as a microcosm of the nation's debate over the need for "100 percent Americanism." San Francisco's designation as a city of immigrants allows for the study of varying reactions to American entrance into World War I and the war's impact on ethnic groups. In San Francisco, a majority of residents could identify themselves as members of an ethnic group, but the focus of Chapter Six is on the city's three largest contingents – the Irish, Germans, and Italians. All three faced unique challenges during the war, depending on the diplomatic relationship of the United States to their country of origin. Each sought to improve the image of their ethnic group within the larger community by supporting federally approved wartime activities, while also struggling to protect elements of their ethnic culture they considered important not only to themselves but to the diversity of San Francisco.

Each chapter begins with the description of one of the city's many parades or large public functions. These activities reflected not only residents' desire to express their support for the American war but also their desire to show the nation that San Francisco stood behind the cause 100 percent. According to Roger Lotchin, city leaders

used civic events during World War II to suppress individualism and draw residents closer together. I argue that this can also be seen with public displays of patriotism during the Great War. People of various backgrounds in part defined themselves based on their perception of what it meant to be a San Franciscan. Patriotic rallies united residents in a common purpose: helping their city and nation win the war. Organizations conducted these parades in the city's most public spaces, generally starting or ending somewhere along Market Street, the artery that cuts diagonally from the Ferry Building, through the downtown business district, to City Hall. According to historian Jon C. Teaford, business districts in the early twentieth century served as the "knot uniting the various strands of the city." Any parade of people on Market Street was sure to grab the attention of the masses who might live in neighborhoods scattered throughout San Francisco, but who in many ways connected to the larger community by their presence on Market Street.[29] Such visual manifestations of patriotism served to commemorate unity, while hiding the fissures within the community. While San Franciscans wanted to promote a concerted war effort, they also sought to secure their vision of the city's future and secure their way of life. Businessmen wanted to draw more business to the city; politicians and would-be politicians wanted to get elected; labor wanted to keep their unions strong; soldiers wanted reminders of home; and immigrants wanted the larger populace to accept their ethnic diversity while they enjoyed the economic benefits

---

[29]Roger W. Lotchin, *The Bad City in the Good War: San Francisco, Los Angeles, Oakland, and San Diego* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 35; Jon C. Teaford, *The Twentieth-Century American City: Problem, Promise, and Reality*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 6-8.

associated with at least a modicum of assimilation. The divisions inherent in the urban populace resulted in serious disagreements regarding how to achieve urban goals, creating a fractured vision of San Francisco's current and future identity.

This *sturm* and *drang* is evident in residents' desires to promote a concerted war effort while competing with others for political and economic power. During the war, divergent segments of the populace used patriotic rhetoric to attack their urban opponents, labeling them disloyal or at the least patriotically inept. San Franciscans united for general purposes, such as reconstruction, the graft trials, the PPIE, and the Great War, but differed widely on the specifics of how theirs goals should be achieved. The greater the challenge, the more orderly and organized the people and neighborhoods functioned, no matter how disconnected their individual aspirations. The war provided an overarching organization system, one in which participation in the war effort united the diversified groups, creating a well-operating city and war machine.

Chapter One
"It is in San Francisco because she knows how": The Panama Pacific International Exposition and the Struggle for an Urban Identity

On the morning of October 14, 1911 San Franciscans lined six miles of city streets from the St. Francis Hotel to Golden Gate Park's stadium. Shortly after ten o'clock, mounted police began escorting automobiles carrying President William Howard Taft, along with city and state dignitaries, to the site of the ground-breaking ceremonies that would initiate the construction of the Panama Pacific International Exposition (PPIE). Residents of the city followed the long line of cars, marching bands, soldiers from the Presidio, and sailors from the Naval Training Station as they made their way to the spot in Golden Gate Park that had been home to the Midwinter Fair of 1893. The ceremony at the park was, as the *San Francisco Chronicle* described it, "simple in the extreme." Charles Moore, president of the Panama Pacific International Exposition Company, made a few brief comments, as did Mayor Patrick McCarthy and Governor Hiram Johnson. President Taft then addressed the crowd, examining the history of Panama and the progress made to date on the canal. In conclusion, he praised San Francisco and California as a whole for "their energy and their enterprise and their patriotism and their generosity" in raising the funds necessary to commemorate what Taft considered a seminal event for America as it expanded its international trade and intercontinental ties. Using a silver spade, President Taft scooped up a small amount of dirt, which he poured into a rosewood box held by Charles Moore. President Taft then

raised the exposition flag up a makeshift pole while workers released one hundred white doves and the crowd sang the "Star Spangled Banner." Moore dismissed the crowd as fireworks erupted overhead.[1] This simple public exercise was the culmination of years of hard work by San Franciscans to draw international attention to their city and achieve national recognition for their impressive reconstruction since the earthquake and fires of 1906. Golden Gate Park was symbolic of how far the city had advanced in just five years and the pride San Franciscans felt in rising like a phoenix from the ashes. In 1906 the park had served as a temporary shelter for the city's homeless. In 1911 it sat poised to entertain a world fair.

The day after the ground-breaking ceremony President Taft dined with PPIE directors at the Cliff House. Moore presented the president with a commemorative exposition flag like the one he had raised at Golden Gate Park. In accepting the gift, President Taft encouraged the directors to make the PPIE the "most successful exposition in the world." He believed it would be a significant festival because it commemorated the completion of the Panama Canal, a project Taft considered one "of the greatest work of five, ten and fifteen centuries." He concluded by reminding those present that he had supported San Francisco in her bid to host the exposition, for as "I have said before why it ought to come here – I can only repeat – it is in San Francisco because she knows how."[2] For years to come, San Franciscans would passionately recite the last phrase of Taft's speech, identifying San Francisco as "The City that Knows How." While the

---

[1] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 15 October 1911, 34-35.

[2] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 16 October 1911, 3.

moniker denoted no specific urban action, for San Franciscans it conjured images of a city constantly striving, and succeeding, to reach envisioned goals. In 1911 San Francisco was on its way to developing a new image of itself as a city that knew how to land an international exposition despite recent devastation. However, there were questions about what else the city knew how to do besides rebuild. Beyond the Panama Pacific International Exposition, what else could San Franciscans boast their city was capable of achieving?

The ground-breaking ceremonies provided residents with the opportunity to show how far they had come since the earthquake and fire of 1906 destroyed five square miles of the city. It forced residents to consider where they had collectively been and where their community was headed. In expressing the spirit guiding the city into the future, many San Franciscans referred to its unequaled past. At the opening reception held for President Taft the night before the PPIE dedication, two San Franciscans searched for links to the city's past in their evaluation of its present triumphs and future goals. For Charles Moore, president of the PPIE Company, the opening of the Panama Canal was an opportunity for commercial pioneers to develop economic supremacy over trade with the Orient and Latin America, comparable to San Francisco's dominance of hinterland commerce in nineteenth-century California, Washington, and Oregon. Moore believed the Exposition would create economic bonds between city businessmen and foreign commercial entities, setting the stage for San Francisco to stake a claim to international trade, just as city residents had controlled Nevada through their stakes in the Comstock. For Moore, San Franciscans were not leaving the past behind, but developing a new

monopoly over Pacific commerce that would reinvigorate the image of the pioneer. William B. Bourn, president of Empire Mines and the Spring Valley Water Company, also saw the city's former pioneer identity as intrinsically linked to its future. For Bourn, most American cities had virtually identical spirits, "differing only in the degree of intensity with which the same pursuits are followed." He believed San Francisco was unique because the gold rush had shortened the city's childhood, causing it to develop into an adolescent city faster than most.[3]

In describing the city, Moore touched on the key to San Francisco's early identity. The gold rush had converted a Mexican outpost into what one historian called an "instant city," which rapidly "joined the ranks of cities that had taken centuries to evolve." As an instant city, residents embraced the belief that their present circumstances were ever-changing and pioneers who quickly learned to adapt reaped huge rewards. At the same time, the instant city gained control of the hinterland, spreading its economic and political power and further fueling San Francisco's rapid growth.[4] This progression of urban development led residents to search for ways to keep the spirit of their outpost beginnings even as they outgrew the volatility of the 1850s. The spirit of the frontier was easy to maintain during the late nineteenth century when the pioneers were still alive and the city continued to dominate the economy of California and the Pacific Coast. After 1906 it became more readily apparent to residents that the instant city was gone and that other Pacific Coast cities were becoming San Francisco's competitors, shedding their

---

[3] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 14 October 1911, 15-16.

[4] Gunther Barth, *Instant Cities: Urbanization and the Rise of San Francisco and Denver* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), xxi-xxiv.

dependent status. For William Bourn, who described the city in terms of human development, the San Francisco of 1911 was on the verge of achieving full maturation. However, he and others were unsure how to define this new urban adult. While they knew the city could no longer identify itself as a frontier outpost and increasingly faced stiff competition from other West Coast cities, both men looked to the past to guide their interpretation of the city's present and future.

For many residents San Francisco's new identity would inevitably reflect its unique past. Americans had arrived in the small Mexican village of Yerba Buena in July 1846. What they found was a small population of a few hundred residents huddled around the community's two central features: the military outpost at the Presidio and Mission Dolores. The Americans quickly surveyed the land, marking city lots for potential future real estate development. On January 30, 1847 the military officer in charge bowed to pressure from new residents and officially changed the name of the town to San Francisco to more clearly identify the community with the Bay that served as its lifeblood rather than the small cove of Yerba Buena. A year later the town was almost completely evacuated when word of the discovery of gold in the American River reached the community, but boatloads of newcomers seeking immediate wealth, envisioning San Francisco as the financial center for the mining boom, quickly replaced the first residents.[5] After the initial wave of miners poured through the Golden Gate, those who

[5]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Report on the Social Statistics of Cities*, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1887), 2: 800-801; Charles Wollenberg, *Golden Gate Metropolis: Perspectives on Bay Area History* (Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1985), 74; Gray Brechin, *Imperial San Francisco: Urban Power, Earthly Ruin* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), xxiv, Barth, *Instant Cities*, xxi-xxii.

had made it rich as miners, or as merchants serving the miners, turned to banking or commercial pursuits. These entrepreneurs invested throughout the far west but continued to use the city as their base of operations, pumping riches into the local economy. Meanwhile, more laborers moved into the city and became hired hands for mining companies and the machine shops that produced mining equipment. As consumers, these laborers stimulated the urban economy with their purchases.[6]

While mining lured many into the region, the city's economic structure rapidly diversified. In 1880 San Francisco had 105,000 laborers; 36 percent worked in manufacturing and construction, 29 percent in trade and transportation, and 34 percent in service industries. Manufactured goods from San Francisco were essential to the hinterland, which was also dependent on the City by the Gate for its imports and exports. Thanks to its harbor, San Francisco dominated shipping. San Francisco held a virtual monopoly on Pacific Coast imports and controlled 83 percent of the exports from the west coast of North and Central America. The U.S. Census in 1887 considered San Francisco to be the "commercial metropolis of the Pacific Coast." Thanks to its harbor, and the tributary rivers from the Sierra Nevada Mountains, San Francisco dominated the region's shipping.[7] The city was the center of the state's industrial output, providing manufactured goods such as ships, iron, cloth, and processed foods to residents from Washington state to the Mexican border. In that year San Francisco had seven times the

---

[6]Barth, *Instant Cities*, 26-30.

[7]William Issel and Robert W. Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 23; U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Report on the Social Statistics of Cities*, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1887), 2: 803.

industrial output of its nearest competitor in the state, Los Angeles. However, by 1910 the city's manufacturing output had stagnated due to the transfer of some manufacturing to the East Bay after the earthquake and fires and the rapid growth of Los Angeles. By 1920, San Francisco's manufacturing output was in noticeable decline. In 1925, Los Angeles surpassed San Francisco in manufacturing, having increased its output by 100 percent between 1900 and 1910 alone.[8]

The economic opportunities available in trade, manufacturing, and the service sector made San Francisco the most heavily populated city on the coast from the time of the gold rush until the 1910s. Fire destroyed the 1850 national census records for the city, but the 1852 state census placed San Francisco's population at 34,776. By 1870 San Francisco was the tenth largest city in America and the only Western city in the top ten until Los Angeles moved into ninth place in 1920 with 576,673 residents. Los Angeles moved ahead of San Francisco by expanding its city boundaries farther into the suburbs within its county. San Francisco had been reporting combined city and county totals since 1856 when the Consolidation Act merged the city and county of San Francisco into one political entity. It also separated San Francisco County from the southern portion of the Peninsula, which become San Mateo County. This division prevented San Francisco from expanding beyond its 1856 size of forty-two square miles.

---

[8]The 1920 census showed that of almost 266,000 workers only 31% worked in manufacturing, with 41% in trade and transportation and 28% in service jobs. Barth, *Instant Cities*, 168-169; Mansel G. Blackford, *The Politics of Business in California, 1890-1920* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1977), 15-16; Robert Glass Cleland, *From Wilderness to Empire: A History of California* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962, 282; Robert Glass Cleland, *March of Industry* (San Francisco: Powell Publishing Co., 1929), 146-147; Michael Kazin, *Barons of Labor: The San Francisco Building Trades and Union Power in the Progressive Era* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987, 17.

After the earthquake and fire, city leaders became more concerned about the economic competition of other Bay Area communities and the continued geographic expansion of Los Angeles. They sought to protect their prosperity through annexation. In 1907 San Franciscans began a concerted effort to develop a Greater San Francisco that included San Mateo County, East Bay communities from Richmond to San Leandro, and Marin County cities. The bid for the PPIE won support from all these areas, leading San Francisco business and political leaders to assume they would endorse the Greater San Francisco plan. Civic boosters successfully completed a petition drive that led to a statewide initiative on the November 1912 ballot. While many around the Bay supported the initiative, San Franciscans did not anticipate the strong resistance that came from Oakland. Determined to retain its independence, Oakland led the state opposition to consolidation. On election day, only three counties voted for the initiative – San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin. Despite this overwhelming defeat, San Franciscans continued to talk about the possibility of a Greater San Francisco, although more narrowly defined. Leaders directed their efforts at consolidating San Mateo County as a way to create what many assumed would be a more dynamic and prosperous San Francisco. For the next twenty years, politicians and Chamber of Commerce members from both counties studied the possibility of consolidation. In the end, San Mateo residents rejected San Francisco's plan of total annexation. When San Franciscans refused to consider the establishment of a borough system of government, the Greater San Francisco plan ceased to be a viable option. Today, San Francisco remains an urban

community that encompasses only forty-seven square miles.[9] These geographic limitations prevented San Francisco from continuing to compete with other metropolitan centers that had the capacity to spread their population over a larger area. At the same time, the city's truncated size enabled it to retain a distinct geographical identity.

The compact nature of San Francisco also accentuated another unique aspect of San Francisco's identity: its varied ethnic composition. San Francisco, like many Western urban centers, was a city with a historically large proportion of foreign-born residents. The gold rush brought in people from around the world and that trend continued into the twentieth century. In 1870, 42 percent of the city's residents were foreign-born whites and another 30 percent had white, foreign-born parents.[10] By 1900 the number of foreign-born whites had dropped, but the overall percentage of residents from a foreign land or only one generation removed from migration remained high at 75 percent.[11] In the decades after the gold rush, the Irish were the dominant ethnic group, comprising nearly one-third of the city's population in 1880.[12] German-born residents came in second behind the Irish from 1880 to 1910.[13] Though a small percentage of the

---

[9] Wollenberg, *Golden Gate Metropolis*, 81; Mel Scott, *The San Francisco Bay Area*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 134-148, 178-183; Brechin, *Imperial San Francisco*, xxv. For an editorial showing the connections San Franciscans made between progress, prosperity and consolidation see *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 28 January 1916, 4.

[10] When one combines those figures with the 8% of residents from China and Japan, 79.3% of San Franciscans had been born overseas or were tied to the immigrant experience by their parentage.

[11] Data from Table 5, "Race, Nativity, and Origin of the Population of San Francisco," in Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 56.

[12] Wollenberg, *Golden Gate Metropolis*, 142.

[13] Susan Englander, *Class Conflict and Coalition in the California Woman Suffrage Movement, 1907-1912: The San Francisco Wage Earners' Suffrage League* (Lewiston: NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 17.

overall immigrant population before 1900, Italians increasingly made San Francisco home, coming in third with almost 29,000 foreign-born residents in 1910. In 1920 there was not one immigrant group identified by the U.S. Census Bureau that was not represented in San Francisco.[14]

Despite large Irish, German, and Italian immigrants, the geography of the city retarded the development of ethnic neighborhoods. While transportation advances after 1900 allowed new residential development west of Twin Peaks, most new residents moved into already established neighborhoods. While Chinese and Japanese inhabitants lived in segregated neighborhoods, seven of the nine distinct neighborhoods in this period cannot be defined simply by ethnicity. Marital status, occupation, and income were just as significant in determining where someone would reside in early twentieth century San Francisco. Without strong ethnic enclaves, residents defined their neighbors and neighborhoods by class rather than nationality. However, ethnic background influenced activities such as church attendance, support for local politicians of similar ethnic make-up, and participation in social associations.[15] Since most early twentieth century residents had immigrant parents, or were from Europe themselves, San Francisco's identity was in large part tied to its large immigrant population and immigrant traditions. Residents took pride living in a city of such ethnic diversity and often described it as a "city of immigrants."

The ethnic diversity of San Francisco, and a flexible social hierarchy typically

---

[14]United States Bureau of the Census. *Fourteenth Census of the United States taken in the year 1920*. (Washington: G.P.O., 1922), 109.

[15]Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 58; Kazin, *Barons of Labor*,14, 20.

found in an instant city, prevented the establishment of a political elite. As a result, the city often found itself with inefficient governance, run by political bosses who used egalitarian themes in pursuit of their own power. Only when these municipal governments failed to maintain order and protect property did residents interfere with the political status quo.[16] Part of the political culture's egalitarianism stemmed from the anti-Chinese and later anti-Japanese rhetoric that united white San Franciscans. Racism gave whites a means of delineating between residents they believed deserved equal rights and those who should be socially, economically, and politically inferior. The free labor ideology of the gold rush encouraged immigrants and native-born laborers to organize unions that also prevented political dominance by the wealthy business elite. By the early twentieth century, one-third of the city's workers belonged to unions that, according to Michael Kazin, "wielded significant power over working conditions and elected officials," making the city "an anomaly that either impressed or horrified contemporaries."[17] The power of labor unions suggests that citizens continued to believe they lived in an urban community in which workers had just as much opportunity to achieve political power as the wealthy of Nob Hill. The pace of change may have slowed from the days of the instant city, but San Franciscans in the early twentieth century still embraced that image of their city. Born fully-formed from the gold rush San Francisco afforded the pioneers who could tame the frontier fantastic opportunities. No one, however, could tame mother nature.

---

[16]Barth, *Instant Cities*, 167-180.

[17]Kazin, *Barons of Labor*, 14; Wollenberg, *Golden Gate Metropolis*, 148.

At 5:12 a.m. on April 18, 1906 an 8.25 magnitude earthquake struck San Francisco. In the aftermath of the quake, fires broke out across the city, and due to the broken water mains the city's fire department had limited resources to fight the blazes. Firefighters and volunteers could only dynamite buildings to create fire breaks and wait for the fires to burn themselves out. When the last of the fires died out on April 21 five square miles of San Francisco lay in ruins, including most of the financial and retail districts, as well as large portions of the wholesale, factory and entertainment sections of the city. The fire destroyed more than 28,000 buildings and left three-fifth's of the city's 250,000 residents homeless. On the morning of the earthquake, Mayor Eugene Schmitz responded to the disaster by creating a Committee of Fifty to handle the immediate task of providing necessities to the homeless. Led by former mayor James Phelan, the committee aided Presidio officers as they organized approximately one hundred sanitary camps for residents. The committee also divided the city into seven sectors for efficient distribution of food and supplies. Bolstered by $2 million in immediate relief from Congress and several million in Red Cross donations, city leaders shifted their focus in May from relief to rebuilding. The mayor replaced the Committee of Fifty with the Committee of Reconstruction.[18] This committee included former city politicians, business leaders, professionals, and union members who put aside previous personal and class divisions to develop plans for rebuilding the city. Civic pride encouraged them to seek out a comprehensive plan for reconstruction that would not only return the city to its

[18] John Bernard McGloin, S.J., *San Francisco: The Story of a City* (San Rafael: Presidio Press, 1978), 145-147;

former glory, but create a better organized, more efficient, more modern San Francisco.

The Committee initially turned to a plan developed and published just prior to the earthquake by the Association for the Improvement and Adornment of San Francisco. Emerging as a construct of the city beautiful movement, leading merchants and social elites had formed the IASF in 1901 to encourage investors to buy city bonds for civic improvements.[19] In 1905 the IASF commissioned a study from the famous urban planner Daniel Burnham. Burnham had served as the chief architect of the Chicago World's Fair in 1893, had been a member of the Senate Park Commission that helped beautify the Capitol, and designed a civic center for Cleveland in 1903. The IASF challenged Burnham to create a master plan for the city, one that would encompass and incorporate all of San Francisco's public spaces into a unified, communal ideal. The Burnham plan called for a city organized around concentric circles, each devoted to a different urban activity – residential, educational, administrative, etc. Streets would cut diagonally through the circles, while parks and tree-lined boulevards would provide open spaces. At the foci, Burnham envisioned a Civic Center that would serve as the city's political and cultural heart. Supporters argued that such impressive changes would provide a more aesthetically pleasing environment that would draw in new businesses, tourism, and national recognition.[20] Creating a city greater than the one destroyed by the earthquake

---

[19] Judd Kahn, *Imperial San Francisco: Politics and Planning in an American City, 1897-1906* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979), 83-84.

[20] Kahn, *Imperial San Francisco*, 83-84; T. H. Watkins and R. R. Olmsted, *Mirror of the Dream: An Illustrated History of San Francisco* (San Francisco: Scrimshaw Press, 1976), 203-204; Jon C. Teaford, *The Twentieth-Century American City*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 40-42; Mansel G. Blackford, *The Lost Dream: Businessmen and City Planning on the Pacific Coast, 1890-1920* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993), 40-42. Daniel Burnham went on to develop a

and fire drew widespread praise from many in San Francisco. Mayor Schmitz argued that by following the Burnham model the city would not be building "for today but for all the generations to come."[21] In the immediate aftermath of the disaster, residents supported replacing the uglier aspects of the instant city, particularly its haphazard construction and low-quality materials, with a new San Francisco built on a foundation of civic beauty. Such a city would attract international attention for its progressive engineering and modern application of scientific principles, a far cry from the wild west image of the old San Francisco.

However, support for Burnham's plan receded almost as rapidly as the fires. Residents began to recognize that the Burnham plan was not realistic; nor was it devised for a city in desperate need of quick restoration. For example, the plan did not provide specifics for construction of sufficient housing, vital for the thousands of homeless residents. Businessmen, eager to resume their work, also rejected Burnham's street design because they could not construct buildings until the city completed the complex, spoke-like street placement. A large number of residents also dismissed the plans for the Civic Center because the city could not afford to raise property taxes if it wanted people to rebuild. The Committee of Reconstruction quickly realized that the city needed immediate reconstruction of businesses and homes so residents could get out of the temporary camps or return from suburban communities. The Committee, like many San Franciscans, feared that those who had fled the city during the fire would take up

---

comprehensive plan for Chicago in 1909.

[21] Quoted in McGloin, S.J., *San Francisco*, 150.

permanent residence elsewhere if the city could not show imminent opportunities for return. Therefore, grandiose plans for civic improvement gave way to the reality of the situation. The Committee of Reconstruction encouraged rapid, if not efficient and centrally-organized, rebuilding.[22] By the end of July the mayor boasted that 25,000 men had begun construction on seventy structures and that the city had issued another four hundred building permits that month alone. At the same time, the number of people receiving food relief dropped from 250,000 to 17,000. The pace of construction, unhampered by overarching city plans, continued rapidly. By 1909, 20,500 structures had risen in the areas of the city gutted by fire.[23]

The San Francisco of 1909 did not look like the San Francisco of 1905, nor was it a new construct. The rapid pace of reconstruction, void of central planning, imitated San Francisco's instant city origins. Architects restored some buildings gutted by the fire, like the Call Building and Old St. Mary's Cathedral, to look much as they did before the devastation. However, some of the city's most iconic landmarks could not easily be replaced. The fire destroyed the Mechanic's Institute and its library of more than 200,000 books. The Grand Opera House, the art collection at the Mark Hopkins Institute, and the City Hall were all a total loss. Such destruction prevented the city's inhabitants from simply reconstructing the past. The Burnham plan could have served as the central design needed to create a new identity for San Francisco as a model urban landscape. However, without expedited construction of homes and businesses, there would have

---

[22]Blackford, *The Lost Dream*, 44-52.

[23]McGloin, S.J., *San Francisco*, 151-153.

been fewer residents to fund Burnham's expensive projects. Without a comprehensive reconstruction plan, residents would continue to search for ways to define the new San Francisco.

Having rejected the Burnham plan, a majority of San Franciscans embraced a quest to rid the city of political corruption. Even before the 1906 disaster the city's leading progressive reformers had begun advocating a campaign for good municipal government, initiating secret investigations into corruption within the Union Labor Party. In 1901 Abe Ruef helped form the party after unions failed to win a general strike. Boss Ruef's mayoral protégé, Eugene Schmitz, won the November 1901 election. By keeping the police out of subsequent strikes in 1902, Schmitz and Ruef established labor's political domination over San Francisco businessmen. During the reign of the Boss Ruef, San Francisco was recognized as the "tightest closed-shop town in the nation." Despite such advancements for labor, it became widely known throughout the city that political patronage could easily be bought if the price were right. In 1905, Schmitz won reelection and all eighteen members of the Board of Supervisors belonged to the Union Labor Party. Many of these men envisioned their political position as a means to wealth.[24]

The earthquake and fire temporarily forced the mayor, the supervisors, and Boss Ruef to put the needs of the city first. However, political corruption soon returned. United Railroads bribed supervisors to grant the company a free charter for installation of

[24]George Mowry, *The California Progressives*, 24-26; Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco 1865-1932*, 154-155.

overhead trolleys. In doing so the Supervisors rejected a bid by the newly formed Municipal Railway Company for less obstructive underground conduits. Consequently, investors in the Municipal Railway, who were also members of the Good Government League, hired an unofficial investigator to look into urban corruption. Based on those findings, District Attorney William Langdon created a grand jury to study allegations of graft, and it indicted Boss Ruef and Mayor Schmitz for extorting money from houses of prostitution. Weeks later police caught several supervisors openly accepting bribes. Special prosecutor Francis J. Heney offered immunity to the supervisors for confessions of their misdeeds, and eventually more than a dozen supervisors testified against Ruef.[25] Residents of San Francisco supported the investigation into the corruption, seizing on the opportunity to create a new national image of San Francisco as a city free of politicians who accepted bribes and catered to the vice underworld.

As with the Burnham plan, public support quickly evaporated for the graft trials as idealism clashed with economic realities. Boss Ruef's confession led to the indictment of Patrick Calhoun, head of United Railroad, in the summer of 1907. Simultaneously, Calhoun defeated the city's streetcar union by housing strikebreakers in carbarns. The strike and the trial of Calhoun heightened the class-consciousness of the city's wealthy conservatives. Many became vocal opponents of the trials, accusing prosecutors of calling for the full force of the law only against the bribe givers and letting the bribe takers go free. A jury convicted Ruef and sentenced him to fourteen years in San Quentin. Calhoun's trial ended in a hung jury in 1908 and a second trial in 1912 resulted

[25] Kahn, *Imperial San Francisco*, 111-122; Mowry, *The California Progressives*, 28-33.

in an acquittal. While residents applauded efforts to remove corrupt politicians, there seemed to be little interest in punishing the city's business elite, many of whom had contributed to the national economic prominence of San Francisco.

Laborers also opposed the trials' continued attacks on the Union Labor Party. Although labor unions and business leaders disagreed on who should reign over the city's economic and political future, both rejected the Good Government League and opposed the progressive political vision for the city. As a result, neither group strongly opposed the other's candidates in the 1909 elections. P. H. McCarthy, president of the Building Trades Council, won the mayoral race and Charles Fickert, favored by conservative businessmen, became the city's new district attorney. The labor-business consensus against the Good Government League masked the conflict between these two segments of the populace who sought to reduce the power of the other. What people outside San Francisco witnessed was civic unity in rebuilding homes and businesses and the removal from power of a quintessential political boss. [26] However, labor's quest to maintain union supremacy in politics, and the desire of business owners' to destroy the closed shop, seriously undermined any attempts at future consensus.

Believing such unanimity vital to the continued health of the city, P.H. McCarthy, and his successor James Rolph, juggled the demands of both labor and business. McCarthy failed to maintain the balance, angering unions when he supported business initiatives and losing middle class voters with his lax approach to vice eradication.

---

[26] Wollenberg, *Golden Gate Metropolis*, 167; Mowry, *The California Progressives*, 23-38; Kahn, *Imperial San Francisco*, 121-127; Kazin, *Barons of Labor*, 130.

McCarthy's opponent in the 1911 mayoral race, James "Sunny Jim" Rolph, defeated the incumbent by personally imbuing qualities to which a variety of San Franciscans could relate. Rolph was a son of immigrants, raised in the working-class South of Market neighborhood (SoMa), and personified the American ideal of social mobility most San Franciscans expected their residents could achieve. In the days after the earthquake, Rolph founded the Mission Relief Association to raise funds for the people of SoMa and organized distribution of aid. He had also been one of the most prominent promoters of the 1909 Portola Festival that had demonstrated residents' ability to produce a citywide event despite reconstruction. Citizens could see in Rolph a mayor that would support them because he was one of them. Once in office, Rolph became the city's number one booster, encouraging national recognition of past achievements while developing future plans for civic improvement and economic development. With the support of his constituents, Rolph set out to help San Francisco reclaim its title of Jewel of the Pacific.[27]

The election of Rolph took place just as San Francisco won the government's bid to host the Panama Pacific International Exposition, a civic project of international proportions. San Franciscans' efforts to serve as the exposition's host city had been a decade in the making. In 1904 the San Francisco Merchant's Association (one of several organizations that merged in 1911 to form the Chamber of Commerce) urged city leaders to volunteer San Francisco as the site for a planned exposition to commemorate the

---

[27] Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 156-158; Liston F. Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast" (M.A. thesis, San Francisco State College, 1960),62-69; McGloin, *San Francisco*, 296-299; Lewis Francisc Byington and Oscar Lewis, eds., *The History of San Francisco*, 3 vols (Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1931), 464.

completion of the Panama Canal. While the dual disasters of 1906 caused many to question the feasability of hosting such a fete, the speed at which reconstruction commenced led residents to believe that San Francisco could be ready for an exposition in 1915. The event would give San Franciscans the opportunity to advertise themselves as residents of a world-class city and aid in the formulation of a new urban vision.[28] Having risen from the ashes and cleaned up corrupt politics, the PPIE would be the event through which residents could unveil their new city. San Franciscans wanted to produce an exposition that would rival those held by other American cities and show their city's global importance.

To win the exposition, San Francisco businessmen, politicians and civic boosters organized a new corporation in 1910 to develop the city's proposal and initiate the drive for community support and financial subscriptions. On April 29, 1910 the corporation held a mass meeting meant to send a message to Washington that San Franciscans were committed to the exposition. In only two hours, the corporation raised $4 million. Over the next two months San Franciscans subscribed another $2 million. While a significant portion of this $6 million in promised funds came from wealthy benefactors and civic donors, the prospect of an international festival drew support from all segments of the urban populace. Unions viewed the exposition as furthering the opportunity for employment in construction and other service-sector industries. Many residents would

---

[28]McGloin, S.J., *San Francisco*, 156-157; Marjorie M. Dobkin, "A Twenty-Five-Million-Dollar Mirage," in Burton Benedict, ed., *The Anthropology of World's Fairs: San Francisco's Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915* (Berkeley: Scolar Press, 1983), 67-71; Robert W. Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 214.

profit from the increase in tourism as people from around the world came to participate in the exposition. On January 31, 1911, the U.S. House granted the PPIE to San Francisco, making it the first international exposition held on the Pacific Coast. The House only approved the site, not the funds to construct or carry out the exposition. The money came from San Franciscans, who turned their proposed subscriptions into approval of a $5 million city bond**,** with matching state funds.[29] With the growing economic importance of Southern California, and the movement of residents and businesses to other areas of the Bay after the fire, San Franciscans privately worried that federal officials might disregard its bid because it was a city, at best, in disrepair. The acceptance of their bid to host the PPIE gave San Franciscans national validation for their efforts to reestablish their role as the premier city of the west.

When Taft broke ground in October 1911 at Golden Gate Park, local leaders had yet to decide the exact location of the PPIE grounds. Eventually, the PPIE's executive committee and city leaders settled on Harbor Cove, near Fort Mason, as the heart of the exposition. The contractors then began the process of creating a city within a city. Harris de Haven Connick, director of the city's Board of Public Works, oversaw the construction of the exposition's infrastructure, while the privately-led Directors of the Exposition supervised the construction of the buildings. First, workers had to construct a seawall and pumps to draw water out of the cove. Then, they dredged the Bay to fill in one hundred acres of new land; the last extensive landfill project in the city. Before buildings could be erected, sewers, water and gas mains, they installed railroad spurs and fire protection

[29]McGloin, S.J., *San Francisco*, 157; Watkins and Olmsted, *Mirror of the Dream*, 205.

measures across the site.[30]

If the PPIE were to be a reflection of the city that surrounded it, certain civic improvements needed to be implemented alongside the construction at Harbor Cove. In March 1912 voters approved an $8.8 million bond for the purchase of land for a civic center complex, following the spirit of Burnham's vision if not his exact plan. Residents voted ten to one in favor of the bond, signaling the importance they placed on the creation of an urban epicenter as a means of redefining what they considered vital to the city's infrastructure and to make their city ready for the PPIE. Mayor Rolph immediately announced a public design competition for the civic center's first building, a city hall. Unlike its predecessor, which had taken twenty-seven years to build and whose shoddy construction and collapse during the earthquake had come to symbolize the graft and corruption of old San Francisco, the new city hall became a symbol of open, efficient government that the Good Government League had envisioned. Completed in three years and under budget, the new city hall represented the will of San Franciscans to rebuild quickly and efficiently, with good building materials and quality workmanship. Mayor Rolph liked to boast to visiting dignitaries that the city hall dome stood eleven feet, seven inches higher than the Capitol dome in Washington, D.C., making it the tallest such structure in the nation at the time. Rolph advertised the city hall as a national monument, denoting his belief that it was something far grander than just a city project. For Mayor Rolph and other civic boosters, city hall reflected their concerted desire to build a radiant

[30] The infrastructure projects would prove far more permanent than the PPIE structures, serving as the foundations for the development of the Marina District in the 1920s. Dobkin, "A Twenty-Five-Million-Dollar Mirage," 75-87.

city out of the ashes and win the admiration of people around the world for their efforts.[31]

Once residents approved the purchase of the civic center land, municipal leaders began plans for other significant architectural projects in the city's new political and cultural center. The auditorium project, completed before the city hall, combined the desire to have an anchor point for the development of a grand city epicenter with the practical needs of the upcoming PPIE. While PPIE directors wanted to keep their attractions concentrated on the exposition grounds, they needed a venue that would seat up to 10,000 for exposition attractions, concerts, and national conventions that wanted to hold their annual meetings in the exposition city. One million of the $5 million bond voters had approved for the PPIE went into the construction of the auditorium. After the PPIE closed, the auditorium became the property of the city. One month after the closing of the PPIE work began on the third facet of the civic center plan, a public library. Mayor Rolph and the Board of Supervisors approved $772,220 from city funds for the construction of the library and another $375,000 came from Andrew Carnegie. The library was the final project completed before American entrance into World War I. At that time, plans were underway to finish the civic compound with a state building for the housing of government offices and an opera house, but those would have to wait for more funds. Even without these two structural additions, San Franciscans could perceive the development of the civic center complex as granite and steel embodiments of their determination to craft an urban center. The mature San Francisco that William Bourn had

---

[31]David Wooster Taylor, *The Life of James Rolph, Jr.* (San Francisco: Committee for Publication of The Life of James Rolph, Jr. [Recorder Printing and Publishing Co.], 1934), 65.

envisioned in 1911 was becoming an architectural reality.[32]

The PPIE also reflected San Franciscans' attempts to redefine their city. Expositions were meant to promote a nation's achievements, provide entertainment, and allow visitors a glimpse into foreign cultures. For any city hosting an exposition, the international attention was an opportunity to showcase the advances of its residents and promote the unique qualities that had compelled federal leaders to grant it the exposition in the first place. Robert Tydell, drawing from sociological references, argued that fairs provided the residents of the host city a chance to define their history visually while helping them comprehend the present and express hope for the future. The PPIE, like previous American expositions, sought to create symbols of collective unity without any inclination of class tension. The exposition directors were among San Francisco's wealthiest businessmen, including William H. Crocker, Reuben Hale, I.W. Hellman, and M. H. De Young. It was their vision of an ordered society that determined the layout of the exposition, but there is no indication that their plan met with opposition from other segments of the San Francisco populace.[33] Residents of San Francisco, as they had after the 1906 disaster, joined forces to support the purpose and image conveyed by the PPIE. They envisioned the PPIE as a means to advertise the progress of their city and to impress

---

[32] Lawrence Kinnard, *History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region*, 3 volumes (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1966), 182; Mel Scott, *The San Francisco Bay Area*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 156; Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 171-172.

[33] Rydell, *All the World's a Fair*, 2-5; Ben Macomber, *The Jewel City: Its Planning and Achievement; Its Architecture, Sculpture, Symbolism, and Music; Its Gardens, Palaces, and Exhibits* (San Francisco: John H. Williams, 1915), 197; Dobkin, "A Twenty-Five Million-Dollar Mirage,"88; George Starr, "Truth Unveiled: The Panama Pacific International Exposition and its Interpreters," in Benedict, ed., *The Anthropology of World's Fairs*, 142.

the throngs of American and international visitors. The displays incorporated into the PPIE illustrate the desire of Exposition directors, architects, and landscapers to portray San Francisco as a modern city, surging ahead of Eastern communities that had become static and unappealing. PPIE exhibits were meant to help define the city's future, but developers also used the exposition to construct a more desirable past. They rejected images of San Francisco's frontier days and instead emphasized what they considered more appealing, and ancient, cultural influences. Throughout the PPIE grounds developers promoted what they hoped represented the present and future direction of San Francisco – refinement and harmony.

While a handful of exhibits displayed San Francisco's gold rush past, planners chose to imagine San Francisco as the far-flung descendant of ancient Mediterranean cities, around which great men had built massive empires. These ancient emperors had employed men skilled in all facets of art – architecture, painting, sculpting, and landscaping – to produce exquisite cities that represented their power over an entire region. The PPIE was to create in illusionary form the same for San Francisco. The exteriors of all the major buildings throughout the exhibition were covered in faux travertine, replicating the marble patina of Roman palaces, and appearing in the California sun as a "pale pinkish-gray buff." Wide-open courtyards, dotted with sculptures and fountains, lay between the great walls of the eight main exhibit halls – more regally referred to in the literature as palaces. In the portals and archways marking each palace's entrance, sculptors had created intricate reliefs, mimicking the European Renaissance. The palaces were meant to remind visitors of the great monuments of

history, such as the Mosque of Ahmed I in Constantinople and St. Peter's in Rome. Even the Tower of Jewels, a 435-foot tall structure at the main entrance, was meant to exude refined taste. Covered in more than 100,000 polished pieces of glass, each of which hung like the crystals of a chandelier, the Tower glistened in the sunlight or spotlights. As the coastal winds blew, the glass reflected the colors of the natural and man-made world around it, giving the tower the illusion of being adorned in jewels. An "Eastern woman of culture" validated the planners' goals of creating a cultural mecca on the Pacific Coast when she exclaimed as she walked through the grounds, "Why, all the beauty of the world has been sifted, and the finest of it assembled here!"[34]

The inclusion of the Byzantium and Roman influences was only the beginning of the diverse, Mediterranean style represented at the exposition. However, this expression of varied forms was brought into harmony by the requirement that all buildings conformed in color and general architectural scheme. The eight central palaces, designed by different architects and adorned by many artists, reflected the individual visions of their creators. At the same time, each building appeared to be part of the same design thanks to the use of travertine for the exterior walls, the use of domes, and similar entrance porticoes. This design did not, therefore, require absolute uniformity, but a more harmonious, blending of styles, including elements of Italian, Spanish, Moorish, Byzantine, Roman, and Far Eastern designs.[35] The incorporation of so many varied styles reflected a desire to allow individual artistic vision while keeping the exposition from

---

[34]Macomber, *The Jewel City*, 5, 19, 39-40.

[35]Ibid, 15, 25-28.

appearing to lack cohesion. Planners and artists worked to create a balance between conformity that would quash independent expression and too much individuality.

Another way to create this harmony of design was through the use of color and building materials. Exposition directors hired Jules Guerin to oversee the colors used on all exteriors, which even included walkways, flags, and exposition guard uniforms. Guerin selected nine colors for the exposition palette, each a subtle shade that would remind visitors of the hues found naturally in and around the Bay. The greens, golds, reds, and blues selected also imitated the subtle shades commonly associated at the time with images of Mediterranean communities. Contemporary descriptions of the PPIE frequently mention that one of the most unique aspects of this exposition was the level of coordination that went into the planning and design for the entire exposition.[36] While San Franciscans had rejected the grand planning of Daniel Burnham, the cohesive style of the PPIE provided a visual denunciation of the images outsiders might have had of the city. Built almost as quickly as it had been born, the PPIE's harmonious blend of artistic styles promoted the exposition, and the city that hosted it, as a community that had shed its haphazard, frontier past. The PPIE encouraged San Franciscans, and visitors to the exposition, to think of San Francisco as a city capable of balancing cultural differences and willing to embrace a future where cultural refinement could be achieved.

On February 20, 1915, the Panama Pacific International Exposition opened, welcoming visitors from around the world to experience the idealized vision of San

---

[36]Macomber, *The Jewel City*, 36-41; Gray Brechin, "Sailing to Byzantium: The Architecture of the Fair," in Burton Benedict, ed., *The Anthropology of World's Fairs*, 97.

Francisco embodied in the "Jewel City." The day began with a wireless radio message from President Wilson, the first sent from the White House to the West Coast, symbolizing the rapid pace of technological progress. First day's attendance was estimated at 245,000 patrons. By the end of the first ten weeks the exposition boasted more than four million attendees. The opening salvos of the Great War in August 1914 hindered international attendance and participation. Great Britain, Germany, Russia, and Austria did not send official representatives to the PPIE, but merchants and artists from those countries erected booths in the various exposition halls. Despite the war, San Francisco entertained more than 18.7 million visitors before the lights on the exposition grounds were extinguished for the last time on December 4, 1915.[37] Those who traveled to San Francisco during the PPIE witnessed the concerted efforts of city residents eager to serve as gracious hosts to the world. The fact that these residents, through perseverance, financial pledges, and general hospitality had successfully carried off an international exposition less than ten years after the earthquake and fire had required civic unity. Those unified efforts provided residents with a distinct urban identity, an understanding that sacrifice could lead to great rewards and recognition, reflected in President Taft's proclamation that San Francisco was the "City that Knows How." Residents put aside their class, political, and ethnic differences to advertise to the world, through the PPIE, their vision of San Francisco as the most refined, cosmopolitan, commercial center on the West Coast.

---

[37] *New York Times*, 20 February 1915, 10; McGloin, S.J., *San Francisco*, 158-160; Wollenberg, *Golden Gate Metropolis*, 172-173; Scott, *The San Francisco Bay Area*, 159; Kazin, *Barons of Labor*, 87; Kinnard, *History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region*, 181-182.

However, the PPIE had simply covered over the urban realities with faux travertine and mirrors. With the closing of the PPIE, the monolithic display of unity began to fracture as various segments of the population struggled for control. City labor unions had suspended all work stoppages during the PPIE in return for preferential employment on projects associated with the exposition. Six months after the PPIE ended, their conflict with business owners resumed. On June 22, 1916, longshoremen and steamboat workers initiated a strike that threatened to halt all shipments in and out of San Francisco. When shipping companies hired strike breakers, Mayor Rolph leaned toward supporting the workers by refusing to provide extra police at the docks to protect employers and their strikebreakers. The Chamber of Commerce president, Frank Koster, sought to quash the current strike and eradicate the closed shop. Only with an open shop policy could San Francisco businesses compete successfully against the growing economic power of Los Angeles.

Koster believed such goals required a more unified commitment from the city's leading businessmen and professionals. He started by organizing a five-man Law and Order Committee on July 10. This Committee publicly professed to champion the rights of employers to hire whom they wanted regardless of union membership and urged donations from businessmen to aid the committee in protecting the waterfront. The fact that the Chamber chose to call this the Law and Order Committee reflected the city's vigilante past. While this new organization might not resort to executions to advance their concept of justice, they saw the committee as capable of exerting physical, political, and economic pressure to kill the power of the city's unions. A week after the creation of

the Law and Order Committee, the waterfront strike ended, but the committee continued to look for ways to undermine the economic and political power of the city's unions.[38]

As residents recovered from the tensions surrounding the waterfront strike, the Chamber of Commerce organized a demonstration of its support for the growing national preparedness movement. The Chamber called for a parade on Preparedness Day, Saturday, July 22. They chose Thornwell Mullally, Patrick Calhoun's nephew and chief assistant to him during the 1907 United Railroads' strike, as the parade marshal. Preparedness, and the prominent position in the parade of a symbol of the open shop fight, pitted labor against the city's business elite. The Labor Council announced that the unions affiliated with it would not participate in the parade. The editor denounced the event as an "artificial stimulation of patriotism within our city" and insisted war preparedness only aided military contractors. During the parade, a bomb exploded at the intersection of Steuart and Market Streets, a block from the Embarcadero. The blast claimed the lives of nine people and injured at least forty others. Two days later, Frank Koster expanded the Chamber's Law and Order Committee to one hundred members, pledging to seek out the bombers and anyone else planning another attack. The Law and Order Committee, looking at the bombing as another opportunity to reduce the strength of the closed shop, considered union members to be the most likely suspects.

Though no witnesses came forward in the days after the bombing, police arrested two well-known labor radicals, Warren Billings and Tom Mooney. In August, a grand

---

[38] Richard H. Frost, *The Mooney Case* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968), 60-61; Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 92-93; David F. Selvin, *Sky Full of Storm: A Brief History of California Labor* (San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1975), 37.

jury indicted both men, along with Mooney's wife Rena, a jitney driver named Israel Weinberg, and local union organizer Edward Nolan. By the time the United States entered the Great War, a jury had sentenced Billings to life in prison and Mooney had received the death penalty. Most unions placed considerable distance between themselves and the supposed bombers, emphasizing that the accused were not members of the city's mainstream unions and that labor had nothing to gain by such destruction of life and property. Prosecutors and the Chamber, however, painted Billings and Mooney as part of a greater conspiracy of unionists who sought to drive the city and the nation into chaos just as the United States found itself careening toward war with Germany.[39]

By the end of 1916, many San Franciscans could not have failed to notice that their city had not live up to the qualities of refinement and harmony displayed so prominently by the PPIE. The intensification of class conflict in the summer of 1916 made clear the unity displayed during the PPIE was as temporary as the exposition's faux travertine buildings, most of which were razed in the months after the fair ended. The PPIE had served as the culmination of a decade-long quest to rebuild, reinvigorate, and reinvent San Francisco. The Preparedness Day bombing, the creation of the Law and Order Committee, and the trials of the supposed conspirators threatened to undermine San Franciscans' efforts to redefine themselves as residents of the "City that Knows How." San Franciscans desperately needed another seminal event to refocus their

[39]Frost, *The Mooney Case*, 81-118; Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1864-1932*, 177; Robert Edward Lee Knight, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1900-1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), 310-311.

energies, unite their divergent populace, and promote their city as the preeminent West Coast community. The Congressional declaration of war against Germany, signed by Woodrow Wilson on April 6, 1917, provided San Franciscans that opportunity. As San Franciscans sacrificed for the war effort, they sought to express the same qualities promoted in the PPIE - a refined city whose divergent populace worked together harmoniously for the greater good. In doing so, San Francisco could again show its importance to the nation and why it was still the Jewel of the Pacific.

Chapter Two
"Oh if the Germans would only quit": The Soldiers in San Francisco

In the fall of 1917, Charles Byron Swope enlisted in the army in his hometown of San Diego. In December, the military ordered him to report to San Francisco. Accompanying Charles to the Bay Area was his 17-year-old wife of five months, Gretchen. After arriving at the Southern Pacific Depot in Oakland, Charles left his bride in the care of her uncle and headed across the Bay. At the Ferry Building, Charles discovered that he was not the only man to report that day. Military officials soon ordered Charles and approximately twelve thousand other recruits to march up Market Street en masse to the Recruiting Office. There, recruiters ordered Charles and about eight hundred others to go to Fort Mason, located next to the PPIE site, where a transport ship would take them to Angel Island. By the time the recruits marched to Fort Mason, the vessel had already left for the island "and no one seemed to know when we would get the next one." While waiting, Charles experienced the cold winds of the Bay, which went straight through his thin civilian clothing and "abbreviated BVDs." Slowly the fog set in and became so thick that Charles did not see the huge army transport until it was almost at the pier. He felt himself lifted off the ground by the swell of men clamoring up the gangplank, and the distance between him and Gretchen became palpable. "Oh how I did feel the heart strings draw closer and tighten until it seemed something must break." Consumed by emotion, Charles' did not notice the scenery as the ship made its way north

to Angel Island.[1]

The boat docked at Angel Island's Fort McDowell. Charles found the island to be very beautiful, much like the natural scenery of Catalina Island in Southern California. Unlike the resort island, Angel was covered with "little brown blotches" where the army had set up barracks and tents. The new recruits marched up the hill to the government buildings of the East Garrison where they were issued their uniforms. Officers then directed them to the mess hall for supper. Charles, eager to find out how his wife was adjusting to her new surroundings, headed to the YMCA building where the army had installed one of two telephones on the island. He found ten men waiting to use the phone, but some men became so impatient with the wait that they left before the operator had placed their calls. Charles waited an hour before realizing that the central phone operators on the island had discarded the whole call list from Charles' location due to the increasing number of unanswered calls. Charles did manage to talk briefly with his wife, but his first night on the island did not get any easier. Exhausted by the day's events and the emotional toll they had taken, Charles hoped to get to bed early, only to find that the new recruits were forced to sleep on the second floor of the main hall. Below, in the mess hall, a motion picture played until ten o'clock. Once the movie concluded, more than seven hundred recruits cleared the chairs and hauled out mattresses. Each had two blankets, but for Charles it was not enough to keep out the damp cold and he kept waking

[1] The title in the quote came from Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 10 November 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego; Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, December 1917, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

from dreams of "being in the arctic." At four o'clock, officers roused the recruits from sleep and Charles began his first full day at Fort McDowell, Angel Island.[2]

Charles and Gretchen Swope spent the war in the Bay Area struggling to maintain their relationship and adapting to Charles' military service. The Swopes were not the typical wartime family in that few weeks went by that they did not see each other. However, the Swopes serve as an example of how typical American couples faced the challenges of balancing duty to country with a desire to maintain stability at home. Compared with the men who trained in cantonments in sparsely-populated areas of the west and south, Charles Swope's story illustrates the experience of men training in an urban setting, and the impact such a military presence had on a large civilian population. The large influx of men like Charles Swope encouraged San Franciscans to search for ways to make their city appealing to the U.S. military. The opening of the Panama Canal in 1914 compelled the War Department to make plans to divide the U.S. Navy more equally between the two oceans and create more permanent bases on the Pacific Coast. The presence of the Presidio, several smaller installations in close proximity, and the Bay itself made San Francisco a logical choice. The continued expansion of the military presence in San Francisco after the war would provide residents with a new urban identity – Defender of the Pacific. The Great War became a test of San Franciscans' willingness and ability to create a safe environment for soldiers in training. If residents failed to provide an appropriate atmosphere for men preparing for combat, the city's reputation

[2]Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, December 1917, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

would be tarnished. Not only would the military refuse to trust the city with a naval headquarters, but potential tourists and businessmen would refuse to support a city that had not done its very best to serve the nation in its wartime demands.

Charles Swope's journey demonstrates the growing military presence in San Francisco as the U.S. Army and Navy filled the Bay Area's forts and bases. To San Franciscans, the war was an opportunity to prove their city's superiority over other western training facilities. Men from eleven western states traveled by ferry, train, and automobile to the area's military encampments. Writer Arthur Dahl described the city in *Overland Monthly* as the center of the government's military operations on the Pacific Coast and called it a "busy and warlike city. Its streets are filled with uniformed officers and enlisted men, the flags of the various recruiting and examining branches of the Service are flying before numerous buildings, and troops of incoming soldiers, sailors and marines are landing daily. . . ."[3] Indeed, the city's oldest fortress served as the engine in San Francisco's military machine. The Presidio had served as the embarkation point for the nation's soldiers during the Filipino Insurrection. In 1916 the Army deployed all but about one hundred soldiers from the Presidio to the Mexican border.

That same summer, fueled by calls for preparedness, Congress passed the National Defense Act, which established an Officers' Reserve Corps, to train new officers from the civilian and enlisted ranks, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for colleges and universities. The Presidio became home to training for both forms of

---

[3]Arthur L. Dahl, "War Preparations on the Pacific Coast," *Overland Monthly* 72 (September 1918), 234.

military instruction after the declaration of war April 6, 1917.[4] The first Officers' Training camp opened in May 1917 and the second in August 1917, each with 2,500 potential officers. After three months of training, the Army recommended officer commissions to approximately half of those who had started the program. Commanders then sent these newly commissioned officers to fill the ranks of newly created army units at Camp Lewis and Camp Fremont.[5] A three-month ROTC camp provided training for university students in the summer of 1918 and included students from a number of western universities. During the eighteen months of the war, the Presidio also served as temporary home to regiments from four Regular Army divisions training for overseas combat, along with two National Guard regiments, a machine gun battalion, a field artillery brigade, base hospital units, signal corps and several other non-divisional military units.[6]

While not all of the Army's units served at the Presidio simultaneously, the influx of soldiers required the Presidio to utilize its East and West Cantonment fully, and to

---

[4] Erwin N. Thompson, *Defender of the Gate: The Presidio of San Francisco, A History from 1846 to 1995* (Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California: National Park Service, 1997), 600.

[5] Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 602; National Park Service, *The Presidio of San Francisco, 1776-1976: A Collection of Historical Source Materials* (San Francisco: National Park Service, Western Regional Office, 1976), 315; San Francisco, Presidio Training Camp Records, 1917, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[6] Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 604; Erwin N. Thompson and Sally B. Woodbridge, *Special History Study: Presidio of San Francisco; An Outline of Its Evolution as a U.S. Army Post, 1847-1990* (Denver: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1992), 99. Divisional units at the Presidio included the 12th Infantry, 62d Infantry, and 2d Field Artillery of the 8th Division; 63d Infantry, 11th Division; 44th Infantry, 13th Division; 143d Field Artillery, 40th Division; Division headquarters, 363d Infantry, and 348th Machine Gun Battalion of the 91st Division. No figures exist for the exact number of men stationed at the Presidio or most other Army posts in the Bay because the Army had abandoned monthly Post Returns in late 1916.

begin expansion onto the former grounds of the PPIE immediately.[7] New construction in this area, which became the North Cantonment, began in late May 1917, replacing Exposition buildings with temporary facilities. [8] The Quartermaster Corps wasted no time constructing the wood-framed, unsealed, single-story buildings, averaging a new building every forty-two minutes.[9] Within eighteen days of initiating their work, the Corps had completed the new cantonment, including 81 barracks, 60 lavatories, 45 mess halls and storehouses enough to equip 6,000 men.[10] San Franciscans showed great pride in the rapid return of the Presidio's importance as the nation mobilized for war. Impressed by the speed in which soldiers constructed the North Cantonment and the upsurge of soldiers in khaki pouring into the city, the editor of the *San Francisco Call and Post* proclaimed the Presidio "the greatest training camp of the West."[11] Such city-promotion sought to identify San Francisco as the center of the War Department's work in the west, highlighting the speed with which a large urban community could mobilize to meet the needs of a growing military and support a greater surge of troops.

When the war began, the Presidio also boasted the largest Army hospital in the country, Letterman General. With an average admittance of around three thousand patients a year, Letterman received wounded men from the Pacific arena, the Panama Canal zone, and western military bases. During the war, East Coast hospitals surpassed

---

[7] *San Francisco Examiner*, 14 May 1917, 2; Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 605.

[8] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 29 May 1917, 5.

[9] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 18 June 1917, 2.

[10] Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 600.

[11] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 29 May 1917, 5.

Letterman's size. However, Letterman still cared for almost 19,000 patients during the eighteen months of the war. The growing number of sick and wounded in the hospital required additional facilities, leading to the construction of the complex known as the East Hospital. Here, crews constructed eighteen patient wards, two barracks for military employees, a kitchen, mess hall, and a building for the Red Cross. The main hospital also required renovations, including new barracks, a nurses' dormitory, two dinning rooms and a one hundred patient psychiatric ward that replaced barred windows with "hotel fashion" dormitories. Letterman also specialized in the treatment of venereal disease, created a unit of the Army School of Nursing, and developed an orthopedic center for the treatment of amputees.[12]

The work performed by Letterman General earned it a reputation as a premier hospital and rehabilitation center for the nation's armed services. As wounded men arrived for treatment toward the war's end, the *Army and Navy Journal* insisted that the "fame of Letterman has stretched to the four corners of the nation and to foreign lands, where it is rated among the top-notchers, and it is this reputation that has attracted some of the finest surgeons and medical men of the country for service on its staff."[13] Despite its distance from the Western Front, the Presidio in San Francisco provided broken sailors and soldiers a respite from the war and through rehabilitation prepared them to reenter the civilian world. The hospital's growth benefitted many city residents who found

---

[12]Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 345, 363-366.

[13]Letterman General Hospital, *The History of Letterman General Hospital* (San Francisco: Listening Post 1919?), 5.

employment on the base as military personnel were transferred to the East or to France. San Franciscans also looked at the expansion of Letterman as further proof of the city's ability to support the Presidio and its personnel. Residents took pride in boasting that Letterman was the largest military hospital in the West, despite the establishment of forty-four other general military hospitals during the war.[14] The expansion of the hospital during the war led to national recognition, like that expressed by the *Army and Navy Journal*, and added validity to the argument that San Francisco should be the West Coast base of operations for the U.S. military in the future.

The Presidio was only the largest in a series of military bases that dotted the San Francisco landscape. Around the turn of the century, the United States government bolstered the military presence in San Francisco with the construction of coastal defense posts to guard the entrance of the Golden Gate. Forts Barry and Baker sat directly across the Gate at the foot of the Marin hills and were easily visible from the residential sections of San Francisco.[15] Fort Funston, whose temporary gun batteries the army constructed in February 1917, served as the southernmost San Francisco garrison, set within the dunes between Lake Merced and the ocean.[16] Fort Miley, completed in 1900, sat at the northwestern tip of San Francisco in Lands End. The Army made Fort Miley the headquarters of the South Pacific Coast Artillery District and was home to four Coast

---

[14]Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 366-368.

[15]*The San Francisco Call and Post*, 4 June 1917, admen edition.

[16]Mark J. Berhow, "Historic California Posts: Harbor Defenses of San Francisco," from website of California State Military Department, The California State Military Museum, http://www.militarymuseum.org/HDSF.html.

Artillery companies.[17] Fort Winfield Scott, consisting of the western grounds of the Presidio, became the base for fourteen Coast Artillery companies, two of which were deployed to France. The Army designated Fort Scott one of only two civilian Coast Artillery training camps in the nation (the other was Fort Monroe, Virginia). It was also one of six national sites for specialized training of enlisted men. In October 1917, Fort Scott had 2,157 Coast Artillery soldiers and trainees, more than any East Coast defense post. These new residents required the construction of fourteen new barracks, seven messes, and fourteen sets of officers' quarters.[18]

The men stationed at these harbor defenses and at the Presidio required a vast array of equipment and tons of food, which came from the general supply depot at Fort Mason. Located east of the Presidio, Fort Mason was not only responsible for providing supplies to the troops of San Francisco, but to all posts and stations of the Army's Western Division.[19] According to the Army, Fort Mason "specialized in subsistence" acquisitions, providing supplies to an average of 75,000 soldiers a month. Fort Mason also supplied 204,000 tons of foodstuffs for soldiers on the East Coast and sent 20,000 tons to troops fighting in Siberia in 1918. During the war, the Quartermaster Corps purchased $65 million in foodstuffs from growers and processors in the Western

---

[17]Berhow, "Historic California Posts: Harbor Defenses of San Francisco," from website of California State Military Department, The California State Military Museum, http://www.militarymuseum.org/HDSF.html; Center of Military History, *Order of Battle of the United States Land Forces in the World War*, Volume 3 (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O, 1931-1949), 150-151.

[18]Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 561, 603; Center of Military History, *Order of Battle of the United States Land Forces in the World War*, 146-148.

[19]This included the National Army at Camp Lewis (American Lake, Washington) and National Guardsmen at Camp Kearney (San Diego County) and Camp Fremont (San Mateo), as well as all bases and posts in Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming.

Department's eight state region. This included 21 million pounds of evaporated peaches, 19 million pounds of dehydrated vegetables, and 85 million cans of salmon. To make room for these goods, the army constructed thirteen extra warehouses at Fort Mason and extended the State Belt Railroad of California from the Presidio across Exposition grounds, to Fort Mason, improving the transportation of supplies and men.[20] The tonnage handled by Fort Mason also required the base to expand its personnel. The depot opened a school for clerks, employed from the civilian sector, as more experienced military clerks moved to mobilization camps and overseas service. The number of employees at Fort Mason grew from 195 in early 1917 to a high of 900 at war's end, mostly from San Francisco's civilian populace.[21]

Several military camps outside San Francisco's city limits were very much a part of the city's scope of influence, since most sailors and soldiers on day leave could take a short ferry or train ride into San Francisco. The Yerba Buena Naval Training Station on Goat Island was one of four naval training stations in the nation and the only one west of the Mississippi. Men from western states received almost three months basic training or education in one of the station's six specialty schools. In any given month, the station could house five thousand men. By the end of the war 21,000 sailors had received

---

[20] Thompson and Woodbridge, *Special History Study: Presidio of San Francisco*, 99-100; *San Francisco Examiner*, 14 May 1917, 1.

[21] Major Mark L. Gerstle, "Historical Report San Francisco depot, Fort Mason, Calif. General Supply Depot, Zone 13, April 1, 1917 to April 30, 1919," San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Records, 1851-1962, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco; Center of Military History, *Order of Battle of the United States Land Forces in the World War*, 426, 453; Thompson and Woodbridge, *Special History Study: Presidio of San Francisco*, 99-100; *San Francisco Examiner*, 14 May 1917, 1.

training at Yerba Buena.[22]

Mare Island, on the north end of the Bay near the community of Vallejo, was the designated site of a naval reserve training facility, one of three on the West Coast. Ten thousand men received training at this facility, while an additional ten thousand worked at the Mare Island Naval Yard. These laborers constructed battleships and destroyers, refitted German ships captured at the beginning of the war in Western ports, and repaired various naval vessels. Employment at the naval yards jumped from three thousand at the beginning of the war to ten thousand sailors and civilians by the end of 1918. While most of the men and women who worked at the yards lived in nearby Vallejo, many ventured into San Francisco by ferry on the weekends. Mare Island was not within the city limits, but San Francisco newspapers often counted the swelling production of ships there as part of San Francisco's wartime achievements. These efforts to tie Mare Island with San Francisco reflect the continued attempts by city residents to fabricate a Greater San Francisco. The people of Vallejo, like Oakland in 1912, openly rejected such notions. Vallejo papers "kept several barrels of printers ink and a scathing editorial writer on hand to repulse out-of-town glory grabbers," but the connections, real and perceived, to San Francisco persisted.[23]

---

[22] United States, Naval Training Station (San Francisco, Calif.), *San Francisco Naval Training Station* (San Francisco: The Station, [1917?]), 2-9; Michael D. Besch, *A Navy Second to None: The History of the U.S. Naval Training in World War I* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2002), 45-90. During the war, the eastern naval training stations at Newport, Rhode Island and Norfolk, Virginia trained twice the number of men that Yerba Buena did. all three saw far fewer than the Great Lakes Station, which trained 109,199.

[23] Arnold S. Lott, *A Long Line of Ships: Mare Island's Century of Naval Activity in California* (Annapolis: U.S. Naval Institute, 1954), 161-164; Besch, *A Navy Second to None*, 143-144.

While the residents of Vallejo objected to San Francisco's encroachment on their achievements, the residents of San Mateo County were more accepting of this outside interference. Without the financial assistance of San Francisco businessmen, the War Department might have abandoned its plans for Camp Fremont near Menlo Park (twenty-five miles south of San Francisco – see Chapter Four). The camp, completed at the end of 1917, eventually became home to the 8th Division of the Regular Army, comprised of regiments from the Philippines and the Presidio, as well as draftees from Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. During Camp Fremont's first month of operation, the military transferred 7,317 men to the new facilities. At its peak in June 1918, Camp Fremont was home to 24,085 soldiers.

These figures make Camp Fremont one of the smaller national cantonments, with numbers comparable to Camp Kearny (San Diego), Camp Cody (Dening, New Mexico), and Camp Beauregard (Alexandria, Louisiana). The largest camps were on the East Coast, where peak numbers averaged between 45,000 and 58,000. The largest cantonment in the West was Camp Lewis, more than forty miles from Seattle. Most of San Francisco's draftees, along with men from seven other western states, were trained there. The camp reached a high of 44,000 men by the summer of 1918. One can attribute Camp Fremont's lower figures to a number of factors, including delays in opening the camp, the early deployment to France of the national guard division original slated to train in the camp, and the lower draft allotments for the states sending men to Camp Fremont. Also, unlike Camp Lewis, Camp Fremont noticed a precipitous drop in residents in the last few months of the war as the army deployed the 8th Division as part of

the Siberian Expeditionary Force to Vladivostok.[24]

Angel Island, though not strategically located for harbor defense, served multiple purposes thanks to its centralized position in the Bay. Foreign ships stopped at Angel Island's Immigration Station and Quarantine Station where government officials inspected passengers and ships. Until mid-1918 the Immigration Station housed enemy aliens arrested in California, the Pacific Northwest, Hawaii, and the Philippines, including the German consul Franz Bopp. At any given time the facility held more than seven hundred prisoners before the War Department moved all German detainees from bases across the United States to two internment camps in North Carolina.[25]

Also on the island was Fort McDowell, a receiving station for new recruits. Here, officers initiated the men in military drills while they awaited their regiment assignments and transportation to one of the Western Department's cantonments. At the beginning of the war, Fort McDowell processed 750 recruits per month, and within two months that number jumped to three thousand. The month Charles Swope arrived, December 1917, Fort McDowell processed about four thousand men. Like most, Charles expected to be rotated off the island after he completed his preliminary training. Due to his recruitment in the camp's band, however, the army extended his stay at Fort McDowell. Swope watched as by mid-1918, three thousand enlisted men from California and Oregon arrived

---

[24]Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 612; Center of Military History, *Order of Battle of the United States Land Forces in the World War*, 696-951; Colonel William F. Strobridge, U.S.A., *Golden Gate to Golden Horn: Camp Fremont, California and the American Expedition to Siberia of 1918* (San Mateo: San Mateo County Historical Association, [1975?], 37-38.

[25]John Soennichsen, *Miwoks to Missiles: A History of Angel Island* (Tiburon, Calif.: Angel Island Association, 2001, 85-118.

at Fort McDowell every two weeks. Swope eventually became one of less than 20 percent of the men on Angel Island whom the army considered permanent residents.[26] For the rest, Fort McDowell was merely the first stop.

The men processed at Fort McDowell before the arrival of the first draftees in September 1917 had many reasons for enlisting. One of the most repeated refrains among the city's volunteers concerned their sense of duty to the nation and willingness to sacrifice present comforts and their lives in its name. In seeking a recommendation letter from Mayor Rolph, San Francisco attorney John Lawlor expressed his intention to enter any service of the military that would take him, forfeiting his $500 monthly salary, because he considered it "my duty to sacrifice it for my country."[27] The city's coroner, Thomas Leland, resigned because his "duty to my country prompted me to cast aside all other considerations and immediately respond to that call." He understood the sacrifices involved regarding his government position, medical practice, and family, but readily put these responsibilities aside to take up his position as an officer in the California Naval Militia.[28] The newspapers encouraged men to volunteer by introducing unique examples of men compelled by their sense of duty to join the armed services, cultivating an image of the heroic Californian, and more specifically, San Franciscan. San Francisco native Angus McDonald had returned to the city after receiving life-threatening wounds while

---

[26]Ibid, 153.

[27]John G. Lawlor to James Rolph, 12 June 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[28]Thomas S.E. Leland to James Rolph, 17 August 1917, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

serving with the British at Ypres. Despite his injuries, he presented himself to the San Francisco army recruiting office in early 1918 and Secretary of War Baker provided special permission for him to join the U.S. Army. No one would have challenged McDonald's patriotism if he had chosen to remain on the sidelines and convalesce, but *The Bulletin* focused on his willingness to sacrifice again, even though he knew better than most what that really meant.[29]

While some men expressed an overwhelming sense of patriotism and an enthusiasm to sacrifice everything for the nation, others struggled with whether to join the colors or remain at home. For these individuals, like the son of California Senator Hiram Johnson, Sr., the growing number of San Franciscans headed off to war made them doubt their own decisions. Hiram Johnson, Jr. hesitatingly claimed draft exemption due to his wife's failing health. His decision involved serious soul-searching, for his father had instilled in him and his younger brother, Archibald, "a certain love of country and patriotic fervor."[30] He supported his brother Arch's decision to volunteer and wished he could also "bear the physical hardship and the burden that come with the enlistment of all the decent upright fellows who are doing their duty."[31] Charles Kendrick began his war journal the day he left San Francisco for military training in Kansas City. On that day he felt his "grief too poignant for my own good" as he thought about the impact of his

---

[29] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 10 January 1918, 5.

[30] Hiram W. Johnson, Jr. to Hiram W. Johnson, Sr., 31 July 1917, Hiram Johnson, Sr. Papers, 1895-1945, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[31] Hiram W. Johnson, Jr. to Hiram W. Johnson, Sr., 28 February 1918, Hiram Johnson, Sr. Papers, 1895-1945, The Bancroft Library, Univiersity of California, Berkeley.

departure on his family and life's work. Despite this pain, Kendrick accepted that for the foreseeable future he was "under the comand [sic] of Uncle Sam. The wishes of the army are my commands. . . . I am now a sacrifice to my country, whatever the outcome." After this first emotional entry in his diary, Kendrick laid aside his personal feelings and the rest of his journey, ultimately to France, reflected an acceptance of his fate and responsibility, chronicling only the scenery and events of his day.[32] Family and careers made the choice to join the armed services more difficult, but many believed that the United States required such sacrifices from its most noble citizens and that a man's duty to his country came first.

Historian Cecilia O'Leary has argued that World War I provided a temporary solidification of American nationalism based on a "racially exclusive, culturally conformist, militaristic patriotism. The rhetoric of men like Leland, Johnson, and Kendrick suggests that nationalism, in part, explains their participation. However, O'Leary's argument that the propaganda machine's sacrificial rhetoric was the predominant reason for enlistment or draft acceptance does not fully explain these men's motives.[33] For Hiram Johnson, Jr. his father's lessons on the proper conduct of a citizen influenced him far more than the patriotic articles disseminated by the Committee on Public Information. Thomas Leland sacrificed his position as coroner in August 1917, just as the propaganda machine began its work. Charles Kendrick, who had no reason to

---

[32]Charles Kendrick, Diary entry, 20 December 1917, Charles Kendrick Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford, California.

[33]Cecilia Elizabeth O'Leary, *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 7, 221.

express in his personal diary anything other than his full emotions, perceived his actions in enlisting as his effort to do "my duty as I see it," not as the result of pressure he felt to respond appropriately to government expression of patriotic responsibility.[34]

O'Leary also identified a national decline in more traditional patriotic expression, those that emphasized the importance of freedom and democracy, as the CPI churned out reports that emphasized "a faithlike loyalty to the nation as the highest form of allegiance."[35] However, San Francisco residents expressed patriotic obligation along with progressive, democratic goals in their descriptions of the impact military service would have on the city's citizen soldiers. Military training not only made soldiers but developed in them desirable qualities all citizens should emulate. A young man of wealth, described in *The Daily News* as an "unmotivated sort," living a life surrounded by wine, women, and leisure, discovered that he really did not mind pealing potatoes after only a few months training. Gone were the late night parties, which could have led him to an early grave. The moral, according to the editor, was that "war may be hell but hell may be salvation, in some cases."[36] In explaining why the United States entered the war, the editor of *The San Francisco Call and Post* acknowledged that war was hell but the only way to alter archaic political systems significantly. Thanks to the war, China and Russia had overthrown tyranny and showed signs of becoming republics. The author also believed that war would remake American society. "Caste, rank, class feeling–these

---

[34]Charles Kendrick, Diary entry, 20 December 1917, Charles Kendrick Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford, California.

[35]O'Leary, *To Die For*,220.

[36]*The Daily News* (San Francisco), 1 December 1917, 4.

things the war is wiping out, as a hundred years of peace could never even hope to do."[37] Passionate, patriotic rhetoric suffused the speech and actions of San Franciscans during the war, but so did progressive nationalist sentiments that emphasized responsibility over blind acceptance of duty. The goal of spread democracy abroad and egalitarianism at home still factored into many men's explanations for enlistment.

While politics or patriotism drove some to join the colors, others joined for financial reasons. The Army paid a private, first class, $36.60 a month; non-specialized seamen, first class, made a dollar less. If an enlisted man had dependents, the War Department required that he allocate at least $15.00 of his monthly salary to them. If a soldier or sailor had dependents, and therefore an allotment, the government provided an additional allowance to the man's family, based on the number of dependents. The wife of a serviceman received a $15.00 allowance, $10.00 for one child, $17.50 for two, and $5.00 for each additional child. A single soldier could also allot part of his salary to his parents, siblings, or grandchildren if he could show they were his dependents. This dependence made them eligible for the government allowance as well. Although the maximum government allowance was $50.00, when combined with at least $15.00 from the soldier's allotment, many unskilled laborers found they could provide more for their families by serving in the military than they could in civilian work.[38]

The government, at times, also used bonuses to encourage enlistment. An

---

[37] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 4 June 1917, 4.

[38] *Uncle Sam's Fact Book of the World War* (New York: C.S. Hammond and Company, 1918), 124-125; Paul H. Douglas, "The War Risk Insurance Act," *The Journal of Political Economy* 26 (May 1918): 466-469; John Whiteclay Chambers II, *To Raise an Army: the Draft Comes to Modern America* (New York: Free Press, 1987), 185.

announcement by the army that they would pay members of the first Officers' Training Camp $100 a month for their three months of training sparked an increase in applications. According to the *Examiner*, this salary made it easier for "hundreds who heretofore had felt they could not afford to go" to sign their applications.[39] Those who joined after the announcement of pay worried that their own reasoning for enlistment might be questioned as a result. In his request for a recommendation letter from University of California professor David Barrows, George Finnegan recognized that he would be competing for a position in the training camp with "thousands who have discovered hitherto undiscovered patriotism after the promise of one hundred dollars per month."[40] In order to build infantry bands for the Presidio regiments, the army advertised their plan to pay musicians $36 to $48 a month, beyond the regular pay afforded a soldier in the army.[41] While Charles Swope did not comment on this additional stipend when he accepted the position with the band at Fort McDowell, that money would be important to him and Gretchen as they tried to assert their financial independence from their families.

Money may have driven some men to enlist in the early months of the war, but after the initiation of the draft, men still undecided about whether to volunteer had little time to act. San Francisco newspapers shifted the focus from how much a man could make in the army with immediate enlistment to the men's ability to select how to serve. One advertisement for the Naval Reserve targeted registered men by informing them

---

[39] *San Francisco Examiner*, 30 April 1917, 3.

[40] George Finnegan to David Barrows, 2 May 1917, David Prescott Barrows Papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[41] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 13 Jun 1917, 2.

there was "***No Drafted Men*** in the United States Navy" and that by volunteering for the naval reserve they could receive the same pay, perform the same duties, and share in the same opportunities for promotion as men in the regular navy, but with one important distinction: they would serve for only four years or "***For the Duration of the War***" [emphasis in the original].[42] When Arch Johnson volunteered for the California Grizzlies, his father agreed that it was "infinitely better" for Arch to go in July, when he could receive a position as Captain, "than that you go six months or a year hence, as a private or a subaltern, with all its disadvantages."[43] *The San Francisco Call and Post* interviewed men at the recruiting stations in June 1917. They found that "practically every man who enlisted today stated that he preferred to go into service voluntarily and make his choice of arms and branches of the land forces than to wait for conscription and be assigned wherever the military authorities may elect to send him."[44] The last day the army allowed draft eligible men to volunteer was December 14, 1917. In the six days before the cutoff, San Francisco stations logged two thousand enlistments and expected another thousand in the last twenty-four hours before the deadline.[45] It may not have been a patriotic response, but it served a practical purpose in that men could choose how to serve if the government were going to require it anyway.

San Francisco draft-aged men not persuaded to enlist by a sense of duty or the

---

[42] *San Francisco Bulletin*, 25 July 1918, 13.

[43] Hiram W. Johnson to Archibald Johnson, 27 July 1917, in *The Diary Letters of Hiram Johnson, 1917-1945*, vol. 1, ed. Robert E. Burke (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1983).

[44] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 25 June 1917, 3.

[45] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 13 December 1917, 1.

possibilities of personal advancement found that after Registration Day, June 5, 1917, social pressure and the law limited their decision-making abilities. As the city geared up for Registration Day, Superior Judge Thomas Graham, chairman of the County Council of Defense, proclaimed that he was "relying upon the patriotism of Young America to rise to the occasion" and registrar for the draft. However, if any draft age men planned to avoid service, they would "find themselves unpopular among their neighbors and scorned generally." A few days after the registration drive, the San Francisco draft boards posted the names of all who registered at city hall, the post offices, and in the local papers.[46] At nine o'clock on the evening of registration, the city's police began to check registration cards and raid rooming houses, hotels, and saloons for those who had violated the law and whom the police, and the city at large, now referred to as slackers.[47] Newspapers recommended that men always carry their blue registration cards as the police stopped "every man who looks as though he is of the registration age."[48] Though those arrested could face one year in jail for defying the draft, judges typically ordered the defendant to register, at which time the charges were dropped.[49] No city or state in the nation could afford to win a reputation as a safe haven for slackers.

After registration, draft age men waited for letters from local draft boards who notified the men randomly selected to serve their country. Once in front of the draft

---

[46] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 26 May 1917, 2;

[47] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 5 June 1917, 2.

[48] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 23 June 1917, 3.

[49] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 20 June 1917, 2; Cecilia O'Leary says that nationwide only a small fraction of draft evaders faced prosecution when picked up in draft raids. O'Leary, *To Die For*, 230.

board, men could claim exemption for marital status or essential wartime occupations. One of those who filed an exemption was Hiram Johnson, Jr. The case of Hiram Johnson, Jr. illustrates one of the biggest problems with the Selective Service Board's initial implementation of its exemption policy. In trying to fill the first draft quota by September 1, 1917, the War Department gave the local draft boards considerable leeway in interpreting the Selective Service Act. For example, the Act stated that a married man could claim deferment if he had dependents who had no other means of support. Local draft boards, therefore, had to determine if a married man could legitimately claim exemption because he had dependents. In some locales, boards refused exemptions if it appeared that men had married just to get a deferment, what many called "slacker marriages," while other boards gave blanket exemptions to all married men. In the case of Hiram Johnson, Jr., the local draft board interviewed his father-in-law, P. E. Bowles (president of American National Bank), who told the board that he was not willing to support his daughter and her children, but would do so if Hiram did not receive an exemption. The board used this testimony to deny Hiram's deferment.[50]

Like most draft boards in the nation, Hiram's board included members of the city's political, business, and professional elite. The chair, Randolph V. Whiting, was a former assistant District Attorney and a reporter for the State Supreme Court. John S. Phillips was co-owner of Van Norden-Phillips Printing Company. Draft boards normally had three members but, ironically, Hiram Johnson, Jr. had been appointed to the third seat

---

[50]Chambers, *To Raise and Army*, 179-191; Hiram W. Johnson, Jr. to Senator Hiram Johnson, 16 August 1917; Hiram W. Johnson, Jr. To Senator Hiram Johnson, 27 August 1917, Hiram Johnson, Sr. Papers, 1895-1945, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

on the board. When he realized it was possible he could be drafted, Johnson resigned and the position was still vacant when the board reviewed his case. On the one hand, Johnson's case looks like a local draft board unsure how to define the new rules established by the Selective Service Act. Hiram himself was unsure of his ability to win the appeal, despite his father's insistence from Washington that the Senate has passed the Selective Service Act with the expressed understanding that unmarried men would be the first to go. Hiram recognized that the draft boards could define the vaguely worded law to mean that only those men who could prove that their dependents would become wards of the state would be exempt. However, Hiram Johnson's questions to the board after their ruling suggests that his situation was more than a case of questionable interpretations of the law. When asked if the board had denied exemption to any other married man with dependents, or if the board had brought any other married man's in-laws in for questioning, the draft board replied in the negative.[51] This led Hiram and his father to believe that the senator's political opponents, and not the wording of the Selective Service Act, had determined the outcome of the draft board's decision.

Hiram immediately acted by sending a letter of appeal to the regional board, accusing the local board of using his name, and the political reputation of his father, to garner personal notoriety for the board members. Hiram also suspected that some of his father's political rivals in the city, who went unnamed in his correspondence, had influenced the decision, particularly when the *Chronicle* began to publish comments

---

[51] Hiram W. Johnson, Jr. to Senator Hiram Johnson, 6 September 1917, Hiram Johnson, Sr. Papers, 1895-1945, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

about the case from Phillips and Whiting. No evidence of a greater political conspiracy surfaced, but the issue brought out Senator Johnson's local supporters to defend his son, notably Senator Johnson's law partners Matt Sullivan and Theodore Roche (also close advisors of Mayor Rolph) and *Bulletin* editor Fremont Older.[52] Once the draft board resolved the matter in late August, and Hiram received his exemption, the matter faded and Hiram appeared to suffer no further public scrutiny of his decision to stay in San Francisco.[53] While his case was unique in that no other son of a U.S. Senator faced such scrutiny in asking for a draft exemption, it also identifies a problem many married men across the nation faced as draft boards fumbled to interpret their responsibilities under the Selective Service Act. It is likely that men without legal training or the support of influential fathers might not have requested exemptions, not understanding the law any more than the draft boards did. Public reaction against this particular element of the draft forced the War Department to develop a classification system for draft registrants based on occupation and marital status by the end of 1917.[54]

For men who did not claim or receive exemptions, the next step was training. As seen in the records from bases in and around San Francisco, the military expected these new citizen-soldiers to adapt quickly to military routine. An example of this regimented lifestyle is evident in the training of officers at the Presidio. The three months of

---

[52]Hiram W. Johnson, Jr. to Senator Hiram Johnson, 6 September 1917, Hiram Johnson, Sr. Papers, 1895-1945, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[53]Hiram W. Johnson, Jr. to Senator Hiram Johnson, telegram 30 August 1917, Hiram Johnson, Sr. Papers, 1895-1945, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[54]Chambers, *To Raise and Army*, 190-191.

intensive study centered on preparing men to become commissioned officers, including perfection of the same drills they would soon teach others, management techniques necessary for proper organization of enlisted men, and leadership skills. During the first month, all R.O.T.C. students followed the same course of instruction, after which they were assigned to artillery, cavalry, infantry, or engineering.[55] They spent between twelve and twenty hours each week in drill and another two to three hours per week marching or on guard patrol.[56] Besides drill, students spent twelve to fifteen hours a week in lecture classes. Mandatory evening study hours rounded out each trainee's day. Students worked half days Saturday, studying anything instructors felt needed to be added. Once the trainees moved to the specialized courses, the work week rose to between forty-eight hours a week (the average for the infantry and engineers) to fifty-eight hours a week (the average for artillery).[57] Anytime during this process, the military could release the men from camp for health reasons or failure to pass course examinations. The men who survived the three months of training then faced final examinations and placement.

Due to the extensive amount of material drill sergeants and instructors needed to

---

[55]War Department, *Training Camps for Reserve Officers and Candidates for Appointment as such, May15-August 11, 1917*, Speical Regulations No. 49 (Washington, D.C: GPO, 1917), 9-15, Graupner Family Papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[56]These drills at times took the men off the Presidio's grounds into greater San Francisco. For instance, the army, with the cooperation of city officials, staged a mock sea invasion during which trainees and their officers had to mobilize quickly, organize themselves for motor transport to the foot of Sloat Boulevard (8.7 miles from the Presidio), fire rounds at beach targets, and return to base. Nearly one thousand men took part in the exercise, which lasted approximated five and a half hours. Presidio Headquarters to James Rolph, 28 June 1918, and Col. H.M. Dichmann to James Rolph, 25 July 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[57]War Department, *Training Camps for Reserve Officers and Candidates for Appointment as such, May15-August 11, 1917*, Special Regulations No. 49 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1917), 32-56, Graupner Family papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

cover, the training schedule for potential officers was more rigorously enforced than the average enlisted man might face at other bases around San Francisco. Despite attempts by the Army General Staff to develop a standard training program, maintaining a monthly training schedule when new men trickled into camp weekly was impossible. Officers, many of them fresh out of officer training, pieced together a daily routine as best they could. They frequently focused on providing recruits with the basics – drill and marksmanship. Most assumed, like one new lieutenant stationed at Camp Fremont (who himself had little more than theoretical training with machine guns before being placed with a machine gun company at Fremont), that the real training would come once they arrived in France.[58]

Though their days revolved around drill and study, there was time for leisure activities. Men generally had several hours of free time in the late afternoon, again after dinner, and at least a half day Saturday, and all day Sunday. With this much time off, President Wilson and his advisors worried about the possible trouble men might get into without familial constraints. They therefore created the Commission on Training Camp Activities in the days after the war declaration. The CTCA served as the central organization responsible for providing men with what its board of progressive reformers considered proper, moral forms of entertainment. They hoped to prevent "the American army from suffering the moral and physical degeneration commonly associated with military training camps." To fulfill this goal, the CTCA established in-camp recreation,

---

[58]Jennifer D. Keene, *Doughboys, the Great War, and the Remaking of America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 36-40; Marsh [last name unknown] to Sidney Howard, December 23, 1917, Sidney Coe Howard Papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

organized social hygiene education for the men, and coordinated soldier and civilian interaction.[59] Most of the national guard and army cantonments lay in or near towns unable to provide sufficient entertainment opportunities for the tens of thousands of men who inhabited the camps by early 1918. Sixteen of thirty-three cantonments were located in or close to towns with populations smaller than that of the nearby camp at maximum capacity. Only eight camps, including Camp Fremont, lay within thirty-five miles of a city with a population of more than 200,000 in the 1920 census.

Most communities, therefore, did not have the facilities to house large groups of men in search of theatrical or musical entertainment. The CTCA stepped in and with the assistance of a host of religious and reformer organizations, established facilities for live and filmed entertainment, known as Liberty Theaters.[60] Local civilians, both amateurs and professionals, provided live entertainment in the same auditoriums that housed the movies. Nine hundred men attended a production of *Mikado* by the San Francisco Players Club at the Y's Letterman auditorium.[61] Understanding the importance of such activities, San Francisco citizens raised money to purchase Smileage Books, a booklet filled with five cent coupons that entitled the bearer to free admittance in Liberty

---

[59]Nancy Kathleen Bristow, "Creating Crusaders: The Commission on Training Camp Activities and the pursuit of the progressive social vision during World War One (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1989), 8-10.

[60]Bristow, "Creating Crusaders," 94-96, Appendix D. The CTCA's associates in camp included the YMCA, YWCA, Salvation Army, American Literary Association, War Camp Community Service, Knights of Columbus and the Jewish Board.

[61]Letterman General Hospital, *The History of Letterman General Hospital*, 48.

Theaters, Liberty Tents and auditoriums run by the CTCA in local camps.[62] In the first two days, San Francisco purchased more than six thousand books and sent them to camps so men could participate in "first-class, wholesome and thoroughly entertaining shows of all kinds. . . ."[63] The CTCA's quest to channel spare time into morally appropriate pursuits determined the types of entertainment allowed in camp. The CTCA frequently issued approved movie lists to all its camps, each including the names and descriptions of approximately fifty recent releases considered morally and patriotically acceptable.[64]

Music also played an integral part of the Commission on Training Camp Activities' entertainment plans. The CTCA at first saw singing as a leisure activity that men could do independently, but increasingly they sought to direct men toward music that, like the movies, they perceived as patriotic and above reproach. In August 1917 the CTCA created the Camp Music Division. The Division designated camp song leaders and initiated the printing of the Official Army Song Book. The CTCA distributed this book to every officer and soldier in the Army and National Guard. They published two editions of the Song Book during the war. Put together quickly to give soldiers some musical guidelines, the 1917 version provided words to favorite tunes while the 1918 edition, which was more carefully prepared, included melody lines and illustrations. Both books contained more than eighty songs and like the CTCA's movie program, limited its contents to music that "showed the dignity of America's position and respect for Allies."

---

[62] Frank Kester Scrapbook page, Frank Kester Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[63] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 30 January 1918, 9.

[64] Bristow, "Creating Crusaders," 649-650.

These included hymns like "Nearer, My God, to Thee," patriotic tunes such as "America, the Beautiful," along with popular and regional songs, including "Aloha Oe," and "Yaaka Hula Hickey Dula."[65]

Catchy, popular tunes exemplified the CTCA's efforts to provide men with fun and enjoyable activities while restraining emotional expression. The CTCA published songs with lyrics that verbalized their personal thoughts on such important issues as homesickness, boredom, camp monotony, and fears of the future. However, the singing occurred in a public setting where releasing emotions would be constrained by the presence of hundreds of other people. A song like "Where Do We Go From Here" allowed men publicly to utter the great question these men must have thought to themselves. However, when performed by the one thousand trainees at Mare Island at a jovial, upbeat tempo, the sailors did not have time to think too deeply about the answer. The words of the song also maintained the light-hearted mood by explaining that they were heading to Germany to "slip a pill to Kaiser Bill and make him shed a tear" while shooting his men "in the rear."[66] The power of music to raise morale and provide restrained, emotional release for trainees led the War Department in the summer of 1918 to order regimental bands increased in size from twenty-eight to forty-nine pieces, and the government appropriated money for more instruments and sheet music.[67] This increase

---

[65]Commission on Training Camp Activities, *Camp Music Division of the War Department* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919), 9-12; 42-43

[66]*The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 19 January 1918, 4; Commission on Training Camp Activities, *Camp Songs for the United States Army and Navy* (Philadelphia: Public Ledger, 1918?), Charles Kendrick Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford, California.

[67]Commission on Training Camp Activities, *Camp Music Division of the War Department*, 35.

made way for Charles Swope's addition as a permanent member of Fort McDowell's band and lessened his concern about deployment to France.[68]

With his position in the band, Swope's daily schedule had little to do with drill and military study and everything to do with music, including morning and afternoon rehearsals, private practice time, and performances at both the East and West Cantonments on Angel Island.[69] Swope's participation in camp practice, rehearsals, and concerts kept him busy. It also reflected the importance the CTCA, and the military overall, placed on musical activities in camp. The CTCA believed such musical troupes would boost morale and reduce boredom, preventing men from seeking less morally appropriate forms of entertainment. The letters of more conservative men in camp show the CTCA's endeavors were not completely successful. Men did attend CTCA-sponsored camp activities, but these events did not significantly alter their moral character. Charles Swope complained that most of the men at Fort McDowell spent their leisure time playing poker and cursing. While he admitted that he was not always as kind to his wife as he should be, he was in no way "as vile minded as some of these dogs."[70] Bruce Howard began his military training at Fort McDowell and reported to his older brother, Sidney, that the camp was "a fright, filled with the lowest scum and jailbirds of S.F., who

---

[68]Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 18 July 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

[69]Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 21 January 1918; 27 January 1918; 20 February 1918; 15 July 1918; 12 August 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

[70]Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 29 January 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

occupy themselves with talking, fucking and crap-dice."[71] The CTCA could require that their new civilian-soldiers participate in wholesome sing-alongs, but vice remained in every camp.

The CTCA also could not prevent men from leaving the base in search of entertainment, no matter how many performances and physical activities they provided. Men from the Presidio ventured out into the city that surrounded the encampment when they had a few hours to spare. Soldiers stationed at Fort McDowell and Camp Fremont had to wait for scheduled ferry and train services, limiting their excursions to days when training was cancelled or weekends. San Francisco was not unique in its attraction to American soldiers and sailors. The U.S. Army Military History Institute surveyed World War I veterans and when asked about nonmilitary activities, found that "going to town or visiting the nearest city" ranked first. What was special about San Francisco was that its size and diverse population provided greater entertainment options than were available to most military trainees. Only three other camps, all on the East Coast (Camps Mills, Dix, and Meade), were within thirty-five miles of a city larger than San Francisco (New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore respectively).[72] The men stationed at Camp Fremont and the other military outposts in the Bay Area could experience all that one of the most heavily populated cities in the nation had to offer. Unfortunately, some of those recreational experiences could undermine the health and well-being of the men in uniform, leading the

---

[71] Douglas Bruce Howard to Sidney Coe Howard, undated letter 1918, Sidney Coe Howard Additions, 1903-1939, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[72] Willis J. Abbot, *The United States in the Great War* (New York: Leslie-Judge Co., 1919), 42; United States, Bureau of the Census. *Fourteenth Census of the United States taken in the year 1920*. (Washington: G.P.O., 1922).

War Department to threaten to abandon any encampment if municipal governments and residents allowed immoral activities to corrupt trainees.[73]

Facing the possibility that the economic benefits from the military camps would evaporate and leave the city with a reputation of moral corruption that might hurt future tourism and war contracts, city leaders worked with the military to create proper forms of entertainment. At the request of Governor William Stephens, civic-minded residents held the first meeting of the San Francisco Committee for Recreation of Soldiers and Sailors on July 14, 1917.[74] Its purpose was to stimulate civilian interest in recreation for men in uniform, to coordinate city clubs' activities for soldiers, to make available to the armed services all city facilities, and "to decrease and eliminate those forces in the city which thrive by the degradation of enlisted men." As the CTCA became more nationally organized in late 1917, the San Francisco Committee became one of the hundreds of local organizations around the nation collectively known as the War Camp Community Service. The goals of the original committee, however, remained unchanged.[75]

The WCCS in San Francisco was divided into subcommittees, each responsible for one component of the activities the city planned to furnish men in uniform. The Educational Committee supplied French and English lessons as well as citywide lectures on national and international affairs. The Library Committee extended the city's library

---

[73]Bristow, "Creating Crusaders," 138-139.

[74]William D. Stephens to Simon Lubin, 9 July 1917, Simon Julius Lubin Correspondence and Papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[75]For a national look at the WCCS see War Camp Community Service, *War Camp Community Service, A Retrospect: How a Nation Served its Sons in Army and Navy through Organized Community Hospitality* (New York: War Camp Community Service, 1920).

facilities and publicized their availability to enlisted men. Other committees cooperated with churches and fraternal organizations in preparing hospitality tents and proper entertainment for the troops. The WCCS encouraged families to adopt soldiers and invite them to their homes for Sunday dinner or an evening of games. They petitioned residents with vehicles to join the Auto Recreation Corps, donating their machines and a driver one day a month to take men on sightseeing trips around the city or into the country.[76] With the approval of the WCCS, the Palace Hotel opened one of its ballrooms for enlisted men. The room included card tables, writing desks, food, and "a bevy of young girls, from the best families in San Francisco" as dance partners.[77] The Hotel St. Francis and Hotel Whitcomb set aside rooms, at discounted rates, for soldiers so they would have respectable places to stay while in town.[78]

The WCCS also provided funds to organization wanting to establish club rooms that catered only to men in uniform. The California League for Women's Service used such funds to rent space in the basement of the Monadnock Building on Market Street and at 2526 Lombard Street, close to the Presidio. The League converted both spaces into service mens' clubs; the former called the National Defenders' Club and the latter the Presidio Defenders' Club. Both stayed open from nine in the morning until eleven at night and provided lounges and reading rooms, private rooms for napping, billiard and

---

[76]George E. Dickie to Arthur Arlett, 22 August 1917, Arthur Arlett Papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; Arthur L. Dahl, "Community Life for Our Soldiers and Sailors," *Overland Monthly* 72 (October 1918), 308; *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 23 November 1917, 11.

[77]Arthur L. Dahl, "Community Life for Our Soldiers and Sailors," 307.

[78]*San Francisco Examiner*, 14 May 1917, 5; *Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly* (San Francisco), 16 June 1917, 16.

card tables, shuffle board, writing desks, pianos, a stage for concerts, and a lunch counter.[79] The WCCS advertised for the local YMCA branches in town, which gave any man in uniform free access to their physical and educational facilities. The Y's Golden Gate Avenue branch estimated that it served between three and four thousand soldiers and sailors each week.[80] Local theaters donated more than two thousand tickets a week to the WCCS for distribution to enlisted men on leave in the city, guaranteeing good, wholesome shows. As on base, music served as an important component of the WCCS, providing an opportunity for civilians and soldiers to join in patriotic, religious, and entertaining choruses, reaffirming the reasons for going to war and displaying the support of people back at home.[81]

Arthur Dahl of the *Overland Monthly* believed the WCCS in San Francisco achieved its goal of serving the physical and mental needs of the area's soldiers while establishing "higher mental standards." For young men, away from home for the first time and in the big city, the temptation to blend into the crowd and experiment in unwholesome desires was great. Thanks to the WCCS, Dahl and other moral reformers believed they were witnessing the development of gentlemen who increasingly demanded

---

[79] Jean Howard McDuffie to Sidney Coe Howard, 20 October, Sidney Coe Howard Papers: Additions, 1903-1939, MSS 83/82 z, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. Mrs. McDuffie's letter also includes a sketch of the layout of the National Defenders' Club; Letterman General Hospital, *The History of Letterman General Hospital*, 38; *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 2 January 1918,4..

[80] *The Wasp: A Weekly Journal of Illustration and Comment*, 16 March 1918, 5. For a history of the San Francisco YMCA during both wars see Clifford M. Drury, *San Francisco YMCA: 100 Years by the Golden Gate, 1853-1953* (Glendale, California: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1963).

[81] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 20 July 1918, 3; H. Feldman to Edward Rainey, 5 June 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

of themselves and others a higher moral standard of living.[82] San Francisco's large and diverse population provide resources, like a variety of social associations and well-funded business establishments, that allowed the city to extend services and facilities to citizen soldiers, many from rural areas of the West, who probably had never experienced all that a large metropolis had to offer.

Reports in the city's newspapers, however, suggest that the WCCS activities did not motivate all soldiers and sailors to behave like proper gentlemen, or even to abide by the law. Congress passed a law in May 1917 prohibiting the sale of liquor to uniformed men. Anyone caught violating the law faced a military court, while those who sold the liquor faced a fine of $1000 or one year's imprisonment.[83] The threat of incarceration, however, did not stop people from selling drinks to men in uniform. Soldiers were also known to violate military regulations by wearing civilian clothes to purchase liquor in stores that abided by the law. The San Francisco Morals Squad, led by police Lieutenant Charles Goff, disguised themselves as soldiers and attempted to purchase liquor at the city's hotels and bars.[84] Officers also investigated hotels and boarding houses rumored to be providing aid to men who wanted to violate the liquor prohibition. The Morals Squad discovered that room 18 at the Santa Fe Hotel provided soldiers with civilian clothes that could be rented for $3 a day.[85]

---

[82] Arthur L. Dahl, "Community Life for Our Soldiers and Sailors," *Overland Monthly* 72 (October 1918), 308; *Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly* (San Francisco), 13 October 1917, 12.

[83] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 26 May 1917, 1; *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 25 May 1917, 2.

[84] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 16 August 1917, 1; *The Daily News*, 17 August 1917, 1.

[85] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 30 November 1917, 1.

Besides liquor, the Morals Squad raided brothels, arresting "immoral women and visitors."[86] The number of venereal disease cases reported to the San Francisco Health Department made no distinction between men who contracted gonorrhea or syphilis before arriving in camp and those within the city. However, one can assume that out of thirty-seven cases of syphilis and three cases of gonorrhea reported for one week in February 1918 from the Presidio and Yerba Buena training station, at least a portion contracted the disease due to sexual activity in San Francisco.[87] One Presidio medical officer provided the San Francisco Health Department with the address of a hotel where one soldier had acquired "an acute case of gonorrhea."[88] While some weeks the Health Department recorded no sexually transmitted diseases from the military bases that did not mean soldiers and sailors always stuck to what the CTCA and WCCS considered proper, moral entertainment.

One man who did not need to limit his leave-time activities to the morally prescribed entertainments of the CTCA or WCCS was Charles Swope. Swope's experiences as a soldier stationed in San Francisco contrasts with the vast majority of men who spent their days and nights in the company of strangers. Charles spent his free time with his wife, Gretchen. A newlywed, with no children and no property, Gretchen could relocate to Oakland. Without her extended family, Gretchen could not have joined Charles in the Bay Area, for the newlyweds had little money. The couple had been living

---

[86]*The Daily News* (San Francisco), 16 August 1917, 1.

[87]*Municipal Record* (San Francisco), 14 February 1918, 52.

[88]Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 606.

with Charles' parents in San Diego since their wedding. In the early months of 1918, Gretchen took care of her relatives' house, and their young children, in lieu of paying room and board. At first, Charles seemed happy with this arrangement, sensing that his wife was better off with her kin than living alone in San Francisco.[89] However, within a month of their arrival, Charles began to worry that her family, whom he barely knew, would think badly of an in-law who could not provide for his wife.[90] Despite the War Risk Insurance Act, Charles had yet to see a paycheck and the government was delayed in sending out allotments and allowances. While Charles had the courage to sacrifice his life for his country, his inability to take care of his wife made him overly sensitive about remarks Gretchen's family made regarding his leave time in Oakland. In an emotional letter to Gretchen, Charles remarked that Otto's "kindness has in reality been a 'camaflouge' [sic] of the real situation."[91] Charles' own insecurities, namely his inability to assert his position as husband and man of his own house due to the war, led to repeated arguments between him and his wife and created tension between Charles and his new in-laws when he visited their Oakland home.

Charles' struggle – to be husband, provider, and soldier – was common among military trainees, whether their spouses remained geographically close or not. Most were unable to care for the financial needs of their families due to the inability of the federal

---

[89]Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 26 December 1917, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

[90]Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 17 January 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

[91]Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 1 February 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

bureaucracy to keep pace with the growing military. In Charles' case, the army did not send Gretchen her first allotment check until June 1918, more than six months after they had arrived in the Bay Area, and that was only after Charles had filed the appropriate paperwork twice. For the first half of the year, the couple searched for ways to supplement the three to six dollars per month the military paid Charles for band performances. The couple received an untold sum of money each month from Charles' parents while Charles did what many soldiers and sailors did in his situation – filed for relief with the Red Cross.[92]

Red Cross Chapters around the Bay Area worked diligently to take care of the needs of soldiers' and sailors' families in their community through their Civilian Relief Home Service Sections. Between October 1917 and October 1918, the San Francisco's Home Service Section provided assistance to 2,060 families in the city. Thirty-five percent of those families required financial aid like Charles and Gretchen. The rest received medical services, hospital care, legal advice, insurance, assistance obtaining allotment checks and "friendly advice."[93] Charles, like most soldiers, assumed that government allowances would be mailed to dependents soon after their induction into the military. Enlisting, and ultimately drafting, a four million man army required an efficiency that did not appear overnight and government clerks could not keep up with

---

[92]Gretchen Swope to Charles Byron Swope, 28 January 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego; Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 30 May 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

[93]Harry G. Bogart to James Rolph, 12 October 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

demand. In early July 1918 the government reorganized the allotment payment system, dividing the paperwork load between the Bureau of War Risk Insurance (which was trying to process more than 2.5 million claims), the War Department, the Navy Department, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance provided only the minimum $15.00 allotment and government allowance, while the military branches assumed responsibility for any additional allotment a soldier or sailor wanted deducted from his salary.[94] Until the government developed more effective ways of paying soldiers and their dependents, families like the Swopes had to rely on the generosity of others and wait for the backlog to clear.

Gretchen, like many American women during the war, decided she could not wait for the federal government to act. She suggested in late January 1918 that she should find a job, but her uncle and husband advised against it at the time, believing the allotment and allowance would be forthcoming. However, when the checks failed to arrive by May, Gretchen did not feel she could continue to wait. With Charles' tacit acceptance of the necessity of the situation, Gretchen accepted a job as a cashier in an Oakland store. Once Gretchen began receiving the army checks in June, combined with her pay at the store, the couple finally asserted their independence from her family and considered the possibility of Gretchen renting a room in San Francisco. Such a move would give them their own space for the first time since they had married and more time together during Charles' leave from the island as he would not have to wait for the ferry from San Francisco to Oakland. Charles believed that the cost of living with relatives was twice as

---

[94] *Bulletin* (San Francisco), 9 July 1918, 2.

much as renting a San Francisco flat.[95]

Charles was also increasingly worried that his young wife's current living situation might compromise her moral integrity. Charles disapproved of Aunt Minnie's entertainment choices, including "old dances, theaters, and other cheap amusements," which he believed reflected her overall immorality. Charles insisted that Aunt Minnie was "not refined enough to enjoy anything real good. We want to be with some one who can inspire us with higher ideals, instead of draging [sic] us lower and lower."[96] Charles had never questioned Aunt Minnie's activities before the couple claiming their economic independence from Gretchen's relatives. Unable to secure a better situation for his wife, Charles remained silent on the issue of Minnie's morality. Once able to provide for his wife through the allotment checks, Charles reasserted his position as defender of his wife's character. His wife's youth, the fact that she was experiencing life in a big city for the first time, and the couple's growing bank account also played a factor in Charles desire to find new housing for Gretchen. Although she would be closer to the vices of San Francisco, she would also be closer to Charles and his moral influence.

Charles felt even better about Gretchen's situation when her older sister, Katherine, moved to San Francisco from San Diego after the YMCA appointed her husband to serve in the Golden Gate Branch. Gretchen moved in with her sister and her two children and soon afterwards discovered she was pregnant. Sharing the expenses

---

[95]Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 9 July 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

[96]Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 9 July 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

with her sister, Gretchen quit her job and paid her share of the rent, utilities, and food with her allotment and allowance. However, Charles worried about providing for their new baby. Until early October 1918, Charles still believed there was a good chance his band assignment would end and he would be shipped to France. Consequently, Charles sought ways to supplement his income, using his time not engaged in band responsibilities to engage in economic pursuits.[97] Charles, an amateur photographer and print maker, turned his hobby into a moneymaking venture at Angel Island by photographing men who wanted to send photos home to their families. Charles developed the film with his own chemicals and dark room in the band barracks.[98] In mid-August, Charles wrote his wife that he could already contribute $35.00 for the month to their savings from his photographic work.[99]

Charles' efforts to supplement his income were not unique. In the summer of 1917, before the men of the Officers' Training Camp at the Presidio received their pay, several entrepreneurs used their leave Saturday and Sunday to find part-time work downtown.[100] For full-time soldiers unsure of their immediate future and unable to control whether they would be sent to France, taking care of current financial needs and

---

[97] Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 8 June 1918; Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 11 June 1918; Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 13 July 1918; Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 3 September 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

[98] Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 5 August 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

[99] Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 17 August 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

[100] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 4 June 1917, 7.

planning for after the war was all they could control. Charles Swope concentrated on his long-term goal of taking care of his wife and child after the war by saving enough to buy land in San Diego for a farm. After the newlyweds went on a reckless spending spree while Charles was on one of his leaves, he observed that they must "think of our farm and skimp for the present."[101] While the war enveloped the here and now, the financial resources they accumulated during the war might make their future brighter. Though the couple could do little about their current situation, they spent the last months of the war looking ahead.

For men like Charles Swope, still stationed stateside, the armistice ended their military service swiftly. After the armistice declaration, the bases in the Bay Area relaxed their leave policies even further, allowing Charles to visit his wife frequently enough that letters were no longer necessary. As a result, the story of Charles and Gretchen Swope abruptly ends November 12, 1918. It is unclear what happened to the couple after Charles left the service, but however brief Charles Swope's time in the U.S. Army, the war did alter his family. Learning to cope with everyday life, made more trying by wartime separation, forced American families to adapt. Despite the brevity of the war, such lessons could not be erased. Gretchen had learned to manage her family's finances and was forced to make decisions that ran counter to advice from her husband and other male relatives. The young couple also got a crash course in making ends meet in the midst of a rapidly changing economic climate. The Swopes had grand plans of starting a

[101] Charles Byron Swope to Gretchen Swope, 19 August 1918, Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918, Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.

farm near their parents in San Diego, and there is no evidence that the year they resided near the Golden Gate had swayed them into remaining in the area. Nevertheless, Charles' letters express nothing but San Francisco's positive attributes. In the case of Charles Swope, San Franciscans succeeded in taking care of him and his wife's needs and making both feel welcome.

San Franciscans could not have expected all the soldiers and sailors temporarily stationed in the city to stay when the war ended, but they hoped that by providing wholesome, and yet varied entertainment that they had created thousands of boosters. These men would return to their home communities praising all the wonderful opportunities for leisure and work the City by the Bay had to offer, inciting friends and families to venture into San Francisco. City leaders also expected to use what many considered the improved moral environment of San Francisco as proof that the nation's growing military machinery would be warmly, and properly, accepted in San Francisco. When the war ended and the War Department had the time to select a home base for the Pacific Coast naval fleet, Mayor Rolph and other city leaders quickly offered Hunter's Point in San Francisco.[102] San Francisco had reaped huge financial rewards from the military during the Great War. Thousands of men stationed in and around the city used what money they had not allotted to their families to purchase San Francisco commodities like meals, gifts, hotel rooms, trolley and jitney rides, and entertainment. Many civilians had also found employment as contract workers on the bases, providing services formerly

---

[102] Roger W. Lotchin, *Fortress California, 1910-1961: From Warfare to Welfare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 43-45.

done by soldiers too busy with training and preparation for deployment. With the war's end, city leaders sought to continue the financial boom by taking advantage of the military's proposed expansion. Thanks to their wartime experiences, San Franciscans could easily envision their city as the new headquarters of the Pacific fleet. The military had always had a presence in San Francisco, but this new opportunity led residents to imagine a redefinition of their city as a bastion of military supremacy.

Chapter Three
"Mayor of All the People": James Rolph and Municipal Governance

On the afternoon of September 21, 1917 San Franciscans celebrated the filling of the Selective Service Act's first quota with a parade. Rain showers ended just before a line of more than 10,000 men began their march from the Ferry building to the Civic Center. Led by a platoon of mounted police and flanked by six regular army soldiers for every one enlisted man, the 1,500 civilian-dressed draftees made their way along Market Street to say goodbye to their city before proceeding to basic training at Camp Lewis, American Lake, Washington. George Gallagher, president of the Board of Education, ordered all schools closed for the day so children could join parents and teachers in the festivities as "every window on both sides of the street and from the roofs of office buildings" was filled with well-wishers. The parade turned north on Van Ness Avenue and continued its march, single file, into City Hall. In the lower corridors of the Hall, Annette Rolph – the mayor's daughter – and 300 school children handed each man a bronze button as "a souvenir and a token of recognition." James Rolph, Jr. met the contingent in the Hall's foyer where he shook hands with each man before they made their way out to the Civic Center grounds. Once they were all assembled, Mayor Rolph spoke to the waiting crowd. He addressed the men as "soldiers of the United States Army," sparking an eruption of cheers from all gathered. Rolph expressed the gratitude of the people of San Francisco for the soldiers' "obedience" to their nation's call to arms and wished them "Godspeed when you go to carry the flag of our country to foreign lands

and to fight for the honor of America." The mayor's oration blended the right amount of patriotic reverence with light-hearted exuberance. After telling the young men that residents were "filled with emotion" to see them head to war, he lightened the mood by holding an impromptu neighborhood competition. As Rolph shouted out the names of the city's major residential districts, he encouraged the new soldiers to out-cheer their brothers-in-arms from other neighborhoods.[1] This parade to commemorate the beginning of a journey for San Francisco's favorite sons was an opportunity for the city to honor those who might sacrifice their lives for their country and their city. It was also a parade in which James Rolph could exercise one of his favorite duties as mayor, strengthening bonds of friendship with city residents. No one was mayor of all the people like "Sunny Jim."

The war provided Mayor Rolph with opportunities to do what he did best: promote civic unity, advertise the city's great accomplishments, and provide oversight to the various municipal departments under his control. His desire to be the "mayor of all the people" meant reminding San Francisco's residents of their common goals: the successful completion of the war and the safe return of the city's soldiers. This unity required Rolph's participation in activities he loved, especially events that allowed him to interact personally with the people of San Francisco. Critics have derided Rolph for wasting too much time on ceremonial duties, particularly after the PPIE closed. They argued that his obsession with the titular role of mayor prevented him from providing

---

[1] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 21 September 1917, 3; *San Francisco Chronicle* 22 September 1917; draft copy of James Rolph's 21 September 1917 speech, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

effective leadership, which ultimately led to political factionalism in the city by the 1920s.[2] Part of the reason for such harsh criticism of one of San Francisco's most popular mayors stems from the lack of extensive research into his life and work. Despite his nineteen years as mayor of one of the nation's most heavily-populated cities and a term as California governor during the early years of the Great Depression, there has been little attempt to chronicle his political activity in the decades since his death in 1934.[3] While the scope of the present study is too narrow to rectify this historical oversight, the mayoral work of "Sunny Jim" during the war illustrates the importance of his leadership to San Francisco and its residents.

Rolph recognized that if the city's leaders could not put aside their personal, political, and ideological differences, the city could not respond effectively to the war dictates from Washington, thus putting the city's future federal assistance and its national reputation in jeopardy. James Rolph held together San Francisco's political factions by promoting himself as the "Mayor of All the People," in public ceremonies and municipal meetings, unifying the city's disparate groups, and responding to the important wartime

---

[2] William Issel and Robert W. Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 161-180. Other historians and contemporaries did not necessarily blame Rolph for the factional political culture of the 1920s, but did find him to be an ineffective leader engrossed in creating a cult of personality and intellectually lacking. T. H. Watkins and R. R. Olmsted, *Mirror of the Dream: An Illustrated History of San Francisco* (San Francisco: Scrimshaw Press, 1976), 213; Jerry Flamm, *Good Life in Hard Times: San Francisco's '20s and '30s* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1978), 74.

[3] Shortly after Rolph's death two works provided an overview of his life, the first by his personal secretary. David Wooster Taylor, *The Life of James Rolph, Jr.* (San Francisco: Committee for Publication of The Life of James Rolph, Jr. [Recroder Printing and Publishing Co.], 1934) and Herman G. Goldbeck, "The Political Career of James Rolph, Jr.: A Preliminary Study," (Master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1936). James Worthen recently published a study of Rolph's time as governor which sketches the life and mayoral years of Rolph, but without significant analysis. James Worthen, *Governor James Rolph and the Great Depression in California* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland and Company, 2006).

tasks required by the government. Rolph sought to mobilize residents behind his vision of the city's future that included greater support for war veterans, municipal ownership, and a compromise solution to the city's vice issue. Though not always successful in gaining the support of San Franciscans to adopt his plans for the city, Rolph's attempts during the war reflect a mayor engaged in resolving the problems that plagued his city.

James "Sunny Jim" Rolph, Jr. started life "South of the Slot" on August 23, 1869. He was the eldest son of James Rolph, Sr. and Margaret Nicol, who met on a ship from New York to San Francisco in 1868 and married two days after they debarked. James Rolph, Jr. graduated from the Episcopal Church's Trinity School in 1888 and went to work as a messenger in the shipping firm Kittle & Company. Employing knowledge learned from that company, Rolph started his own shipping partnership in 1898 with George Hind. Hind, Rolph & Company found success importing sugar from Hawaii, lumber and nitrates from South America, and wool and coal from Australia. Rolph married Annie M. Reid in 1900 and despite his growing assets, the couple lives in the same working-class neighborhood in which they were both raised. Rolph stepped into the public arena after the 1906 earthquake and fire, establishing the Mission Relief Association with the help of neighborhood friends, including Matt I. Sullivan. The Association sought to meet the immediate needs of neighbors and Rolph's home became the supply depot.

Rolph continued his public activities by supporting the reconstruction of the city, most notably through the work of the Mission Bank he founded and his service on the

Portola Festival Committee in 1909.[4] The five-day festival marked the city's return as a tourist destination, showing the nation that San Francisco could organize and carry out a large event, putting the city in the running for the PPIE. Rolph served on the Committee of Six that worked successfully to get the exposition, propelling Rolph to the top of the list of individuals who could upset incumbent P.H. McCarthy in 1911. Rolph bridged class differences. He owned a shipping company and a bank, and was a three-term president of the Merchants' Exchange; yet, Rolph supported organized labor and the unionization of his shipping firm. As president of the Shipowners' Association of the Pacific, he had helped to maintain good working relations with the Sailor's Union of the Pacific through its first formal contract and resigned from the Association in 1906 when members decided to back the open shop. Rolph's campaign slogan, "South of Market for Mayor," aptly identified his working-class background. Many laborers choose Rolph over McCarthy because they believed the latter had spent his term in office courting business interests to the detriment of labor. On September 26, 1911, Rolph beat McCarthy nearly two to one, inaugurating the nineteen-year reign of Mayor James Rolph.[5]

In historical monographs that discuss the work of California progressives, Rolph is not even a footnote. Some have argued that the mayor was more comfortable practicing traditional politics based on personal relations than progressives who preferred

---

[4]Taylor, *The Life of James Rolph, Jr.*, 24-44.

[5]Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 161-164; Taylor, *The Life of James Rolph, Jr.*, 44.

a more logical and rational management style.[6] Others have denied that Rolph was a true progressive because California progressives were "more hostile to organized labor than they were to corporate monopoly."[7] This perspective, which defines progressives as intellectual elitists, excludes anyone outside the professional middle class from the progressive ideal.[8] Rolph's support of organized labor should not invalidate his progressive nature. More recent definitions of progressivism reject the notion that it was a well-organized political agenda. Rather, progressivism was a political culture formed "to bring about a politics of needs . . . and government by administration rather than by party. . . ."[9] In his 1918 gubernatorial bid, Rolph sounded very much like a progressive in his pledge to continue the "great humanitarian, constructive, progressive work of Governor Hiram W. Johnson's administration." He advocated state ownership of utilities, called for health insurance and some form of unemployment and old age insurance, as well as the cleanup of any inefficient state boards of commissions.[10] His vision of San Francisco's identity required its residents' to unite behind common civic goals to create a city that, at the very least, was comparable to the great cities of the

---

[6]Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*,162-166.

[7]Liston F. Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast" (Master's thesis, San Francisco State College, 1960), 82.

[8]Ibid, 82-85.

[9]Philip J. Ethington, *The Public City : the Political Construction of Urban Life in San Francisco, 1850-1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 345.

[10]*Bulletin* (San Francisco), 25 July 1918, 5.

world.[11] Rolph's 1911 campaign platform resounded with progressive visions of the future: an end to municipal patronage and graft through civil service, reform of liquor licensing, municipal ownership of utilities, improved transportation, and promotion of the city through public works. Such progressive characteristics won Rolph continuous support from a broad cross-section of San Franciscans.

Rolph initiated his plans for the city during his first term in office, including construction of the Civic Center complex, the development of the Hetch Hetchy project, and municipal ownership of utilities through the creation of the Municipal Railway. He frequently turned to personal advisors for guidance, including recognized leaders of the Progressive Party, such as Matt I. Sullivan and Theodore Roche (law partners of Governor Hiram Johnson). Rolph also fully utilized the abilities of experts whom he appointed to municipal positions, allowing them a free reign to develop city policy based on their wealth of knowledge. This less aggressive approach to mayoral governance has drawn criticism from contemporaries and historians alike. Some have argued that after the close of the PPIE and the move into City Hall in late 1915, Rolph retreated from executive leadership.[12] A 1960 interview with Andrew Gallagher, a San Francisco supervisor in the 1920s, is often cited as the source for this argument that Rolph served more as a figure head than a leader. Gallagher told one historian that ". . . as the years passed the Mayor gave a decreasing amount of his attention to the problems of

---

[11] John Whiteclay Chambers II, *The Tyranny of Change: American in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920*, 2nd ed. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2000); Steven Diner, *A Very Different Age: Americans of the Progressive Era* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998); Alan Dawley, *Changing the World: American Progressives in War and Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

[12] Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 197.

administration and he relied increasingly on his capable secretaries, advisors, and political supporters to attend to the day-by-day problems of government."[13]

Even historians who portray Rolph as a good mayor concede that his executive skills did not make him a great mayor. They describe Rolph as a "neutral harmonizing force, the vital human amalgam around whom all San Franciscan's converged and without which no city can truly live and thrive."[14] During the Great War, these skills were of tremendous importance. Rolph's ability to resolve conflict between competing factions proved essential, particularly in his efforts to protect the city's relationship with the military. At the same time, Rolph was also more politically active than others have given him credit. In 1918 he ran as a candidate in the California gubernatorial election, promoted the interests of soldiers and their families, and continued to push for the expansion of municipal ownership.

Critics of Mayor Rolph use his frequent absences from the city during the war to prove his lack of diligence to the needs of his constituents. The most notable case of this was in the summer of 1918 when Mayor Rolph decided to run for governor. His challengers were William D. Stephens, Hiram Johnson's successor when he assumed his senatorial duties in March 1917, and Francis J. Heney, original prosecutor in the San

---

[13]Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast," 55. It must be noted that while Gallagher served as a Supervisor during Rolph's mayoral years, and therefore, would have first hand knowledge of Rolph's activities, or lack thereof, he may not have been a supporter of Rolph. Gallagher may have been continuing a life-long mantra against Rolph, for Gallagher ran against Rolph in the mayoral election of 1915, at a time when Rolph had successfully begun a number of municipal projects, yet Gallagher referred to the mayor as idle and a circus performer.

[14]Moses Rischin, "Sunny Jim Rolph: The First "Mayor of All the People," *California History* 53 (Summer 1974): 172. For Philip Ethington, this need to develop consensus spoke as much about Rolph's personality as it did the changing political dynamics wrought by the Progressive Era as interest group politics replaced party politics. Ethington, *The Public City*, 345-346.

Francisco graft trials. A 1913 state law allowed office-seekers to cross-file, creating the possibility that one person could win a plurality in both party primaries, or win the primary of a party not their own. In 1917, the state legislature added Section 23 to the state election law that stated that a candidate had to win his own party's nomination to win any other primary. All three candidates took advantage of cross-filing in 1918. While Rolph stuck to the two main parties, Stephens filed with the Republican, Prohibition, and Progressive parties and Heney ran as a Democrat and Progressive party candidate.[15] While the other two candidates announced their intention to run in early 1918, Rolph did not get into the race until early summer, spending most of July on the campaign trail in Southern California. The fact that he did not decide to run until late in the campaign season led Hiram Johnson, Sr. to disregard Rolph as a viable candidate. He refused to support his candidacy, despite his personal disdain for Stephens.[16]

Whether Johnson's assistance would have helped Rolph is debatable because the counties Rolph lost were rural counties and Los Angeles – counties Stephens won because of his support for prohibition. In the end, Rolph lost the Republican primary to Stephens by 21,952 votes.[17] Though not a member of the Democratic Party, Rolph won that primary over Heney, 74,955 to 60,662, sparking intense debate regarding the

---

[15] Royce D. Delmatier, *The Rumble of California Politics, 1848-1970* (New York: Wiley, 1970), 189-194; "The Primary Election and Its Results," *The Argonaut* (Berkeley) 83 (7 September 1918), 145.

[16] Hiram Johnson, *The Diary Letters of Hiram Johnson*, *1917-1945, e*dited by Robert E. Burke (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1983), 22. According to Burke, some of Johnson's friends believed that if the Senator had been more supportive of Rolph, Stephens, whom Johnson did not like, would not have won the Republican primary and the election would have gone to Rolph.

[17] In San Francisco, Rolph beat Stephens for the Republican nomination by over 20,000 votes. *Municipal Record* 11 (12 September 1918), 298.

legitimate Democratic Party candidate for governor. The Democratic State Central Committee endorsed Heney, arguing that since Rolph had not polled enough votes in his own party's primary, Section 23 disqualified him from winning the Democratic nomination. California Secretary of State Frank C. Jordan ruled that neither Rolph nor Heney could run in the general election because they had failed to win their party's nomination as required by Section 23.[18] Theodore Roche and Matt Sullivan took Rolph's case to the state Supreme Court, insisting that Section 23 was unconstitutional. On September 25, 1918, the Court ruled against Rolph and Heney, leaving the Democratic Party with no candidate at all. Despite his defeat, the 1918 gubernatorial race demonstrated Rolph's statewide popularity. In total primary votes, Rolph polled thirty-five thousand more votes than Stephens and almost 158 thousand more votes than Heney.[19] Rolph's campaigning took him out of San Francisco for a number of statewide speeches but the mayor did not neglect his city. San Francisco and its wartime efforts continuously drew Mayor Rolph's attention, and his personal involvement, back to his work as municipal leader.

Rolph frequently used his position as municipal executive to secure the well-being of the city and its citizenry, especially those affected personally by the war. In November 1917, Rolph requested an investigation by the City Attorney, George Lull, into the impact of war service on men of the Police and Fire departments who enlisted in the armed forces. Lull replied that their leave of absence would hurt their pensions, as the city

---

[18]Delmatier, *The Rumble of California Politics*, 195.

[19]Taylor, *The Life of James Rolph, Jr.*, 76; Delmatier, *The Rumble of California Politics*, 196. Rolph would ultimately win the 1930 election with three times more votes than his closest opponent.

charter required continuous active service for a prescribed period. Therefore, the city would need to amend its charter if these men were to receive full benefits. Rolph's official response to Lull's communication is unknown, but at the top of Lull's letter Rolph scribbled: "By all means prepare amendment."[20] This proposal received approval from the Board of Supervisors and they submitted it to the people in the 1918 general election as charter amendment number 28. The amendment allowed members of the Police and Fire Department to serve their country without breaking the "continuity of service required" to receive a pension, though they would not count the time spent in the military as service toward retirement.[21] "Pensions with colors" as the papers called the amendment, passed 42,499 to 22,163. This two to one support for the amendment signifies the importance Mayor Rolph, and the large majority of voting residents, placed on providing the city's men in uniform with compensation for their service to the city and the nation.[22]

Rolph also had a hand in the creation of proposed charter amendment 26 that would have established a three-year fund to take care of servicemen's dependents.[23] In early 1918, Rolph became involved in the issue of welfare for dependents when he started receiving letters from servicemen's family members, unable to pay their bills due to government delays in sending allotments and allowances. One father, whose son was in

---

[20] George Lull to James Rolph, Jr., 13 December 1917, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[21] San Francisco, Charter, *Proposed charter amendments to be submitted November 5, 1918* (San Francisco: Press of the Phillips & Van Orden Co., 1918), 5-6.

[22] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 9 November 1918, 4.

[23] San Francisco, Charter, *Proposed charter amendments*, 3-4.

training at Camp Lewis, worried that his daughters would have to leave high school to "fill the gap" in the family's income left by their older brother's military service.[24] In May, Rolph suggested the Board of Supervisors allocate $100,000 from the city's budget to help "those San Franciscans who may be made dependent by the war."[25] The Supervisors initially unanimously supported the measure, but when Lull questioned the legality of such a budgetary change, they backed away from the proposal. Rolph promised one man who had written to him that the Supervisors' decision would not deter him from raising the money privately, if needed.[26]

The letters from constituents also fueled his support for Chapter Amendment 26, which would allow city-based welfare for soldiers' dependents. Not everyone backed such an amendment. The Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations urged its members to vote against amendment 26 after its Board of Governors met with leaders of the local Red Cross. The Red Cross argued relief for dependents fell under their administration and a city fund would create a "duplication of effort and energy."[27] Rolph attempted to appease the Red Cross by offering to appoint five members from the San Francisco Chapter to handle the funds. In late October, he issued a public statement urging people to vote for the amendment, reminding the city of the sacrifices made by

---

[24] Anonymous letter to James Rolph, Jr., 11 July 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[25] J.M. Bailey to James Rolph, Jr., 21 May 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[26] James Rolph, Jr. to J. Murray Bailey, 31 May 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[27] *Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco* 4 (October 1918), 4.

those serving the armed forces. "Shall we at home show that we have neglected our civic duties, that we have made no progress. . . . Surely, San Francisco patriotism demands better things of citizenship."[28] However, by the time Rolph made this heartfelt request, the military had sorted through its backlog of paperwork and families were receiving their money.

Coupled with Red Cross assistance, there was no evidence by the end of October that military dependents were still without basic necessities. By election day it was also evident from news reports that the war would not last another couple of years, but a few more months at the most. As a result, newspaper editors like M. H. De Young of the *Chronicle* urged residents to vote down amendment 26. De Young thought it was not only unnecessary, but likely to encourage corruption because the amendment lacked any mention of commission oversight. Such arguments against the amendment led to its overwhelming defeat.[29] In this case Rolph proved unable to unify the people to support his plan for welfare to soldiers' families, but no urban mayor could win majority support on every measure. Rolph's failure to secure passage of this amendment should not take away from his attempts to meet the special needs of soldiers and their families during the war.

Rolph's concern for the future well-being of the soldiers and the city led him to help returning veterans find employment. Board of Supervisors' Clerk J.S. Dunnigan was

---

[28]Mayor James Rolph, "To the People of San Francisco," *Municipal Record* 11 (October 31, 1918), 349.

[29]*San Francisco Chronicle*, 1 November 1918, 16; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 9 November 1918, 4.

in Washington, D.C. in October 1918 and reported in a confidential telegram to Rolph that San Francisco must quickly show ways it could employ demobilized soldiers and sailors. Military officials had told Dunnigan that they would more rapidly return men to communities where jobs were readily accessible. With the Presidio designated a demobilization center, if the city could advertise a list of employment opportunities, the city could benefit from the large number of men from around the west mustered out of the military in San Francisco. The committee Rolph created included members of the Board of Supervisors, Rolph's close advisors, union leaders, and a secretary charged with preparing a register of every San Franciscan in the service at the time of the Armistice. Members of the committee then sought to verify which men on the list already had assurances from prewar employers that they could resume their jobs when they returned. The committee then sought out private companies with jobs available and developed a list of vacant municipal offices. They even sent letters to the federal government urging it to lift construction restrictions on city projects as soon as possible so the city could hire soldiers for public works projects upon their return.[30] Rolph's creation of this committee reflected his belief that the municipal government should do everything possible to help San Franciscans regain their livelihoods and stave off unemployment and discontent. Rolph sought to circumvent the economic downturn that normally struck urban areas in the months after a war as government contracts and war-related industries retreated, thereby creating a city policy that the rest of the nation could emulate. Rolph's efforts to

[30] Telegrams from J.S. Dunnigan to James Rolph, Jr., 31 October 1918 and James Rolph, Jr., to J.S. Dunnigan, 7 November 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

provide aid to those suffering from wartime dislocation furthered his image as the "Mayor of all the People" while boosting the national reputation of the city as one that cared for its residents in the hope of attracting new residents and industries.

To provide living and working space for potential new residents, the city also needed to continue its infrastructure improvements. Crucial to this endeavor for Mayor Rolph was municipal ownership of the city's rail lines. With municipal ownership, Rolph argued, all San Franciscans benefitted, not just the wealthy or special interest groups.[31] Despite constraints placed on the municipal budget as the result of the war, Rolph fought to extend the city-owned railroad, the San Francisco Municipal Railway. The Municipal Railway emerged in response to the power of the United Railroads in the city, its connections to the 1906 graft scandal, and its brutal suppression of the Carmen's Union strike in 1907. In December 1909, voters approved a bond issue to purchase the private Geary Street line, creating the first municipal railway in the nation. By 1915, the Municipal Railway controlled ten lines and the Public Works Department had begun work on the Twin Peaks tunnel, necessary to connect the western region of the city with downtown.[32]

To further promote expansion of residences to this remote region of the city, and to extend the reach of the Municipal Railway, Rolph supported and the Supervisors approved the financial resources necessary to construct new rail lines on Market Street. In June 1916, City Engineer Michael O'Shaughnessy oversaw the beginning of the

---

[31]Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast," 151-153; 194.

[32]Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 173; 181.

project as workers ripped up the pavement on Market to make way for the lines, which would run parallel to the existing United Railroad tracks.[33] United Railroad retaliated by getting a court-ordered injunction against the city, arguing that it had exclusive rights to run lines on Market. In late January 1917, the U.S. District Court lifted the injunction, permitting "the extension of the Municipal Railway upon any street as the public necessity might require."[34] The District Court's decision gave the city the legal green light to proceed with construction of the Market Street line. It also bolstered Mayor Rolph's resolve to challenge the United Railroad's power in other areas of the city. Thus the city, and not United Railroads, began to take control of the future development of the city's transportation facilities.

The start of the war did not hinder construction of the Twin Peaks Tunnel, which opened on July 14, 1917. The tunnel's completion intensified the conflict between supporters of the Municipal Railway and United Railroad. The tunnel was only wide enough for two sets of track and the mayor envisioned the tunnel as a conduit for municipal trains exclusively. Lack of access to the tunnel would prevent United Railroad from gaining a foothold in the western sectors of the city. However, many leading businessmen insisted United Railroad should be allowed to compete for passengers, thereby requiring the city to allow its usage of the city's tunnel. The mayor's plan for independent Municipal Railway lines on Market Street and control of the Twin Peaks tunnel received support from residents who believed the city would charge more

---

[33] *San Francisco Call and Post*, 12 June 1916, 1.

[34] *Municipal Record* 10 (25 January 1917), 25.

reasonable rates and provide the geographically-constricted city with new residential development west of Twin Peaks. Real estate agent A.S. Baldwin argued that such a real estate boom would benefit the entire city – increasing construction jobs, raising municipal tax revenue, and preventing the loss of residents to East Bay competitors who promoted the more plentiful land options of their communities.[35] The Mission [District] Promotion Association supported Mayor Rolph's position. Although some of its residents might choose to leave their neighborhood for newer housing, the Mission Association believed municipal ownership of the tunnel was in the city's best interest. Like many San Francisco residents, members expressed their opposition to United Railroad's use of the Twin Peak's tunnel by reminding the mayor of the company's connections to the scandals of the previous decade.[36]

Their support of the mayor's plan reflected the sentiments of many who saw the Municipal Railroad as the way to clear the city of United Railroads perceived depravity. The mayor's vision of a city void of private ownership of transportation also found adherents among union labor that had fought for a decade against United Railroad's anti-union policy. A piece in the Building Trades Council's *Organized Labor* urged its members to rally behind the mayor, insisting the new municipal lines "would provide people with much-needed service" at reasonable rates and prevent the "plundering and robbing of our city of valuable rights and property." The paper couched their argument

---

[35] A.S. Baldwin to James Rolph, Jr., 17 January 1917, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[36] Harold W. Groom to James Rolph, Jr., 31 July 1917, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

for city-run transportation in wartime rhetoric, urging city leaders to thwart the "lip-patriotism" being spouted by the United Railroads in its attempt to continue dominating city rails. They urged the supervisors to do their patriotic duty to end the "public robbery."[37] For the Building Trades Council and others, heightened wartime patriotism ran parallel with their civic ideals. They envisioned a city unhampered by United Railroad's history of corruption and with the municipal resources necessary to entice new residents and businesses.

Those opposing Mayor Rolph's plan expressed doubt that the city could generate economic development if the Municipal Railroad continued to expand. They argued that the mayor's policy was fiscally irresponsible, inefficient, and a threat to public safety. The Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations considered the entire Municipal Railway project to be a financial liability for the city. Though city officials claimed the Railway had begun to show a profit by early 1917, the League thought its figures proved otherwise. According to the League, the real expenses – including the interest on the bonds, legal fees, and the general operating expenses – showed that the Railway was not running in the black. The League compared this deficit to the city revenue collected consistently by taxing private transportation companies. They concluded the city could lower taxes and provide other necessary services, like street work, if they turned the Municipal Railway over to private investors.[38] The League also considered the additional two tracks being constructed down Market a disaster on several

---

[37] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 12 May 1917, 7.

[38] "Municipal Railway," *Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco* 3 (June 1917), 4.

fronts. First, the League considered it a financial disaster, one that would result in depressed real estate prices on Market Street as businesses sought less congested parts of the city (or maybe another city) to ply their trade. It would also be an efficiency disaster in that the unified car service and universal transfers provided by the United Railroads could not continue. Lastly, the League envisioned personal disasters as pedestrians precariously maneuvered across four tracks of speeding trains and dodged cars and jitneys that shared the street.[39]

The Chamber of Commerce seconded the Civic League's fears that the additional tracks increased the potential for serious accidents and injuries. The Chamber insisted that just the risk of injury would keep consumers away from the heart of the city. Merchants south of Market worried they would have to close because "women shoppers will not risk the loss of life and limb by crossing a thoroughfare congested by four car lines, jitneys, automobile and vehicular traffic." Both the Chamber of Commerce and the Civic League believed the best solution was to terminate construction on the new tracks and for the city to accept the United Railroad's offer to continue providing service on Market Street – from the Ferry to the residential districts west of Twin Peaks.[40]

Ultimately, in August 1917, the Supervisors rejected a proposed compromise with the United Railroad that would have allowed joint use of the Twin Peaks tunnel and the

---

[39]"Four Tracks Ordered," *Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco* 3 (August 1917), 1-2.

[40]"Chamber of Commerce Opposes Four Tracks on Market Street," *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (19 August 1917), 179.

existing lines on Market.[41] The city inaugurated street car transportation service through the tunnel in early February 1918 and contractors completed the last of the new tracks on Market in late May. Although wartime conservation forced the city to cut back on road construction for the last few months of the war, Rolph's vision of the city unified by the Municipal Railway made great strides during the war.[42] Besides the creation of the "K" line from Twin Peaks, the city also expanded the "D" line into the Presidio, further serving the needs of the military and the city[43]. Rolph reported to A.S. Baker of Salt Lake City that San Francisco's Municipal Railways "are in every way satisfactory, beneficial and conspicuously successful." For Rolph, the city had won its battle against "exclusive private ownership" by wresting absolute control of transportation away from corporations, providing an efficient, profitable utility that employed more than eight hundred by May 1918.

The conflict that arose over the expansion of the Municipal Railway, and the subsequent limits placed on the United Railroads, shows the debate over municipal ownership did not diminish just because the city mobilized for war. For Mayor Rolph, municipal ownership allowed the people the power to "run their own affairs," creating a more egalitarian urban political culture.[44] The interests of the city as a whole outweighed

---

[41] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 6 August 1917, 1.

[42] *Municipal Record* 11 (29 August 1918), 282. The Federal Highways Council suspended all street and highway construction not considered a military necessity beginning September 10, 1918

[43] *Municipal Record* 11 (7 February 1918), 42; *Municipal Record* 10 (29 November 1917), 395; *Municipal Record* 11 (9 May 1918), 147.

[44] James Rolph, Jr. To A.S. Baker, 1 May 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

the interests of the wealthy business elite in his mind. The Civic League and Chamber of Commerce opposition to the Municipal Railroad illustrates a common division within the city regarding municipal ownership of utilities. Unions and working-class neighborhoods, like the Mission, joined forces with city progressives and some businessmen to support Rolph's vision of a municipal government that controlled utilities and provided services to all residents at more affordable rates. For the heads of San Francisco's largest corporations and their small business backers, the expansion of municipal control threatened private enterprise. Despite their ongoing battle with labor (see Chapter Five), the Chamber of Commerce did not attack municipal ownership as a plot devised by socialist-leaning unions and their political backers. Instead, they challenged the economic feasability of the plan and its impact on the city's future success.

Both sides of the municipal ownership debate wanted the same thing – an efficient transportation system that provided access to the greatest number of potential customers. They wanted to be able to advertise San Francisco as a city ready for development, with an infrastructure that attracted new residents and businesses. Each side believed the other's plan for this goal would ultimately undermine economic growth, leading potential investors to select one of San Francisco's urban competitors instead. This conflict over municipal ownership would continue to arouse heated debate well into the 1920s not only over transportation, but also the delivery of San Francisco's water and energy.

Rolph, with the assistance of Chief Engineer O'Shaughnessy, refused to let the war halt work on the Hetch Hetchy Dam and aqueduct and the city's quest for an adequate water supply. O'Shaughnessy, who had previously served as chief engineer for

the Southern California Water Company, designed and promoted the project after its construction began in the summer of 1914.[45] Despite the war, Blyth, Witter & Company completed a significant part of the overall plan in October 1917 by laying the last of the sixty-eight miles of track that connected the Sierra Railway with the Hetch Hetchy dam site.[46] The new track enabled O'Shaughnessy to ship heavy machinery and materials to the area, but other wartime problems prevented the chief engineer from meeting prewar construction goals. Shortly after the completion of the rail line, O'Shaughnessy admitted to members of the Civic League that the limited availability of supplies due to wartime construction had increased the price of equipment and materials. He hoped the project would stay within the $45 million budget he had proposed in 1916, assuming prices dropped after the war.[47]

To add to the financial stress, the Board of Supervisors failed to find buyers for the $11 million in bonds O'Shaughnessy had requested at the beginning of the year. The war, and the subsequent bonds issued by the government, had diverted people's attention and money away from Hetch Hetchy. As a result, the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors had only disposed of $1.6 million in bonds at the end of the year.[48] The war

---

[45] Lawrence Kinnard, *History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region*, vol. 2 (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1966), 298; Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 176.

[46] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 27 January 1916, 7; Kinnard, *History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region*, vol. 2, 303.

[47] "Special Committee Report on Hetch Hetchy," *Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations* 4 (March 1918), 7. The postwar prices did not decline and the ultimate cost of the Hetch Hetchy projected soared to $100 million by 1934. Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 182.

[48] "Special Committee Report on Hetch Hetchy," *Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations* 4 (March 1918), 8.

also reduced the pool of industrial workers who sought city jobs. O'Shaughnessy complained in August 1918 that while more than four hundred men worked on the project, another two hundred could be employed, "but they cannot be got."[49] O'Shaughnessy needed many of those missing workers for the completion of a dam at Lake Eleanor. The dam was needed to insure sufficient water during the dry season to operate the Lower Cherry River power plant, which began operations May 6, 1918. The power plant was essential to O'Shaughnessy's overall plan, providing the electric power required in the construction of the rest of the project. O'Shaughnessy originally intended for the dam to be ready by June 1918, but it was late September before workers had the Eleanor dam operational.[50]

The completion of this portion of the project occurred at an auspicious moment for the city and its efforts to further the Hetch Hetchy project while doing its bit for the war effort. In early August, the Federal Power Administration, led by H.G. Butler, ordered municipalities to cut their use of power. The city cut back operation of street lights and implemented "skip-stops" on the Municipal Railway.[51] With the completion of the Eleanor dam, Butler directed the city to sell its surplus power. The *Municipal Record* estimated that the Lower Cherry River power plant generated enough power to operate all the Municipal street car lines and was doing its part to relieve the power shortage in

---

[49]*Municipal Record* 11 (15 August 1918), 267.

[50]"Special Committee Report on Hetch Hetchy," *Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations* 4 (March 1918), 7; Kinnard, *History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region*, vol. 2, 303; *Municipal Record* 11 (3 October 1918), 322. For a history of the Hetch Hetchy valley and the conflict over the dam project, see Robert W. Righter, *The Battle Over Hetch Hetchy: America's Most Controversial Dam and the Birth of Modern Environmentalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

[51]*Municipal Record* 11 (1 August 1918), 247.

California. Though the restrictions on the municipal use of electricity ended with the war, the city continued to sell electricity to Pacific Gas and Electric from its Hetch Hetchy project well into the 1920s.[52] The war might have slowed construction, but Hetch Hetchy's ability to contribute to wartime needs kept the project moving forward with the blessing of the federal government. The War Industries Board classified the work as an essential industry a month before the armistice, entitling the city to priority privileges on material required.[53] Unlike most construction jobs that were suspended due to the lack of resources and manpower, the war aided the completion of Hetch Hetchy by turning it into a regional wartime essential rather than a city project.

In the case of Hetch Hetchy, San Francisco gained from the expanded wartime powers of the federal government. However, in other cases federal dictates challenged residents' efforts to promote their city as a premiere Pacific destination.[54] Of all the federal demands on the city of San Francisco, the pressure to get control of vice created the greatest amount of discussion and received the most attention from the city's political leaders. San Francisco's reputation as a haven for drinking, gambling, drugs, and

---

[52]*Municipal Record* 11 (3 October 1918), 322; Kinnard, *History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region*, vol. 2, 305.

[53]*Municipal Record* 11 (10 October 1918), 327.

[54]Historians have more frequently looked at the impact of federal legislation on the wartime actions of state governments and state-organized agencies, particularly the State Councils of Defense. For a national analysis of the work of the formation of the State Councils of Defense by the federal government see William J. Breen, *Uncle Sam at Home: Civilian Mobilization, Wartime Federalism, and the Council of National Defense* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984). The inability of the Missouri State Council of Defense to rally support for wartime activies is a significant part of the narrative in Christopher C. Gibbs' *The Great Silent Majority: Missouri's Resistance to World War I* (Columbia: University of Missour Press, 1988). The power given to the Minnesota Committee on Public Safety reflects a unique situation in which the state legislature created an agency before pressured by the federal authorities, an agency with "almost dictatorial powers" as described in Carl H. Chrislock, *Watchdog of Loyalty: The Minnesota Commission of Public Safety During World War I* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1991).

prostitution threatened to undermine the city's future ability to win military bases and promote the city as a good place to visit and relocate. Even before the United States entered the Great War, some residents had attempted to rid the city of its vice districts, most notably the Barbary Coast and the Tenderloin. Residents had tolerated prostitution in the Barbary Coast since the Gold Rush days, but the moral reform movement of the early twentieth century increasingly put pressure on the city to bring it under control. In March 1911, Mayor McCarthy and the Board of Supervisors – responding more from concerns about rising venereal disease rates than a desire to shut down the Coast – established regulations for prostitutes.[55] Every four days the Board of Health examined prostitutes and issued certificates of health if they were clean, or sent the women to the new Municipal Clinic for treatment. The Municipal Clinic treated nearly one thousand women a month, with a revolving contingent of approximately twenty-five hundred.[56]

James Rolph continued to support the Clinic when he became mayor, as did his new President of the Police Commission, Theodore Roche. Rolph, Roche, and several Supervisors believed that prostitution resulted from human nature. They could regulate, but never completely suppress it. The Clinic and the health certificates brought the venereal disease rate in the red light districts down by 66 percent, but moral reformers demanded nothing short of the complete destruction of the Coast and Tenderloin, along with the dissolution of the Municipal Clinic that they believed encouraged improper

---

[55]Linda L. Ambrosini, "The San Francisco Civic League and the Redefintion of Women's Role, 1911-1921," (Master's thesis, California State University, Hayward, 1980), 36.

[56]Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast," 136-137.

behavior by treating the diseased. [57]

In 1913, various religious and women's organizations, along with *The Examiner*'s editor, John McGrath, formed a committee to pressure the municipal government to close the vice districts. Unlike in previous years, when reformers argued the measure was morally necessary, this committee won a larger following by emphasizing the negative impact the regulated vice districts might have on the image of San Francisco as it prepared for the PPIE. In May, bending to growing public pressure, Mayor Rolph stopped police assistance to the Municipal Clinic, effectively killing it. In September, the Police Commission issued new regulations for the Barbary Coast that prohibited dance halls from serving liquor and banned women from saloons. The state's Red Light Injunction and Abatement Act, passed in 1914, gave the city even more power to combat vice, but the Police Commission preferred a passive approach, revoking liquor licenses rather than investing in large raids of the district. For the next two years, the city's police worked to close houses of prostitution as they found them, but various groups within the city demanded a more stringent policy. The vice crusade heated up again after the closing of the PPIE when publicity concerning the subject could not severely damage Exposition tourism. Former mayor Eugene Schmitz – in an effort to re-enter municipal politics – led the charge in 1916, publishing reports of continued vice in supposedly closed districts. He also initiated a recall petition against Mayor Rolph. The recall campaign went nowhere, and Schmitz – intrinsically linked to the city's history of political corruption –

---

[57] Jacqueline Baker Barnhart,*The Fair But Frail: Prostitution in San Francisco, 1849-1900* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1986), 100; Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast," 138; Ambrosini, "The San Francisco Civic League and the Redefintion of Women's Role," 36.

failed to provide the leadership moral crusaders demanded.[58] In early 1917, those opposed to vice in San Francisco turned to Rev. Paul Smith.

Smith was the pastor of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church in the Tenderloin District. Smith and his congregation often came face to face with the effects of vice. Some claimed that Smith's crusade against the district began after a prostitute solicited the pastor directly.[59] Starting in early January 1917, Smith regularly called for the elimination of the district in his sermons. He spent his weekdays urging prominent citizens to assert their influence with the Police Department.[60] Smith not only sought the closing of the Tenderloin and what was left of the Coast; he also wanted to see the police do more to end vice in residential areas and to enforce the city's two a.m. drinking law.[61] Not everyone agreed that vice would disappear with more rigid police inspection. Fremont Older, editor of *The Bulletin*, insisted that prostitution would simply scatter across the city, making it more difficult to detect. He urged the vice crusaders and the city officials to find a compromise.[62]

One historian has argued that Mayor Rolph remained "largely detached" from the January vice debate, but there is evidence to suggest that by the end of the month, Smith's vice crusade led the mayor to act.[63] At a large anti-vice rally at the Dreamland Rink on

---

[58]Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast," 141-187.

[59]Barnhart, *The Fair But Frail*, 100.

[60]Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast," 188.

[61]*The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 17 January 1917, 2.

[62]*The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 27 January 1917, 6.

[63]Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast," 194.

January 25, Rev. Smith and his supporters overwhelmingly passed a resolution calling for the mayor to create a vice commission. Several days later, city newspapers reported that Rolph had selected twenty-five people to serve on such a commission, including several pastors, social workers, physicians, and one of Rolph's personal advisors.[64] The Police Commissioners also created a "Morals Squad," led by Sergeant Charles Goff, which began raids on suspected brothels in mid February. The police arrested men and women for suspicion of prostitution and blockaded the entrances to streets and alleys where men were known to frequent roving bands of women.[65]

Despite the appointment of the Vice Commission and the Morals Squad, Rev. Smith continued to attack Mayor Rolph.[66] A week before the declaration of war, Smith sent an open letter to the mayor through the press, providing names and places where prostitution was "both fostered and tolerated." Smith attacked the mayor by holding him responsible for the eradication of the vice dens. He also threatened to make public the names of businessmen who owned the buildings where prostitutes openly worked. [67] In many ways, Smith was trying to generate attention for his vice crusade by resurrecting the specter of the previous decade's graft trials. Smith believed that the city's politicians and business leaders profited from allowing prostitution to continue and that, just like in the days of Boss Reuf, such toleration of corruption would cause moral decay that could

---

[64] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 26 January 1917, 1; *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 31 January 1917, 7; *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 10 February 1917, 1.

[65] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 14 February 1917, 1.

[66] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 10 February 1917, 1.

[67] *San Francisco Examiner*, 1 April 1917, 7.

destroy the city – just as the shoddy work on the old City Hall was responsible for its collapse.

Because America's declaration of war came so closely on the heels of Smith's threat to city leaders, estimating the impact of Rev. Smith's crusade on shutting down the vice districts in 1917 is difficult. Historian Liston Sabraw estimates that Smith's campaign led to the closing of almost four hundred houses of "ill-fame" in the next two years, but he fails to consider what happened to the vice crusade after America entered the war.[68] When the war started, Smith's attacks were not the municipal government's primary concern regarding vice conditions. Facing increased pressure from the federal government, particularly the War Department, Mayor Rolph and others struggled to make the city acceptable as a place to train a clean fighting force.

In July 1917, the War Department issued a statement meant to quell nationwide rumors that the men heading to training camps were being "hounded by a 'vice trust'." They insisted that the police in large cities, working with military officers, had closed established vice districts, specifically mentioning the closure of San Francisco's Tenderloin. The greatest threat to a soldier's morality, the War Department believed, was in bands of "scattered adventurers, gamblers, dramsellers," and the like. The War Department made it clear that local governments should eradicate these threats or face losing camp sites to cleaner communities.[69] The Morals Squad, led by the promoted

---

[68]Sabraw, "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast," 188. Eugene Maclean of *The Daily News* believed that Rev. Smith was a political liability by the summer of 1917, hurting any politicians candidacy if Smith were to support him. *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 6 November 1917, 4.

[69]"Police Officials Help Clean Up Army Towns," *Municipal Record* 10 (19 January 1917), 242.

Lieutenant Goff, continued to raid "notorious places," arresting women and their visitors and barring anyone from returning to those alleys, boarding houses, or hotel rooms. On May 21, 1917, Goff's squad brought one-hundred twenty-five men, women, and girls before the Police Judges in a single day.[70]

To aid in the cleanup, the San Francisco Department of Health recommended that the Board of Supervisors allocate $6,000 for a new ward at San Francisco Hospital that could care for women suffering from venereal diseases, thereby removing the possibility of their contact with soldiers and sailors on leave. The Board of Health did not refer to the defunct Municipal Clinic in its explanation of the proposed "Ward L," but the creation of the new ward reflected the old clinic's successful reduction of venereal disease. Unlike the Municipal Clinic, which had been closed to protect the moral image of the city at the time of the PPIE, they could tout Ward L as a war measure vital to the security of the nation's soldiers. Such patriotic motives saved Ward L from the condemnation of moral reformers that ultimately killed its predecessor. Health Officer William C. Hassler deemed the ward an "urgent necessity at this time owing to the fact that a very large number of infections are being spread and that this menace is more grave at this time by reason of the war conditions" and the possibility that more undesirable women might flow into the city as the military camps grew.[71]

Mayor Rolph, in assuring the military that San Francisco would protect soldiers

---

[70] *San Francisco Examiner,* 1 May 1917, 5; *San Francisco Examiner*, 14 May 1917, 5; *San Francisco Examiner*, 22 May 1917, 6. Although the number of individuals arrested appeared impressive, Police Judge Sullivan held only two women on May 21, releasing the rest for lack of evidence.

[71] William C. Hassler to Health Committee, Board of Supervisors, 14 July 1917, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

and sailors from the spread of disease, supported the creation of the ward. He promised that he would "use his best endeavors to secure the money" despite a limited emergency budget.[72] The Board of Supervisors showed their support by allocating the money needed to operate the hospital war. Soon afterwards, judges in the city's Women's Court began turning over women suspected of prostitution to doctors for examination. In October 1917, Judge Matthew Brady heard 497 cases. He ordered 135 women suspected of prostitution or other illicit behavior that might lead to disease to undergo testing at the hospital. Twenty-eight of those women spent time in Ward L.[73] Such numbers suggested to city leaders and the War Department a vigorous effort to clean up the city and protect the soldiers training in the area.

The support of the War Department enabled Mayor Rolph and other supporters of Ward L to provide public health care as a patriotic endeavor. Raymond Fosdick, chairman of the Commission on Training Camp Activities, gave his public support as did Western Department army officials. The Supervisors allowed the Board of Health to spend whatever they needed to keep the ward running through the 1917-1918 fiscal year. At the special request of the U.S. Army, the ward's budget increased to $50,000 the following year. In supporting the appropriation, Rolph told Fosdick that San Francisco would do whatever it could to help quickly end the war. "We want all Government

---

[72] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 16 July 1917, 1.

[73] "Report of Women's Court," *Municipal Record* 10 (8 November 1917), 367. Women arrested on suspicion of prostitution were not the only ones that might be ordered to undergo a medical exam. Only 95 of the women brought before Judge Brady were charged with prostitution or with running a house of prostitution, which means at least another 40 women arrested for other crimes, possibly vagrancy or larceny, were also turned over to the Health Department.

Departments to feel that they need but ask, and it shall be done."[74] Despite its opposition to the mayor's Municipal Railroad expansion, the Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations supported the work of the ward and donated money, considering it the "duty of the authorities intrusted with the preservation of the public health to protect the civilian as well as the military."[75] The support for Ward L from the municipal government and organizations like the Civic League reflected the belief that they could not eradicate vice from the city, but that they could eliminate the aspects most dangerous to soldiers - and the reputation of San Francisco - through regulation.

Many moral crusaders, however, considered Ward L to be nothing short of municipal sanctioned prostitution. Mrs. C.E. Grosjean, a member of the Board of Directors for the Taxpayers League and member of the Parents' Rights League, denounced the mayor and Supervisors for supporting Ward L. Mrs. Grosjean argued that all the ward did was provide willing women for soldiers, women taught by the very existence of Ward L that they "can sin and go free." Rolph deflected this criticism by reminding Grosjean that the city had budgeted money at the insistence of the U.S. Army, and therefore, the city could not revoke the money or close the ward. [76] Sentiments like that of Mrs. Grosjean had led to the closing of the Municipal Clinic in 1913. However, the moral reformers' vision of a city completely clean of vice failed to see the reality

---

[74]Notes of meeting in Rolph's office, 14 June 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco; James Rolph to Raymond B Fosdick, 25 April 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[75]*Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations* 4 (March 1918), 3.

[76]Minutes of meeting in mayor's office, 14 June 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

facing San Francisco during the war. It would be impossible for city leaders to rid the city of vice with so many transitory soldiers and sailors in its midst. Municipal officials, like Mayor Rolph and members of the Board of Health, believed the best way to handle urban vice was to regulate it and control the spread of disease. Therefore, they saw no reason to go further than the War Department required to keep military encampments in San Francisco.[77]

The establishment of Ward L did not end the debate over the diligence of municipal leaders to keep the city free of vice. Judge P.F. Barlow, a New York woman's court judge, railed against San Francisco's judicial structure that allowed most women charged with prostitution to return to the streets in short order without serving jail time. As a result, the court saw the same women time and again. Barlow suggested the city adopt New York's policy of sending repeat offenders to a workhouse for two years.[78] The report of the Women's Court could confirm Barlow's analysis of the situation. While Judge Brady sent 135 women for medical examinations in October 1917, the judge only sentenced fourteen women to the county jail.[79] Meanwhile, the Heath Department reported fluctuating numbers of venereal disease cases appearing in the city and military bases. For the week ending December 29, 1917 (the first week the Health Department published the number of syphilis and gonococcus infections), the Health Department

---

[77] For an extensive, comparative study of the efforts of San Diego, San Francisco, Portland, Seattle to control the spread of venereal disease in the decade before the war and how each treated cases during the war see Nancy Rockafellar, "Making the World Safe for the Soldiers of Democracy: Patriotism, Public Health and Venereal Disease Control on the West Coast, 1910-1919" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1990).

[78] *The Daily News* (San Francisco) 31 October 1917, 3.

[79] "Report of Women's Court," *Municipal Record* 10 (8 November 1917), 367.

learned of 103 new cases of syphilis and four cases of gonococcus infection in the city, though the Presidio and Yerba Buena Training Station reported no new cases of venereal disease. Two weeks later, the city reported only three new syphilis cases and seven gonorrhea infections, but the bases reported sixteen men with syphilis and ten with gonorrhea.[80]

Fearing that the two dozen cases might evolve into an epidemic that would force the War Department to transfer its men to healthier communities, Mayor Rolph requested a meeting with Arthur Murray, Commander of the Western Department Headquarters of the War Department.[81] The meeting, which took place in Rolph's office on February 11, reflected the divisions within San Francisco regarding vice and Rolph's attempts to quell the disparate voices so that what people saw outside San Francisco was a city united. Those assembled included Mayor Rolph, four police judges, the Provost and Assistant Provost Marshals, Police Chief White, Police Commissioner Roche, several members of the Board of Health, and the Chief Medical Officer of the Western Department. The meeting began with intense debate over the best way to clean up the city and quickly degenerated into a battle over who should be blamed for the continuation of the problem. The military's representatives denounced the women of the city, especially "girls in department stores . . . working on small salaries," who picked up soldiers for fun and carelessly spread disease. They suggested that the city hire more women social workers

---

[80]"Health Department Local Morbidity Statistics," *Municipal Record* 11 (3 January 1918), 4; "Health Department Local Morbidity Statistics," *Municipal Record* 11 (17 January 1918), 20.

[81]Arthur Murray to James Rolph, 8 February 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

to patrol the streets looking for such girls, with the power to force them to undergo physical exams or face jail time. Speaking for the police, Theodore Roche retorted that he did not believe his officers should subject women to random medical exams without evidence of a crime, which led to a brief discussion of whether such exams would violate the women's civil liberties. Then, the military blamed police judges for failing to jail more women suspected of prostitution. Judges Brady and Sullivan countered by suggesting that the police sent the court insufficient evidence. Many of the women, and the men accused of being their pimps, demanded jury trials, resulting in acquittal due to lack of evidence. Brady turned the tables on the military, suggesting that the army failed to do its part to protect its men. Rather than harshly punishing the weak women in Brady's court, why not "discipline [the] strong soldiers at the Presidio." Colonel Maus, Army Chief Medical Officer for the Western Department, retorted that he objected to such a suggestion, for it was "prostitutes [who] sow seeds of syphilis" and no matter how much the Army disciplined soldiers, it "cannot change human nature."

Mayor Rolph, in hopes of saving his city's patriotic reputation and the money generated by the military's presence, became the mediator in this den of accusations. Trying his best to find a solution, Rolph emphasized the work the city had already accomplished in cleaning up vice and its desire to maintain good relations with the military. "We don't want [the] reputation of Seattle," Rolph insisted. "We [will] co-operate in every way and we [will] bear the expense."[82] Despite his usual deference to the

[82]Minutes of conference on moral conditions, 11 February 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

expert suggestions of his advisors, Rolph sided with the military and refused to blame the soldiers for the problem. The mayor ultimately left the decision of how best to clean up the city to the military officers. Rolph, Roche, Brady, and Sullivan preferred to focus on treating cases of disease and limit raids of boarding houses. However, Rolph agreed to do more to eliminate prostitution if it would keep the military from sending soldiers and sailors elsewhere, hurting San Francisco's reputation and future relationship with the military.

The congenial atmosphere Mayor Rolph's words established at the end of the meeting on February 11 appeased the military authorities. The War Department did not call for any further meetings or pressure city officials to alter their established anti-vice policy. Rather, the police and soldiers assigned to the Morals Squad continued their efforts as before – arresting street solicitors, suppressing liquor sales to soldiers, and investigating immoral activities and rooming and apartment houses. The lack of public complaints from moral reformers or the War Department for the duration of the war indicates that those who lived and played in San Francisco found the city's efforts satisfactory. The measures were successful enough to draw condemnation from residents who supported regulated prostitution. Mayor Rolph received several letters arguing that if single men did not have access to "girls of the business," who knew how to keep themselves free of disease, they would turn to "chippy girls" looking for a good time who did not know how to take care of themselves.[83] While Rolph may have agreed with this

[83]"Citizen" to James Rolph, 25 February 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

sentiment, given his history of support for regulated prostitution, he could not retreat from his wartime policy.

In his efforts to win the War Department's approval of the city's efforts to clean up vice, Mayor Rolph hoped to attract national attention to San Francisco's patriotic national service. He received such validation when in March 1918 the Federation of Jewish Charities in Louisville, Kentucky wrote to the mayor, asking for his advise on how to handle their vice problems. Louisville, home to the Army's Camp Taylor, was a city of more than 200,000 residents and more than 57,000 soldiers by the summer of 1918. It faced many of the same challenges as San Francisco in providing wholesome entertainment for men in uniform. The fact that they turned to Rolph for guidance suggests that national publications had suggested that San Francisco, long known as "frisky Frisco" by sailors, had cleaned up its act. In his response to the Federation of Jewish Charities, Rolph praised the diligence of his city's police and the police judges and the important contributions of Ward L to San Francisco. According to Rolph, the "results of this system have been far-reaching," leading the State Board of Health and military officials to commend the city for its efforts.[84] Rolph continued to believe that vice could not be eliminated, and he continued to oppose laws that would attempt to banish it outright, a position at odds with the city's moral reformers. However, Rolph's policy of presenting the city as a willing facilitator in the demands of the federal government appeased the War Department, preventing the relocation of thousands of men

[84] James Rolph to Lula D. Krakaur, 11 March 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco; *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 1 June 1917, 6.

from San Francisco. The city kept its bases and the city's government improved its image as a caretaker of the nation's citizen soldiers.

Mayor Rolph, endeavoring to be the mayor of all the people and promote a spirit of egalitarian, spent the eighteen months of the Great War struggling to balance competing forces, both municipal and national. Rolph used his ceremonial responsibilities – as parade marshal or goodwill ambassador to the troops at Camps Fremont and Lewis – to create an image of a city united behind the war effort. He worked throughout the war to provide for the men, and their families, who represented San Francisco on the battlefield in France and Siberia, promoting civic pride in the city's wartime accomplishments even when he did not win a majority of supporters for his cause. In handling the vice issues in a way that appeased the War Department, if not moral reformers, Rolph protected the civilian-military relationship San Francisco would need to utilize after the war and created a system that other urban centers could emulate. His desire to administer a well-planned, efficiently run city despite wartime conditions remained paramount, leading him to continue his plan to expand the Municipal Railway into new parts of the city. These actions required Rolph's personal attention, but the more routine daily administration of his office was frequently left to the boards and commissions of experts that served the executive, laying the foundation for 1920s political conflict. The factionalism that became part of the city's political culture in the 1920s is evident during the war, as seen in the heated debates regarding amendment 26, expansion of municipal ownership, and the conflicts regarding the vice question. Despite these clashes with residents who did not share Rolph's vision of what San Francisco in

the postwar decades should look like, Rolph managed to maintain majority support. Sunny Jim remained the Mayor of All the People for another decade before running for governor and winning the political prize he had failed to achieve in 1918.

Chapter Four
"You Have Not Invested Till It Hurts": City Businessmen and the Chamber of Commerce

On Sunday morning, October 6, 1918, a massive crowd poured into Golden Gate Park and headed for the baseball fields. The people were to take part in a new film directed by Thomas H. Ince. Dubbed the "Sweetheart Film," the stars of the silent drama were the friends and relations of men serving in the United States military. The U.S. Division of Films promised that they would show the finished product in all the American rest camps in France. Northern California soldiers would have the opportunity to see their families on the movie screen and everyone wanted to send the men their best wishes. People from as far north as Shasta County and as far south as Fresno made their way to San Francisco for the occasion. At one o'clock, a rocket shot up from the recreation fields and an estimated 150,000 began slowly to march northward to the Mid-Winter Fair Memorial Museum where Ince's cameras were rolling. Many participants carried signs with short messages for their soldiers. One mother carried a small baby in one arm while holding a sign in the other that said "Dad, this is Patricia." The city's firemen marched before the cameras with a message to their comrades in France that read "Never mind the bacon, but bring home the Rhine." For three hours this procession made its way past the cameras, smiling and waving for posterity. For a brief moment, many families felt more connected to their soldiers overseas than they had since their departure.[1]

---

[1] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 2 October 1918, 1-2; 3 *Chronicle,* 3 October 1918, 16; *Chronicle*, 4 October 1918, 9; *Chronicle*, 5 October 1918, 9; *Chronicle*, 7 October 1918, 8-9.

The 150,000 residents of northern California who participated in the film had one man to thank for its production, *San Francisco Chronicle* owner Michael H. de Young. De Young, who had founded the paper in 1865 with his brother, had the financial resources and business contacts necessary to get this film made. He used his newspaper to publicize the event and his money to get Ince and his crew to film it. De Young, like many of San Francisco's business elite, also donated part of his fortune to civic improvements. His favorite project was the Mid-Winter Fair Memorial Museum, which served as the backdrop for the film, advertised in de Young's paper as "the greatest love story ever told, and filmed."[2] De Young donated many items from his personal art collection to the museum and provided much of the funding necessary for its expansion in 1917.[3] His contributions to the museum reflected de Young's desire to make San Francisco the cultural destination of the West, an image most publicly expressed during the PPIE.

In his work with the museum and his efforts to provide San Franciscans with the chance to send visual messages to loved ones in France, de Young represented the qualities the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce expected of its members. Formed in 1911, the Chamber of Commerce sought to facilitate trade networks and mobilize support for civic improvements.[4] In doing so, the Chamber hoped to promote San Francisco as

---

[2]*San Francisco Chronicle*, 2 October 1918, 1-2; 3.

[3]Jerry Flamm, *Good Life in Hard Times: San Francisco's '20s and '30s* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1978), 26; Christopher Pollock, *San Francisco's Golden Gate Park: A Thousand and Seventeen Acres of Stories* (Portland: West Winds Press, 2001), 72-73.

[4]William Issel and Robert W. Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 39; Richard H. Frost, *The Mooney Case* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968), 52.

the best place on the coast to start a business and raise a family. When the United States entered the Great War, the Chamber called on its members to demonstrate their patriotism and willingness to make immediate sacrifices for future rewards. For Chamber president Frederick Koster, the community could only meet the nations' needs if it were "run with the utmost smoothness." That would require significant sacrifices from the city's businessmen.[5] "You are not a patriot – not worthy of the name of an American if you have not invested until it hurts."[6]

In bringing Ince to San Francisco, Chamber member Michael de Young was investing – in his personal, business, and city's reputation. As owner of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, De Young experienced the economic benefits and the difficulties associated with running a business in wartime. The influx of troops meant a growing readership, but a reduction in supplies resulted in federal calls for paper conservation. This forced the *Chronicle* and other city papers to reduce the number of pages printed by 12.5 percent.[7] Some industries, like printing, faced uncertain times caused by wartime regulations, while other sectors profited by catering to the military's needs and increased Pacific trade. In either case, San Francisco businessmen sought to portray themselves and their companies as American patriots, making sacrifices for the greater good.

De Young's film drew national attention to San Francisco, fulfilling one of the Chamber of Commerce's goals during the war – displaying San Franciscans' patriotism.

---

[5] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities*, 5 (28 February 1918), 65-66.

[6] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities*, 5 (17 October 1918), 329.

[7] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 31 July 1918, 4.

With a membership roster of almost 8,000, the San Francisco Chamber was the largest in the country. It used its size to promote the city while uniting the business community behind a common vision of an urban metropolis. The city's businessmen, who historically did not run for elected municipal office, used the Chamber to affect urban change.[8] Besides advertising the city's patriotism, the Chamber spent the war defending San Francisco's business interests from Pacific Coast competitors. To accomplish that task, the Chamber had to take on the city's labor unions. The Chamber believed that as long as businesses had to bow to union pressure and accept the closed shop policies of the last decade, the city had no hope of luring businesses away from West Coast rivals like Los Angeles. The Chamber used its patriotic activities to justify its attacks on labor. It also explained the wartime profits of some of its members as the rewards of loyal service to the nation.

Not every businessman in San Francisco reaped huge financial gain during the war. Some had to sacrifice current profits for the sake of the war effort, hoping such acts would result in future economic rewards. In no area of the business sector was this more true than in public eating establishments, including restaurants, hotel dining rooms, and social clubs. They faced the daunting task of adapting to the ever-changing Food Administration's edicts while keeping their businesses afloat. One of the earliest departments created by the California Food Administration was the Public Dining Service, headed by Edward Benjamin, to coordinate food conservation by restauranteurs.

---

[8]Steven C. Levi, *Committee of Vigilance: The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Law and Order Committee, 1916-1919: A Case Study in Official Hysteria* (Jefferson, N.C..: McFarland, 1983), 90; Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco,1865-1932*, 6, 204.

Benjamin encouraged public dining houses to pledge conservation of important food items like beef, pork, wheat, and sugar.[9] Every establishment that accepted the restrictions received a replica of the Food Administration emblem for their front window so that customers would know that their business was supporting federal policy.[10] Business without the insignia faced declining patronage as residents sought out patriotic establishments.

In early November 1917, San Francisco restaurants and hotels decided to take the lead in adopting Food Administration guidelines, inaugurating Meatless Tuesdays and Wheatless Wednesdays. Rather than wait for the federal government to implement restrictions, San Francisco eateries joined eastern cities, like New York, in professing their patriotism by initiating voluntary action.[11] However, living up to the guidelines jeopardized the very existence of businesses dependent on providing customers with products containing meat and wheat. According to Edward Krehbiel in his report on the California Food Administration, one San Francisco businessman with a roast beef stand along the waterfront almost went out of business trying to live up to Meatless Tuesdays. To feed the more than two hundred workers who patronized his establishment at lunch, the businessman replaced his standard fare with cheese, sardines, and jelly and served

---

[9] Edward Krehbiel, *Report of the United States Food Administration for California* (typescript, 1919), Public Dining Service Section, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

[10] William Clinton Mullendore, *History of the United States Food Administration, 1917-1919* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1941), 95.

[11] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 5 November 1917, 3; Mullendore, *History of the United States Food Administration*, 96.

double portions at the same price.[12] The businessman's patrons continued to frequent the stand and luckily, Meatless Tuesday proved short-lived. Thanks to a shortage of trains to transport cattle from western ranches eastward, the Food Administration lifted the restrictions on beef consumption for six western states in January 1918. That summer, the Food Administration simply suggested strict economy for beef rather than voluntary elimination.[13]

Although beef became more plentiful at San Francisco eateries, the need to ship tons of wheat and flour to France required tighter federal restrictions. While individual households were encouraged to conserve voluntarily, the federal and state Food Administration carefully regulated public eating establishments. Beginning January 28, 1918 wholesale suppliers for restaurants could not sell their clients any more wheat flour than they sold them in wheat substitutes. These alternatives included corn meal and corn flour, barley flour, potato or sweet potato flour, rice flour and buckwheat flour.[14] The California Food Administration required bakers to substitute at least one-third of their baking flour with the approved alternatives. They could advertise their cakes, pies, doughnuts, and pastries as "Victory Products" that could be sold on Wednesdays and Wheatless Mondays. Ralph Merritt reminded bakers that omitting regular flour was a

---

[12] Edward Krehbiel, *Report of the United States Food Administration for California* (typescript, 1919), Public Dining Service Section, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

[13] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 14 January 1918, 1; Mullendore, *History of the United States Food Administration*, 115-116.

[14] Mullendore, *History of the United States Food Administration*, 105.

patriotic duty, but the restrictions were anything but voluntary.[15] The Food Administration mandated that hotels and restaurants using three or more barrels of wheat flour a month obtain a license to purchase the commodity.[16] If an eatery failed to stick to Food Administration guidelines, licenses could be revoked. As a result, hotels and restaurants had to adopt all federal and state Food Administration directives or face losing their license and their ability to do business. By the end of the war, the number of restrictions had increased. This included providing Victory Breads that were no more than two ounces, excluding wheat from all evening meals, and limiting wheat flour to six pounds for every ninety meals served.[17] These restrictions required restaurants to make sure their bakers complied with these instructions. Miscalculations in the amount of wheat flour used could result in the Food Administration forcing the business to use all substitutes. In extreme cases, the Food Administration could revoke a baker's license, cutting off his access to supplies.

Unfortunately for San Francisco restaurants and cafes, wheat flour was not the only commodity restricted by the Food Administration. Due to the increased prosperity tied to war production, people had more money for luxury items like candy and soft drinks. At the same time, America competed with its Allies for sugar from Cuba (which suffered from a decrease in production) as Germany had cut off their trade with sugar

---

[15] Ralph P. Merritt, 13 February 1918, Mrs. J. E. Thane Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

[16] Mullendore, *History of the United States Food Administration*, 105.

[17] Ralph P. Merritt, 1 April 1918, Pamphlet Box of Materials on California in the World War, 1914-1918, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

plantations in the East Indies. The submarine attacks on cargo ships exacerbated the situation in the Atlantic.[18] As a result, after May 15, 1918, the Food Administration began requiring certificates to purchase sugar. Public eating places, to which the Food Administration issued Class C certificates, could purchase three pounds of sugar for every ninety meals. Bakers, who held Class D certificates, could use 70 percent of the sugar they had used during the same period in 1917.[19] With these restrictions, restaurants limited their patrons' consumption of sugar or risked running out before they could purchase another month's supply.[20] An eating establishment without sugar would not be a popular place, and no sugar would also suggest a lack of loyalty to the nation. Therefore, city restaurants and bakeries had to alter their menus for the sake of the nation and their businesses' future.

Failure to comply with the Food Administration's guidelines could also generate negative publicity for San Francisco and its food service industry. This led some of the city's leading café and restaurant owners to take a proactive stand. They organized a citywide jury of restauranteurs to monitor the city's public dining halls to make sure all followed the rules. The jury investigated businesses and "tried" owners accused of serving wheat beyond the Food Administration's requirements. The jury served as an intermediary between the Food Administration and local businesses, providing restauranteurs the opportunity to handle disloyal actions without government interference.

---

[18] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 2 July 1918, 9.

[19] Mullendore, *History of the United States Food Administration*, 28, 112-113; *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 1 July 1918, 18.

[20] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 9 July 1918, 2.

When the jury found five restaurants guilty of serving wheat "without efficiency," they gave the businesses the option to close for two days or have their cases turned over to the national Food Administration. The Food Administration would impose more severe penalties if it investigated and determined the business had violated the restrictions. When it acted against five other San Francisco bakeries for the same infraction, the businesses were each closed for seven to fifteen days. Such extended closings could put the survival of a small firm in jeopardy.[21] The local food jury enabled San Francisco eateries to protect their own by limiting the severity of the punishment. It also provided peer pressure to keep everyone in line and prevent the stigma of disloyalty from tarnishing the reputation of the city's food service industry.

San Francisco restauranteurs also worked together to educate themselves, their employees, and their patrons regarding the most effective ways to handle the limitations on sugar. On July 15, 1918 some of the larger restaurants hosted an informational meeting for the city's food industry workers. This gathering was part tutorial and part patriotic rally. Entertained by a jazz band, one thousand café, hotel, and restaurant workers learned the importance of conserving sugar from Food Administration representatives. The goal was to provide the employees with the proper, Food Administration-approved, responses to customer demands for more sugar. This meeting, according to journalist Oscar Ingels, placed every cook and waiter "in the first line of the Food Administration trenches."[22] They put the staff in charge of reminding residents the

---

[21] California Food Administration, "Official Food Bulletin," 13 August 1918, Mrs. J. E. Thane Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

[22] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 16 July 1918, 18.

important work of the consumer in wartime. By explaining the reasons for their sacrifice, the employees felt they had done their patriotic duty, appeased hungry customers, and protected their employer from an investigation by the jury or the Food Administration. By working together, San Francisco's food service industry upheld federal mandates and gave credence to the idea that the city's businessmen were loyal patriots who would invest until it hurts.

Another government restriction affected restaurants whose location put them at a geographic disadvantage. The Selective Service Act prohibited the consumption of liquor on military bases and prohibited anyone from selling liquor to a man in uniform. In June 1918, President Wilson signed a law that closed all saloons, liquor-selling cafes, and liquor stores within one-half mile of any base with more than one hundred fifty garrisoned men. More than one hundred saloons and cafes around the Presidio, Fort Mason, Fort Scott, and Fort Miley were closed. The Cliff House, owned by Adolph Sutro's daughter Dr. Emma Merritt, was one of those within the zone around Fort Miley. John Farley, Cliff House manager, pledged to keep the downstairs facilities open for visitors, but the upstair's café had to close. Farley admitted that the closing was "for the good of the country," but he, as did the reporter for the *Bulletin*, mourned the loss of one of the "most celebrated and gayest original cafes in America."[23] The federal government's wartime food and drink restrictions altered the way San Francisco restaurants and cafes did business, if they were permitted to continue in business at all. They could take solace in knowing that the sacrifices they made during the war might lead to greater rewards in

[23] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 13 July 1918, 24; *The Bulletin*, 30 July 1918, 2.

subsequent years. Their fellow citizens would remember what businesses had complied with federal authorities and frequent the establishments of those who had done their patriotic duty. The Chamber of Commerce could also use these displays of loyalty by San Francisco restauranteurs in its booster campaign. This campaign sought to advertise the city's wartime efforts to national authorities. The Chamber hoped such reminders would sway the government to think of San Francisco when allocating military and civilian contracts. In expressing the patriotism of San Francisco businessmen, the Chamber noted that other West Coast cities did not show the same concerted, effective action to comply with federal mandates.

The Chamber considered one of the most important postwar federal projects to be the construction of a port for the Navy's Pacific fleet. Chamber members agreed with Mayor Rolph and other civic leaders that the war afforded San Francisco the opportunity to demonstrate that it could meet the War Department's needs. No action would prove that more, they felt, than helping the federal government finance the construction and maintenance of Camp Fremont. As the nation prepared to call the first wave of draftees in the summer of 1917, communities vied for the right to host a new military training camps. Each city, and its patriotic wealthy backers, promised land to the War Department, knowing that in return the government and its soldiers would financially give back to the community. On June 28, a committee of businessmen met with Mayor Rolph and offered the War Department a one year free lease of land near Palo Alto. Three prominent San-Francisco commercial leaders promised that their companies would donate the essentials for the camp. S. P. Eastman of the Spring Valley Water Company

vouched for an ample water supply for the camp. John A. Britton, President of Pacific Gas & Electric, assured the camp sufficient gas and electricity. E. D. Leavitt, representing William Sproule of the Southern Pacific Railroad, guaranteed spur lines to connect the camp to San Francisco.[24]

San Diego and Los Angeles also placed bids for army cantonments. Los Angeles promoted its city as more suitable for an encampment by highlighting San Francisco's reputation for open acceptance of vice. One hundred Los Angles businessmen sent telegrams to Congressmen urging them to reject San Francisco's proposal because soldiers "would be debauched. Moral conditions were so bad in and around San Francisco, the telegrams declared, that soldiers could not be near this city and remain uncontaminated."[25] Some residents of Palo Alto worried about the moral conditions, but their concern was with soldiers encouraging the coeds at Stanford University to engage in immoral behavior. Despite such concerns, local opposition to the camp was limited.[26] Most residents perceived the training camps as an economic blessing. The camp would symbolize the region's patriotism and provide recruits from the Pacific Coast with a training facility close to home. It would also be a financial windfall for local businesses who would profit from the money soldiers spent.

Los Angeles' attacks on San Francisco's moral fitness did not prevent the War

---

[24] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (26 September 1917), 312.

[25] *Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly* (San Francisco), 14 July 1917, 14.

[26] *The Argonaut* (Berekley), 14 July 1917, 18. *The Argonaut* reported two months later that one man near Menlo Park had asked the court for an injunction against the training camp construction, but that appears to have been denied. *The Argonaut*, 1 September 1917, 130.

Department from accepting San Francisco's proposal in July 1917, designating the camp for the Forty-First Division, National Guard. The government did reject the city's original land offer near Mayfield for a more suitable, and less costly, piece of real estate adjacent to Menlo Park. Leasing the land, approximately 7,200 acres, cost around $150,000. The government expected San Francisco and the other communities on the Peninsula to raise the money for the lease while the government allocated more than $1 million for camp construction. San Francisco's Lindgren & Company received the War Department's construction contract and at the height of construction, 1,800 laborers from the area worked to ready the camp for the soldiers.[27] The importance of this encampment to the commercial elite of San Francisco is evidenced in the fact that, in late July, the Chamber of Commerce dispatched its vice president, Robert Newton Lynch, to Washington to keep the project on track.[28]

Despite Lynch's efforts, the construction of the camp did not go smoothly and at one point it did not look like soldiers would ever train at Camp Fremont. On August 23, after the government had expended most of its budget on the project, the War Department ordered the Forty-First National Guard Division to head for Charlotte, North Carolina.[29] The same day, the government suspended all work at Camp Fremont and sent the workers

---

[27] Colonel William F. Strobridge, *Golden Gate to Golden Horn: Camp Fremont, California and the American Expedition to Siberia of 1918* (San Mateo: San Mateo County Historical Association, [1975?]), 2; *San Francisco Chamber of commerce Activities* 4 (9 August 1917), 180; *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 23 August 1917, 2. The government ultimately spent $1.9 million in the construction of the camp. Erwin N. Thompson, *Defender of the Gate: the Presidio of San Francisco , A History from 1846 to 1995* (Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California: National Park Service, 1997), 612.

[28] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (26 July 1917), 163.

[29] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 23 August 1917, 1.

home.[30] Newspapers in San Francisco reported that the military would abandon the camp, and writers at *The Argonaut* vented their frustration by attacking those they blamed for this embarrassment to the city. They chastised Mayor Rolph for his inability to raise the $150,000 promised to lease the land quickly. They speculated that Rolph's ties to the city's unions prevented him from fraternizing with the city's wealthy elite, who had initially promised the funds. The magazine also accused Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels of pressuring the War Department to give his home state of North Carolina a training camp at the expense of San Francisco.[31] In articulating the reasons they believed work had ended at Camp Fremont, the magazine touched on two common fears San Franciscans frequently contemplated during the war. One was the inability of the city's factions to work together for the greater good and the other was the possibility that the city would not appear attractive enough to compete with other cities for federal dollars. In reality, the problem was the State Board of Health's rejection of the drainage system at the camp and the War Department's decision to send the Forty-First Division to France as quickly as possible. In mid-September, construction resumed when the government announced a new order for four million feet of lumber to complete the camp's construction.[32] Less than a week later, the War Department ordered the transfer of five infantry regiments from the Presidio to Camp Fremont when laborers finished the

---

[30] *The Daily News*, 23 August 1917, 2.

[31] *The Argonaut* (Berkeley), 1 September 1917, 130; *The Argonaut*, 8 September 1917, 147.

[32] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 4 September 1917, 1; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 19 September 1917, 2.

construction work.[33] Due to cramped condition at the Presidio, the 8th Infantry regiment arrived at Camp Fremont in late September and began getting the camp ready for the first wave of the Selective Service Act's draftees.

Those draftees were slow to arrive. While *The Argonaut* incorrectly blamed the work stoppage in August 1917 on Rolph's failure to raise the promised funds, Rolph and the Chamber of Commerce were to blame for the delays in troops deployment to Camp Fremont in the fall of 1917. The city had not raised the money necessary for the land lease and less than twenty-five businessmen had donated funds to complete the sewer work.[34] The War Department refused to move more soldiers until the land they needed for training had been assured and the sewer work completed.[35] On November 27, Frederick Koster urged members of the Chamber of Commerce to organize a Camp Fremont Fund Committee, consisting of one hundred businessmen, to take care of this threat to the city's reputation.[36] Within minutes, the businessmen donated $10,000 and organized to raise the rest. *The Daily News* editor and president Eugene MacLean insisted it would "look mighty odd" if the city "should fall down flat on its share of the bargain after inviting the government to settle near the city. "It will be downright poor business if San Francisco lets that camp be abandoned," MacLean declared, "and rather

---

[33] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 20 September 1917, 2.

[34] *Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly* (San Francisco), 29 December 1917, 8; *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (29 November 1917), 305.

[35] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (6 December 1917), 312.

[36] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (29 November 1917), 305; *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 27 November 1917, 6.

doubtful patriotism."[37]

Not only did the lack of funds call residents' patriotism into question, many feared it would negatively affect San Francisco's chances of getting a larger share of the military's resources in the future. Colonel Richard Park of the Army's Engineer Corps compared San Francisco's slow response to that of the other West Coast cities with Army camps. San Diego had already raised enough money to give the Army 8,000 acres rent free for five years and Tacoma $70,000 for one year.[38] The Chamber's Camp Fremont Committee presented their case to the businessmen as vital to the city and their individual pocketbooks. Committee chair John Britton urged his fellow businessmen to subscribe "not only as a patriotic duty but from a sound business standpoint." Articles in the Chamber's *Activities* sounded nothing like the emotional, patriotic pleas for sacrificial donations found during the Red Cross and Liberty Loan Drives. The articles described Camp Fremont as an essential component in San Francisco's economic future. They described Camp Fremont as the city's financial responsibility and that if businessmen failed to see that duty fulfilled the War Department would take its business elsewhere. By this time, Camp Kearny was fully operational and one million dollars a month went from the soldiers into the hands of San Diego businessmen. While Britton encouraged San Franciscans to "give cheerfully," his message reflected an underlying fear that San Francisco was in danger of failing to keep economic pace with its urban rivals.[39]

---

[37] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 3 December 1917, 4.

[38] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (29 November 1917), 305.

[39] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (6 December 1917), 311-312.

By early January 1918, the Chamber's Camp Fremont Committee, with help from the Rotary Club, raised approximately $125,000 of the city's promised contribution to the cantonment.[40] Each subscriber to the Camp Fremont Fund received a placard that depicted a soldier, the American flag, and a picture of John Charles Fremont for whom the camp was named.[41] Such illustrated cards enabled businessmen to display their patriotism in their front window for all potential clients and customers – particularly the newly arrived soldiers – to see. With the bulk of the money raised, the army moved several additional regiments from the Presidio to Camp Fremont in January 1918.[42] However, not everything turned out as advertised by the Chamber's Camp Fremont Fund Committee. The Chamber of Commerce acknowledged that they never met the $150,000 goal, falling $10,000 short, but it never explained this failure.[43] The delays in completing the camp and collecting the funds meant that Camp Fremont never achieved maximum capacity. Although the camp could hold up to forty-thousand men, at its peak in the summer of 1918 Camp Fremont had only twenty-seven thousand. Most of those trained at Camp Fremont were members of the 8th ("Golden Arrow") Division. This division began leaving Camp Fremont in August 1918 for Siberia and the army did not add significantly to Camp Fremont's troop levels after that.[44]

---

[40] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 5 (3 January 1918), 7.

[41] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 5 (10 January 1918), 11.

[42] Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 612.

[43] John Britton to James Rolph, Jr., 6 June 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[44] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (6 December 1917): 312; Thompson, *Defender of the Gate*, 612.

Despite falling short of their intended goals, the businessmen of San Francisco and the surrounding communities profited from the troops stationed at Camp Fremont. A number of Menlo Park store owners rented space to San Francisco merchants so they could ply their wares closer to camp. These included at least three candy shops, four cafes, two photo studios, two jewelry shops, a French laundry, and a storefront for San Francisco's United Cigar Company. Newsboys delivered four of the five major San Francisco newspapers daily to the camp to provide men with information regarding "things for them to do in their off duty time" in San Francisco. For men who wanted to partake in what the city had to offer, jitney drivers charged soldiers on leave a dollar a piece for a ride from camp to Market and Fifth Street, twenty-four hours a day.[45] For soldiers who did not need to get to town (or back to camp) immediately, Southern Pacific ran regularly scheduled service from Camp Fremont to San Francisco, charging soldiers $1.10 round trip. San Francisco's Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations urged Southern Pacific to lower fares to encourage more men to venture up to the city.[46] While Southern Pacific refused, arguing the rates were comparable to those provided between Camp Kearny and San Diego, it did eventually establish three special trains from the camp to the San Francisco depot at Third and Townsend.[47]

The importance of Camp Fremont to the San Francisco business community, and their significance in calling the camp into existence, is evident in the program printed for

---

[45]Strobridge, *Golden Gate to Golden Horn*, 4-10.

[46]*Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco* 4, no. 4 (May 1918), 8.

[47]*Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco* 4, no. 6 (August 1918), 8; Strobridge, *Golden Gate to Golden Horn*, 23.

the camp's Patriotic Song Festival on June 9, 1918. On the page of "Patrons and Patronesses," twenty-two of thirty-five couples listed held strong ties to the business interests of San Francisco. The list included the presidents or owners of four San Francisco newspapers: R. A. Crother (*Bulletin*), M. H. DeYoung (*Chronicle*), F. W. Kellogg (*Call & Post*), and Eugene MacLean (*Daily News*); bankers William H. Crocker, Herbert Fleishhacker, and I.W. Hellman, Jr.; and wealthy San Francisco patrons W. Mayo Newhall, George A. Pope, and James L. Flood.[48] Camp Fremont provided the city's wealthy elite the opportunity to express their loyalty to the nation and promote their own businesses. It also gave San Francisco boosters a chance to show the federal government that San Franciscans could stand united to take care of the War Department's financial and logistical needs. The fact that the Chamber, Mayor Rolph, and city as a whole failed to raise the money cast doubt on their ability to follow through with their promises. Nevertheless, the Chamber and city leaders considered the construction of the base and its housing of thousands of men a successful showing of their city's eagerness to work with the War Department.

Furnishing services to the men at Camp Fremont was only one way San Francisco businessmen took advantage of the increased wartime needs of the military. The Quartermaster depot at Fort Mason was charged with providing the food and basic supplies needed by approximately 150,000 men stationed in the Twelfth Army District during the war. Fort Mason sent out weekly notices, reprinted in the Chamber's

---

[48]Program "For the Boys at Camp Fremont: Mammoth Patriotic Song Festival," Jeffrey Schweitzer Papers, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

publication, with a list of items required by the growing number of soldiers in the district. This list included subsistence goods, much of which went through San Francisco wholesalers on its way from farms to military encampments. Fort Mason also needed various miscellaneous supplies (things like drawing ink, needles, scissors, and laundry soap) that it procured from commercial firms in the area when they could not obtain them directly from the manufacturer. Eastern depots quickly went through their supplies of uniforms and field equipment, and no factory on the West Coast had ever manufactured Army apparel before. Therefore, Fort Mason accepted bids from companies willing to produce the Army's wool uniforms, as well as denim and cotton clothing, and eventually contracted with ten businesses in its district. San Francisco manufacturers won four of those contracts, twice as many as its nearest competitor, Seattle. By the end of the war, the Quartermaster depot had placed 20,000 purchase orders and contracts.[49] The limited number of manufacturing facilities in San Francisco meant that the city could not supply all of the Army's needs. Companies in Los Angeles, Tacoma, Portland, Spokane, and Seattle benefitted from military contracts. However, the speed with which goods from local businesses could reach the depot gave San Francisco businessmen an advantage over their manufacturing rivals elsewhere.

While some San Francisco companies produced the field equipment for the district's soldiers, others received contracts to construct the ships to transport the men and

---

[49] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 14 (8 February 1917), 26; *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 14 (12 April 1917), 75; *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 14 (10 May 1917), 96; *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 15 (9 May 1918), 143; Mark L. Gerstle, "Historical Report San Francisco depot, Fort Mason, Calif, General Supply Depot, Zone 13, April 1, 1917 to April 30, 1919," San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Records, 1851-1962, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

protect them on their voyage to the battlefield. Union Iron Works of San Francisco, owned by Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, received government contracts for twelve submarines in May 1917. This contract required company president John McGregor to make a quick trip east to get the tools and equipment necessary to expand his company's production capacity. This expansion required the construction of a new machine shop and $1 million in equipment expenditures. Union's expansion continued in early 1918 when the Navy Department took possession of the old Risdon Iron Works and turned it over to McGregor so that his company would have the space needed to construct torpedo boat destroyers. In commemoration of Independence Day in 1918, Bethlehem's two San Francisco shipyards, along with its Alameda plant and two Oakland shipyards, launched seventeen vessels in a single day – the most in the Bay's history to date. Each of the Bethlehem plants launched four destroyers, but the Union plant held the distinction of launching the most tonnage in one day of any yard in the nation. In 1918, the shipyards in San Francisco Bay launched sixty-four ships, almost half the total number of vessels constructed on the West Coast that year.

San Francisco newspapers publicized such statistics as evidence of San Francisco's strength, ignoring the performance of residents and businessmen from the East Bay. "If the world were a Cyclops, its single eye would be turned on San Francisco today," *The Bulletin* declared. The Chamber of Commerce, on the other hand, conceded the fact that only two of the eight shipbuilding plants were located within the confines of San Francisco. However, the Chamber still incorporated the number of ships constructed in the entire Bay area when in sought to prove San Francisco's dominance on the West

Coast. The Chamber boasted that San Francisco (like *The Bulletin* omitting the word Bay) had successfully constructed 40 percent of the steel vessels built on the Pacific Coast, more than the output of Oregon and Washington combined and "more than two-thirds the number being built in other California Yards."[50] The Chamber's inclusion of the figures from the East Bay shipbuilding yards, while excluding the cities themselves, reflected the conflicting images of San Francisco and whom the city represented. On the one hand, cities like Oakland and Alameda were rivals, drawing industries and residents away from San Francisco. On the other, the successes of those cities had to be included if city boosters wanted to put San Francisco head and shoulders above its rivals in Los Angeles, Seattle, and Portland.

To maintain its competitiveness, San Franciscans needed to seek out new economic opportunities aggressively before they fell into the hands of other coastal metropolises, whether across the Bay or down the coast. Dominance in international trade, long a source of pride for San Francisco, was one area businessmen could not take for granted during the war. San Francisco had profited from the disruption of European trade with Asia and the Pacific since 1914. That year, the value of imports and exports through San Francisco was $80 million and $64 million respectively. By the time the U.S. declared war, the value of exports had doubled and imports had risen 68 percent. The trade values continued to rise, each surpassing $200 million by the end of 1918.

While the trade with China and Japan remained relatively steady, the greatest

---

[50] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 25 May 1917, 2; *Pacific Marine Review* (San Francisco) 15 (March 1918), 53; *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 4 July 1918, 2; *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 5 (4 July 1918), 216.

growth resulted in new commercial ventures with other areas of the Pacific Rim, most notably the Dutch East Indies and Australia. The value of exports to Australia tripled from January 1917 to December 1918 as San Francisco businessmen filled the gap left by British merchants unable to get ships or supplies to that part of the commonwealth.[51] The Dutch East Indies, with its tobacco, cane sugar, copra, and hardwoods, also emerged as a new area for San Francisco trade in large part because of the war. Before 1913, the Bay Area averaged only one Dutch ship a year, loaded with sugar from Java. Cut off from traditional markets in late 1914, the Dutch turned to the American West Coast. In 1916 San Francisco welcomed eighteen Dutch ships with 200,000 tons of goods, worth approximately $5 million. In just the first month of American participation in the war, the city's newspapers reported twelve steamers en route from Batavia to San Francisco. By the end of the year, Dutch imports surpassed $40 million.[52]

Businessmen realized, however, that such wartime gains could prove short-lived, as they found out with Russia. When the U.S. declared war, the government confiscated German ships previously interned in American ports to protect neutrality. In June 1917, the government gave shipping interests – like San Francisco-based Pacific Mail Steamship Company and Dollar Company – the right to use these ships to transport railroad equipment and machinery "for the rehabilitation of Russia." San Francisco

---

[51] San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, *Seventh Annual Statistical Report of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce for the Year Ending December 31, 1918* (San Francisco: Publicity Department, 1918),7, 14-16; *The Bulletin*, 1 January 1918, 17; *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 5 (10 January 1918), 11; *Pacific Marine Review* (San Francisco) 15 (January 1918), 70.

[52] *Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly* (San Francisco), 7 April 1917, 5; *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 1 January 1918, 17.

served as the center for this Russian trade and a number of German ships underwent repairs at the Union Iron Works shipyard, having been scuttled by their crew before American confiscation.[53] After the Bolshevik Revolution in October 1917, the trade quickly dried up. San Francisco merchants shipped $1.3 million in goods to Russia in 1917, compared with $63,000 the following year.[54] Such precipitous declines in trade could also happen in areas of the Pacific Rim traditionally beholden to European colonizers once the war ended. Recognizing that the wartime trading boom could lead to a postwar bust, the Chamber and others sought to secure San Francisco's interests and establish new partnerships before the end of the war in hopes of holding off foreign and regional competition.

To save San Francisco's future trade networks, the Chamber sought to protect wartime gains from federal intervention. When the War Trade Board added copra (dried coconut kernels whose oil served as a substitute for fat in manufactured goods like soap) to their list of restricted imports, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce launched a protest campaign. In letters to the War Trade Board, various members argued that the copra trade was vital to San Francisco shipping interests. Copra provided lumber-filled ships going to the South Sea Islands with a product that they could transport back to San Francisco rather than inefficiently run with an empty vessel. The Chamber also had evidence that Japanese firms were making deals with Central and South American

---

[53] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 27 June 1917, 1-2.

[54] *The San Francisco Call and Post*, 27 June 1917, 1-2; San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, *Seventh Annual Statistical Report of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce for the Year Ending December 31, 1918* (San Francisco: Publicity Department, 1918), 14-15.

companies to ship Oriental goods that they could not sell in the U.S. due to the wartime embargo. The Chamber urged the War Trade Board not to put too many restrictions on U.S. trade or Japan would seize control of Pacific markets, reducing San Francisco's chances of expanding trade with South America in the future. The pressure from individual businesses and the Chamber of Commerce, along with copra's multiple uses as a substitute, caused the War Trade Board to reverse its decision. Only a few weeks after initiating the ban on copra, the WTB dropped it from the list of banned imports.[55]

The Chamber also attempted to reduce the negative impact of the U.S. Shipping Board's rulings on San Francisco trade. Soon after the war declaration, the Shipping Board began commandeering steamships and other vessels. Citing wartime necessity, the government could commandeer any ship for its use.[56] In late October 1918, those in San Francisco's import and export businesses saw the commandeering of the Pacific Mail Company's steamships *Venezuela* and *Santa Cruz* as a serious threat to the passenger and freight lines between San Francisco and Asia. The Chamber of Commerce's committee on foreign trade tried to convince the Shipping Board to reverse its decision to seize the two ships. It raised six objections, including the possible loss of trade to other countries, the "serious curtailment" of tax revenue that would weaken the federal government's ability to fund the war, and freight congestion that would undermine war efficiency. The Chamber also insisted that Pacific Coast shipping companies had already sacrificed their fair share. They had constructed half the nation's new naval vessels on the West Coast,

---

[55] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 5 (25 July 1918), 236.

[56] *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities*, 4 (2 August 1917), 175.

preventing production of new boats for the commercial fleet. Left with aging ships requiring repairs, companies now had to worry about losing those vessels too. The Chamber noted that the federal government threatened to destroy the "present and future prosperity of this Coast." The Chamber was not the only one to recognize the danger. Approximately two hundred individuals and businesses sent telegrams of protest to the Shipping Board and to California's senators and congressmen regarding the matter.[57]

The war ended within weeks of this dispute over the confiscation of the Pacific Mail's vessels, but the uproar it caused, along with the copra import debate, illustrates a strong movement within the business community to challenge the federal government's wartime mandates. Individual businessmen were willing to sacrifice to help the nation win the war – buying bonds, contributing to the Camp Fremont fund, and encouraging valuable employees to enlist. However, they expected these sacrifices to pay off in the long term. When the restrictions on trade appeared to threaten the future of San Francisco's shipping industry, businessmen did not hesitate to express their opposition to federal authorities. While serving the nation was important, they did not believe they were disloyal in protecting San Francisco's economic interests and future economic potential.

Not only did city businessmen worry about federal restrictions undermining their ability to import and export goods, they also had to compete with other Pacific Coast cities vying for a piece of the foreign markets. In this area, San Francisco's foreign tradesmen perceived their greatest rival to be Seattle. Compared with other West Coast

---

[57] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 2 November 1918, 14.

ports, Seattle's share of the markets had grown exponentially in just a few years. In 1910, San Francisco shipped 36 percent more tonnage than Seattle. When the shipping figures for 1917 were released, San Franciscans discovered that for the first time Seattle had handled more shipping tons than San Francisco. The gap between San Francisco and Seattle grew wider in 1918 when Seattle's shipping tonnage was 125 percent higher than San Francisco. R. H. Swayne, a city shipping broker, tried to calm concerns about Seattle by emphasizing that Seattle's growth lay in its shipping of war materials and supplies rather than goods more commonly in demand in peacetime. Swayne perceived San Francisco's growth to be the result of carefully planned relationships with merchants in Asia, the South Pacific, Australia, the Philippines, and the East Indies. Such development of trade networks would build permanent ties with Pacific rim governments and industries that would quickly surpass Seattle's temporary wartime advantages.[58]

Despite such optimistic predictions, maintaining and expanding foreign trade relations increasingly took on an air of urgency by the end of the war. Captain Robert Dollar urged San Franciscans in July 1918 to begin thinking ahead to foreign business ventures they could cultivate after the war. "San Francisco must prepare for the fiercest competition it has ever known once the war is over," Dollar declared.[59] The Civic League of Improvement Clubs agreed. The League urged its members, and those of the Chamber, to pursue every way San Francisco could retain "the prestige of the greatest maritime port on the Pacific Ocean." Unlike Swayne and Dollar, the League did not suggest measuring

---

[58] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 17 July 1918, 2.

[59] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 20 July 1918, 3.

San Francisco achievements based on its ability to surpass Seattle in shipping tonnage. Perhaps League members understood that growing Pacific markets meant greater competition from all West Coast cities with decent harbors, not just Seattle. By following Swayne and Dollar's advice, San Francisco might grab a significant portion of this shipping fortune, but it would always have to share. Instead, the Civic League sought a way San Francisco could sustain a unique maritime identity, one that designated it as the dominant city on the West Coast. The Civic League believed this could be accomplished if the city could entice the War Department to make San Francisco the headquarters of the Navy's Pacific Fleet. It urged San Franciscans to participate in its lobbying campaign to convince the California legislature to pass an enabling act. This would allow for the creation of a commission to prepare a plan to turn San Francisco's Hunter's Point into an attractive harbor capable of serving as the Navy's headquarters.[60]

Despite growing fears regarding the city's future after the war, many San Francisco businessmen prospered because of increased trade and expansion of industrial production that fulfilled government demands. This helped to swell the holdings of the city's banking houses. The four Liberty Loan drives also helped to expand the holdings of these banks. When the government announced its intention to initiate the Liberty Loan in April 1917, banking institutions rushed to advertise subscriptions to their patrons. Isaias W. Hellman, president of Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank and board chairman of the Union Trust Company of San Francisco (as well as the Farmers and Merchants

---

[60] *Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco* 5, no. 2 (February 1919), 1.

Bank of Los Angeles), promised the directors of both companies that he would make sure their banks subscribed "liberally" to the loan and Hellman distributed circulars in which he encouraged clients and shareholders to "permit their subscription to pass through this Bank, thus enabling us to subscribe for a large block of the war loan."[61] The Bond & Goodwin branch at 454 California Street mailed postcards to customers announcing its "pleasure in placing at your disposal all the facilities of our organization, either in securing prompt information regarding this loan or in attending to the details of your subscription."[62]

The Bank of California also used mailers to pressure patrons to contribute, reminding them that "everyone is expected to do his or her share." Along with the letter, the Bank of California included a blank Treasury Department bond application that the bank recommended that patrons fill out and mail back to the bank "because you are on the list and the authorities in charge of the distribution want to know what you do."[63] Although there was no legal penalty for not buying government bonds, the Bank of California's letter suggested that San Francisco's wealthy elite had a responsibility to purchase bonds. The proper authorities would know if, and how much, they contributed. Such information might finds its way into print and if that happened they could face public ridicule and social embarrassment. Worse, it could negatively affect their

---

[61]I. W. Hellman to the Board of Directors of Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank, 3 April 1917; Union Trust Company fo San Francisco, 8 May 1917, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[62]Card from Bond & Goodwin, SF, 12 April 1917, Pamphlet box of materials on California in World War, 1914-1918, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[63]Bank of California Liberty Loan Call, 22 May 1917, Pamphlet box of materials on California in World War, 1914-1918, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

economic and political prospects. No one would want to associate with disloyal businessmen. Voluntary investment was a far more attractive option.

Banks also had economic incentives to promote government bonds aggressively. According to Hellman, failure to make liberal subscriptions to the Liberty Bond drive might result in fewer government deposits in the future.[64] The bankers who generously contributed might also receive immediate rewards. Hellman's Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank oversubscribed its portion of the loan by 133 percent.[65] As a result, Hellman received personal letters from both the president of the San Francisco Federal Reserve Bank, Archibald Kains, and Treasury Secretary William McAdoo thanking him for "unswerving loyalty, enthusiasm and industry."[66] For his efforts, Hellman received personal praise and a seat on the Liberty Loan Advisory Council for the Twelfth Federal District while his banks experienced financial benefits.[67] The people coming into the bank to buy bonds also conducted other transactions and business customers frequently required advice on such "war-time perplexities" as how much merchandise to hold and the impact of possible price regulations. As a result, the bank increased its customer base and financial assets. The bank also invested in the Liberty Bonds, purchasing $3 million

---

[64]I. W. Hellman to J. A. Graves, 15 June 1917, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[65]I. W. Hellman to Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank Board of Directors, 26 June 1917, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[66]Archibald Kains to I. W. Hellman, 19 June 1917; William McAdoo to I. W. Hellman, 22 June 1917, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[67]I. W. Hellman to William McAddo, 7 September 1917, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

in the third and fourth drives in 1918. The 4.5 percent per annum interest on the bonds meant future profits for the bank.[68] In a letter to Kains, Hellman humbly expressed his belief that he was simply doing his "duty towards our country and our government in the Liberty loan matter."[69] Nevertheless, Hellman also improved the economic conditions of Wells Fargo and the other banks under his guidance in San Francisco and Los Angeles by advertising the bond drives and contributing time and money to the cause.

While Hellman urged his banks' patrons and employees to invest in bonds, he also demanded that the banks under his control be cautious. The war created uncertainty in the money markets, which reduced the willingness of bankers to take risks. In late 1917 Hellman chastised the loan officers at Farmers and Merchants in Los Angeles for being "very liberal in making loans. I think money will become more stringent and I advise going slow." He ordered bank workers not to allow their cash reserves to dip lower than their current mark. In these unpredictable times, Hellman wanted to prepare his banks for whatever the government might require next of its financial institutions.[70] As government restrictions on certain industries tightened in early 1918, combined with the drive for the third Liberty Bond, Hellman insisted that "it behooves us to be careful and conservative. Avoid all business of a speculative nature even to good clients and be ready to assist our

---

[68]I. W. Hellman to Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank Board of Directors, 14 January 1919, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[69]I. W. Hellman to Archibald Kains, 22 June 1917, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[70]I. W. Hellman to Farmers and Merchants National Bank of Los Angeles, 6 December 1917, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Government when called upon. Such should be our aim while the War lasts."[71] By the summer of 1918, Hellman reported to the Wells Fargo directors that the bank was no longer opening new accounts that required large lines of credit and was only offering loans to regular customers who required "temporary financing for absolutely necessary business needs."[72] This conservative fiscal policy was not limited to the banks under I. W. Hellman's management. Hellman reported to an individual in Los Angeles inquiring into San Francisco's loan policies that there were no savings banks in the city "taking mortgages on outside property at present. Loanable funds have become quite scarce on account of our Government requirements."[73]

Despite Hellman's worries about the wartime financial markets, his banks experienced tremendous growth. At the end of 1916, the Well Fargo-Nevada National Bank holdings stood at a little less than $44.5 million. By September 11, 1917, the bank held deposits of a little more than $53 million, which Hellman recognized as "by far the highest point in our history."[74] By the end of the year, the figure was more than $55 million and by the end of June 1918 close to $57 million.[75] This trend was consistent

---

[71] I. W. Hellman to Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank Board of Directors, 5 February 1918; I. W. Hellman to Farmers and Merchants National Bank of Los Angeles, 2 March 1918, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[72] I. W. Hellman to Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank Board of Directors, 9 July 1918, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[73] I. W. Hellman to Jacob Stern, 13 June 1918, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[74] I. W. Hellman to Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank Board of Directors, 2 October 1917, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[75] I. W. Hellman to Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank Stockholder, 8 January 1918; I. W. Hellman to Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank Board of Directors, 25 June 1918, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

with banks across the city, which registered $1.1 billion more in October 1917 than they had at the same time in 1916.[76] This growth translated into an increase in Wells Fargo-Nevada's yearly earnings, which rose from $464,884 in 1916 to $705, 213 at the end of 1917. Hellman attributed this growth to war-related factors, including the demands of clients who held large government contracts, government expenditures, and the need to conserve rather than spend profits on luxuries.[77]

The need for more customer service representatives required Wells Fargo-Nevada to hire seventy-four additional employees in 1917, most of them women. Wartime profits paid for the construction of an additional floor at the bank's Montgomery and Market Street headquarters. Administration offices were moved to the new floor to make more room for customer relations on the lower floors.[78] The war required Hellman and the banks he managed to work diligently to provide services to patrons and meet the federal government's monetary demands. At the same time, their wartime expansion made apparent San Francisco's continued strength in the financial sector. For a city seeking to identify itself as superior to its economic rivals, the wealth stored in San Francisco's banks – and the commercial relationships that represented – served as an important indicator of continued economic strength.

While the Chamber advertised the financial successes of its members and

---

[76] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 5 November 1917, 1.

[77] I. W. Hellman to Wells Fargo Stockholders, 8 January 1918, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[78] I. W. Hellman to Wells Fargo Stockholders, 8 January 1918, Isaias W. Hellman Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

promoted the present and future potential of the city, they sought to defend their class interests from attacks by San Francisco's labor unions. The wartime profits earned by businessmen like Isaias Hellman and shipping operator Robert Dollar made them susceptible to attacks that the Great War, like previous conflicts, was a rich man's war and a poor man's fight. On several occasions in the early months of the war, union leaders published articles comparing the city's businessmen with Germany's Junker class, expressing their perception that neither nations' economic elite functioned with the best interests of their country in mind. Editor Olaf Tveitmoe frequently attacked the city's businessmen for considering their money and their land more sacred than the lives of their employees – both in the factory and on the front lines.[79]

Such attacks reflected growing tension between San Francisco's businessmen and the city's labor unions. This conflict, dormant during the PPIE, erupted in June 1916 when the city's longshoremen had gone on strike, the first significant walkout since the exposition. In response, the Chamber of Commerce created a subcommittee known as the Law and Order Committee. The Law and Order Committee began as a five-person subcommittee whose creation was approved by two thousand merchants, ostensibly to quell violence associated with the longshoremen's strike. The Chamber's Board of Directors, however, had been contemplating action against the city's unions for months and the three stated goals of the Law and Order Committee reflected the long-term plan of the Board. They charged the Committee with the "maintenance of law and order" and creating a business atmosphere in San Francisco that supported "contractual relations"

---

[79] *Organized Labor*, 28 April 1917, 5; *Organized Labor*, 12 May 1917, 1.

and the "principle of the Open Shop."[80]

This mission might have gone unredeemed if the Committee had collapsed after the longshoremen strike ended a week later, but the Preparedness Day bombing served as Koster's justification for expanding the Committee (see Chapters One and Five). On July 26, 1916, six-thousand businessmen voted to increase the size of the Committee to one hundred, "picked from the best stock San Francisco could produce in an hour of need." The men selected were business leaders from the wealthiest families in San Francisco, including William H. Crocker, A. P. Giannini, Jesse Lilienthal, William Sproule, and Isaias Hellman, Jr. The fear of further bombings created an atmosphere much like the one that fostered San Francisco's 1856 vigilante movement. In both cases, businessmen depicted their opposition as dangerous criminals bent on the moral and physical destruction of San Francisco.

The Law and Order Committee did not limit its attacks to radicals like Warren Billings and Thomas Mooney, the men indicted for the bombing. The Committee depicted any labor union that denied the right of employers to choose their own workers as part of a conspiracy to intimidate the city's businesses with violence and anarchy. By labeling unions as antithetical to law and order, at a time when many in San Francisco feared for their safety, the Chamber managed to win enough support to kill a culinary craft strike in the fall of 1916. They also lent financial support to the Retail Lumber

---

[80]San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Law and Order Committee, *Law and Order in San Francisco, a Beginning* (San Francisco: The H. S. Crocker Company, 1916), 5, 17-18. The five members were Koster, President of California Barrel Company; Wallace M. Alexander of Alexander & Baldwin; C. R. Johnson, president of Union Lumber Company; C. F. Michaels of wholesale drug company Langley & Michaels (later replaced by Milton Esberg), and the mayor's brother, George M. Rolph, general manager of California and Hawaiian Sugar Refining Company.

Dealers Association and the city's steel operators who both faced walkouts on the heels of the longshoremen strike. The Chamber's financial assistance, along with the Law and Order's passionate ads that portrayed the employers as the victims struggling against union tyranny, eventually forced retail lumber employees and steel workers to call off their strikes. As with the culinary workers, the lumbermen and steel workers failed to secure union recognition and employers were free to hire non-union employees.[81] The Chamber effectively harnessed the public's fear of radicalism in its drive to destroy unionization efforts in the fall of 1916.

The Chamber and its one hundred man Law and Order Committee used the charged atmosphere to develop two initiative petitions that would curtail labor activities. The initiatives, one that made picketing illegal and the other requiring street speakers to obtain a city permit, passed by slim margins in November 1916. In both cases, working-class districts rejected the measures 2-to-1 while the Committee's campaign resonated strongly with the wealthy of Pacific Heights and Nob Hill and modest support from the middle class in the city's western districts. While campaigning for the measures, the Chamber encouraged businessmen to join the association. In the past, the Chamber had advertised itself to businessmen as way to make social and economic connections and promote their industries. Now, the Chamber sent out six hundred members to canvass the city, encouraging owners of small and medium-sized businesses to join as a way to save their businesses from union domination. In reaching out to entrepreneurs who had seen

---

[81] San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, *Law and Order In San Francisco*, 5-18, 38; Levi, *Committee of Vigilance*, 81-89.

the Chamber as a haven for the elite, the Chamber united many in the business community, expanding their membership roster from 2,474 to 7,940 by November 1916.[82] Such a precipitous increase, combined with the unifying goals of the Law and Order Committee, meant that the city's labor unions would face a more powerful opposition in the coming years. In winning its initiatives and quashing the strikes of 1916, the Chamber showed that organized effort on the part of business leaders could undermine labor's strength.

By the time the United States entered the Great War, a jury had convicted both Billings and Mooney, sentencing the former to life and the latter to death. Although San Francisco unions placed considerable distance between themselves and the convicted bombers, the Chamber continued to drum up support for its open shop plan by using residents' fears of more terrorist attacks sparked by labor unrest. Federal and state crackdowns on union radicals prevented the Committee from assuming a role as law enforcers as the vigilantes of 1856 had done. However, in portraying itself as a defender of law and order, the Committee developed the discourse necessary to overthrow labor's power in San Francisco. During and after the war, the Chamber of Commerce succeeded in establishing or maintaining the open shop when it could convince San Franciscans that unions were dangerous to the city's economic future and traitors to their city and nation.

This advantage was greatest when San Francisco's labor unions engaged in strikes that escalated into violence. The Committee's campaign against the closed shop waned

---

[82]San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, *Law and Order In San Francisco*, 19-35; Levi, *Committee of Vigilance*, 93-95; Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 187-191.

until August 1917 when the bastion of the open shop, United Railroads, needed its help. The men employed by United Railroads were attempting union organization and initiated a walk out. Just as it had before, the Law and Order Committee condemned city leaders for failing to provide adequate law enforcement personnel and vowed to lead the charge to protect United Railroad employees and patrons from violent attacks by striking workers. After someone killed a U.R. strikebreaker on August 23, the Committee issued a public statement attacking Mayor Rolph for failure to perform his sworn duty to protect his constituents. Koster did not threaten action against the popular mayor, but did demand that Rolph act to prevent violence. In describing the strike, Koster and the Law and Order Committee portrayed United Railroad's president Jesse. W. Lilienthal and his strikebreakers as the victims. They insisted that U.R. had gone to great expense to import competent operators who were unarmed, and therefore the strikebreakers were the murderers.[83]

Despite Rolph's calls for peace, the violence continued throughout September and the Committee mobilized many of the city's business clubs and associations to denounce the failures of the municipal government in allowing the lawlessness to continue. They promised funds and personal service to "protect our city." Although they never overtly expressed a patriotic message, they labeled the strikers as a lawless element, reminding residents of the radicals and anarchists currently held by federal authorities in local and national I.W.W. raids. While law enforcement was evidently handling the I.W.W.

---

[83]Levi, *Committee of Vigilance*, 99-100; *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities*, 4 (30 August 1917), 199-200

situation, the Committee believed that the U.R. strike injured San Francisco's national reputation. The Committee and its supporters insisted that if municipal officials refused to act, the Committee would have to assume control in order "to show that our citizens do not countenance these acts and that they will take steps to stop them in the future."[84] The Committee feared that the lack of action would damage the city's economic future. If the Carmen's Union closed another industry, it would make it more difficult to attract businessmen who would prefer Los Angeles' open shop policy.

Mayor Rolph retorted that the Law and Order Committee did nothing but stir up "industrial unrest and class hatred" and compared Koster to the Russian tsar. Rolph did not believe that the strength of the city's unions would affect future business prospects – the continued existence of a private railroad company in San Francisco would. While the striking carmen had support from individuals like Mayor Rolph, they failed to get union recognition. Many men returned to work after a month of unemployment, realizing that U.R. was easily replacing them with strikebreakers. Lilienthal recruited more than one thousand strikebreakers. He banned them from carrying weapons, lending credence to the Committee's claims that these were peaceful professionals. As a result, the strike slowly died and by early December the Carmen's Union turned in its charter.[85] U.R., with the support of the Law and Order Committee, maintained the open shop principle. It had also helped to continue the debate over which organizations in San Francisco had the best

---

[84] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 9 September 1917, 2; Levi, *Committee of Vigilance*, 102-103; *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities*, 4 (27 September 1917), 231.

[85] Robert Edward Lee, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1900-1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), 346-347.

interest of the city's economic future at heart. While many residents had supported the Carmen's Union when the strike began, they were also concerned about the negative light the strike violence shed on San Francisco. Labor rights had always been important, but during the war, portraying San Francisco as a patriotic metropolis took precedence.

In early 1918, the city's two largest union organizations, the Building Trades Council and the Labor Council, pledged to work with employers to prevent strikes. This significantly reduced the tension between labor and employers, and the lack of violence gave the Law and Order Committee little ammunition to continue its attack on the closed shop. This did not prevent Frederick Koster from occasionally reminding residents that law and order was still an essential component of the Chamber's duties to its members and the city as a whole. In various addresses before the Chamber and other civic organizations, Koster expressed his vision of a postwar San Francisco. In these speeches, Koster did not describe a war between labor and owners, retreating from the fiery rhetoric with which the Law and Order campaign had begun. Instead, he described San Francisco as a city in which everyone's rights would be respected, but not a city where labor unions had "more rights than any other group of persons and thereby set themselves above the law." For Koster, law and order meant developing mutual respect, and "rights in accordance with the basic laws of civilization itself."[86]

Koster's more conciliatory approach reflected the abating of tensions between labor and business during the last months of the war, but it also suggested the future

---

[86]Frederick J. Koster, *Law and Order and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, An Address* (San Francisco: San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, 1918); *The Wasp: A Weekly Journal of Illustration and Comment* (San Francisco), 2 March 1918, 25-26.

strategy of the Chamber of Commerce in its campaign for the open shop. Strikes would return at war's end, and the Chamber wanted San Franciscans to see it as the defender of law and order, the one institution capable of saving San Francisco from the subversive elements lurking in its midst. The Chamber's quest for law and order through the open shop united businessmen in a common cause and gave them an organization that inspired confidence. For the Chamber and its members, the future of San Francisco lay in its ability to encourage new investors and residents. They envisioned San Francisco, as they had during the PPIE, as an international destination for work and leisure. Such a cosmopolitan city would foster an entrepreneurial spirit, encouraging new businesses that would not have to accept the closed shop or worry about politics dominated by unions. Businessmen had spent the war investing until it hurt. Once it was over, they expected to reap the rewards.

Chapter Five
"Labor's voice must be heard and heeded": San Francisco's Organized Labor

The San Francisco *Bulletin* described the city's Labor Day festivities of 1917 as one of the most unique commemorations of the holiday in the city's history. Unions had for years provided scheduled events for working class residents, celebrating the special occasion with all the fervor of the Fourth of July. Organized labor did not cancel their fete because of the war, but the war certainly subdued the mood. Labor Day in 1917 also coincided with the notification of men chosen in the first round of the draft. They would soon be leaving San Francisco for military training facilities. In San Francisco, the war was not the only reason for the change in humor. Tensions between the Carmen's Union and United Railroad had boiled over and workers had gone on strike a week earlier. As a result, United Railroads, which had always provided additional cars on its lines to accommodate Labor Day revelers, was forced to cancel all services. Only Municipal Railroad trains and jitneys transported the city's workers to the activities at Golden Gate Park.

Labor also continued a policy of not marking the day with a big public parade. In 1914, the city's unions had banned the traditional street parade, announcing that "labor has walked long enough." Instead, the day's organized activities began with a sports program in which athletes from the Olympic Club, Amateur Athletic League, the University of California and the Y. M. C. A. entertained the working-class spectators. Next, the Municipal Band treated the crowd to a concert of popular and patriotic tunes.

John Francis Neylan, an attorney with a long history of supporting labor rights, gave the day's keynote speech. In it, he expressed the wartime concerns of the city's unions. The Labor Council had proclaimed "Unity" the slogan of the day, but Neylan did not believe the war was a time when workers could find common bonds with the business class. Businessmen, he proclaimed, did not really care about whether America won the war, only their own ability to profit from it. Neylan conceded it was possible that capitalists would suppress their "selfish and autocratic power" and do what was best for the nation, but such sacrifices would require them to accept the role of unions in the workplace. Neylan thought it was more likely that businessmen would languish in their avarice, undermining the nation's war efforts and proving once and for all their true nature. Although the U.S. had been engaged in combat for only a few months, Neylan believed San Francisco's businessmen had already proven their unwillingness to repress greed. The reason United Railroad workers had chosen to strike, he insisted, was not because laborers lacked patriotism or were led by anarchists, but because the company refused to treat workers equitably. San Francisco's unions were engaged in two wars – one against German despotism and one against employer tyranny. Both wars would ultimately lead to "a new industrial realignment . . . men who cannot see that other adjustments have to be made are blind and mere trailers along the march of progress."[1]

Neylan's Labor Day speech reflected the war being fought by labor within the confines of the city. As they had before the war, workers sought to retain union power by protecting the closed shop and facilitating the creation of new unions in companies and

[1] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), Special Labor Day Edition, 1 September 1917, 1-5.

industries where it had previously proven unsuccessful. Wartime pressures to increase production and delay any actions that might interrupt such works made fulfilling these goals more difficult. Ignoring these long-term goals, however, was not an option. Labor faced stiff competition from open shop advocates, like the Law and Order Committee and D.A. Charles Fickert, who used wartime fears of violent insurgents in their campaign against unions. To combat attacks from San Francisco's political and business conservatives, labor fought back. Unions challenged their opponents' assertions that their support of Mooney and use of strikes made them disloyal to the United States. They argued that if Americans were fighting for global democracy in France, they were fighting for that same democracy in San Francisco.

For organized labor, San Francisco was a safe haven for union activity and they took pride in their successful defense of workers' rights. By early 1918, the wartime atmosphere had forced San Francisco labor unions to become more conciliatory toward employers. Rather than assaulting the greedy actions of the economic elite, they focused on advertising the patriotic actions of their members. In doing so, they sought to protect their previous gains and prepare for postwar challenges. This wartime strategy also legitimized efforts to win Thomas Mooney a new trial. Ignoring his previous affiliation with radical organizations, the Labor Council and Building Trades Council emphasized the unseemliness of sentencing a man to die based on perjured testimony when the nation was fighting a war to rid the world of such tyrannical practices.

Despite the graft trials, the power of San Francisco unions had diminished little since the election of Union Labor Party mayor Eugene Schmitz in 1901. The Union

Labor Party controlled municipal politics for all but two years between 1901 and 1911, and many unions supported James Rolph's bid for mayor although the incumbent was a member of Union Labor. Rolph was not a party member, but he had shown his willingness to support labor unions by accepting the closed shop in his own business and by resigning from the Shipowners Association of the Pacific during the 1906 waterfront strike. As a politician, Rolph had to recognize the importance of winning support from the two largest labor organizations in the city, the Labor Council and the Building Trades Council. The Labor Council, formed in 1892, was a loose federation of unions over which the Council had little direct control. While they did not always agree on specific tactics, most of the affiliated unions recognized the need to maintain a unified front against employers. In 1915, the Labor Council included 150 affiliated unions, representing approximately 50,000 San Francisco workers. The Building Trades Council had only 16,000 dues-paying members in 1916, but its control of urban construction gave it considerably more power than its numbers suggested. During the PPIE, both organizations – along with an additional 30,000 unionists not directly attached to the larger associations – agreed to adopt the exposition's harmonious image of San Francisco and banned the use of strikes. Unions considered this a temporary moratorium and longshoremen, suffering from higher costs of living caused by the European war, went on strike June 1, 1916. The strike lasted only six weeks, but it reopened the conflict between union labor and businessmen, who retaliated by forming the Law and Order Committee.[2]

---

[2]Ira B. Cross, *Collective Bargaining and Trade Agreements in the Brewery, Metal, Teaming and Building Trades of San Francisco, California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1918), 240; Michael Kazin, *Barons of Labor: The San Francisco Building Trades and Union Power in the Progressive*

The chief reason the Law and Order Committee outlasted the longshoremen's strike was the destruction – of life, property, and a sense of security – caused by the Preparedness Day bombing. In the months following the July 22 attack, which killed ten and wounded forty, the Law and Order Committee consistently linked organized labor to the bombing conspirators.[3] Both the Building Trades and Labor Council vehemently denied any connection to the five arrested conspirators. They insisted that Thomas Mooney and Warren Billings, the supposed ringleaders, were transient anarchists with no ties to San Francisco's mainstream labor unions. Such assertions were easier for labor organizations to make about Warren Billings than Thomas Mooney. Oakland police had arrested Billings in the summer of 1913 carrying a suitcase of dynamite. He was convicted and spent two years in Folsom Penitentiary. Mooney's past ties to San Francisco unions, however, was possible to find. He was most notably associated with San Francisco's radical fringe, helping Edward Nolan and Alexander Berkman establish the anarchists' journal *Blast* in January 1916. However, Mooney also attempted to establish more closed shop industries in San Francisco, giving him a common cause with the Labor Council. After the PPIE ended, Mooney devoted his attention to organizing a Carmen's Union among United Railroad workers. Eight times since Patrick Calhoun's defeat of the Carmen's Union in 1907 workers at United Railroad had unsuccessfully

---

Era (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 29, 235; David F. Selvin, *Sky Full of Storm: A Brief History of California Labor* (San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1975), 37, Issel, William Issel and Robert W. Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 92-93.

[3]The five indicted for the Preparedness Day bombing were Warren Billings, Thomas Mooney, Rena Mooney, Israel Weinberg, and Edward D. Nolan.

attempted to win union recognition. Before he could lead a handful of carmen on strike in June 1916, Mooney was arrested for suspicion of dynamiting a high voltage tower outside San Francisco that provided power to United Railroad. He was out on bond at the time of the Preparedness Day bombing.[4]

Of the five indicted by a grand jury in August 1916 for the bombing, Warren Billings was chosen to stand trial first. In September, a jury convicted him of murder and sentenced him to life in prison. The city's labor unions ignored Billing's case, believing that an anarchist, previously convicted of possessing dynamite, was obviously not a part of the city's mainstream unions.[5] In the fall of 1916, San Francisco unions were busy with more pressing matters. They ultimately lost the fight to expand union membership in the culinary, lumber, and steel trades and unsuccessfully prevented passage of an anti-picketing ordinance. The victor in these contests was the Law and Order Committee. To celebrate, members published an account of the organization's origin and achievements in January 1917. The pamphlet espoused the Committee's efforts to protect San Francisco, the Constitution, and the "spirit of human liberty" from the subversive forces of labor.[6] In its scathing critique of the pamphlet, the editor of the Building Trades' weekly newspaper, *Organized Labor,* urged residents to see the document for what it was – an attempt by the business elite to "attract non-union and anti-union capitalists and employees to the city." Despite its loses in late 1916, or maybe because of them, the

---

[4]Richard H. Frost, *The Mooney Case* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968), 23, 45, 72-76.

[5]Ibid, 118, 145.

[6]San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Law and Order Committee, *Law and Order In San Francisco, A Beginning* (San Francisco: H. S. Crocker Company, 1916), introductory page.

Building Trades continued to challenge the Law and Order Committee's real intentions, and in doing so, they had to maintain as much distance between organized labor and the accused bombing conspirators.[7] When a jury found Thomas Mooney guilty of complicity in the bombing on February 9, the city's union-run newspapers supported the verdict. Before a judge sentenced Mooney to death on May 17, however, some residents of San Francisco began to wonder if their previous assertions about Mooney had been correct.[8]

One of the primary reasons Mooney received the death penalty and Billings was given life in prison was the power of the testimony provided by Frank C. Oxman, an Oregon cattleman. After the national publicity given to the Billings trial, Oxman notified San Francisco District Attorney Charles Fickert that he had seen Billings and Mooney on July 22, placing a suitcase on the sidewalk at the site of the explosion. D. A. Fickert brought Oxman to San Francisco to testify for the prosecution in the Mooney case, providing the first eyewitness information that put the men at the exact scene of the crime. To strengthen Oxman's credibility, Fickert also brought in F. Edward Rigall, an associate of Oxman, from Illinois. Rigall testified that he had spent part of July 22 with Oxman in San Francisco. However, *Bulletin* editor Fremont Older was suspicious of these two outsiders who conveniently came forward in time for Mooney's trial. His staff began investigating the two men and, in the process, obtained correspondence between the two that they had written before their arrival in San Francisco to testify against Mooney. The letters, which the *Bulletin* published on April 11, 1917, suggested a

---

[7] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 3 February 1917, 7; *Organized Labor*, 6 January 1917, 4.

[8] Frost, *The Mooney Case*, 195.

conspiracy to frame the bombing defendants. Based on the material in the letters, a grand jury was called to investigate Frank Oxman. During those hearings, Rigall confessed that he had never been to San Francisco before Fickert had called him to testify in Mooney's trial. Oxman had encouraged his friend to lie to Fickert so Oxman's claims would appear more reliable. Rigall also claimed that Oxman had confessed to him that he had not been anywhere near the Preparedness Day parade at the time of the bombing. On April 18, Police Court Judge Matthew I. Brady issued a warrant for Oxman's arrest for subornation of perjury. However, these revelations did not stop Judge Franklin Griffen from sentencing Mooney to death a month later.[9]

The perjured testimony, and Judge Griffen's refusal to acknowledge the information, raised serious doubts for Fremont Older and some in the Labor Council and Building Trades about the guilt of Thomas Mooney and the others supposed conspirators. If the *Bulletin* could uncover the truth about Oxman, why didn't D.A. Fickert figure out his star witness was a liar – or did he know and ignore the information to get a conviction? The possibility that Fickert was using the Mooney case to aid the business community it its quest to portray all unions as subversive seemed more probable when the Law and Order Committee began expressing their overwhelming support for the actions of the district attorney. On April 28, the Law and Order Committee took out full page ads in the city's papers, except the *Bulletin*. The advertisements claimed that anarchists were attempting to thwart justice by attacking the prosecution in the Mooney case. This was diverting attention away from the real criminals – the five bombing conspirators and their

[9]Ibid, 205-212.

union associates.[10] This public attack on organized labor – and the refusal by Judge Griffen, D. A. Fickert, and the businessmen of the Law and Order Committee to consider Mooney's trial invalid – led many laborers to suspect a wider conspiracy against labor and a concerted effort to bypass the judicial process.

Almost overnight, many union members came to believe that Thomas Mooney's case was their own. *Organized Labor* called the Law and Order Committee the "usurper of municipal government." San Francisco's most prominent unionists and political supporters countered the Law and Order ad with a full-page ad of their own. In it, they appropriated the Committee's oft-repeated phrase: "we affirm our belief in Law and Order." The advertisement characterized labor's actions as democratic. It compared the open and public nature of labor union meetings, most notably the recent meeting called by the Labor Council to discuss aid for Mooney's defense, with the covert gatherings of the Law and Order Committee. In making this comparison, they intimated that corruption thrived in such backroom meetings. This fit with labor's assertion that the Law and Order Committee was just the public face of a larger conspiracy by San Francisco business leaders to undermine the advancements of the working class. The ad demanded a full investigation "in accordance with the law" into the Mooney case. In proving that they were not the subversives, the ad's authors insisted that they were the ones demanding public action to protect law and order. In emphasizing that point, fifteen local union leaders signed the proclamation, representing the affiliated and autonomous unions, but also politicians charged with promoting the greater good, including California's 5th

[10]Ibid, 219.

District Congressman John I. Nolan and Speaker of the California Assembly C. C. Young.[11]

Armed with this new information regarding Oxman's perjured testimony, labor organizations across the state mobilized to defend the five bombing conspirators. Paul Scharrenberg, State Federation of Labor president, had previously denounced Mooney as a traitor. Now, Scharrenberg defended him, arguing Mooney was a pawn in the Chamber's attempt to destroy support for labor. Scharrenberg took charge of raising money for Mooney's defense at the state level while the San Francisco Labor Council requested that all affiliated unions assess their members one hour of pay for the fund. In making the request, the Council reminded union members that the Chamber of Commerce had raised one million dollars for the Law and Order Committee "for the express purpose of fighting Labor Unions."[12] The high cost of living would make such donations difficult, but the Labor Council considered such sacrifices to be just as important as war related ones. Labor had to be able to defend its interests from the growing strength of the Chamber of Commerce.

Despite the developments in the Oxman case, District Attorney Fickert proceeded with the trial of Rena Mooney. Although just months earlier the paper had denied the five indicted bombers had anything to do with the city's unions, *Organized Labor* now warned that trying Rena Mooney would "fan the ever smoldering fires of social unrest."[13]

---

[11] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 5 May 1917, 5.

[12] Frost, *The Mooney Case*, 274; *Call and Post*, 19 May 1917, 1.

[13] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 2 June 1917, 8.

During the trial, the California State Federation of Labor started a letter writing campaign, urging members to contact State Attorney General U. S. Webb's office and demand a full investigation of Oxman's relationship to Fickert. The State Federation expressed concern that the Oxman case threatened to erode the confidence of San Franciscans in their judicial system, which was "becoming enveloped . . . in the fog of doubt and distrust and that no ordinary man of the people will longer expect an even chance at the bar of justice."[14] Without Oxman's testimony, a jury voted for acquittal. Rena's attorney hoped the verdict would ease working class fears that they would not receive a fair trial if their "legitimate efforts for betterment arouse the enmity of employers."[15]

Such statements reflected the shifting argument made by labor in defense of the bombing conspirators. Thomas Mooney's imprisonment was not the result of his prior anarchist views but because he had attempted to unionize United Railroad carmen. By associating him with organized labor's prime directive, unionization, Mooney became a part of the mainstream labor movement. William Billing's former conviction, however, made him more difficult to redeem and claim as their own. Therefore, the Building Trades and Labor Council did not consider Billings a suitable martyr for labor's cause. After Rena Mooney's acquittal, the unions assumed the prosecution would dismiss the remaining charges against Rena, Israel Weinberg, and Edward Nolan. This would allow them to concentrate on winning a retrial, or the release of, Thomas Mooney.

---

[14] *Organized Labor*, 14 July 1917, 8.

[15] *Organized Labor*, 28 July 1917, 1.

District Attorney Fickert, however, had other plans. Instead of releasing Rena Mooney, Fickert sent her back to jail to await trial on one of seven other indictments brought against her by the original grand jury. Robert Minor, writing for *Organized Labor*, believed the tactic was meant to drag labor defendants into court as often as it would take "to wear down the treasuries of the Labor Unions that support the defense."[16] For unionists, the continued detention of Rena Mooney and the trial of Israel Weinberg, which began in October 1917, reflected the corruption within the district attorney's office and his connection to those businessmen of the city who sought labor's destruction. Ed Gammons of *Organized Labor* declared: "This IS a fight for the life of trades Unionism in San Francisco. We accept the gauntlet!" At the beginning of Weinberg's trial, Judge Emmet Seawell noted the tension between unions and employees had risen to dangerous levels, preventing either side from maintaining objectivity. As a result, the judge did not allow any labor union or Chamber of Commerce members on the jury.[17] After a seven-week trial in which the prosecution presented no new evidence, the jury took twenty-three minutes to find Weinberg not guilty. Like Rena, Weinberg returned to jail to await trial on the other seven indictments. The District Attorney's office announced it would begin the trial of Edward Nolan next.[18]

It was at this point that San Francisco's labor organizations, along with other residents who believed the district attorneys office was catering to special interests, began

---

[16]*Organized Labor*, 4 August 1917, 4.

[17]*Organized Labor*, 29 October 1917, 4.

[18]Frost, *The Mooney Case*, 255. None of the defendants faced trial after the acquittal of Weinberg, but only Nolan was released before the end of 1917.

a campaign to recall Charles Fickert. In the recall debate, both sides used the war atmosphere, using fears that keeping or losing Fickert would seriously undermine San Francisco's patriotism and national reputation. Fickert charged that the money used to defend the bombing conspirators came from German sources and was funneled through the city's unions. Fickert had local papers print a telegram he sent to Theodore Roosevelt, meant to earn the former president's endorsement. In it, Fickert insisted that his recall would bring "woe and destruction upon our beloved country" in its time of greatest danger. In response, the editor of *The Daily News*, Eugene Maclean, insisted that residents had to recall Fickert because his rejection of the law would undermine America's relations with its wartime allies. These allies expected the United States to uphold the standards it required of everyone else.[19]

Attorney Charles Sweigert campaigned to replace Fickert should the recall prove successful. Sweigert brought two vocal forces together in supporting his bid – organized labor and moral reformers. Sweigert catered to labor by declaring that Fickert was willing to violate the law for the sake of his wealthy business supporters. The war made the situation even more serious, Sweigert argued, because the nation expected the San Francisco district attorney to do everything in his power to protect the soldiers "from the evils of liquor and vice." While others in the city blamed law enforcement, Sweigert "flayed" Fickert for failing to prosecute offenders.[20] In attacking the opposition, Sweigert and Fickert publicly displayed the divisions, usually kept hidden, within San Francisco.

---

[19] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 21 November 1917, 4.

[20] *The Daily News*, 7 December 1917, 11.

They also advertised to the nation an image of the city as lawless and corrupt. For a brief moment, the Chamber of Commerce and labor unions failed to advertise San Francisco as a city that had left its wild past behind.

The recall exposed fissures within labor's ranks. Some trade unionists still considered Mooney an anarchist and agreed with Fickert's prosecution of the five defendants. Labor Council president Arthur Brouillet was one of those individuals. He had allowed the Council to collect money but had refused to allow any public rallies for the defendants, believing that despite the Oxman evidence, Mooney was guilty. During the State Federation of Labor convention in late October, Brouillet got into a verbal altercation with Mooney supporter Selig Schulberg. Schulberg had suggested that the convention send a resolution to President Wilson showing support for the President's recent decision to have the Justice Department investigate the Mooney case. Brouillet rejected the idea and threatened to give Schulberg an even greater beating than the one he had received from Charles Fickert a week earlier. Fickert had punched Schulberg in the face and claimed he had acted in self-defense. Also during the convention, Brouillet called Fremont Older a "dirty skunk" for publishing the Oxman and Rigall letters. The verbal attacks on Schulberg and Older were too much for the rest of the Labor Council's executive committee. At the end of the state convention, they voted to suspend Brouillet and elected vice president Daniel Haggerty to replace him.[21] Brouillet was not alone among union members in his belief that the bombing conspirators had nothing to do with organized labor in the city and that their previous ties to radicalism were enough proof of

[21]Frost, *The Mooney Case*, 273-276.

their guilt. However, the Labor Council executive committee's ability to remove Brouillet from office reflected the limited strength of Brouillet's argument within the Council and its affiliated unions. By removing Brouillet, the Labor Council had made its choice to stand in solidarity with Thomas Mooney and against Charles Fickert.

Sweigert won considerable support from members of the Labor Council and Building Trades, along with reformers like Rev. Paul Smith, but 62 percent of voters rejected the recall of Fickert.[22] Several factors led to Fickert's success. First, wealthy businessmen and political conservatives financially supported Fickert. Both the Chamber of Commerce and the Civic League of Improvement Clubs endorsed Fickert and urged their members to campaign on his behalf. Wealthy residents of the Pacific Heights and Nob Hill districts voted overwhelming for Fickert.[23] Fickert also received votes from people who had supported Theodore Roosevelt in his 1912 presidential race. Thanks to San Francisco attorney Charles Hanlon, who had personal ties to the former president, Fickert received a public endorsement, which the *Call and Post* published. Most important, the night before the recall election, a bomb exploded in front of the governor's mansion in Sacramento. With San Francisco papers announcing the attempted assassination of the governor as people headed to the polls, citizens from the city's wealthier neighborhoods came out in surprising numbers. Those who agreed with the propaganda of the Law and Order Committee immediately concluded that such anarchic

---

[22] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 19 December 1917, 2.

[23] *Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco* 3 (November 1917), 1-4; *San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities* 4 (13 December 1917), 319; Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 191.

actions were the work of individuals tied to unionism. In voting for Fickert, they believed his aggressive tactics in the bombing trials was proof he would fight against radical and dangerous elements no matter the personal cost.[24]

The conviction of Mooney and Fickert's recall challenge were not the only occasions in 1917 that organized labor had to worry about being labeled subversive. Walking a fine line between defenders of democracy and disloyal workers, San Francisco unionists struggled with the appropriate use of one of their most effective tools – the strike. The acrimonious relationship between unionists and the city's leading businessmen that developed during the 1916 strikes intensified the difficulties in successfully carrying out a strike. After the war declaration, the first question for potential striking unions was whether they even had the legal right to strike. The Advisory Labor Committee, a subcommittee of the National Council of Defense, struggled to create a policy regarding strikes that provided the right balance of patriotism and protection for workers. The committee, consisting of labor leaders and businessmen from around the country, created a vaguely worded compromise that rejected any "material or big change in the existing status between employers and workers." It did not expressly forbid strikes. John H. Walker, president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor and member of the Advisory Labor Committee, explained the details of the committee's agreement in a letter to *Organized Labor*. He stated that wages could, and should, keep pace with the rising cost of living during the war. However, Walker admitted that he was not sure that workers should still employ strikes. Instead, he

[24]Frost, *The Mooney Case*, 263-265.

encouraged workers to make their employers aware of their financial struggles, believing that patriotism and wartime prosperity would sway them to raise wages.[25]

Rising inflation made it difficult for San Francisco unions to wait for employers to decide it was in everyone's best interest to increase wages. The cost of living in the Bay Area rose 29 percent in the two years prior to American entrance into the war. Figures published in *Organized Labor* in June 1917 showed that dairy prices had risen 84 percent in two years. Labor organizations encouraged workers to boycott companies charging unfair prices and praised women's groups that formed consumers' leagues to study ways they could conserve food. Olaf Tveitmoe hoped that as workers learned to conserve foodstuffs, thanks to the Food Administration guidelines, there would be a reduction in consumer prices that would prevent workers from having to strike for higher wages.[26] However, like many longtime unionists in San Francisco, Tveitmoe could not deny the rights of non-union workers to organize even during a world war. While Thomas Mooney had failed to organize carmen in 1916, a number of platform men working for the United Railroads renewed the union's charter in the summer of 1917. United Railroad president, Jesse Lilienthal, refused to raise wages to adjust for the higher cost of living. For the platform men, the dangers of being branded disloyal for striking during the war paled in comparison with their declining purchasing power. United Railroad, the bastion of the open shop since the days of Patrick Calhoun, was the perfect target for

---

[25] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 7 July 1917, 4.

[26] Frederick L. Ryan, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Building Trades* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1936), 138-139; *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 23 June 1917, 1; *Organized Labor*, 7 April 1917, 6; *Organized Labor*, 23 June 1917, 1.

union action. For over a decade, Calhoun and his successor had thwarted all unionization efforts, hiring spies to keep tabs on workers and immediately firing anyone with union sympathies. If the Carmen's Union won, it would go a long way to reversing the losses organized labor had suffered the previous year.[27]

On Sunday, August 12, 1917, approximately fifteen hundred United Railroad platform men walked off the job, tying up 80 percent of United Railroad's street cars. Lilienthal and the Law and Order Committee immediately went on the offensive. Lilienthal tried to garner sympathy by declaring that his company, faced with competition from the city's Municipal Railroad line, could not pay workers more. Chamber of Commerce members donated the funds needed to pay for armed guards hired to protect United Railroad's strikebreakers.[28] These strikebreakers were migratory outsiders whom the company quickly hired, not checking for criminal histories. This worried residents who feared the motives of these transients. Public fears seemed confirmed when police began arresting strikebreakers days after their arrival for illegally carrying weapons. Police also raided several United Railroad car barns and arrested men for not registering for the draft.[29] A telegram to Mayor Rolph from one San Francisco resident visiting family in Truckee warned that he had seen three hundred strikebreakers on their way to the city and "nearly all are armed. . . . These men are not good citizen [sic]."[30] Lilienthal

---

[27] *Organized Labor*, 18 August 1917, 1.

[28] Steven C. Levi, *Committee of Vigilance: The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Law and Order Committee, 1916-1919: A Cast Study in Official Hysteria* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 1983), 100.

[29] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 17 August 1917, 1.

[30] J. Phillip Dodge to James Rolph, 19 August 1917, James Rolph Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

rejected the idea that his company was intentionally hiring gunmen to run his streetcars, but arrests of armed strikebreakers continued.[31]

The image of the lawless strikebreakers stood in stark contrast to the peaceful rallies at the Labor Temple. Striking workers paraded peacefully down Market Street, with wives and children in tow, publicly displaying banners and wearing buttons that called for $3.50 an hour and an 8-hour workday. The State Federation of Labor, San Francisco Labor Council, and the Building Trades Council all supported the actions of the new union. They encouraged their locals to assess members fifty cents each to help defray the expenses of the strike. The Labor Council urged all San Franciscans to support the strikers by boycotting the United Railroad lines. Labor Council secretary and State Council of Defense member John O'Connell met with Mayor Rolph. He requested enforcement of a city ordinance requiring new platform men to have a week's training before operating a street car.[32] In doing so, O'Connell performed two functions: advertising union concern for the safety and well-being of all residents and fulfilling his duties as part of the state's wartime defense organization. Peaceful demonstrations and efforts to show that the Carmen's Union and its labor supporters were the defenders of law and order successfully deflected, for a time, the attacks of disloyalty by the Chamber of Commerce. Unfortunately, peace was not easy to maintain.

On August 22, people at four different United Railroad stops in the Mission District threw stones at the cars, leading the strikebreakers to disembark and attack. This

---

[31] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 18 August 1917, 1.

[32] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 15 August 1917, 1; *The Daily News*, 17 August 1917, 1.

action made it difficult for even the pro-labor *Daily News* to put the blame squarely on the strikebreakers. The paper noted that the strikebreakers had been "spreading riots and disorder as they went," but most of the article portrayed the strikebreakers as victims. In several cases that day, strikebreakers had been dragged from their cars and beaten, while others were kidnaped and taken to the Labor Temple.[33] Despite the violence, residents in general were slow to give up their support of the Carmen's Union. United Railroad's history of corruption and the fact that the men on strike were residents of the city – not transients like the strikebreakers – led many to hope for a quick resolution in favor of the Carmen's Union. O'Connell played to these assertions by urging residents to compare the motives of both sides: "Mr. Citizen are you with the URR and its colleagues, or with the man seeking a decent wage? The URR is the corporation which debauched and bribed our city officials in years gone by. Its substitutes are thugs, gunmen and slackers." To diffuse suggestions that the strikers caused much of the current violence, O'Connell assured residents that the Carmen's Union had already told their members that if they were caught with a concealed weapon or under the influence of alcohol the union would expel them. He also insisted that, despite the recent spate of violence, none of the men arrested were card-carrying members of the Carmen's Union.[34] While it is unclear whether O'Connell's claim was accurate, many residents were inclined to believe the Carmen's Union was doing its best to maintain law and order within its ranks. Instead of

---

[33] *The Daily News*, 22 August 1917, 1.

[34] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 30 August 1917, 1; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 1 September 1917, 1,2; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 2 September 1917, 1,2; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 3 September 1917, 2.

calling for an immediate end to the strike when the violent attacks began, most residents stopped riding on United Railroad streetcars to avoid being caught in the crossfire.

The Carmen's Union's attempts to resolve the strike through arbitration lent credence to O'Connell's assertion that the union wanted a quick resolution to the strike without resorting to violence. The Carmen's Union offered to return to work without wage concessions if the company allowed United Railroad workers to vote for or against the closed shop. The carmen argued that this request was the best way to protect workers' long-term needs while getting them back to work quickly. With no wages, hours, or other issues to negotiate, workers would be back to work as soon as Lilienthal approved the vote. Although carmen would be forgoing immediate relief from inflation, they believed that once workers had the opportunity to vote for the closed shop they would have the power necessary to compel change. Despite this carefully crafted perception of carmen willing to sacrifice immediate gains for the good of the city, the Labor Council's quest for expanded unionization was evident. Not surprisingly, Lilienthal rejected this attempt to thwart the open shop movement, refusing to recognize the union and insisting there was nothing to arbitrate. As a result, the arbitration committee had no choice but to end its efforts. O'Connell again used the opportunity to attack the company and place any subsequent violence squarely on United Railroad's shoulders. "Whatever happens," O'Connell declared," we want the public to place the responsibility where it rightfully belongs – upon Jesse W. Lilienthal."[35]

---

[35] Robert Edward Lee Knight, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1900-1918* (Berekeley: University fo California Press, 1960), 344; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 7 September 1917, 2.

Lilienthal's refusal to resolve the matter through arbitration helped the Carmen's Union maintain public support and some notable municipal employees spoke out on the union's behalf. Mayor Rolph, in a letter to the Board of Police Commissioners about the strike violence, endorsed labor in the matter. He believed that the city's labor leaders and "good Union men" had nothing to do with the actions of a "small group of lawless men" engaged in "cold-blooded criminal assault.[36] Police Judge Morris Oppenheim handled many of the strike violence cases, including the murder trials of six strikers accused of killing a strikebreaker on August 23. The six strikers did not appear to be union members and Judge Oppenheim told the grand jury the Carmen's Union was not on trial and that they should not blame the union for the violence. He insisted that the attacks were the result of United Railroad's disregard for safety and careless hiring of "the worst characters that could be found in the slums of Eastern cities. Nothing could be more vicious."[37] Timothy Reardon, head of the city's Board of Public Works, joined striking carmen at the Labor Temple where he publicly challenged Lilienthal's reputation as a charitable citizen. He urged Lilienthal to resign so arbitration had a chance of moving forward. He also warned the strikers to distrust those who advocated violence because "you will find they are not working for you, but for the United Railroads in whose pay they are in."[38]

---

[36]James Rolph to Board of Police Commissioners, 7 September 1917, James Rolph Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 8 September 1917, 3.

[37]*San Francisco Chronicle*, 9 September 1917, 2.

[38]*San Francisco Chronicle*, 10 September 1917, 2.

The municipal and public support for the Carmen's Union suggested that, despite the war, San Franciscans would not react negatively to laborers who used strikes to improve their conditions. On September 15, the Iron Trades Council's (ITC) contract with the California Metal Trades Association (CMTA) and the California Foundrymen's Association (CFA) expired. The twenty-five unions affiliated with the Iron Trades Council wanted an increase in wages that reflected not only the rising cost of living, but also the tremendous growth in profits the shipbuilding companies earned thanks to war contracts.[39] The two sides failed to reach an agreement by the end of the contract but hoped that the U.S. Shipping Board would quickly intervene to prevent a strike in a crucial wartime industry. However, the Board did not act fast enough. On the morning of September 17, thirty thousand employees in the iron trades failed to report to work or walked off the job. The *Daily News* reported that the "Mission [District] was black with men," as striking iron workers joined the striking carmen milling about their neighborhood. This new influx of strikers led to a spate of violence against United Railroad strikebreakers, leading Lilienthal to declare it the bloodiest day since the start of the carmen's strike. Lilienthal responded by cancelling all night service in the South of Market and Mission Districts.[40]

The strike by carmen, while significantly disruptive to urban mobility, became

---

[39] Knight, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area*, 340. Led by M.J. McGuire of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders and Helpers of America, iron workers had participated in demonstrating against United Railroad and at one point McGuire even gave his men permission to take their lunch hour and go pull United Railroad strikebreakers off the cars. *Daily News*, 4 September 1917, 1.

[40] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 16 September 1917, 1-2; *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 17 September 1917, 1; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 18 September 1917, 1-2.

secondary to the strike of thirty thousand shipyard workers. The iron workers strike in San Francisco occurred at the same time as shipyard strikes in Seattle, Portland, and Los Angeles. This work stoppage on the Pacific Coast held up about 12 percent of the government's ship construction. Because of the serious repercussions to the nation's war effort, officials with the U.S. Shipping Board scurried to find an agreement that the strikers would quickly accept. Federal authorities also immediately dispatched two Marine companies from Mare Island to protect San Francisco's Union Iron Works and shut down saloons within a half mile of the plant. Federal officials considered the streetcar strike to be a local matter and not essential to wartime production. In the case of the iron workers, Washington made it clear that they would "settle the wage question by speedier methods than an endurance test between labor and employers." [41]

Compared with the local carmen strike, which disrupted metropolis transportation, the iron workers' strike had the potential to disrupt the nation's ability to win the war. As a result, accusing the iron trade unions of disloyalty was easier for employers. The owners, as part of the Metal Trades Conference Committee, claimed that they had sought a compromise with the unions before the strike began, recognizing the "vital necessity of keeping shops operating on account of the national crisis." The owners did not directly question the Iron Trades Council's patriotism. Instead, they made it clear that the ITC had made the conscious decision to strike and that the nation "would be the principal sufferer on account of the cessation of work."

The Iron Trades Council retaliated with its own statement. It argued that the

---

[41] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 18 September 1917, 1, 3.

strike was necessary and its workers were more loyal than the employers: "We do not think it fair to ask the workers to starve themselves to show their patriotism, while the employers wax fat and rich on war contracts." In making its case that workers, even on strike, were more patriotic than employers, the ITC recited the oft-repeated union refrain – greed prevented industrialists from sacrificing for the greater good. While the members of the California Metal Trades Association reaped wartime profits, workers sacrificed. Not only did they build the ships in record time, they donated to war drives despite the lack of pay incentives. Even with the high cost of living, the employees at Union Iron Works had purchased $621,000 worth of Liberty bonds in the first drive, averaging $70.25 per worker.[42] ITC used the same tactics as the Carmen's Union and labor organizers who fought to save Tom Mooney. In each case, they could easily link the rights of workers to receive equal treatment - whether that meant a fair share of the nation's prosperity or fair treatment in the courts - to the nation's efforts to promote democracy and progressive ideals.

While it is difficult to determine how much was gained by attacking the opposition's loyalty, the iron workers and carmen paid a heavier price as a result of the increasing street violence. Letters to the *San Francisco Chronicle* editor before the iron workers' strike reflected general support for the Carmen's Union. Two days after the iron trades' strike began, the letters-to-the-editor columns were filled with demands that both strikes end quickly. Residents who wrote into the newspaper demanded the mayor step

[42] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 17 September 1917, 2; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 18 September 1917, 3.

up the police presence in the Mission District and have officers riding the United Railroad cars to protect passengers. They began to blame union leaders, rather than employers, for the strikes. One anonymous author believed the officers of the boilermaker unions had gone on strike just to incite violence, suggesting that at least some residents had adopted the Law and Order Committee's argument that the city's unions were filled with anarchists.[43] The *Chronicle*'s editor also feared that the violence would significantly harm San Francisco's chances of winning future government contracts. With two major strikes and millions of dollars at stake, the editor believed that the city's rivals would use the situation to their advantage to lure contracts away. He urged the mayor and the police to do their duty and urgently declared: "Let this violence stop!"[44] No matter how convincing the Iron Trades Council and Carmen's Union was in labeling their rich opponents as disloyal villains, the violence led most residents to demand an immediate resolution to the crisis. They did not care who won or lost so long as the city streets were safe and workers quickly resumed the crucial war production in the shipyards. Many residents supported the labor organizations' vision of San Francisco as the bastion of the closed shop. However, the heightened tensions caused by the war and the armed conflict on their residential thoroughfares led residents to believe that now was not the time for unions to take an aggressive stand against employers.

Although the two sides in the carmen's strike remained unmoved, the government's intervention in the iron worker's strike resulted in a quick settlement. On

---

[43] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 19 September 1917, 18; similar letters appeared in other editions of the paper, see 22 September 1917.

[44] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 21 September 1917, 16.

September 23, an arbitration committee worked out a temporary agreement to get the men back to work while the newly created U.S. Emergency Fleet Corporation developed a permanent wage rate for all shipbuilders on the coast.[45] The committee reached its agreement soon after it received a telegram from President Wilson. In it, the president promised that the government would treat workers fairly in any new wage agreement. He also urged the arbitration committee to resolve the matter quickly for it would "be most gratifying to Washington in view of the effect it would have on the labor troubles in Seattle, Portland and elsewhere." The president's telegram, published in the *Daily News* and the *San Francisco Chronicle*, made it clear that San Francisco's resolution would set the standard for other Pacific Coast cities.[46] Labor ideology might divide employers and employees, but an opportunity to make the city stand out as the bastion of harmony on the West Coast brought the two sides together. Both sides would benefit from portraying San Francisco as a city where labor and business might disagree but could compromise for the sake of the nation.

While the thought of showing that San Francisco was the "City That Knows How" to the rest of the Pacific Coast galvanized workers and owners, divisions among unionists in the Bay Area threatened to keep the iron workers' settlement from going forward. Despite the tentative agreement, the iron workers did not return to work as quickly as expected. Thirteen of the seventeen ITC unions approved the temporary agreement on

---

[45] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 21 September 1917, 1; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 23 September 1917, 3; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 24 September 1917, 1.

[46] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 24 September 1917, 1; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 24 September 1917, 1.

September 26, claiming that while they were not in full agreement with the settlement, they accepted it to "demonstrate the patriotism of the workingmen of the San Francisco bay counties." However, not all agreed that loyalty should trump the workers' immediate needs. Several men who attended the ITC vote told the *San Francisco Chronicle* that Oakland and Alameda union members overwhelming voted against the agreement while San Francisco laborers voted "unanimously for acceptance." [47]

The newspaper's reporting of the votes did not uncover the divisions on both sides of the bay. Three of the East Bay unions who rejected the agreement voted to accept the majority decision, but the Oakland Boilermakers' Unions refused to return to work, voting against the settlement almost four to one. San Francisco delegates were fairly evenly divided on the proposal and quite a number of union members did not attend the vote. The problem for the Boilermakers lay in the settlement's acceptance of shipping company usage of materials from non-union lumberyards. Historian Robert Knight also believed that East Bay union members also used the vote as an opportunity to protest their opposition to the fact that San Francisco union leaders dominated the arbitration committee.[48]

In an attempt to smooth over the bay rivalries, leaders from both sides of the bay called for another vote on September 28. This time, more San Francisco unionists participated and only 503 voted against the settlement, most from the East Bay. With the majority in support, R.W. Burton, ITC president, instructed everyone to return to work

---

[47] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 27 September 1917, 2.

[48] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 28 September 1917, 1-2; *Daily News*, 28 September 1917, 1; Knight, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area*, 360.

the next day.[49] For the most part, the Boilermakers accepted the verdict and returned to work, but the rift between the bay city unionists remained. A week later, Olaf Tveitmoe chastised the East Bay Boilermakers for delaying ship construction beyond what was necessary, considering it detrimental to the nation's ability to fight the war effectively. Tveitmoe was angry with the Boilermakers for rejecting the original decision by the ITC majority: "How absurd it appeared for a few hundred Boilermakers to attempt ruling or ruining an organization involving thousands. That might be consistent with I.W.W. propaganda, but it is not craft or trade unionism."[50] While Tveitmoe did not espouse the Law and Order Committee's rhetoric that all unionists were anarchists, he did believe that the East Bay unions' unwillingness to compromise with the government called their loyalty – to their union brothers, their country, and their Bay communities – into question.

The rift within the boilermaker's unions ultimately led the East Bay unions to charter their own separate local the following year, allowing them to challenge not only the ITC but also the permanent shipbuilding agreements made in late 1917.[51] In November 1917, the Emergency Fleet Corporation issued a new wage scale for all shipbuilders on the Pacific Coast.[52] The new agreement did not satisfy all the Iron Trades Council's original demands, but instead of going on strike again, ITC sent two San Francisco delegates to Washington. As a result of their negotiations, V. Everitt Macy, head of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, announced a supplemental wage increase of 10

---

[49] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 29 September 1917, 1-2.

[50] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 6 October 1917, 4.

[51] Knight, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area*, 362-363.

[52] *Organized Labor*, 10 November 1917, 5.

percent on December 10, 1917. The settlement ended the possibility that a strike would threaten shipbuilding in San Francisco.

However, the fight over acceptance of the temporary agreement in September 1917 illustrated the significant ideological differences between the unions of San Francisco and the East Bay. While iron workers in San Francisco did not threaten to walk off the job for the rest of the war, the Boilermakers' Local 233 in Alameda threatened several strikes and staged one-day walkouts throughout 1918.[53] For San Francisco at least, the iron workers succeeded in their September 1917 strike. However, the division with unions across the Bay made evident the increasingly precarious position of San Francisco organized labor. They had managed carefully to craft an image of their laborers as patriots unified to protect workers and do their part for the war. However, in reality labor unions in the Bay Area were not resolutely in support of the same goals. San Francisco unions could now no longer expect to have East Bay unions wholeheartedly back their efforts to maintain the closed shop, undermining their strength in the region.

While the iron trades' strike led to a compromise solution with federal authorities, the Carmen's Union strike ultimately failed. Sporadic violence continued, but according to a later report by the police department, there were fewer disturbances during the carmen's strike than in previous city strikes.[54] Most San Franciscans did not reject the strikers or their goals, nor did most question labor's patriotism in holding the strike. The

---

[53]Knight, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area*, 341, 363.

[54]Copy of Police Department report to the Foreman and Members of the Grand Jury of the City and County of San Francisco, 13 February 1918, James Rolph Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

reason the strike failed lay more in the union's inability to keep United Railroad cars from running. By early October, the more migratory strikebreakers who had been paid to come to San Francisco from New York or the Northwest headed home or kept a much lower profile while driving the streetcars. City officials indirectly aided the company by ordering police to remove inexperienced carmen from cars, disarming strikebreakers, and raiding the carbarns and arresting draft slackers.[55] Despite the number of men who walked out in August, one-third of the experienced United Railroad workers remained on the job and as the strike wore on, another two hundred returned to their jobs. Combined with the strikebreakers who stayed in San Francisco long enough to learn the trade, it was not long before United Railroad could resume normal schedules. On November 22, the Carmen called off the strike and within several weeks they turned in their charter.[56]

The war had given iron workers an effective bargaining tool, but the same was not true for the carmen. The failure of the Carmen's Union to sustain a permanent union and the lack of a unified labor front in the Bay's iron trades forced the Labor Council and Building Trade Council to withdrawal their support of strikes for the war's duration. Although they had deflected charges of disloyalty, the loss by the Carmen's Union undermined morale among the city's labor unions. Unwilling to try another strike for fear of weakening unions further, labor organizers turned to activities that they believed would help them win back the favor of San Franciscans and show that they, more so than city business leaders, were the trusted defenders of democracy and justice.

---

[55] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 17 October 1917, 1.

[56] Knight, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area*, 347.

As 1918 began, the Labor Council and its affiliated unions focused on winning a retrial or acquittal for Thomas Mooney whom they had come to see as the symbol of the injustice wrought by the city's Chamber of Commerce and conservative politicians. The forced resignation of Arthur Brouillet, the conservative president of the Labor Council, sparked "more energetic action" by the Labor Council in its aid to Mooney and the other defendants still being held in jail. Led by Daniel Haggerty, the Labor Council sought ways to refute the claim made by the Chamber of Commerce and D.A. Fickert that all unionists were radicals. On March 20, the State Supreme Court gave the supporters of the bombing defendants a significant victory when it overruled a lower court decision that had allowed Israel Weinberg to be held without bail. The International Workers' Defense League posted his bail and ten days later, Rena Mooney was also released on bail. While the California Supreme Court's decision paved the way for the resolution of Mrs. Mooney and Mr. Weinberg's cases, the same month the Court denied Thomas Mooney's regular appeal for a new trial. They argued that they lacked the ability to set aside the ruling in the case unless there was evidence of error, which they did not see. According to the Court, the only one who could save Mooney was Governor William Stephens, who had the power to pardon the condemned man.[57] With a gubernatorial election slated for November 1918, Mooney's case became another opportunity for labor and business to battle over the political future of the state.

In a letter to Governor William Stephens, Andrew Furuseth, president of the International Seamen's Union, urged the governor to pardon Thomas Mooney and retry

[57]Frost, *The Mooney Case*, 256-297.

him on one of the other seven charges to prove his guilt or innocence. As other union leaders had done the previous year, Furuseth compared the injustices done to Mooney with the actions of men like Kaiser Wilhelm, describing Mooney's imprisonment as the "autocratic act of an irresponsible monarch; it cannot be the act of the free State of California. The State cannot do this and remain a free State in the true sense of freedom."[58] When Furuseth wrote his plea, San Franciscans well understood that the United States was fighting abroad for democracy and an end to tyranny. *Organized Labor* had published Wilson's Fourteen Points on the front page of its January 12, 1918 edition. The paper proclaimed jubilantly that accomplishing these goals would allow "working people of every nationality [to] assert their power," replacing the "days of double dealing diplomacy and secret compacts."[59] If the United States was fighting for democracy abroad, then San Francisco's workers should protect that democracy at home as well.

A public display of support for the release of Thomas Mooney came at a mass meeting in the Civic Center Auditorium on April 16, 1918. The crowd that gathered in defense of Mooney reflected the divisive background of Mooney's supporters and the precarious position the city's moderate labor unions found themselves in while supporting Tom Mooney. Speakers included radical activists like Mother Jones, who pledged that labor would "no longer be content with the crumbs which fell from the master's table." Mrs. Hannah Sheehy-Skeffington, the wife of one of the Easter

---

[58] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 13 April 1918, 5.

[59] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 12 January 1918, 1.

Uprising's martyrs, struck a Marxist tone by stressing the importance of international labor, including Bolshevik Russia, in winning Mooney's release. All workers, she believed, must work together to make sure America provided justice, even to laborers.[60] At the time of the mass meeting, California authorities were cracking down on dissenters, most notably the Industrial Workers of the World. Governor Stephens had encouraged employees of the state's Division on Immigration and Housing to spy on labor activities, including the Mooney rally. J. Vance Thompson, reporting for the CIH, believed that only about 20 percent of the nine thousand attendees at the Mooney rally were average citizens. The rest were anarchists and socialists.

However, Thompson also had to concede that most workers who supported Mooney were not radicals. While extremists had infiltrated the International Workers Defense League, which had handled all the contributions for the bombing defendants, the organization could not be considered disloyal. Many organizations, including the Labor Council, had donated money to the Defense League. Thompson believed that members of these organizations had come to the rally because they felt "that a great wrong has been perpetrated." He hoped the League would manage to weed out the subversives and protect their patriotic image. Despite the radical dominance of the meeting that Thompson observed, Olaf Tveitmoe, stated that the meeting itself had not been deemed unpatriotic in any circles with whom he had spoken. The only criticism he heard about the mass meeting concerned a single woman in the audience who failed to stand during

---

[60] *Organized Labor*, 20 April 1918, 5.

the "Star-Spangled Banner."[61] As it had the previous year, unions that supported Mooney had to be clear that they supported the convicted bomber because his views reflected their own. Mooney's radical past was to be feared, and repressed publicly if possible.

The Defense League was more successful in connecting Mooney's cause with organized labor during its July 28 meeting that commemorated what unions across the country called "Mooney Day." Despite national support, San Francisco's labor unions still worried about putting on a rally that supported their cause without giving their opponents the ammunition needed to brand them unpatriotic. During a Labor Council meeting the night before the rally, delegate Selig Schulberg explained that the greatest question facing the city's organized labor was "What can labor do? How far can it go without embarrassing the government war program, to prevent the judicial murder of Tom Mooney?" Without expressly stating it, the delegates of the Labor Council determined that the answer lay in continuing to promote the responsibilities of labor to the war effort while challenging the patriotism of those making a profit during this time of sacrifice.[62]

The six thousand people who attended the July meeting at Dreamland Rink personified the reputable element of San Francisco's unions. Chief Justice McCoy and several unnamed members of Congress were in attendance. John H. Walker, now a member of President Wilson's Mediation Commission that had recommended a new trial for Mooney, was the featured speaker. Walker's speech portrayed D. A. Charles Fickert

---

[61] J. Vance Thompson to Simon Lubin, April 1918, Simon Julius Lubin Papers, 1912-1936, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; *Organized Labor*, 20 April 1918, 5.

[62] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 27 July 1918, 1-2.

as disloyal to his country and his president. Fickert had attacked Felix Frankfurter, secretary of the Mediation Commission, for supporting a retrial for Mooney. In calling Frankfurter, a man appointed by the president, a Bolshevik, Walker believed Fickert had crossed the line of decency and had indirectly assaulted the patriotism of the president. While Walker only insinuated that Fickert had violated the Sedition Act, he directly accused Fickert of connections to C. C. Crowley, a man convicted in the Hindu-German plot (See Chapter Six). Walker whipped up the crowd with his statement (printed in bold type in the *Bulletin*): "We've got to lick the army of the Kaiser, and we've got to lick his army that's working under cover over here–many of them with a flag wrapped around them, sworn to uphold justice and administer the law." Walker urged workers to continue to show their support for Mooney in ways that also supported America's war effort and did "not cast discredit on this cause or jeopardize the men in the trenches. Build up your organizations and fight and agitate for five years, if necessary, instead of five months, and you will not only make it impossible for Mooney to be hanged illegally, but you will make it impossible for anybody else to do anything like that to a man in the ranks of the workers."[63]

The actions of Governor William D. Stephens the day before the Mooney Day rally led to intensified efforts on Mooney's behalf. Stephens granted Mooney a stay of execution until December 13, 1918, a month after the gubernatorial election. The reprieve, however, only delayed Stephen's decision on the matter and did not satisfy San

[63] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 3 August 1918, 3; *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 29 July 1918, 1.

Francisco unionists or labor organizer across the country. On July 30, delegates from the American Federation of Labor attempted to meet with President Wilson. The delegation included officers from nineteen different AFL affiliated unions, along with San Franciscans Fremont Older and Andrew Furuseth. While the President did not meet with the delegates, they left a written plea for the President's assistance.[64]

At the time, few knew all of the steps President Wilson had already taken to try to win a new trial for Mooney. In late January 1918, the President's Federal Mediation Commission privately issued its report to the president. In it, the Commission questioned the fairness of Mooney's trial. The Commission's report, and Wilson's subsequent correspondence with Governor Stephens on the matter, was not published until Stephens won reelection and had commuted Mooney's sentence to life in prison. At that time, Stephens revealed the three telegrams he had received from the President in January, March, and June – each requesting the commutation of Mooney's death sentence and a new trial. Each telegram emphasized the significance of Mooney's case to America's international relations.[65] With workers around the world rallying to support the cause of Thomas Mooney, President Wilson did not need a case in which the United State appeared to be putting a worker to death on invalidated testimony. Just as San Francisco's unionists had argued in their mass meetings, President Wilson believed the Great War required America apply its democratic principles at home if it were to spread those ideals to nations liberated in war.

---

[64] *Organized Labor,* 3 August 1918, 3.

[65] *Organized Labor*, 7 December 1918, 4.

The Mooney case permitted organized labor to attack its opponents as disloyal to the nation while the unions sought to show residents the strong patriotism of their members. With the stabilization of inflation and the general rise in wages in 1918, most San Francisco workers were more confident in their personal economic situations. In this more prosperous climate, union leaders felt that committing their members to patriotic fund raisers was easier than it had been the previous fall. This is evident in the different emphasis labor put on the two major Red Cross drives during the war. During the first in June 1917, *Organized Labor* advertised the importance of giving to the Red Cross by reminding its readers of how the organization helped San Francisco after the earthquake and fire, not with accolades for Red Cross's current war work.[66] While the paper insisted that President McCarthy and the Building Trades Council were showing their enthusiasm for the local drive, the Council at the end of the drive had to add from its budget to make the total Council contribution $500.[67] With sixteen thousand members in 1916, the fact that they raised such a small amount suggests the difficulties workers faced due to the high cost of living.[68] It also reflects the fact that Building Trades Council leaders had yet to determine the positive effects the wartime drives could have on labor's cause.

By the time of the second Red Cross drive in May 1918, the Building Trades Council leaders had realized that the publicity they earned from supporting this patriotic cause could aid their efforts to cast themselves as defenders of democracy. They also

---

[66] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 23 June 1917, 4.

[67] *Organized Labor*, 30 June 1917, 2.

[68] Kazin, *Barons of Labor*, 235.

believed that by advertising the sacrifices of workers, they could show the stark contrast between their laborers, who gave everything they had, and their employers, who might give more money but really sacrificed less. Olaf Tveitmoe published his letter to the chairman of the San Francisco Chapter of the America Red Cross, in which he gave the drive the full support of the Building Trades Council and its affiliated unions. A quarter page advertisement in the paper encouraged workers to give to the Red Cross War Fund by using the organization's slogan: "If you knew a day's pay would save a Life – would you give one day a month?"[69]

Building Trades Council president P. H. McCarthy served as organized labor's most devout fundraiser and brought citywide recognition to union efforts to do their bit. As a Captain in the Red Cross army of volunteers, he encouraged members of the City and State Building Trades Councils to rally their affiliated unions. McCarthy also led Division I of the Third Liberty Loan Drive, consisting of six groups of unionists who canvassed the city subscribing workers to buy bonds. *Organized Labor* proudly announced the efforts of both of McCarthy's teams, boasting that in the Liberty Loan Drive the labor division "secured more individual subscribers than any other," though the paper did not provide the exact figures.[70] In the Red Cross drive, McCarthy's efforts were front page news as *Organized Labor* proudly announced union victory when the labor district team won the award for being the first group "over the top" in meeting its Red Cross goal. At the end of the drive Red Cross officials awarded McCarthy and his

---

[69] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 18 May 1918, 1, 7.

[70] *Organized Labor*, 6 April 1918, 1; *Organized Labor*, 11 May 1918, 4.

unionists a cup for their accomplishment. Unlike the paltry $500 total the year before, the Plumbers' Union alone voted to provide a $1000 donation, which averaged out to a day's pay per member. The article ends by praising the work of the Building Trades affiliated unions and reminding all of their patriotism: "Union labor of California and America has shown in the war emergency to all the world that they are neither anarchists, slackers or seditionists."[71]

Labor took these drives seriously and failure to participate in these public displays of war support resulted in serious repercussions. The Municipal Car Repairers and Trackmen notified Mayor Rolph after the Third Liberty Loan drive that it had voted unanimously to expel two trackman who had "persistently refused" to subscribe to the bond drive despite being financially able to contribute. That the men could subscribe, and refused, threatened the image of the union – a union that had granted the mayor an honorary membership. As if the expelling of the two members was not enough, the letter concluded by reminding the mayor that the members had purchased about $5,000 in the multiple bond drives and had "voted to empty its entire treasury if needed."[72] Although not as wealthy as their employers, labor showed that they could express just as much loyalty, if not more, advertising their importance in winning the war in the factory and with their financial sacrifices.

San Francisco's labor unions also strongly supported the War Saving Stamp Plan in 1918. According to John S. Drum, state director for Northern California' War-Savings

---

[71] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 1 June 1918, 1.

[72] J. J. McCarthy to James Rolph Jr., 24 April 1918, James Rolph Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Stamp (W.S.S.) committee, the plan was meant to provide "every man, woman and child" with the opportunity to do their part for the nation and served as "an appeal for economy and thrift as a patriotic duty." Of all the wartime drives, the War Savings Stamp had a particular appeal for the working class. Each thrift stamp cost only twenty-five cents. Sixteen thrift stamps constituted a complete War Saving Stamp. The minute cost of joining in this endeavor enabled many to make daily or weekly investments in the plan, allowing them to show their willingness to make sacrifices for the sake of the nation and its fighting forces.

The Labor Council endorsed the War Savings Stamp plan and requested that their affiliated unions send the W.S.S. Committee a list of employers in their industry so they could provide literature for the workers' pay envelopes. The Council promised to admonish those unions who did not provide the reports, insisting the "slackers can be easily prompted to make quicker returns." The term "slacker," seen frequently in the papers when rebuking men who failed to registrar or meet the draft, was also used by *Organized Labor* to identify those who failed to purchase stamps. "At the present time there is hardly a person in America who has not one or more relatives or acquaintances in uniform. . . . Bear in mind that any person who can do anything at all to support these men and does not do it is a slacker."[73] The War Savings Stamp gave everyone the opportunity to prove their willingness to sacrifice luxuries to support American soldiers,

[73] John S. Drum to San Francisco Labor Council, 27 December 1917; San Francisco Labor Council to John S. Drum, 29 January 1918, San Francisco Labor Council Records, 1906-1965, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 23 February 1918, 3.

despite the meager funds of working class families and small unions and associations.[74] True loyalty in wartime, *Organized Labor* insisted, required people not just to refrain from saying anything disloyal, but required action. Producing as much as possible in the factories was just one way to act. War Savings Stamps provided another.[75]

Sacrifices for the war ultimately led the city's major labor unions and their leaders to accept a more conciliatory approach toward local businessmen. They hoped that unity of action could bring the two sides closer together than they had been before. At a March 1918 Chamber of Commerce luncheon, P.H. McCarthy addressed a crowd that a year earlier he would have considered labor's enemy: "I do not live in the past," McCarthy told the city's businessmen, "I want this nation and our allies to so live. Let us unite the business and professional and working men of this country and the Prussian ideals cannot live."[76] This desire to work together as a community for the promotion of war industries led union organizations to limit the actions of their members involved in war work. In June 1918 the Labor Council adopted a resolution pledging that its affiliated unions engaged in food production, manufacturing, and distribution would not cease or interrupt work without first attempting to resolve the matter with Ralph Merritt, California Food Administrator. Merritt had suggested a resolution, but left it to the officers of organized labor do decide if it were "wise and proper." Merritt believed, and the Labor Council must have agreed in passing the resolution, that "organized labor would do a patriotic and

---

[74] *Organized Labor*, 27 April 1918, 1.

[75] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 6 July 1918, 4.

[76] *Organized Labor*, 2 March 1918, 4.

unprecedented service" by agreeing to such a measure.[77] The Building Trades Council also accepted a similar agreement with the Emergency Fleet Corporation the following month. It required employers with government contracts to pay union scale, but did not require a closed shop.[78]

The pledges by the two largest labor organizations in the city show the evolution of labor policies as the war progressed. In the fall of 1917, both groups had supported the Carmens' Union strike for its attempt to gain a closed shop and argued that strikes were necessary to protect workers. At that time, attacking the open shop tactics of United Railroads and its supporters in the Chamber appeared to be the best way to preserve labor's vision of San Francisco as a city in which labor's voice was "heard and heeded." However, the failure of the Carmen's strike and the Chamber's victory in thwarting D.A. Charles Fickert's recall forced organized labor to reassess its tactics. By the time the war entered its fourteenth month, labor leaders realized that to win their future demands they had to embrace their role in fighting this war. Whether that meant adhering to the requests of government agencies, pledging their loyalty through oaths and financial donations, or accepting the temporary suspension of strikes, San Francisco unionists sought ways to prove their importance in this national crisis.

At the same time, the discovery of Oxman's perjured testimony meant that San

---

[77] Ralph Merritt to John O'Connell, 10 June 1918, San Francisco Labor Council Records, 1906-1965, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. Ralph Merritt, acting as Federal Food Commissioner for California, relieved the unions from this "voluntary pledge" less than a month after the end of the war. Ralph Merritt to John O'Connell, 5 December 1918, San Francisco Labor Council Records, 1906-1965, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[78] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 15 July 1918, 2.

Francisco's organized labor continued to put pressure on the Chamber of Commerce and others as they sought justice for Thomas Mooney. To retain an image of national loyalty, unions had to ignore Mooney's radical past and concentrate on the crux of America's wartime crusade – democracy. Without democracy, they argued, America's judicial system would crumble and no one would feel safe in their ability to get a fair and impartial trial. This opposition to actions that threatened American democracy served as a rallying point for San Francisco's working class during the war. The emphasis on democracy allowed unionists the ideological space necessary to denounce unfair practices without appearing disloyal. Olaf Tveitmoe believed that organized labor's efforts during the Great War – its promotion of democratic ideals and personal sacrifices – had won it respect that would lead to significant future rewards. "Awakened giants of Labor will be present at the next peace conclave. Their voice is already heard above the roar . . . and the Giants of Labor will shout in clarion tones around the Globe–'WE WIN.'"[79] Organized labor believed America's victory over tyranny abroad would spell victory at home as well.

[79] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 11 May 1918, 1.

Chapter Six
"There is no longer a hyphen . . . ": Living in a City of Immigrants

Three months after the United States declared war, San Franciscans celebrated Independence Day in a way residents had not experienced since the Spanish American War. More than ten thousand marched from the Ferry Building to City Hall. It took over an hour and a half for all to complete the trek. Mayor James Rolph, grand marshal of the parade, served as head of the first division. This included city officials, parade committee members, high-ranking army officers, and members of the consuls of Russia, France, and Italy. Next came the military division, composed of regiments of the Coast Artillery, national guardsmen, and the California Home Guard along with five hundred Boy Scouts. The final division included bands and members of the Native Sons of the Golden West, with one hundred men hoisting an American flag over their heads. Just behind the American flag marched a contingent of civilians invited to participate in the parade because they represented America's allies in the Great War. This group included residents of San Francisco born in France, Russia, Italy, England, Serbia, China and Japan.

At the conclusion of the parade, San Franciscans made their way to the Civic Auditorium for a rousing series of speeches in which patriotism and the wartime role of the city's immigrants took center stage. The ceremony began with young girls whose families had immigrated to San Francisco from the allied nations, reciting the Pledge of Allegiance. Next, a Chinese boy read the Gettysburg Address. Mayor Rolph then gave

the keynote address entitled "America: The Melting Pot of the Nations." For Rolph, San Franciscans stood united behind their president and the nation's call to arms, no matter where residents' forefathers called home. After Rolph's speech the audience heard from five San Francisco residents, each born in one of the five most important nations allied with the United States: Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia and Japan. According to a reporter with the *San Francisco Chronicle*, these five men's speeches verbalized what all patriotic Americans felt as they expressed "their devotion to Liberty and their hope for its preservation by American arms in this war." Italian F. M. Andreani declared "there is no longer a hyphen among the Italians in America. The hyphen now connects Italy and America."[1]

For Mayor Rolph, the son of immigrants, the war required all San Franciscans to serve the United States and it alone. However, the pronouncement by Andreani expresses a more complicated vision of what it meant to be an American patriot and an immigrant living in San Francisco. Italians and other foreign-born immigrants found themselves bound to their adopted nation like never before, but they were also still connected to their homeland. While Rolph sought to convey a message to residents and the nation that San Franciscans stood united, two of the city's largest immigrant groups, the Irish and Germans, played no part in the day's exercises. It is easy to see why parade organizers did not request their participation in a Fourth of July celebration that emphasized the importance of immigrants as allies. German-born residents who had not become naturalized citizens were now alien enemies, a designation that made them antithetical to

[1] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 5 July 1917, 9.

the American image the ceremonies displayed. While the Irish were not alien enemies, their message also did not resonate with the patriotic support for the United States and its allies that the city leaders sought to convey. Irish marchers and speakers would have undermined the image of America's greatest ally, Great Britain, with cries of independence for Ireland.

Although parade organizers' decision to reject inclusion of the Irish and Germans in Independence Day activities appears logical, it sat in stark contrast to the iconic picture of San Francisco as a city of immigrants. Part of the city's charm to visitors and residents alike lay in its long tradition of accepting the diversity of its immigrant populace and giving them a safe environment to express their cultural differences. By comparing the city's three largest foreign-born populations – the Italians, Germans, and Irish – one can examine the different circumstances San Francisco immigrants faced during the Great War. In part, that experience was determined by whether the federal government defined their homeland as an ally, an enemy, or a diplomatic problem. The fact that they were residents of a diverse metropolitan city like San Francisco proved important to that experience as well.

The immigrant experience has undergone more historical analysis than any other single topic on the American homefront during World War I, particularly the limits placed on civil liberties and violent action toward German-Americans. Starting with H.C. Peterson and Gilbert Fite's *Opponents of War* in 1957, historians have frequently highlighted the "American Reign of Terror," the mass hysteria that led to the banning of all things German and physical attacks against German residents suspected of unpatriotic

behavior. Peterson and Fite described the burning of German books, the defacing of their property with yellow paint, and repeated incidents of mobs forcing Germans accused of disloyal utterances to kiss the American flag. They considered Southern Illinois, where a mob lynched German citizen Robert Prager on April 4, 1918, the most "mob-ridden" area of the country as wartime hysteria reached its zenith in mid-1918. Only after a local jury in Collinsville, Illinois found Prager's suspected murderers not guilty in July did President Wilson publicly denounce vigilante justice. It was only then that the number of reported attacks began to abate.[2]

Although the Prager case appears to be exceptional, many local and state histories have also related hostile actions by nativists who sought to force the assimilation of ethnic minorities and eradicate radical unionism which they associated with immigrants. There are a number of such case studies from the American West. For example, one historian found that Utah immigrants carried Liberty Bonds for protection and occasionally these slips of paper saved them from lynching. Other immigrant communities suffered economically as native-born Americans refused to patronize their businesses. A study of South Dakota's immigrants shows that many German Hutterites migrated to Canada during the war because other residents refused to frequent their businesses after they refused to swear allegiance to any country. In these case studies, researchers place the emphasis on the rampant nativist hysteria caused by the war and how it helps to explain the subsequent 1919 Red Scare and the immigration legislation of

---

[2]H.C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite, *Opponents of War, 1917-1918* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), 195-206.

the 1920s.[3] While San Francisco had a history of employing vigilante methods, and the creation of the Chamber's Law and Order Committee in 1916 suggested an attempt to rekindle the passions of 1856, San Franciscans during the Great War did not resort to violent means.[4] A few reports of individuals confronting immigrants they suspected of disloyalty appear in local newspapers, but these were fandom, isolated incidents. Residents expected enforcement of federal legislation by law officers and the courts, believing law and order was best left to the professionals.

There are three reasons those with foreign accents or surnames failed to incite hysteria in San Francisco. First, the size of the foreign-born population, and their native-born children, were in the majority in San Francisco. In 1910, the U.S. Census reported that 31 percent of the city's residents were foreign-born whites, and in 1920 foreign-born immigrants still comprised 28 percent of the population.[5] According to the 1920 census,

---

[3]Helen Z. Papanikolas, "Immigrants, Minorities, and the Great War," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 58 (Fall 1990), 351-369; Rex Myers, "An Immigrant Heritage: South Dakota's Foreign Born in the Era of Assimilation," *South Dakota History* 19 (Summer 1989), 134-155. Other works that describe physical attacks on immigrants include Robert Smith Bader, *Hayseeds, Moralizers, and Methodists: The Twentieth-Century Image of Kansas* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1988); Hugh T. Lovin, "World War Vigilantes in Idaho, 1917-1918," *Idaho Yesterday* 18 (Fall 1974), 2-11; James H. Fowler, II "Creating an Atmosphere of Suppression, 1914-1917," *Oklahoma Chronicle* 59 (Summer 1981), 202-219; Allan Kent Powell, "Our Cradles Were in Germany: Utah's German American Community and World War I," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 58 (Fall 1990), 371-387.

[4]For more on the 1856 Committee of Vigilance, see Josiah Royce and Robert Glass Cleland, *California, from the Conquest in 1846 to the Second Vigilance Committee in San Francisco; a Study of American Character* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1948) and Dutch Charley Duane and John Boessenecker, *Against the Vigilantes: the Recollections of Dutch Charley Duane* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999).

[5]Susan Englander, *Class Conflict and Coalition in the California Woman Suffrage Movement, 1907-1912: The San Francisco Wage Earners' Suffrage League* (Lewiston: NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992, 17; United States Bureau of the Census. *Fourteenth Census of the United States taken in the year 1920*. (Washington: G.P.O., 1922), 127. The census counted the city's Chinese and Japanese population separately and made no distinction between foreign-born and native-born non-whites in those categories. There were 7,744 Chinese living in San Francisco in 1920, down from 10,582 in 1910; there were 5,358 Japanese, up from 4,518 in 1910.

there were 23,924 Italian-born San Francisco residents, 17 percent of the total white foreign-born in the city. German-born inhabitants came in second place with 18,513 (13 percent) and the Irish just slightly behind with 18,257 (13 percent).[6] Despite the decrease in the overall number of foreign-born San Franciscans, the immigrant experience continued to influence the city's population. The 1920 census showed that 39 percent of the native-born white population reported that both of their parents had been born outside the United States. Another 16 percent indicated that one parent was foreign-born. Having at least one foreign-born parent often meant a direct link to that foreign culture, whether in traditions passed down or extended family still living in foreign lands. When one adds the number of foreign-born or with at least one foreign-born parent the percentage of San Franciscans linked by blood to foreign lands is significant. As of 1920, 64 percent of San Francisco's residents fell into one of the categories noted above.[7] Native-born residents with two native-born parents were a minority in San Francisco.

The second factor that limited widespread hysteria in San Francisco was the dispersion of its foreign-born populace. The Italians, the most recent arrivals in the city, were the only noticeable exception. Forty-nine percent of the city's Italian residents lived in the North Beach district in 1920. For the German and Irish immigrants, the financial status of the family contributed more to the location of their residence than their ethnic

---

[6]United States Bureau of the Census. *Fourteenth Census of the United States taken in the year 1920*. (Washington: G.P.O., 1922), 109.

[7]United States Bureau of the Census. *Fourteenth Census of the United States taken in the year 1920*. (Washington: G.P.O., 1922), 127. If Japanese and Chinese residents are added into the figures of foreign-born and their offspring San Francisco's immigrant residents would consist of 66.3 percent of the city's total population.

origin. In 1920 not one of San Francisco's thirteen assembly districts had more than 1,900 German-born residents, but every assembly district had more than 800 German residents. About 30 percent of the German-born inhabitants lived in the Western Addition, Richmond District, and the neighborhoods of Eureka, Dolores, and Buena Vista. All five of these neighborhoods had seen a rising number of apartments since 1906, but in the 1910s they were still characterized by middle and upper-middle class merchants and professional who had followed the streetcar lines west out of downtown. The Irish were only slightly more concentrated in certain neighborhoods than the Germans. Ten out of thirteen assembly districts had more than 1,100 Irish immigrants and only one of those had more than 2,000 Irish residents.[8] Most German and Irish immigrants, therefore, lived in neighborhoods with people from many different nations and a growing number of native-born Americans. The immigrant enclaves, which frequently became targets of wartime hysteria in other parts of the country, were limited to the Italians and the Asian community in Chinatown. Since both Italy and China were American allies in the Great War, the isolation of these groups did not pose the same threat as in other areas of the country that had neighborhoods heavily-populated with alien enemies.

Finally, public hostility and violence toward immigrants failed to overtake San Francisco due to the foreign-born's significant contributions to the development of the city. Longtime residents took pride in the fact that their city had been built by immigrants

---

[8]United States Bureau of the Census. *Fourteenth Census of the United States taken in the year 1920* (Washington: G.P.O., 1922), 127; William Issel and Robert W. Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 59-76, 191.

and continued to be molded by immigrants. Marco Fontana, born in Genoa, founded Del Monte and later served as president of the California Fruit Canners Association, which operated thirty factories by the First World War. German immigrants arrived in large numbers starting in the 1860s, many of whom served in skilled trades and rose to prominence in retail and commerce. Born in Bavaria, Isaias Hellman founded a banking house in Los Angeles in the 1860s and moved to San Francisco around the turn of the century where he served as president of Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank. Many of the city's political leaders had immigrant roots. German-born Julius Kahn had served in several public offices in San Francisco since 1898 and during WWI was the representative for California's Fourth District. Irishman Patrick McCarthy was a former mayor and longtime president of the Building Trades Council. The native-born children of San Francisco's immigrant founders continued to pronounce publicly their immigrant heritage. Senator James Phelan's father was from Ireland, and during World War I he frequently delivered messages from Irish associations to President Wilson. The three sons of German-born Claus Spreckels, who founded the California Sugar Refinery, continued to pursue business interests in the city.[9] San Franciscans did not question the loyalty of men like Rudolph Spreckels or Senator Phelan or members of any other prominent immigrant families. They served as models of what San Franciscans believed all immigrants could achieve if they showed initiative and resourcefulness. As a result, most of San Franciscans with ethnic ties continued to feel comfortable expressing their

---

[9]Charles Wollenberg, *Golden Gate Metropolis: Perspectives on Bay Area History* (Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1985), 144; *San Francisco: Its Builders Past and Present* 2 volumes (Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1913), 1: 21-24; 1:71-73; 2: 5-9; 2: 35-36, 2:57-59, 2:67-68.

foreign heritage. They continued to see San Francisco as an urban environment that accepted the ethnic diversity of its residents and took pride in its moniker, the City of Immigrants.

In other areas of the country, nativist fears of German spies – whom they believed had infiltrated their communities – triggered the physical and verbal attacks against those whose name or accent suggested German origin. While many reports of German spy rings turned out to be nothing more than rumors, San Francisco was center stage for a spy drama that included actors from three continents. In February 1916 a federal grand jury in San Francisco issued indictments against German Consul-General Franz Bopp and five other consular employees. More indictments were to follow, targeting American supporters of Bopp, including owners and agents of several shipping firms, customs brokers, San Francisco merchants, and crewmen on the steamship *Sacramento*.[10] Federal prosecutors based their case on the confessions of one man who testified that those indicted planned to bomb ships and trains carrying Allied war supplies in the United States and Canada. The strongest evidence was against Bopp and the five employees of the German consul. In January 1917 a San Francisco jury convicted them of conspiracy to violate the portion of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act that made restraining interstate trade a federal offense.[11] In sentencing the defendants, Judge Hunt declared that "neutrality carries with it affirmative obligations. The United States canot [sic] be supine and permit its laws, designed to protect neutrality, to be disregarded by the subjects of any foreign

---

[10] *San Francisco Call and Post,* 8 February 1916, 1; *San Francisco Calla and Post*, 9 February 1916, 1.

[11] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 4 January 1917, 1; *The Bulletin,* 22 January 1917, 1.

ruler with whom the United States is at peace."[12] Judge Hunt's decision gave U.S. Attorney John W. Preston the legal grounds necessary to prosecute other cases in which America's neutrality had been threatened, most notably by Germans and German-sympathizers.

From the evidence obtained in Bopp's trial, U.S. Attorney Preston built a wider case related to the smuggling of weapons to India by the German government, a conspiracy known as the German-Hindu plot. By July 1917, a federal grand jury in San Francisco had indicted ninety-eight members of this conspiracy, "from the millionaire capitalist to the lowly Hindu laborer, and located in nearly every section of the world." Courts in Chicago and New York handled conspirators in their districts. In San Francisco, the prosecution tried Bopp, Vice-Consul Eckhardt von Schack, several shipping brokers, and several Indian nationalists, including the editor of San Francisco's *Hindustan Gadar,* Ram Chandra.[13] The case hinged on the British confiscation of arms and ammunition bound for India aboard ships paid for by the German consulate in San Francisco. The trial made public a worldwide German conspiracy to instigate revolution in British colonies. The jury convicted all but one of the defendants who stood trial, with Bopp and von Schack receiving the heaviest sentences of two years in prison and a $10,000 fine.[14] The German-Hindu plot captured the city's attention, and many residents

---

[12] *The Bulletin*, 22 January 1917, 1.

[13] *The Bulletin*, 7 July 1917, 1.

[14] *San Francisco Bulletin*, 1 May 1918, 2; Karl Douglas Hoover, "The German-Hindu Conspiracy in California" (PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1989). The day before the jury handed down their verdict one of the Indian defendants, Bhagwan Singh, shot and killed Ram Chandra in court and was then fatally shot by police.

wondered if other German spy networks had yet to become known. As one anonymous writer for *Town Talk* put it, the war required "a kind of alertness bordering on suspiciousness." It did not, however, warrant hysterical reaction against Germans living in San Francisco.[15]

The conviction of individuals who had lived in the city for years, and in some cases married San Francisco natives, could have ignited fears of resident Germans, but the aforementioned factors prevented residents from going on a hunt for other potential German spies. Even the federal government's policy toward alien enemies did little more than increase awareness of the number of non-naturalized Germans living in the city. In the weeks after the war declaration, the Wilson administration ordered all German citizens to surrender any firearms. The government also prohibited them from entering restricted zones of one-half mile around docks, factories, and arsenals considered vital to the war effort. In San Francisco, the restricted zones included Fort Miley, the Presidio, Fort Mason, the State Armory, and Union Iron Works.[16] In December 1917, the federal government announced that all male Germans and Austro-Hungarians over fourteen years of age had to register with local police. By the beginning of April 1918 San Francisco had 3,793 registrants. That number increased over the summer as the federal government expanded its scope to include female alien enemies and American

---

[15] *Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly* (San Francisco), 17 February 1917, 6.

[16] *San Francisco Examiner*, 24 April 1917, 9; *S an Francisco Examiner*, 1 May 1917, 3.

women married to alien enemies.[17] In each case, registration meant that police monitored the person's whereabouts. If the individual wanted to move, he or she had to report those plans to authorities and receive permission. They could receive special approval to live or work in the restricted zones, but authorities could revoke those passes if there was even the slightest suspicion of shady behavior.[18]

Overseeing alien registration, investigating complaints, and granting various permits to aliens prompted Police Chief D. A. White to create the Neutrality Squad, consisting of German-speaking officers. The oath sworn by registrants only required that they "conform to the laws of the United States." However, the Neutrality Squad also required proof of registrants' patriotism to demonstrate that they were not a threat to America.[19] The Neutrality Squad investigated the overall attitude of the registrants, along with their subscription to the Liberty Bond drives, war thrift stamps, Red cross fund-raisers and any other patriotic drives.[20] Failure to show support for the American war cause was grounds for revoking permits, jail time, and in the most extreme cases deportation.

Having every aspect of their loyalty questioned by police and federal law

---

[17] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 8 January 1918, 9; D. A. White to W. F. Benedict, 1 May 1918, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, North Baker Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco; George Bell to Mrs. Frank Gibson, 5 April 1918, California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Immigration and Housing Records, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; United States Department of Justice, Registration Affidavits of Alien Females and Enemies, History Center, San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco.

[18] *San Francisco Examiner*, 24 April 1917, 9; *San Francisco Examiner*, 31 May 1917, 3.

[19] *Municipal Record* 10 (27 December 1917), 427; *The Courier* (Berkeley) 9 March 1918, 4; Alien Enemy Registration Form, United States Department of Justice, Registration Affidavits of Alien Females and Enemies, History Center, San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco .

[20] *The Courier* (Berkeley), 9 March 1918, 4.

enforcement officials meant becoming publicly marked as suspicious individuals. However, San Franciscans considered the actions of the Neutrality Squad sufficient institutional oversight of the alien's in San Francisco. Residents considered it their patriotic duty to inform the Squad of suspicious actives, but they left the investigation and the assigning of punishment to law enforcement officials. In the case of Kurt Kauffman, a porter at the Buena Vista Café, the police had granted him a permit allowing him to work in the restricted zone because an American citizen had vouched for his character. Kauffman then celebrated this accomplishment by bringing liquor to work, which violated the dry zone around the Presidio. Upon realizing this, his employer reported the matter to the Neutrality Squad. Rather than firing Kauffman, or removing him from the premises by force, his boss turned the matter over to authorities who revoked the permit and Kauffman lost his job. [21] The Buena Vista Café owner gave the authorities the information they needed and left it to the Neutrality Squad to handle the incident. Other cases in San Francisco show a similar pattern of behavior by residents.[22] When someone violated the law, alien immigrant or not, they alerted the police. The existence of the Neutrality Squad strengthened residents' confidence in their police department's ability to handle potential German subversives, preventing wartime hysteria from taking hold as it did in other areas of the country.

There is no doubt that having their actions monitored by the city's Neutrality

---

[21] *San Francisco Call and Post*, 24 May 1917, 4. For other examples see *San Francisco Examiner*, 16 May 1917, 3; *San Francisco Examiner* 9 May 1917, 3.

[22] For other examples see the cases of Otto Janson, Otto Schmidt, and Harry Sulk. *San Francisco Chronicle*, 9 April 1918, 2; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 16 April 1918, 1.

Squad undermined the civil liberties of German citizens, but the sense of security most residents felt in having the Squad allowed aliens to maintain relatively normal daily routines. The case of Frederick G. Schiller, director of the San Francisco Municipal Orchestra, illustrates the support San Franciscans provided fellow residents designated alien enemies. Schiller had taken out his first citizenship papers in 1914 but had not applied for the final papers before the war declaration when the federal government halted all final applications. Schiller and his American-born wife lived within the half-mile restricted zone around Fort Mason. Rather than impose on one of his American friends to vouch for him, Schiller moved out of the zone in May 1917.[23] At the time, Schiller was in the middle of the Municipal Orchestra's inaugural season and at no time did anyone suggest the city replace him. Newspapers lauded Schiller's directorial talents and praised the Orchestra's cultural contributions and promotion of a kind of musical democracy in San Francisco. The *Labor Clarion* believed the Orchestra was a way for San Francisco to stand apart from other American cities. The orchestra was "conclusive proof of San Francisco's distinctiveness among American municipalities, when 10,000 persons, representing every walk of life, will attend and show their appreciation of really good music, played by a really good orchestra, at the nominal cost of 10 cents."[24] *The Bulletin* called the orchestra a "musical democratizer" for serving all citizens the best musical concerts.[25]

---

[23] *San Francisco Examiner*, 19 May 1917, 7.

[24] *Labor Clarion* (San Francisco), 2 March 1917, 10.

[25] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 10 April 1917, 8; *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 27 July 1917, 6.

Schiller created a monthly Municipal Orchestra schedule that all residents could appreciate. Each concert included popular songs, requested by previous audiences who filled out forms clipped from their concert programs. It also included more highbrow selections performed by notable professional musicians from the area. Music was thus chosen by Schiller, the audience, and performers and included German compositions. These German pieces did not generate negative reaction from the audience, the media, or the Board of Supervisors who oversaw the concerts. [26]

The Municipal Orchestra's 1917 season was considered a success and plans were underway for a second season in the Spring of 1918. However, in early 1918 the Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted a resolution that the city could employ no alien enemy in any capacity. They insisted that this was not personal, but a more precise reading of the city's charter that stated that municipal employees had to be citizens.[27] Evidently, the Board of Supervisors had ignored this part of the charter when hiring Schiller. When Supervisor Emmet Hayden made the rest of the Board aware of the discrepancy, everyone realized the necessity of working within the charter.

While the Board of Supervisors claimed that Schiller's firing was simply a matter of complying with the city charter, several articles in the *San Francisco Chronicle*

---

[26] San Francisco Municipal Orchestra Programs, 1917-1918, San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco.

[27] *Municipal Record* (San Francisco) 11 (25 April 1918), 129. For Board of Supervisors' discussion of Municipal Orchestra concerts prior to the firing of Schiller also see *Municipal Record* 10 and *Municipal Record* 11. The director of the San Francisco Symphony Orchestra, Alfred Hertz, was also from Germany, but had filed his final application for citizenship in February 1917. A court ordered that he be made a U.S. citizen in June 1917. *San Francisco Examiner*, 26 May 1917, 22; *San Francisco Call and Post*, 11 June 1917, 1.

suggested otherwise. In making the Board aware of the city charter's stipulation, Hayden – chair of the Supervisor's Auditorium Committee – sought to reduce the budget of the Municipal Orchestra. At the end of the first season, Supervisors had voted to double Schiller's salary. This reduced the municipal funds available for other musical performances Hayden believed were just as important as the Municipal Orchestra. The war demands on the city budget also prevented Hayden from getting an increase in funds for Civic Auditorium events. With Schiller gone, the Board of Supervisors decided to suspend the 1918 season of the Municipal Orchestra, citing the "conservation policy of the government." They argued that the city's other music opportunities, such as the Municipal Band and the privately-sponsored Symphony Orchestra would provide sufficient entertainment for residents.[28] Although Frederick Schiller lost his job due to his alien enemy status, it was not the result of pressure by San Franciscans that led to his dismissal. Just being labeled an alien enemy by the federal government was not enough to cause San Franciscans to reject what the city's immigrant populace had to contribute.

San Franciscans praised the work of Franz Schiller because he brought to the city a musical experience that accepted class differences. The Municipal Orchestra provided a wide array of music; everything from the recently released popular war tunes to the classical compositions more commonly performed by the highbrow Symphony Orchestra. Residents believed that all music could be socially beneficial, whether it was boosting

---

[28] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 23 April 1918, 1; *San Francisco Chronicle,* 24 April 1918, 5; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 25 April 1918, 9; Telegram from Nikolai Sokoloff to James Rolph Jr., 6 May 1918, James Rolph Jr. Papers, North Baker Library, California Historical Society; *Municipal Record* (San Francisco) 11 (25 April 1918), 129.

war morale or refining residents' cultural tastes. While Germany was the enemy, many San Franciscans defended German and Austrian-born performers and the culture they expressed because they believed in the music's uplifting qualities. In April 1917, renowned Austrian violinist Fritz Kreisler was touring California. Kreisler, a soldier in the Austrian army in 1914, was wounded on the Eastern Front and spent most of the war in America with his wife. The editor of the *Bulletin*, Fremont Older, encouraged San Franciscans to support Kreisler's tour because he was a shining example of the "friendly cosmopolitan phases of his countrymen's personality." While Fremont noted Kreisler was an alien enemy, he marveled at the power of his music to move "the hearts of humanity." He regarded Kreisler's gift to the people of San Francisco as far more significant than his nationality.[29] The people of San Francisco generally agreed with such sentiments and Kreisler's San Francisco concerts were well-attended.[30]

Singer Ernestine Schumann-Heink, who had one son fighting in the German navy and three serving in the U.S. Army, also received a warm reception in San Francisco. Despite being born in Austria, the San Francisco War Camp Community Service asked the celebrated contralto to headline a concert for the troops at Camp Fremont in June 1918. Surrounded by ten thousand singing soldiers, Schumann-Heink opened her part of the program with Bach's "My Heart Ever Faithful." The WCCS approved Schumann-

---

[29] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 7 April 1917, 6.

[30] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 9 April 1917, 5. Several private dinner concerts were cancelled due to a failure by Kreisler's wife, an American citizen, to stand during the "Star Spangled Banner." She was hospitalized for a nervous breakdown and no other programs were canceled. *San Francisco Examiner*, 17 April 1917, 3; *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 26 April 1917, 3; *Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly* (San Francisco), 5 May 1917, 14.

Heink's selections and did not believe there was anything disloyal about an Austrian singer opening with a well-loved German song. The song, according to music critic Walter Anthony, was the perfect selection to set the emotional tone of Schumann-Heink's set. The "Bachian simplicity and directness are singularly suited to an assurance which carries with it so much which should cause us deepest gratitude."[31] As was the case with Schiller, San Franciscans considered the musical attributes of Kreisler and Schumann-Heink to be more important than their ethnic origin. Each provided San Franciscans the highest quality experience from a world-renowned performer. That was far more important than the fact that their homeland was America's enemy.

The support for German-born musicians and the acceptance of music by German composers reflected the efforts of San Franciscans to differentiate between positive German attributes and German characteristics that had caused German aggression. Fremont Older expressed this sentiment the day President Wilson singed the war declaration. He encouraged all German-Americans to show their allegiance to the United States. However, he insisted that such loyalty did not "require them to give up the attempt to plant in American the nobler part of German civilization," built on the cultural achievements of "poets, novelists, musicians, philosophers, scientists and inventors" who had "helped to humanize and beautify the world." What America was fighting, Older argued, was the Germany of "agrarian, industrial and military autocracy." For Older, the venerable German qualities would serve as the foundation of a new Germany after the war. They should not, therefore, be destroyed along with what he described as the

---

[31] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 10 June 1918, 9.

savagery of Prussian militarism.[32]

Unlike other parts of the country, and even other communities in California, San Franciscans sought to define and preserve elements of German culture they considered noble. In May 1918, the State Board of Education authorized the barring of the German language in the state's high schools. Three weeks later, the state's high school principals' association voted to support the Board's resolution. However, in San Francisco there was a genuine desire to keep teaching German in the schools. The San Francisco Teacher's Association believed that only the night classes, taught by the German American Alliance (whose national leadership was under investigation by the Senate), should be cancelled. Those German language courses taught by the regular faculty must continue. They insisted that "yielding to prejudice and hysteria" would deny students the opportunity to learn a language that would "be a most helpful contribution toward the final overthrow of the military masters of Germany."[33] City teachers received support from the Civic League of Improvement, which argued that "the language itself was not dangerous" and had "distinct advantage when put to patriotic uses." Members of the Civic League, as they looked to San Francisco's economic future, believed German speakers would be crucial in developing business relations with postwar Germany. They argued that the only materials that should be excluded from the public schools were those that promoted German militarism and loyalty to the kaiser.[34] These arguments reflected the desire by

---

[32] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 6 April 1917, 6.

[33] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 21 May 1918, 9; *The Bulletin*, 14 April 1917, 7; *The Bulletin*, 24 April 1918, 5; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 24 April 1918, 5.

[34] *Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco* 4 (May 1918), 8.

many in San Francisco to divorce Germany's current government from its past cultural achievements and the future necessity of aiding Germany in implementing democracy. While not every resident of the city agreed with the Civic League or the Teacher's Association, the fact that two citywide organizations publicly refused to become intolerant of all things German denotes the relative security in which residents of German descent lived during the war. German books were not burned and musicians were not attacked for singing songs by German composers or speaking in the German tongue.

It is impossible to know how many San Franciscans opposed the continued use of the German language or made derogatory comments to their German neighbors about their ethnic background. A handful of letters to Mayor Rolph suggests that at least some individuals were suspicious of those whose last names sounded German. However, there is no evidence that they physically attacked those neighbors or threatened them in any other way. A few individuals with German surnames chose to change their names during the war, as did German associations and businesses. However, the reasons given for the changes did not indicate significant pressure from other San Franciscans. Irving Kaiser changed his name because he was going to be drafted and did not think a patriotic soldier in uniform should answer to the name Kaiser.[35] Joseph Jacob Rosenthal changed his name to Rosedale as a display of loyalty, but admitted that his German name had never hindered him from "being one hundred per cent American."[36]

---

[35] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 18 April 1918, 11.

[36] Joseph Rosedale to Simon Lubin, 15 July 1918, California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Immigration and Housing Records, 1912-1939, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

For each person who changed his or her name, many others saw no need to do so and did not feel pressured by neighbors to do any more than they were already doing for the war effort. Fred Boecken, superintendent of the Municipal Railway, told Mayor Rolph that it had never occurred to him that his last name "might be construed as German" and had not felt pressured to "advertise in any way" his contributions to the war effort.[37] Some businesses, like the German Savings and Loan and the German Hospital, omitted the word German from their names. They replaced the word with something that reflected their institution's commitment to the United States. [38] Executive officers may have undertaken the change to show support for the American cause, but both businesses were still firmly entrenched in the German community. Franklin Hospital received significant funding from German societies, while German-born directors still ran the San Francisco Savings and Loan and had German -born depositors. San Franciscans did not equate all things German as treasonable during the war, as some historians looking at the national trends toward German-Americans suggest.[39] They accepted the German heritage of residents as part of the cosmopolitan nature of their city.

Living in San Francisco also afforded protection to the city's largest ethnic group, the Italians. Because most Italians were recent immigrants, they faced scrutiny from state and federal authorities, partly the result of changes in California's political culture just as

---

[37]Frederick Boecken to James Rolph, 6 June 1918, James Rolph Jr. Papers, North Baker Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[38]*The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 17 May 1918, 5; *The Bulletin*, 15 May 1918, 9.

[39]Carl Wittke, *The German-Language Press in America* (University of Kentucky Press, 1957), 235.

America entered World War I. When Hiram Johnson, Sr. refused to give up his gubernatorial seat until the beginning of the Senate's emergency session in March 1917, he created a permanent rift between the state's Progressives and the new Republican governor, William D. Stephens. Stephens could be considered a nominal reformer and supporter of progressive ideals, but his desire to create a political machine independent of Hiram Johnson and northern California progressives led him to develop an increasingly conservative administration during the war. Stephens used the threat of radicals, particularly the I.W.W., to draw power away from northern California and the progressives whom he insisted had allowed anarchists to conduct activities for years.

This war on radicalism became an effective tool for anyone aspiring to state political office well into the 1920s.[40] The work of the state's Commission on Immigration and Housing is a case in point. Under Governor Stephens directives, the CIH spent the war targeting those whom they considered the most likely radicals – recent immigrants. When investigating these potential threats to national security in San Francisco, the CIH targeted the Italian communities because many were recent immigrant and because the large concentration of Italians in the ethnic enclave of North Beach suggested a lack of assimilation. The CIH determined that the best way to thwart radicalism in San Francisco and throughout the state was through Americanization programs and infiltration of radical organizations. However, San Francisco's Italian

---

[40] Howard A. DeWitt, *Images of Ethnic and Radical Violence in California Politics, 1917-1930: A Survey* (San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1975), 1-9; Diane M. T. North, "Civil Liberties and the Law: California during the First World War," in Louis Knafla and Susan Binnie, ed., *Law, Society and the State: Essays in Modern Legal History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 243-245, 252.

community resisted outside pressure to Americanize. They sought to adopt only those American attributes that they felt were essential to personal advancement and rejected efforts to eliminate their ethnic identity.

In June 1913, the people of California voted to create the Commission of Immigration and Housing. The progressive agenda of the CIH was to "make full inquiry, examination and investigation into the condition, welfare and industrial opportunities of all immigrants arriving and being within the state." CIH pursued this goal by developing opportunities for immigrant education, inspecting working and living conditions, and making sure that employers did not exploit immigrants by violating the state's labor laws.[41] Although not directly authorized in the CIH act, CIH agents infiltrated labor organizations like the A.F.L. and I.W.W. in order to understand the grievances of immigrant laborers better.[42] After the United States entered the war, the CIH feared that the conservative element in the state, who opposed the social work of the agency, might try to shut down the CIH under the guise of wartime efficiency. Ironically, in their attempts to defend the agency, CIH members abandoned much of their social work for the duration of the war. Instead, they emphasized their role in creating an Americanization program and reporting potential security threats to state and federal authorities.

The first part of the CIH's wartime strategy utilized its traditional role as student of the immigrant condition to launch a statewide Americanization program. The State

---

[41] Commission of Immigration and Housing, "Americanization," (Sacramento: California state Printing Office, 1919), Simon J. Lubin Correspondence, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[42] George Bell to President Woodrow Wilson, 26 July 1917, Simon J. Lubin Correspondence, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Council of Defense, led by Los Angeles businessman A. H. Naftzger, requested CIH help in explaining the war situation to the state's immigrant populace. The State Council of Defense wanted CIH to hire foreign speakers who could educate recent immigrants regarding their wartime responsibilities. The Council of Defense questioned the loyalty of people who had yet to assimilate into American culture and sought to provide educational opportunities that would create 100 percent Americans. In May 1917, CIH and San Francisco city attorney George L. Bell helped Mayor Rolph and the Board of Education launch a free night school that included English and citizenship classes.[43] Bell also worked with San Francisco's "Literary Exercises" Committee, a subcommittee of the Federation of Women's Clubs, that organized women volunteers willing to teach Americanization classes in their neighborhoods.[44] Rather than emphasizing its progressive mandate to provide oversight of immigrant living and working conditions, the classes illustrated the reinvention of the CIH as a commission formed to "bring about a more rapid assimilation and Americanization of foreign-born people within the State."[45] During the war the information they gathered had little to do with how immigrants lived. Instead, they focused on how best to make them loyal American citizens.

During the war, CIH's agents imbedded in the state's labor unions became an

---

[43] George L. Bell to Mrs. F. A. Gibson, 11 May 1917, California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Immigration and Housing records, 1912-1939, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[44] Mrs. Frank A. Gibson to George L. Bell , 15 June 1917, and George L. Bell to Mrs. Frank A. Gibson, 18 June 1917, California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Immigration and Housing records, 1912-1939, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[45] Frontage page of Patriotic Songbook, January/March 1918, California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Immigration and Housing records, 1912-1939, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

important source of information regarding radical activity in the state. The CIH employed J. Vance Thompson, chairman of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, to infiltrate the I.W.W. in the Bay Area. At the beginning of the war, Thompson found few dues-paying members of the I.W.W. in San Francisco. However, he believed that the radical union had the "ability to grasp opportunities to spread." Thompson believed the Italians in North Beach were most susceptible to I.W.W. propaganda for two reasons. First, Thompson noted that since 1910, the number of Southern Italians in San Francisco had risen significantly. North Beach leaders, most of them from Northern Italy, perpetuated a stereotype of Southern Italians as having a lower intelligence, less formal education, and less financial resources. Thompson accepted this stereotype when he expressed concern that fishing captains and canneries were unknowingly hiring German and Austrian aliens, posing as Scandinavian immigrants, who could easily manipulate the feeble minds of Italian fishermen and cannery hands. He believed that subversives had encouraged Italians to abandon fishing vessels the day before a ship was set to sail, leaving the ship without a full crew and delaying by weeks the sailing of the fleet. By delaying when ships sailed, these ignorant Italians reduced the nation's food supply and severely undermined the nation's economic security. Thompson also feared that anarchists had begun to infiltrate the canning factories of the Bay. He believed such activities would eventually result in attacks on vital war-related industries by Italians too gullible to understand the consequences of their actions.[46]

---

[46]J. Vance Thompson to George Bell, 26 March 1917; J. Vance Thompson to unknown member of CIH, 6 July 1917, Simon Julius Lubin Correspondence and papers, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; Macaela di Leonardo, *The Varieties of Ethnic Experience: Kinship, Class, and*

The second reason Thompson considered the Italian community the most likely target of I.W.W. recruitment was their acceptance of jobs that prevented them from living in the city year round. Agricultural workers and sailors frequently spent their off season in San Francisco, but their impermanence thwarted the San Francisco Labor Council's attempts to unionize these laborers.[47] This lack of organization indicated a lack of permanent ties to the city or their labor, both of which concerned Thompson and others during the war. Thompson paid close attention to the general movement of transients in the Bay Area, reporting to CIH officials any time he noted a "jungling up" of such workers. Thompson believed such enclaves, whether rural or urban, were safe places for Wobblies and other radicals to hide, blending seamlessly into the transient populace. Thompson considered these radicals to be far more dangerous than members of the I.W.W., who publicly professed their loyalties by attending meetings at local headquarters across the state. For Thompson and those who read and responded to his reports, the unknown identities and intentions of migratory workers required constant surveillance. Thompson helped to intensify fears of immigrants among the transients by claiming many were really Austrian and German spies who ran their covert operations so far underground that their names and identities were unknown, even to those who did their

---

Gender among California Italian-Americans (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), 19; Deanna Paoli Gumina, *The Italians of San Francisco, 1850-1930* (New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1978), 133-137; Dino Cinel, *From Italy to San Francisco: The Immigrant Experience* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983), 116.

[47] Hyman Weintraub, "The I.W.W. in California, 1905-1931," (M.A. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1947), 63-66.

bidding.[48]

Under the auspices of the Espionage Act, state and federal authorities raided I.W.W. headquarters across the country on September 5, 1917. Federal marshals collected evidence in the two I.W.W. offices in San Francisco – the headquarters on Third Street and the Latin Branch on Stockton Street. Other raids took place in Oakland, Sacramento, Stockton, and Fresno. They sent materials taken from the offices to Chicago to aid the Federal Grand Jury's investigation into the national headquarters, which was closed with the arrest of 125 individuals.[49] While no arrests occurred in San Francisco on September 5, another raid of the Latin Branch the following day led to fives arrests. The head of the Latin Branch, Louis Parenti, was one of those arrested. J. Vance Thompson had already reported that Parenti was a leading I.W.W. agitator in the Bay Area, organizing Italians in both San Francisco and Oakland.[50]

Parenti and four others in San Francisco were among ten men extradited from California to Chicago to stand trial in December 1917. In supporting this extradition, U.S. Commissioner Francis Krull argued that there was no reason to keep the ten men in the state because "these men were not really residents of California."[51] In Parenti's case, there was no evidence that he had ever made any steps toward American citizenship.

---

[48] J. Vance Thompson to George L. Bell, 25 February 1917; J. Vance Thompson to unknown member of CIH, 6 July 1917; J. Vance Thompson report to CIH, 15 May 1918, Simon Julius Lubin Correspondence and papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[49] DeWitt, *Images of Ethnic and Radical Violence in California Politics*, 18.

[50] J. Vance Thompson to unknown member of CIH, 7 August 1917, Simon Julius Lubin Correspondence and papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[51] Weintraub, "The I.W.W. in California, 1905-1931,"138-141; *New York Times*, 16 December 1917, 6.

Krull used this lack of commitment to the United States as evidence of disloyalty. While Parenti was the only one from the Latin Branch sent to Chicago to stand trial, San Francisco newspapers noted that the other Italians arrested in the raids were dangerous because they too refused to become American citizens.[52] Before the war, many Italians had considered their American residency as temporary, hoping to make enough money to live a better life in Italy. Between 1908 and 1923 60 percent of Italians in the United States returned to Italy.[53] Therefore, many Italians living in San Francisco made no effort to become naturalized citizens. However, during the war this lack of permanency, and lack of American citizenship, added to concerns about Italian loyalty and their ties to radical groups.

Governor Stephen's blamed the December 1917 bombing of the governor's mansion in Sacramento on the Wobblies. Two months later a federal grand jury in Sacramento indicted fifty-three members for violation of the Espionage Act. With these indictments, the state and federal government believed that they had arrested the leadership of the state's Wobblies.[54] Law enforcement personnel continued to undermine the I.W.W. by arresting individuals for passing out handbills without a permit or on charges of vagrancy. They also joined with the Department of Justice in persistent raids on local headquarters. By Spring 1918, Thompson conceded that such efforts had driven many "wise wobs" and "footloose rebs" underground or to new "haunts," where their

---

[52] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 13 June 1918, 6.

[53] Cinel, *From Italy to San Francisco*, 2.

[54] DeWitt, *Images of Ethnic and Radical Violence in California Politics*, 21-33; Weintraub, "The I.W.W. in California, 1905-1931,"142-151.

activities might go unnoticed. The intense scrutiny by law enforcement prevented unity and Thompson perceived no impending plots. Instead, what he observed were individuals gathering in "Bohemian" groups to discuss their "'ists and 'isms."[55] Thompson spent most of 1918 following the activities of migrant workers in Stockton, San Jose, and the East Bay, "with their large Socialist populations, and pro-German elements."[56] Thompson did not believe the radicals had been purged from San Francisco, but the city was not a haven for radicals with plots to overthrow the government. This lack of imminent danger, along with a poorly organized Americanization plan, allowed Italians in San Francisco to define assimilation for themselves.

Part of this freedom to pick and choose what elements of American culture to adopt resulted in the CIH's failure to implement a unified Americanization plan. In San Francisco, George Bell struggled with a committee – consisting of educators, labor representatives, and businessmen – that wanted to form an independent San Francisco City and County Committee on Americanization. Bell urged the committee to adopt the CIH's Americanization plan, which allowed CIH to appoint county directors they felt most qualified to handle the job.[57] However, the committee did not readily accept Bell's

---

[55]Suggestions by J. Vance Thompson, 23 May 1918, Simon Julius Lubin Correspondence and papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. Thompson did not attack mainstream labor unions, like the San Francisco Building Trades, at any time during the war. While Thompson knew there were some radicals hiding within these labor organizations, he did not condemn the actions of these unions and there is no evidence that he investigated them for subversive activity during the war.

[56]Supplemental by J. Vance Thompson, 15 May 1918, Simon Julius Lubin Correspondence and papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[57]George L. Bell to Simon J. Lubin, May 17 1918, California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Immigration and Housing records, 1912-1939, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

insistence, and soon afterwards Bell accepted a position with the National Labor Board in Washington, D.C. With Bell gone, the CIH's Americanization program in San Francisco languished. The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce tried to assume control of the city's Americanization efforts, but it was no more successful in getting the various urban associations to accept a comprehensive directive. The CIH did eventually unveil a statewide Americanization plan – after the war ended.[58] This lack of organization and centralized direction allowed immigrant groups like the Italians in San Francisco to develop their own brand of Americanization; one that allowed them to choose the elements of American political and social culture they believed best suited their Italian traditions.

Despite fears that San Francisco Italians might succumb to the radical ideologies of transients in their midst, the ethnic enclave remained relatively impervious to attacks on their loyalty. The community's leaders, the *prominenti*, had arrived in San Francisco before the swell of Italian immigrants after 1900. Many established manufacturing firms in and around the North Beach district had hired recent arrivals from their homeland. The *prominenti* maintained their leadership in North Beach by dispersing the least skilled and most transient Italians to agricultural areas outside the city and preventing their own workers from unionizing. While the *prominenti*'s power in North Beach did not abate with the war, their workers wrestled some control away from them. During the war, each

[58]Frank J. Cunningham to Mrs. F. A. Gibson, 5 October 1918; Frank J. Cunningham to Simon J. Lubin, 8 October 1918; Frank J. Cunningham to Simon Lubin, 14 October 1918; Frank J. Cunningham to Mrs. F. A. Gibson, 27 November 1918, California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Immigration and Housing records, 1912-1939, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

side in the labor struggle crafted a public image of respectability and enhanced loyalty to their adopted nation as ways to protect the entire community. Laborers fought to unionize, working to establish respectability among the city's strong labor unions by rejecting the stereotype of themselves as radicals and transients. *Prominenti* displayed loyalty to the United States through their financial sacrifices while expressing the vitality of their Italian traditions. These images of the Italians as loyal residents of America protected the Italian majority and allowed them to maintain their Italian heritage without the anti-immigrant hysteria and repercussions that existed elsewhere.[59]

One area in which San Francisco Italians separated themselves from the specter of radicalism was in the food canning industry. In July 1917, cannery workers in San Jose and San Francisco established the first cannery workers' union through the A.F.L. affiliate, Toilers of the World. The new union then voted to strike, demanding an increase in pay, an eight-hour workday, and safer working conditions. The California Fruit Canners Association, led by Italian-born Marco Fontana, attacked the workers as radical foreigners. In a telegram to President Wilson, Fontana insisted that this was not a strike over wages, but a "conspiracy to stop fruit and vegetable packing resulting in destruction to large quantities of food products absolutely necessary for use of our Army and Navy our Allies and the country at large."[60] J. Vance Thompson reported to the CIH

---

[59]For more on the development of the Italian colonia in San Francisco also see Deanna M. Paoli, "La Colonia Italiana Di San Francisco = The Italian Colony of San Francisco, 1850 to 1930," (M. A. Thesis, University of San Francisco, 1970) and Paul Radin, *The Italians of San Francisco: Their Adjustment and Acculturation* (San Francisco: California State Emergency Relief Administration, 1935).

[60]Telegram from C. L. Tilden to Simon J. Lubin, 26 July 1917, Simon Julius Lubin papers and correspondence, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

that the more efficient Chinese and Italian cannery hands were being scared off and replaced by Germans and Austrians who had instigated the strike.[61] Many of the five thousand striking workers were immigrants, but there is no evidence to support Thompson's claim that alien enemies or radicals instigated the strike. The Italian cannery workers vehemently rejected the accusation that syndicalist rage fueled their motives. They had originally formed the Toilers of the World for agricultural workers who wanted to distance themselves from the Agricultural Workers' Industrial Union, which was part of the I.W.W.[62] By joining the A.F.L., the Toilers clearly aligned with more moderate union ideals, as espoused by A.F.L. founder Samuel Gompers.

In their attempt to win respectability, the striking cannery workers used their affiliation with a patriotic union, and their long-term residency in the Bay Area. One Italian worker in San Jose, flanked by his wife and eight children, reported to journalist Fred Williams that he and most of the cannery workers had lived in the valley for upwards of twenty years and had no connections to radicals or German spies. They were law-abiding residents whose loyalty lay with their adopted country. Just like the United Railroad carmen in San Francisco who went on strike in August 1917, they were suffering from the effects of wartime inflation (see Chapter Five). Most had never been on strike before and were shocked when the Canners' Association branded them as I.W.W. traitors and threatened to hire private guards to drive the strikers out of town.

---

[61] J. Vance Thompson to unknown member of CIH, 6 July 1917, Simon Julius Lubin Correspondence and papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[62] Greg Hall, *Harvest Wobblies: The Industrial Workers of the World and Agricultural Laborers in the American West, 1905-1930* (Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Press, 2001), 124-125; Weintraub, "The I.W.W. in California, 1905-1931," 90-92.

The newly organized cannery union challenged the power of the Canners' Association by portraying itself as an organization of devoted residents. They were not the stereotypical transient laborers that Fontana claimed were thwarting the patriotic endeavors of the cannery owners. "Drive us out of town?, " the man with eight kids said. "Why, man this is our home."[63]

Although their strike threatened to hamper the nation's ability to feed its troops, the actions of the Italian canners proved to the public that their cause was a respectable one. Union workers showed solidarity by traveling from San Francisco to San Jose where they peacefully rallied. Their speeches and demands showed a lack of radical discourse, focusing instead on basic labor demands. The inclusion of women at the rally in San Jose, and the women's interviews with arbitrators, lent respectability to the union and the strike. In expressing their demands, the women stressed the improprieties of their male supervisors and the cruel treatment they received. They described the cannery supervisors as "vile and insulting" and heartless men who forced them to label boiling hot jars with their bare hands. Such descriptions drew public support for the strike and prevented residents from considering the strike an attempt by radicals to disrupt America's war effort. The need to get canned food to the Allied soldiers prevented a prolonged battle in the canneries. The council of arbitrators secured a wage increase for all cannery workers and the California Industrial Welfare Commission promised to resolve the women's complaints regarding working conditions. The Canners'

---

[63] *Organized Labor* (San Francisco), 28 July 1917, 1; Paola A. Sensi-Isolani, "Italian Radicals and Union Activists in San Francisco, 1900-1920," in Philip V. Cannistraro and Gerald Meyer, ed., *The Lost World of Italian American Radicalism: Politics, Labor, and Culture* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2003), 199.

Association also agreed to take back all striking workers.[64] Italian cannery workers won their demands by proving that their cause was valid and by deflecting attacks aimed at labeling them disloyal. Many San Franciscans regarded them as respectable union members and permanent residents of the urban metropolis.

Italians also had the opportunity during the war to celebrate publicly their heritage without fear of attack for appearing less than 100 percent American. Since Italy was an American ally, Italians could show patriotism for America by promoting the glories of Italy. Their patriotic efforts suggest that there were elements of American culture that they were willing to adapt, but they controlled the level of their assimilation. The Vittoria Colonna Club, an exclusively married Italian women's organization, knitted and sewed for the Red Cross. It also sponsored cooking demonstrations that taught Italian women about food conservation and canning. At the same time, these women did not Americanize their meals for the sake of the war effort as was encouraged by the Food Administration. Instead, they learned to prepare wheatless pastas and polenta dishes and adapted other conservation practices to their traditional Italian cooking.[65] In both 1917 and 1918 citywide celebrations marked the anniversary of Italy's entrance into the war. Italians incorporated into these fetes plenty of patriotic songs and speeches made in English by non-Italians and Italians alike. However, the crowning achievement of these events, for Italians and other San Francisco patrons, was the inclusion of Operatic acts

---

[64] *The Daily News* (San Francisco), 7 August 1917, 2.

[65] City Federation of Women's Clubs, *Yearbook, 1916-1918*, vol. 1 (San Francisco, 1918), 82; Linda L. Ambrosini, "The San Francisco Civic League and the Redefintion of Women's Role, 1911-1921," (M. A. Thesis, California State University, Hayward, 1980), 94-95.

performed by the San Francisco Grand Opera Company. Louise Taber considered the opera company to be a significant venture for all San Franciscans. It was a "popular-priced" opera house, filled with professional artists that provided the city with high caliber performances.[66]

As with the German-Americans in San Francisco, the cultural offerings of the Italian community were supported because they were considered important to the city's cosmopolitan identity. Despite the war, foreign traditions added social flavor and had the ability to refine the tastes of those who cared to listen or participate. For Italian residents, the war provided an opportunity to promote their heritage as part of the larger patriotic exercise. They did not define their celebrations as purely American or entirely Italian but as a melding of the best both cultures had to offer. Such efforts before and during the war sought to unite San Francisco's Italians in a common cause: a better, and permanent, life for Italians in America. What they wanted was not a wholly American experience but a more "grandiose Italian life" in San Francisco.[67] Despite anti-immigrant rhetoric from Governor Stephens and attempts to label Italians as saboteurs and radicals, the Italians of San Francisco maintained their *colonia*. Through their patriotic displays and their insistence that their residents were permanent, they claimed to be a part of San Francisco's loyal constituency.

The Irish in San Francisco faced a unique situation during the Great War. Ireland, as part of Great Britain, was an American ally and as such Irish-Americans did not face

---

[66] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 7 November 1918, 18; *The Bulletin*, 21 May 1918, 5; *The Wasp: A Weekly Journal of Illustration and Comment* (Berkeley), 25 May 1918.

[67] Gumina, *The Italians of San Francisco*, x.

the regulations imposed on German citizens. However, the 1916 Easter Uprising in Ireland forced Americans of Irish decent into a precarious position. In supporting their homeland's quest for independence, they directly challenged America's strongest ally in the war. Unlike the Italians, the Irish in San Francisco were strongly entrenched in positions of urban leadership that protected them from serious questions regarding their loyalty to America. Irish San Franciscans could interlock their goals of an independent Ireland with America's wartime patriotism, giving them the ability to criticize the British government and still be American patriots. President Wilson's vision of the Great War as a battle for global democracy gave credence to their cause of Irish independence and gave them the confidence to challenge those who suggested anything other than complete sovereignty. However, the prosecution of a small number of San Francisco's Irish residents illustrates the repercussions for individuals who refused to ally the cause of Ireland with that of the United States.

While the Italians of San Francisco were mostly recent emigrants, the city's Irish population had contributed to the urban ethnic make-up from the very beginning. In 1880 one-third of San Francisco's populace was Irish.[68] In comparison to eastern cities, frontier dynamics allowed these first generation Irish San Franciscans to easily establish leadership positions in politics, unions, religion, and law. By the time World War I began, Irish-Americans were employed in every municipal government department. They made up most of the city's police officers and municipal office workers. A number of the

---

[68]Charles Wollenberg, *Golden Gate Metropolis: Perspectives on Bay Area History* (Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1985), 142.

city's Supervisors, most notably Andrew Gallagher, came from Ireland or had Irish parents. Gallagher also served in the leadership of the Labor Council, which fellow Irishman John O'Connell presided over. In the city's Catholic Archdiocese, Father Peter C. Yorke consistently championed labor's cause and sovereignty for his homeland.[69] Yorke and many San Franciscans of Irish descent used their leadership positions to rally their fellow compatriots – both Irish and American – to support the independence of Ireland. They believed the freedom of Ireland to be intrinsically linked to the American fight for democracy. In pressing this cause, they frequently found themselves espousing ideas that others considered bordering on treason. However, with so many residents of Irish descent and so many San Francisco Irish in positions of economic and political power, attacks on their loyalty died out as quickly as they appeared.

In the year after the 1916 Easter Week Uprising, Irish residents rallied to support Ireland's independence. Attorney Daniel O'Connell, through the American Independence Union of California, encouraged San Franciscans to raise money for the families of those arrested during the rebellion. Five thousand attended one rally, adopting a resolution urging President Wilson to condemn British attempts to quash the rebellion. At the same meeting, Father Yorke handed out membership forms for a new national organization, Friends of Irish Freedom.[70] During a mass at St. Patrick, Father Barrett prayed for the

---

[69] Roger W. Lotchin, "John Francisc Neylan: San Francisco Irish Progressive," in James P. Walsh, ed., *The San Francisco Irish: 1850-1976*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: The Irish Literary and Historical Society, 1979), 90; Moses Rischin, "The Classic Ethnics," in Walsh, ed., *The San Francisco Irish*, 5-6; Michael Kazin, *Barons of Labor: The San Francisco Building Trades and Union Power in the Progressive Era* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 22.

[70] *San Francisco Call and Post*, 1 May 1916, 1; *San Francisco Call and Post*, 9 May 1916, 3.

uprising's martyrs, whose "death is an act of glorious reparation which will wipe out the crimson stain left by those Irishmen who betrayed their motherland by fighting for England."[71] Though it is unknown how many parishioners rejected Barrett's assessment of Irish volunteers as traitors to their homeland, his willingness to make such a public expression reflected that San Francisco's Irish residents were not afraid to mark Great Britain as their enemy. Their opposition to British rule led many to hope for a German victory. They believed that was the quickest way to undermine Great Britain's power and give Ireland the chance to win independence. Men like Daniel O'Connell supported German aid for the Irish rebellion and several Irish citizens were part of the greater German-Hindu conspiracy that led to the indictments of ninety-eight individuals in late 1916.[72] Once America entered the war, a noticeable fissure developed among the city's supporters of Irish independence. On one side were people like O'Connell, who saw America's participation in the war as a hindrance to the cause of independence. On the other were people like Father Peter Yorke, who came to see America's entrance as an opportunity to expedite the cause of Irish freedom.

The United States declared war shortly before the first anniversary of the Easter Rising. San Francisco's Irish societies used both momentous occasions to make the case for Irish independence again. Father Yorke, local president of the Friends of Irish Freedom (FOIF), organized an April 26 rally to fuse Wilson's vision of postwar peace

---

[71] *San Francisco Call and Post*, 9 May 1916, 5. At this time the British did not conscript the Irish, fearing it would cause further unrest in Ireland.

[72] For the Irish connection to the German-Hindu plot see Matthew Erin Plowman, "The Anglo-Irish Factors in the Indo-German Conspiracy in San Francisco During WWI, 1913-1921," (Ph.D. diss., University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1999).

with that of Irish sovereignty. Wilson's address to Congress included a call for self determination, which Yorke and others believed would be applied to Ireland after the war. Unlike Father Barrett, members of the FOIF believed the Irish had to fight side by side with the British in this war if they wanted to earn independence. For Irish-Americans, they should see the war as an opportunity to express their "undivided loyalty" to America and convey to President Wilson the necessity of sovereignty, not Home Rule for Ireland.[73]

President Wilson did pressure the British government to resolve the "Irish question," leading Parliament in late 1917 to organize an Irish Convention to discuss the future of Ireland.[74] The FOIF believed it was doing its patriotic duty when it sent a resolution to President Wilson explaining that the Convention was unsatisfactory. In their telegram, the FOIF described the Irish Convention as "flagrantly unrepresentative of the people of Ireland." They believed it might lead to Home Rule for Ireland, which they considered unacceptable. They reiterated the president's own creed of self-determination, arguing that Ireland had just as much right to "absolute freedom from foreign rule" as Poland.[75] For members of the FOIF and other Irish societies in San Francisco, attacking the actions of the British was in no way disloyal to the United States. The FOIF's discourse with Wilson was unapologetic. They considered their anti-British stance to be an expression of support for Wilson's democratic ideals.

Not everyone in San Francisco agreed with FOIF's quest for Irish independence

---

[73] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 27 April 1917, 4; *San Francisco Examiner*, 27 April 1917, 8.

[74] F. M. Carroll, *American Opinion and the Irish Question, 1912-23: A study in opinion and policy* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978), 99.

[75] *The Bulletin*, 23 January 1918, 2.

and challenged the organization's definition of loyalty to America. U.S. Attorney John Preston was the first to question the loyalty of Irish-Americans in the summer of 1917. He claimed to have received an anonymous letter outlining treasonous behavior by Irish Americans and turned it over to several local papers. The letter claimed those Catholic priests serving with the armed forces had sent military secrets to the Germans and that the Irish population of America could not be trusted. Preston believed this information was proof that the federal government needed to monitor the Irish, like German-Americans, and curb their organized activities.[76]

Preston's anti-Irish position was shaped by his investigations surrounding the German-Hindu plot. Lawrence de Lacey, an Irish citizen and editor of the local newspaper, *The Leader*, had been indicted along with ninety-two others in the German-Hindu conspiracy. Due to a lack of evidence, Preston knew he could not try De Lacey with Counsel General Bopp and the other major conspirators. According to British informants who had infiltrated Irish organizations in the city, De Lacey bragged that he would escape prosecution. He also claimed he planned to help Franz Bopp and E. H. Von Schack escape to Mexico.[77] With this information, Preston indicted De Lacey in early September 1917 for planning to help the Germans interred at Angel Island escape. De Lacey, in an attempt to use Preston's attack on the Irish community to his advantage, testified that the charges were Preston's way of exacting revenge on the Irish societies of

---

[76] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 9 July 1917, 5; Carroll, *American Opinion and the Irish Question*, 103.

[77] Matthew Erin Plowman, "Irish Republicans and the Indo-German Conspiracy of World War I," *New Hibernia Review* 7 (Autumn, 2003): 91-98.

San Francisco who challenged the validity of Preston's anonymous letter.[78] However, this defense did not sway jurors. Judge William Van Fleet sentenced De Lacey to eighteen months at McNeil Island Penitentiary in Washington State. While De Lacey's conviction may have given Preston proof of Irish disloyalty, Van Fleet quashed any public attempts to hold De Lacey up as representative of San Francisco's Irish community. In his instructions before deliberations, Van Fleet made it clear to jurors that ethnicity should not play a factor in the jury's decision: "Neither a man's parentage, blood, religion nor affiliations have anything to do with the offense charged in this case." Van Fleet reiterated his point during sentencing, declaring that the vast majority of the city's Irish-Americans would have intervened to prevent De Lacey's actions had he told any of them what he planned.[79]

Several days after De Lacey's trial, Preston began prosecuting attorney Daniel O'Connell and several others for obstructing the draft. O'Connell, a strong supporter of Irish independence, also had connections to the Hindu-German conspiracy. He had raised money from German-Americans to pay for the publication of the *American Independent*, a magazine dedicated to Irish independence through German victory in the war.[80] On August 7, 1917, he claimed conscientious objector status. The next day he was arrested at a meeting of the People's Council of America in San Francisco. Led by former Stanford president Dr. Starr Jordan, the organization did not oppose the war but wanted

---

[78] *The Daily News* (San Francisco) , 5 September 1917, 1; *The Daily News*, 7 September 1917, 1.

[79] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 9 September 1917, 1; *The Sacramento Bee*, 10 September 1917, 3; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 16 September 1917, 1.

[80] Plowman, "Irish Republicans and the Indo-German Conspiracy of World War I," 88.

to make sure the Wilson administration kept the spread of democracy at the forefront of wartime policy decisions. O'Connell, like many Irish San Franciscans, saw such groups as helpful to the cause of Ireland. Also in attendance at the meeting was former senator John D. Works. He called O'Connell's arrest a "disgrace to the American people and is done for the purpose of intimidating thinking people."[81]

However, O'Connell was not arrested for his support of democracy in America and Ireland. His arrest occurred because he also denied that either Great Britain or the United States had the right to conscript men into service. He was a founding member of the American Patriots, an organization that challenged the constitutionality of the Selective Service Act. O'Connell and the American Patriots' view on conscription went far beyond the acceptable parameters of the People's Council, which believed men had to fight to promote democracy. As a result, O'Connell received no support from the People's Council during his trial for obstructing the draft. O'Connell and four other members of the American Patriots were tried for violating the Selective Service Act tin late September 1917. O'Connell served as the attorney for himself and the others. His defense hinged on his argument that the American Patriots were not an unpatriotic group. He insisted that only true patriots would sacrifice their freedom for their belief that an act of Congress defied the U.S. Constitution.[82]

A jury did not find O'Connell's argument compelling. The jury convicted all five men of obstructing the Selective Service Act and also found O'Connell guilty under the

---

[81] *The New York Times*, 9 August 1917, 2.

[82] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 21 September 1917, 9.

Espionage Act. In sentencing O'Connell, Judge Van Fleet did not address O'Connell's ethnicity. He called him a traitor and revoked his right to practice law in Federal District Court.[83] While Van Fleet had defended the city's Irish during the De Lacey case, he saw no need to deny O'Connell's connections to the city's Irish-Americans. De Lacey, in aiding the Germans, acted on a general sentiment that many Irish had held before the U.S. entered the war – the belief that a German victory would aid the Irish cause. Van Fleet considered O'Connell's conscription views as radical enough that no one would confuse O'Connell's sentiments with those of the majority in the city who supported Irish independence.

Preston's attacks on the loyalty of San Francisco Irish, and the trials of De Lacey and O'Connell, did not cause Irish societies to apologize for their previous utterances or retreat from public discussion of their views on Irish freedom. Instead, the Irish retaliated against Preston and others who questioned Irish character and patriotic service. Various Irish associations vehemently protested the allegations found in District Attorney Preston's letter and attacked Preston personally. The Ancient Order of Hibernians took time out of their Fourth of July celebration to compose a telegram to President Wilson. In it, they charged Preston with a "sinister attempt to hamper the interests of America" by creating doubts about Irish-American loyalty when none really existed.[84] The Ulster-Celtic Benevolent Association's chairman intimated that Preston wrote the letter himself

---

[83] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 30 September 1917, 1. The San Francisco jury's decision in O'Connell's case was later upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. See *O'Connell v. U.S.*, 253 U.S. 142 (1920).

[84] *San Francisco Chronicle*, 5 July 1917, 4.

to stir up anti-Irish sentiment for his real employer, the English aristocracy.[85] These two organizations, along with the FOIF and others, immediately sent telegrams to Congressmen and Senators, demanding federal authorities look into the matter. They insisted that at the very least Preston's superiors should reprimand him for his actions.

The political influence of San Francisco's Irish community resulted in a rapid-fire succession of responses from Attorney General T. W. Gregory, Congressman Julius Khan, and Senator James Phelan. Each assured the Irish societies that the matter was under investigation.[86] D.A. Preston apologized for his hasty decision to have the letter published and did nothing else to hamper Irish societies' public activities. When Preston's term expired a year later, Attorney General Gregory did not renew it, as had been the case since 1913. Instead, he offered Preston another position in the Justice Department, overseeing the investigations of enemy aliens in the Far West. On July 25, 1918, the Justice Department promoted Assistant District Attorney Annette Abbott Adams, who had worked in the prosecution of Bopp and the Hindu-German conspiracy, to replace Preston.[87] Preston's apology and eventual removal from the Northern California District vindicated the Irish-American community. Preston had been unable to convince others that the Irish were a threat to the nation and his unsuccessful attempt encouraged them to continue professing their desires for Irish independence. They considered themselves the "highest type" of citizens and rejected any assertion that they

---

[85] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 17 July 1917, 10.

[86] *The Bulletin*, 9 July 1917, 5; *The Bulletin*, 20 July 1917, 20.

[87] Mrs. Adams became the first female United States District Attorney. Joan M. Jensen, "Annette Abbott Adams, Politician," *The Pacific Historical Review* 35 (May 1966): 189-193.

could not be loyal to America while exercising their support for a free Ireland.

Another vocal opponent of San Francisco's Irish population was the son of Irish immigrants, attorney Garret McEnerney. In April 1918 T.P. O'Connor, member of Ireland's Nationalist Party and a member of Parliament, came to San Francisco to promote his party's vision of Irish Home Rule. During a reception for O'Connor, McEnerney expressed his distaste for the FOIF and any other Irish society in San Francisco that attacked Great Britain's efforts to resolve the Irish question. McEnerney believed that the Irish independence movement, led by the Sinn Fein organization, was pro-German and therefore anti-American. He believed that anyone who expressed anti-British sentiments was a traitor and should be arrested for violating the Sedition Act.[88] Unlike members of the FOIF and other Irish societies that considered loyalty to the United States as distinct from loyalty to the nation's allies, McEnerney considered anything that might demoralize the Allied war effort to be treasonous. McEnerney, like Preston, sought to force public discourse on whether residents of Irish descent were 100 percent American. Both men believed that any expression of support for Irish independence challenged such assertions.

McEnerney's statements against the Irish in San Francisco led to a passionate response by Father Peter Yorke. In his fifty-page pamphlet, *America and Ireland*, Yorke not only rebuked McEnerney, but, more importantly provided an extensive rationalization for Irish-Americans who wanted to support both Ireland and America. First, Yorke

---

[88] John Riordan, "Garret McEnerney and the Pursuit of Success," in James P. Walsh, ed., *The San Francisco Irish: 1850-1976*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: The Irish Literary and Historical Society, 1979), 73-82.

chastised McEnerney for attending a reception for O'Connor. As a member of the Nationalist Party, O'Connor represented what Yorke considered a small minority in Ireland, those who wanted Home Rule rather than sovereignty. For Yorke, such concessions to the British made McEnerney a traitor to his parents' homeland and did nothing to aid America in winning the war. Yorke argued that the creation of a sovereign Ireland would strengthen the Allies by allowing the British to move their soldiers stationed in Ireland to the front lines. While he wished the British would grant Ireland independence sooner rather than later, he recognized that it might not be possible to complete this until after the war. Therefore, by supporting the United States' efforts to win the war, Irish in America could help shorten British rule in Ireland. For Yorke, there was no division of loyalty for Irish-Americans. The United States was fighting a war for democracy and Ireland would be one of those democracies.[89]

The United Irish Societies, consisting of sixty-four San Francisco Irish organizations, strongly supported Yorke's viewpoint and rejected McEnerney, who they insisted did not speak for the Irish of San Francisco. The condemnation by the Irish societies significantly diminished McEnerney's standing within his own ethnic subculture.[90] For Yorke and the United Irish Societies, the threat of being branded disloyal did not prevent them from publicly expressing their support for Irish independence, even if it meant disputing the actions of the British. The political,

---

[89]Peter C. Yorke, *America and Ireland: An Open Letter to Mr. Garret W. McEnerney by Rev. P. C. Yorke, D.D.* (San Francisco: Text Book Publishing Co., 1918).

[90]*San Francisco Chronicle*, 8 April 1918, 3; John Riordan, "Garret McEnerney and the Pursuit of Success," in James P. Walsh, ed., *The San Francisco Irish: 1850-1976*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: The Irish Literary and Historical Society, 1979), 82.

economic and social connections afforded the Irish in San Francisco a level of protection from challenges to their loyalty. Their desire for a free Ireland as part of America's patriotic vision of a democratic world also provided them with a powerful ideological weapon they could use against those who assailed their heritage.

As a city of immigrants, San Franciscans took pride in cultural diversity and showed support of German, Italian, and Irish residents who conveyed a passion for their European heritage. However, they did expect those individuals to show respect for their adopted country. The war generated a more intense feeling of patriotism that made all foreign-born residents of San Francisco targets of suspicion, but this suspicion did not lead to mob violence or physical retaliation. Residents of the city were more aware of the actions and utterances of their foreign-born neighbors, and might report their suspicions to local law enforcement officials. All three of the largest immigrant groups became targets of suspicion as anyone could behave in a way that undermined the war effort. German citizens were legally bound to a nation that was at war with America, leading to restrictions under the Alien Enemy Act. Italians were under suspicion because they were among the most recent immigrant arrivals, and therefore, the least assimilated. At the same time, their concentration in low-paying factory work led some to see them as potential radicals linked to the Wobblies. Irish activities were not interpreted as a significant threat to America's war effort but could undermine Rolph and other city leader's efforts to evoke urban unity. Their anti-British stand also questioned the actions of America's greatest ally, making their speeches for Irish independence just as disloyal as a German's public pronouncement for the Kaiser.

Despite these questions of loyalty, the wartime atmosphere did not force immigrants to alter their personal perceptions as a member of an ethnic group. All three were in various stages of assimilation, melting into the pot that Rolph described in his Fourth of July address, but living in San Francisco gave them the opportunity to retain just as much of their ethnic traditions as they chose. Some found that they had to alter public displays of their ethnic identity to incorporate American democratic ideals, but they were not forced to abandon their heritage. Residents continued to congratulate themselves for their acceptance and support of diverse social activities and ethnic traditions that made San Francisco the city of immigrants. They took pride in the cultural expressions of their immigrant populace. No matter what side of the war their European homeland was on, San Franciscans overwhelmingly embraced the inclusion of these foreign symbols of culture as vital to the identity of their city.

Conclusion
"Keep alive the memory of sacrifices": San Francisco's New Identity

Just after midnight Monday, November 11, 1918 San Francisco telegraph offices and telephone switchboards conveyed news of the end of the Great War. Fire Chief Murphy proceeded to City Hall where he turned in a general alarm and soon all the church bells in town began ringing. People in various stages of dress left their homes and began parading toward City Hall. The celebrations surrounding the armistice continued for twenty-four hours. Twenty thousand shipbuilders commemorated the event with a parade Monday morning, making their way to City Hall where they surged into Mayor Rolph's office. The mayor was busy producing a flurry of congratulatory telegrams for Generals Pershing and Foch, President Wilson, and the commanders of San Francisco's 363rd Infantry Division and 347th Field Artillery Division. Rolph, "ignorant of the plot that had been hatched [by the shipbuilders]" was hoisted above their heads and carried out of City Hall. "With an arm thrown around a toil-stained jumper on either side and with a body guard of thousands of cheering workmen," Mayor Rolph led them down Market Street to the Ferry Building and back to the Civic Center.

Meanwhile, San Franciscans gathered throughout the city to commemorate the day the Great War ended. In North Beach, young musicians with guitars and concertinas danced and sang through the streets. Revelers packed the neighborhood cafes, all toasting the victory of the Allied forces. *Bulletin* reporter Louis Stellman described women playing ring-around-the-rosy like little girls, while "old businessmen" made drums out of

dishpans and kerosene cans. Well into the night San Franciscans danced down Market Street, trampling confetti thrown throughout the day and "blowing all manner of horns, manipulating every noisemaking engine that ingenuity could contrive." An anonymous writer for *Town Talk* explained that the extended festivities resulted from the wholehearted way that San Franciscans had sacrificed during the war. "Workingman and capitalist, poor widow and society girl – all San Francisco was heart and soul in the war. And so, when the war was over, San Francisco celebrated with her usual gay abandon. San Francisco had earned the right to cut up."[1]

The unified celebrations at the end of the Great War were even more boisterous than the activities surrounding the opening of the PPIE almost four years earlier. Both events represented San Franciscans' endeavors to prove to themselves and to the nation that the City by the Golden Gate had survived the earthquake and fire and bloomed into a mature metropolis. Both the exposition and the war provided residents the chance to showcase their talents, and in the process express urban characteristics they believed were essential to a modern urban identity. The PPIE gave San Franciscans the chance to advertise themselves as residents of a city that had made considerable progress in a short period of time. The city that had emerged out of the ashes was no longer a frontier town. It was also not like its West Coast competitors who were just entering their adolescent phase, still overwhelmed by growing pains. The refinement that came with maturity was reflected in the harmonious design of the exposition and planners' who attempted to

---

[1] *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), 11 November 1918, 1-2; *Bethlehem Star* (San Francisco), no. 4 (December 1918), 3; *The Bulletin*, 12 November 1918, 1; *Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly* (San Francisco), 16 November 1918, 3.

reduce the imagery of the frontier West in favor of ancient culture. The city PPIE organizers imagined, and residents supported, was one in which unified action dominated factionalism. If San Francisco could be perceived as a cosmopolitan city – wholly American, but with Old World style – it could lay the foundations of a new urban identity for residents still grappling with how to define their city in light of its recent physical devastation. The problem with the PPIE image of San Francisco was that it was little more than an illusion, an interpretation of an ideal city that did not exist. Once the PPIE structures were torn down, San Franciscans were left divided on how to create a real Jewel City.

Without a common goal after the PPIE closed, the grand ideals of progress, harmony, and refinement faded into the past. By the summer of 1916, residents faced uncertain times. The Longshoremen's strike in June of that year triggered the strongest opposition from businessmen, led by the Chamber of Commerce, in more than a decade. The creation of the Law and Order Committee signaled the beginning of a concerted effort by the Chamber to improve economic opportunities for businessmen. They believed this could only be done by eliminating the closed shop and thereby attracting businesses away from rivals like Los Angeles. The short-lived longshoremen strike did not give the Chamber the chance to put its full weight behind the Law and Order Committee. Without another significant incident, the Chamber's subcommittee would have collapsed. However, the Preparedness Day bombing in July provided the impetus to keep the Law and Order Committee going indefinitely. Labeling all unionists as potential bombers, the Committee used San Franciscans' fears of violent attacks to win support of

its anti-labor initiatives. The Chamber more than tripled its membership roles in the process.

By early 1917, the issues that divided San Franciscans were more apparent than the ones that brought them harmoniously together. The Chamber's successful actions had significantly weakened labor unions' confidence in their ability to win strikes. At the same time, San Francisco's working class struggled to make ends meet as due to war-related inflation. The municipal government also faced mounting pressure from purity crusaders. While the police had done their best to close the Barbary Coast and Tenderloin districts during the PPIE, they had grown lax in enforcing the laws after the exposition closed. In early 1917 Rev. Paul Smith initiated attacks on behalf of moral reformers against Rolph – as well as property owners and businessmen who profited from the illicit activity. President Wilson had urged Americans to be neutral in thought and action, but for many San Francisco residents that proved impossible. Many had family members who still lived in Europe, fighting for either the Allies or Central Powers. After the Easter Uprising in 1916, many Irish San Franciscans suggested that Great Britain's defeat would be the best way to win Ireland's sovereignty. This put them at odds with pro-British residents of the city. San Francisco appeared to be plunging deeper into factionalism. The harmony emphasized during the PPIE was lost. That was until the American declaration of war against Germany on April 6.

America's entrance into the war silenced most debate in San Francisco over whether the United States should fight and most residents quickly adjusted their views and actions to support the war effort. The Great War provided San Franciscans with

another commonly shared experience, just as the dual disasters and the PPIE had done before. The Great War temporarily eliminated discord and channeled energies toward unified action for the common good. The war stirred nationalistic fervor as residents sacrificed for America's glory. Again, San Franciscans saw a chance to express a shared identity as the "City That Knows How." The desire to outshine their competitors drove residents to proclaim that they were, by far, the most patriotic city in the West. Most residents professed to believe in the old PPIE slogan, but their actions in the name of civic and national pride varied. These variances reflected the fissures that could not be entirely wiped away, no matter how fervently they believed in the ideal.

The start of the war in Europe made clear to many in the U.S. War Department the need for a larger, more efficient navy. The Navy Act of 1916 paved the way for expansion of the Pacific fleet. San Francisco was an optimal choice, thanks to its strategic location and large harbor. The war disrupted the War Department's immediate plans but gave San Franciscans the opportunity to prove the suitability of their city as a naval headquarters. Tens of thousands of men came through San Francisco for processing or training. The existing military encampments, like the Presidio, Fort McDowell, and the Naval Training Station, created temporary camps to house the new soldiers. Meanwhile, the Quartermaster Corps at Fort Mason struggled to provide supplies to the growing contingent of soldiers in the Western District. The construction of Camp Fremont in Menlo Park added significantly to the number of men in uniform looking for a good time in San Francisco.

However, it was readily apparent that if San Francisco relied on the entertainment

of its notorious past, the War Department would not allow its citizen soldiers near the city. The War Department, desperate for western training camps, would turn to other communities, denying San Francisco wartime gains. If the city could not properly handle an emergency, it would not suit postwar military needs. This led residents to work with the Commission on Training Camp Activities to establish entertainment options that would boost morale and encourage moral behavior. Residents donated their time and money to the cause of wholesome entertainment. Some developed personal relationships with the men, inviting them to their homes, sending their daughters to dance with them at chaperoned dances, and volunteering at the local service mens' clubs. Many soldiers and sailors were not local boys, but San Franciscans worked together to take care of these men and treat them like part of the communal family. Patriotism drove these efforts, but residents also recognized that these wartime visitors could be San Francisco boosters, advertising the hospitality found in a big, cosmopolitan city.

While the War Camp Community Service sought to protect the men in camps, and in turn protect San Francisco's reputation, soldiers like Charles Swope tried to protect their families from wartime uncertainties. The federal bureaucracy was not fully prepared to take on the challenges of raising a four million man military, leaving soldiers and their families to cope with the uncertainties. Some civilians, like Hiram Johnson, Jr., clashed with local draft boards when it became clear that parts of the Selective Service Act, particularly the part about exemptions for married men, were open to interpretation. For those soldiers with dependents, the government's delays in processing allotment requests and sending out the promised allowances left families without a steady income. This

forced women like Gretchen Swope to seek out employment opportunities in order to provide for themselves. In accepting a position with the Army band, and by serving as a freelance photographer for the men at Fort McDowell, Charles Swope did what many new soldiers attempted to do – find ways to make their military service pay. Faced with deployment overseas, Swope and others soldiers tried to provide their families with the financial resources they might need for the foreseeable future, while all involved braced for the possibility that their loved ones might not return.

As mayor of all the people, James Rolph wanted to throw his office's full support behind the soldiers training in San Francisco and those residents of the city who joined the colors. His failure to win majority support for a charter amendment guaranteeing municipal funds for military dependents reflected residents' opposition to redundant relief organizations rather than significant resistance to Mayor Rolph's ideas. Rolph's greatest successes during the war were the result of his ability to pair the needs of federal officials with his goals for civic improvement. Despite a reduction in supplies that slowed or halted some public works, Rolph continued his quest for municipal ownership of utilities, particularly transportation. For the first time in its short history, the Municipal Railroad turned a profit, thanks to the Twin Peaks tunnel, the Municipal Railroad tracks on Market Street, and the expansion of lines to Union Iron Works and the Presidio. The war also did not stop the city's quest for reliable drinking water. Michael O'Shaughnessy's ability to get the Eleanor dam completed before the issuance of wartime restrictions protected the Hetch Hetchy project. Desperate for the electricity generated from the Lower Cherry River plant, the federal government granted the project access to supplies denied most

public works' projects in the last year of the war. The war also forced Mayor Rolph to directly address the vice question. While a proponent of regulated prostitution, with Health department oversight of brothels, the war forced Rolph and Police Commissioner Roche to close the Barbary and Tenderloin districts. Working with military police, the municipal government sought to keep soldiers fit to fight and protect the city's partnerships with the military.

If Mayor Rolph was San Francisco's leading civic champion, then the Chamber of Commerce served as the city's largest booster organization. Both Rolph and the Chamber leadership recognized how important it was to advertise San Francisco's positive attributes to the federal government, as well as prospective businessmen and residents. However, Rolph rarely agreed with the Chamber's methods of attaining that goal. The creation of the Law and Order Committee inspired businessmen to unite to force the city to accept the open shop so San Francisco could fulfill its economic potential. The war provided the Chamber with new opportunities to promote its city to international investors and publicize its vision of what the city could be – the economic epicenter of the West Coast. Some businessmen reaped huge profits from the surge of troops, federal contracts, and trade with the Pacific Rim. Such gains had to be tempered with public displays of patriotism. The holdings of banks like Wells Fargo-Nevada National Bank swelled, while its president Isaias Hellman urged fiscal responsibility through Liberty Bond subscriptions. Only by establishing a public perception that its members were making significant sacrifices could the Chamber justify its defense of class interests. When federal agencies threatened to undermine San Francisco's international

trade networks, Chamber members did not consider their formal protests disloyal attacks on the government. Rather, they were civic patriots acting in the best interests of the city, denying coastal competitors the chance to undermine San Francisco's economic potential.

Vital to the Chamber of Commerce's vision of a profitable metropolis was its ability to eliminate the closed shop. However, the city's unions would not go down without a fight. The beginning of the war coincided with revelations that testimony used against Thomas Mooney was seriously flawed. The lack of credible witnesses – combined with continued attacks on the city's unions for what the Chamber labeled disloyal or treasonous actions – required a strong response from organized labor. The Building Trades Council and the Labor Council incorporated patriotic rhetoric into their appeals for Mooney's retrial and support of District Attorney Charles Fickert's recall. They believed that the nation, and San Francisco in particular, was fighting two wars against tyranny – one at home and one abroad.

In supporting the carmen's strike against United Railroad in August 1917, the Labor Council did not emphasize the issue of national loyalty as strongly as it did in proclaiming the injustices to Mooney. They assumed that residents, who had vilified United Railroad for a decade based on its connections to the city's political corruption, could easily spot the local tyrants. The Labor Council sought to resolve the strike in the most democratic way possible – arbitration. However, the carmen's demands did not reflect the Labor Council's portrayal of workers victimized by wartime pressure and corrupt businessmen. Instead of asking for a wage increase, the carmen demanded United Railroad accept the closed shop, reducing public sympathy for the carmen. This also

gave United Railroad's president, and Chamber member, Jesse Lilienthal more reasons to resist. The carmen's strike became a side note when 30,000 iron workers went on strike in September. The Iron Trades Council used the same arguments initiated by the carmen, insisting that iron workers should be compensated for the high cost of living and the tremendous war profits made by the ship building companies. The iron workers were successful because their services were critical to the nation's success in the war and federal authorities quickly negotiated a settlement. The carmen were not vital to the war effort and traditional strikebreaking tactics crushed the union. Once new recruits were trained, United Railroads could operate all of its lines without interruption, leaving strikers nothing with which to negotiate.

After the failure of the carmen's strike, and the unsuccessful attempts to win Mooney a new trial, many of the city's labor unions retreated from the battleground. Both the Building Trades Council and the Labor Council conceded that protecting their image, and that of their affiliated unions, was more important than continued attacks on the patriotism of the Chamber and its members. In pledging to work with businessmen for the sake of the war effort, organized labor sought to protect its reputation. Bolstered with evidence of their patriotic sacrifices, unions prepared to resume their war against the open shop when the Great War ended.

Many members of organized labor were foreign-born or first generation Americans, but that part of their identity typically caused them less trouble during the war than their support for the closed shop. During the war, communities around the country witnessed significant tensions between nativists and recent immigrants whom they feared

were disloyal by the nature of their foreign birth. In places where this tension boiled over into hysteria, people violently retaliated against immigrant residents, forcing those individuals to conform to prescribed notions of proper American behavior. In San Francisco, such attacks did not occur because a majority of the populace was, at most, one generation removed from the immigrant experience. Also, the city's confined geography prevented the division of its neighborhoods into ethnic enclaves except for Chinatown and North Beach. In San Francisco, immigrants were scattered in every district, employed in every business field, and founders of the city's most elite social and economic dynasties. Attacking ethnic heritage might have been acceptable in communities where political and business leaders were the grandchildren of native-born Americans, but most San Franciscans respected cultural diversity and did not seek to impose cultural conformity.

Residents during the war, however, were not always comfortable with ethnic views that did not promote San Francisco as a city of immigrants, harmoniously working together to win the war. The German-Hindu conspiracy and the federal restrictions on alien enemies fueled suspicion of German-born residents, but did not result in anything close to hysteria. While a few German residents and businesses chose to adopt more Anglo-sounding names, those changes were the result of personal preference and did not stem from peer pressure or public threats. Many San Franciscans recognized that the German attributes they appreciated before the war were just as redeeming during the war. Efforts to support the continued teaching of the German language in the public schools and the attendance of residents at the concerts of Ernestine Schumann-Heink and Alfred

Hertz reflected the desire of residents to protect Germany's classical culture while fighting to eradicate its political traditions. The fact that many of San Francisco's German population had been in the United States for many years may have also prevented suspicion that they were tied to the more recent explosion of European radicalism.

While their native homeland was an American ally, the recent Italian arrivals to San Francisco faced scrutiny from state officials who used wartime fears of radicalism to ensure their political futures. The Commission of Immigration and Housing, attempting to protect itself from wartime cutbacks, redirected its agents to organize city and county Americanization efforts. They spent the war investigating organizations that might harbor dangerous radicals, particularly Italians living in San Francisco's one European enclave. Most of North Beach's residents were working class people whose lack of formal education, and attempts to unionize the cannery industry, made them suspect. The CIH ultimately found little evidence of subversive activity among San Francisco Italians. Despite internal divisions between *prominenti* and their laborers who sought to unionize, Italians accepted the need to show respect for their adopted country. North Beach residents financially supported the war drives, volunteered with the Red Cross, and followed Food Administration conservation guidelines, like any other San Francisco neighborhood. At the same time, Italian tradition influenced each of these actions, celebrating the cosmopolitan nature of their adopted city.

For Irish residents who supported the Easter Uprising, the war created a complex situation that required them to explain how they could be patriotic Americans and loyal supporters of Irish sovereignty. Once the United States entered the war, most Irish San

Franciscans expressed the belief that America's quest for global democracy would ultimately lead to Irish independence. The actions of a few Irish immigrants, including Daniel O'Connell, called into question the loyalty of San Francisco's pro-independence Irish. However, the political and economic strength of these residents allowed them to continue their open support for Irish sovereignty. As with the German and Italian immigrants, the wartime atmosphere in San Francisco never resulted in a hysterical reaction against groups expressing their ethnic identity. People believed the proper authorities would deal with individuals whose actions threatened to disrupt the harmonious cultural balance, or threatened the reputation of San Francisco as a loyal American city.

The Great War occurred at a time when Americans were beginning to see the nation's cities not as dangerous outposts, but as the center of a new American culture. Before the 1920 census proclaimed America an urban nation, cities had to define for themselves and everyone else what made the city experience so alluring. With all eyes turned on them, urban residents during the war defended their community's reputation by "doing their bit" for the war effort. In the process, urbanites struggled to define what made their city special and why they should receive national attention beyond their ability to raise funds for Liberty Bonds and knit socks for soldiers. In the quest for recognition, cities found themselves competing with each other for national attention while attempting to establish for their residents a unique urban identity. San Francisco's search for the economic, political, social, and cultural qualities that would make it a premier city had been going on since the earthquake and fire of 1906. Because of the natural disaster,

residents were more aware than those in other American cities in the 1910s that it was time to refine their image. The war was another opportunity, like the PPIE, for San Franciscans to examine their urban traits for elements that would make their city stand out above the rest. What San Franciscans during the Great War did not realize was that they had already lost the battle to maintain urban supremacy on the West Coast. Over the next dozen years, San Franciscans would have to come to terms with the shift of some economic, political, and military power from their city to coastal competitors. The ways San Franciscans chose to commemorate the war reflected their efforts to redefine their city's image by reassessing the qualities that made their city a vital destination for businesses, federal spending, and migration.

The federal attention, and dollars, that came into San Francisco during the war encouraged Mayor Rolph and civic boosters to step up their efforts to secure a naval base for San Francisco. A 1916 report had listed San Francisco and Puget Sound as the most strategic areas on the Pacific Coast for new naval bases. After the war, city leaders advertised Hunter's Point as the most logical place for the Pacific fleet's headquarters. San Francisco immediately faced competition from sites across the Bay that saw the military expansion as a way to reduce their dependence on San Francisco and encourage relocation to their cities. The two leading contenders for the naval base were Alameda and Hunter's Point. Cities of the East Bay refused to support a San Francisco base, fearing that such a step might lead to renewed efforts by San Francisco to push their consolidation plan known as Greater San Francisco. The city of Vallejo, and the political leadership of its Congressman Charles Curry, was also able to hold up construction of a

Bay Area base. Vallejo hoped to outlast both San Francisco and Alameda and thereby win concessions for Mare Island Naval Yard. Ultimately, Alameda won the naval base over its area rivals because city leaders were willing to offer the entire site free of charge. However, the conflict between Alameda, Vallejo, and San Francisco created stalemate that lasted until 1933. This prevented the entire Bay Area from benefitting appreciably from the postwar military expansion.[2]

San Francisco also faced challenges from the cities of Southern California. The 1920 census showed that Los Angeles had surpassed San Francisco in size, moving into the nation's top ten largest cities, while San Francisco dropped to twelfth. Over the next decade, Los Angeles' population doubled, with more than 1.2 million residents, placing it fifth in the nation. There were several reasons for this rapid growth in Los Angeles. One was the fact that L.A. did not face stiff competition from its neighboring communities. Unlike San Francisco's failed consolidation plan, L.A. annexed forty-five adjacent communities in the 1920s. People also migrated into L.A. to take advantage of the tremendous economic growth of the metropolis. The boom in motion pictures, the increasing number of national manufacturers (like Goodyear Tire) with regional plants in L.A., and the discovery of oil in the area drove people to choose Southern California as their home. By 1930, Los Angeles led the state in manufacturing and in shipping.[3]

---

[2]Roger W. Lotchin, *Fortress California, 1910-1961: From Warfare to Welfare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 43-59.

[3]Steven P. Erie, *Globalizing L.A.: Trade, Infrastructure, and Regional Development* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 61-62; Jules Tygiel, "Metropolis in the Making: Los Angeles in the 1920s," in Tom Sitton and William Deverell, ed., *Metropolis in the Making: Los Angeles in the 1920s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 2-3; Robert Glass Cleland, *March of Industry* (San Francisco: Powell Publishing Co., 1929), 147-153; 265.

The growing population and economic resources of California's southern counties led to a shift in the state's political culture. In 1920 James Phelan, fa formerSan Francisco mayor and tireless supporter of a naval base at Hunter's Point, lost his senatorial seat to Los Angeles businessman Samuel Shortridge. While Phelan had sought a compromise in the Bay's division over the naval base, Senator Shortridge allowed the divisions in the Bay Area to continue. While Bay communities fought over the financial resources the U.S. military could offer, San Diego quietly enticed the military to expend more capital in its city. In 1917 the Marines began construction on the base that became Camp Pendleton. By the end of the war the navy had moved its training station from Goat Island in San Francisco Bay to San Diego. During the 1920s, the Navy continued to increase the number of supply depots and repair stations in San Diego and moved its submarines from L.A. to San Diego. Ultimately, the efforts of urban boosterism in California compelled the Navy to diffuse its potential resources in the inter-war years, scattering facilities up and down the coast.[4] As a result of the conflict between Bay communities and the competition for military resources from Southern California, San Francisco's politicians and civic boosters had to find new ways to define their city and promote its importance to the region and the nation in the 1920s.

One such way was to advertise the patriotism of San Franciscans and the warmth with which they greeted outsiders. Almost as soon as the armistice festivities ended, the city prepared to welcome home its men in uniform. The Army designated the Presidio as one of thirty regional demobilization centers nationwide. Their goal was to ease the

---

[4]Lotchin, *Fortress California*, 43.

transition for soldiers by discharging them in cities near their homes.[5] Camp Kearney in San Diego and Camp Lewis near Seattle were the only other demobilization centers on the West Coast. All the men who returned from Siberia in 1919 processed through San Francisco. The Presidio's Letterman Hospital, one of the oldest U.S. Army general hospitals in the nation, admitted 12,900 patients for rehabilitation in 1919. These patients, and the families who came to stay with them, hailed from communities throughout the West, including Alaska and Hawaii.[6] San Francisco would, therefore, host thousands of returning veterans, only some of whom would be local boys. This meant a significant number of homecoming activities to plan. Between December 14, 1918 to May 18, 1919 San Franciscans witnessed seventeen parades and twenty-five receptions.[7] These activities were not simply patriotic gestures. City boosters recognized that each homecoming served as an opportunity to advertise the good qualities of San Francisco to veterans and their families in hopes of creating loyal visitors or potential new residents.

To coordinate the homecoming festivities, the Board of Supervisors authorized the creation of the San Francisco Citizens' Welcome Home Committee in early December 1918. Chaired by Mayor Rolph, the Welcome Home Committee consisted of more than two hundred members who organized and executed celebrations for the next six months. To facilitate the inclusion of the veterans' families in the festivities, the Welcome Home Committee developed a Kinsfolk Division, open to all relatives of

---

[5] Irwin N. Thompson, *Defender of the Gate: the Presidio of San Francisco , A History from 1846 to 1995* (Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California: National Park Service, 1997), 608.

[6] Ibid, 364-368.

[7] *Municipal Record* (San Francisco) 12 (29 May 1919), 181-182.

returning servicemen regardless of whether they or the soldiers were San Francisco residents. Newspapers throughout the region carried notices expressing San Francisco's wish to have the families of returning servicemen present at the ceremonies and encouraging them to register with the Welcome Home Committee. The committee would then in turn issue family members special badges on the day their loved ones disembarked in San Francisco. These badges designated them as VIPs, allowing them to pass through police lines so that they could be the first to great their boys upon arrival. In the first six months after the Armistice the Welcome Home Committee issued more than twenty thousand badges. While the Kinsfolk Division badges denoted family members, the Red Cross pinned more than fifty-four thousand ribbons to the uniforms of each soldier and sailor as he arrived in the city. Each ribbon read, "The People of San Francisco Welcome You Home."[8] Both the ribbons and badges served as unique mementoes of the special occasion. The badges commemorated the return of loved ones and they, along with the ribbons, could be kept for posterity.

The seventy-four thousand badges and ribbons also advertised San Francisco, reminding these individuals for years to come of the city and its residents that joined them in celebrating the return of men home from the Great War. The Welcome Home Committee also provided other commemorative items to servicemen and their kin. The Committee created and published official souvenir booklets for each of the soldiers serving in the seven largest military units discharged in San Francisco. These pamphlets, ranging in size from four to thirty-six pages, included the names of all two hundred

[8] *Municipal Record* (San Francisco) 12 (29 May 1919), 181-182.

members of the Citizens' Welcome Home Committee, the names of that regiment's Kinsfolk Division, a regimental history with illustrations, and a personal note from Mayor Rolph.[9]

The largest festivities undertaken by the Committee were for "San Francisco's Own": the 347th Field Artillery and the 363rd Infantry, both of which arrived on April 22, 1919. This day's fetes illustrated the city's efforts to construct a set of events that would rally civic pride among residents and encourage returning soldiers to see San Francisco as a great place for them and their families to call home. The soldiers disembarked on trains in Oakland, where Red Cross canteen workers pinned the Welcome Home ribbons to their uniforms, designating San Francisco and not Oakland as the welcoming city. The Red Cross workers then escorted them to ferries for the trip across the Bay, and once aboard, they gave each man a pamphlet that carefully outlined the day's events.

Once in San Francisco, the Welcome Home Committee had scheduled a reception at the Ferry Building with family. A parade down Market Street to City Hall would follow, along with a reception and a speech by Mayor Rolph. The festivities would conclude with the unveiling of a monument to the troops before they marched to the Presidio. Despite the meticulous efforts of the Welcome Home Committee the formal parade march down Market never really happened.[10] According to a journalist with *Town*

---

[9] *Municipal Record* 12 (29 May 1919), 181-182. Copies of six of the seven Citizens' Welcome Home Committee souvenir regimental booklets are located at the Hoover Institution Library, filed individually by regiment: "The Grizzlies" (144th Field Artillery), 62nd Coast Artillery Corps, 363rd Infantry, 347th Field Artillery, 18th Engineers and the First Army Artillery Park.

[10] "Red Cross Welcome Home to 'Our Boys,'" Allyne-Burr Family Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Talk, once the men arrived at the Ferry Building, the crowd turned into a "mad mess of inextricable and happy confusion." Family and friends rushed to greet the returning troops, forgetting all formalities. "I saw men kiss men as unreservedly as the women had; military restraint was powerless in the joy of that glorious welcome, and it seemed as though the officers had forgotten their commands to march on in the joy of the moment."[11] Mayor Rolph later commented that the surge of people on Market Street was an electric experience; "it was the finest and most genuine heart throb." Rolph believed the public display of affection for the men returning from war reflected the spirit of San Francisco better than any festivity in his lifetime: "San Francisco is some city, and the spirit of the San Franciscan beats anything known anywhere else in the world. It was a bully party and will never be forgotten, and in the future we will measure things by the home-coming given our boys."[12] For Rolph and many others that day, civic pride coalesced with patriotic fervor. The great parades and celebrations commemorating the return of the San Francisco residents and men provided a forum for San Franciscans to express publicly their patriotism and civic loyalty, ideals many hoped would continue to unify the populace in a common purpose.

During the war San Franciscans came together to win the war and gain national recognition for their efforts. In the 1920s, San Franciscans, often divided by class issues, would find promoting their city as the epicenter of the Pacific Coast a rare, unifying endeavor. Much of the class conflict in San Francisco resulted in the renewed conflict

---

[11] *Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly* (San Francisco), 26 April 1919, 8-9.

[12] *Municipal Record* (San Francisco) 12 (24 April 1919), 131.

between business owners and the city's labor unions. The Chamber of Commerce, in an attempt to strengthen their city's marketability to national corporations looking for places to construct regional plants, continued their wartime goal of implementing the open shop system in San Francisco. Using the techniques developed by the Law and Order Committee in 1916, businessmen challenged organized labor when it attempted to resume the use of strikes after the war. The Riggers' and Stevedores' Union, the organization whose strike in 1916 had led to the formation of the Law and Order Committee, initiated the 1919 strikes. Calling for higher wages and a share in the companies' profits and management, the Longshoremen walked out on September 15. Employers, with the support of the Chamber of Commerce, depicted the longshoremen as subversives who were bent on destroying the city's commercial trade just as jobs became scarcer after the war. The employers locked out the workers and formed the Longshoremen's Association, which became known as the "Blue Book" union. They declared that only those workers who joined the "Blue Book" would be allowed to return to work. Longshoremen slowly conceded to the employers demands, eventually killing the Riggers' and Stevedores' Union. In 1921 the city's shipping companies followed suit after union members went on strike to protest a 15 percent decrease in wages. The impact on the International Seamen's Union was dramatic. In 1919 the union boasted a membership roster of more than 100,000. By 1923 it had fewer than 16,000 members.

In 1921, the Chamber of Commerce, buoyed by its waterfront victories, challenged the city's strongest labor organization, the Building Trades Council. When affiliated unions threatened to strike in 1920, president P. H. McCarthy, fearing a repeat

of the loses suffered by the longshoremen and iron trades the year before, urged the unions to accept arbitration. Responding to the pent-up demands for housing after the war and the increase in unemployment, the three-man arbitration panel recommended a 7.5 percent wage reduction. When unions refused, the Builder's Exchanged locked out the workers. Bolstered by support from the Chamber of Commerce, the Builder's Exchange refused to hire workers who did not accept an open shop. The Chamber then organized the Industrial Association of San Francisco and raised $1 million to fund open shop campaigns across the industrial spectrum. The Industrial Association called their plan the "American Plan," which called for the "right of free contract between men." In declaring the open shop as the way to law, order, and democracy, the Chamber returned to the language of the Law and Order Committee five years earlier.

In light of the more politically conservative atmosphere following the Red Scare, organized labor failed to win public support. For the rest of the 1920s San Francisco experienced only a few, limited strikes. Union membership dropped precipitously and "many of the associations became mere skeletons of their former selves." [13] Organized labor's perception of San Francisco, a bastion of the closed shop, no longer existed. Labor, like the civic boosters who had sought a military bounty for the city, had to discover new ways to define the importance of the city by the Golden Gate. While the Chamber of Commerce and organized labor had fought bitterly against each other for

---

[13] David F. Selvin, *Sky Full of Storm: A Brief History of California Labor* (San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1975), 39-44; William Issel and Robert W. Cherny, S*an Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 94-96; Stephen Schwartz, *Brotherhood of the Sea: A History of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, 1885-1985* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1986), 56; Frederick L. Ryan, *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Building Trades* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1936), 157.

years, both sides by the mid 1920s feared the rise of Los Angeles more. Los Angeles, with its motion picture industry, oil drilling, and manufacturing, threatened to draw workers and potential new businesses away from San Francisco. As during the war, both sides would have to find common ground and support projects that bolstered San Francisco's image as a destination for laborers and businessmen.

The construction of the War Memorial Opera House illustrates the attempt made by the diverse San Francisco populace to express symbolically what they perceived as the most important qualities of their past, present, and future. In seeking these characteristics, residents sought to explain what set San Francisco apart from other coastal cities. In promoting a uniquely San Franciscan experience, residents determined they must also commemorate the wartime sacrifices of their men in uniform. Before the war, the city had completed several parts of its grand civic center complex. However, municipal leaders had been forced to scrap a projected opera house due to a lack of resources needed to develop the property.[14] In 1915 William H. Crocker proposed raising $850,000 in private subscriptions for the music center if the city could raise the other million dollars needed. Rolph rejected the idea on the grounds that Crocker wanted subscribers to manage the opera house rather than the city. Crocker also believed subscribers should have "preferential rights to box seats."[15] Mayor Rolph did not want to see a municipal opera house that catered to the wealthy elite. However, he conceded that private donations would be the only way an opera house would be constructed since city

---

[14]Lewis Francis Byington and Oscar Lewis, eds., *The History of San Francisco* (Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1931), 481; Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 172.

[15]Richard H. Frost, *The Mooney Case* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968), 57.

revenues were tied up in Hetch Hetchy and the Municipal Railroad. Rolph could not accept a city opera house that the city did not operate.[16] Like the Auditorium and the city library, Rolph expected private organizations and donors to raise the funds necessary to initiate public projects that would ultimately benefit the entire community.

In the spring of 1918, the San Francisco's Musical Association decided to raise funds for a symphony house. By the end of the year they joined forces with the Art Association to initiate a fund-raising drive to construct an opera house, symphony hall, and art museum. With the war over, the organizations believed that facilities for music and art would "upbuild the city, contribute to its cultural life, make the city a more interesting place to live in, and a better place to live in."[17] Such statements reflected the middle and upper class desire to impose moral reform through cultural advancement while utilizing public spaces to encourage civic loyalty. To lead the movement toward "civic idealism," San Francisco's artistic community chose eight elite businessmen to organize fund raising for the cultural center.[18] Led by John Drum, president of San Francisco Savings Union Bank, the committee of eight included such notables as William Crocker, Emanuel Heller, and Herbert Fleishhacker. By the summer of 1919, the committee had more than $1 million in pledges, despite a significant number of war-related drives that channeled money away from the project. However, those involved

---

[16]James Rolph to T. G. Morris, 13 September 1917, James Rolph Jr. Papers, North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

[17]James Rolph Jr., *History of the the* [sic] *San Francisco War Memorial: message to the Board of Supervisors and the people of San Francisco at a special meeting of the Board of Supervisors, February 18, 1930* (San Francisco: Ricoden Printing and Publishing Co., [1930?]), 17-18.

[18]Paul Boyer, *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), 253-260.

believed the project would require at least $2.5 million.[19] To raise enough funds and secure the support of San Franciscans for the project, Drum and his committee would have to appeal to a wider audience.

This desire for a cultural center that provided moral uplift coincided with a movement at the end of the war to commemorate the sacrifices of the nation's soldiers. Most veterans and the families of fallen soldiers wanted utilitarian memorials that provided "some form of practical benefit for ex-serviceman, the bereaved or the community as a whole."[20] While several more traditional monuments were eventually erected in Golden Gate Park, many residents and returning veterans wanted something more than a statue or plaque. One of these returning veterans was Charles H. Kendrick, a San Francisco businessman who had made his fortune selling his land options in the Richmond and Sunset Districts after the fire. Upon arriving back in San Francisco from the battlefields of France, Charles Kendrick agreed to help his friend John Drum with the project. Kendrick suggested that a larger veteran's complex could incorporate artistic and patriotic elements. Kendrick garnered support from the five newly created American Legion posts in San Francisco. Each passed a resolution approving the War Memorial project and made Kendrick the chair of the Legion's representatives to the Drum/Crocker

---

[19]Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 113; Charles Kendrick (David Warren Ryder, ed), *Memoirs of Charles Kendrick* (San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co., 1972), 49. There is a discrepancy in the amount of money raised by the committee. Kendrick claimes there was only $1 million raised by 1920, Issel and Cherny put the total at $1,625,000, and in Rolph's *History* John Drum says between $1.4 and $1.5 million. Rolph, *History of the the* [sic] *San Francisco War Memorial*, 18.

[20]Catherine Moriarty, "Private Grief and Public Remembrance: British First World War Memorials," in Martin Evans and Ken Lunn, ed., *War and Memory in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Berg, 1997), 126-128.

committee.

The new fund-raising event began with a mass meeting at the Civic Auditorium on May 18, 1920. Interspersed in the crowd were original donors for the project who were asked to re-pledge publicly to stir others in the Auditorium to donate.[21] The pamphlet passed out at the Auditorium also heightened passions for donating to the War Memorial complex. It stated that primarily this project was a living memorial, not just a static monument, to the sacrifices made by San Franciscans. The authors of the pamphlet believed that an opera house, art museum, and veteran's center would serve as constant reminders of the "sacrifices made in a war of ideals" and the future "development of those ideals, for the perpetuation of a broader, better citizenship." For committee members like Kendrick, Drum, and Crocker the construction of an opera house, art museum and veteran's center would provide opportunities for all citizens to partake in the finer arts that would "strengthen the citizenship" and unify disparate segments of the urban population through community participation in the arts.[22] To get the fine arts center they believed was necessary for the future of the city's role as a preeminent cultural center, civic leaders had to link citizens' desire for personal improvement with patriotic sentiments for honoring the dead.

Problems between the veterans and the elite overseeing the committee began

---

[21] Charles Kendrick (David Warren Ryder, ed), *Memoirs of Charles Kendrick* (San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co., 1972), 50.

[22] Pamphlet considering the War Memorial, no date [May 1920], Charles Kendrick Papers, Hoover Institution Archive, Stanford University, Palo Alto; San Francisco War Memorial pamphlet [May 1920], Pamphlet box of materials on California in World War I, 1914-1918, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

when William Crocker, a University of California regent, suggested that the War Memorial project be made a legal affiliate with the school. Then the project would be exempt from property and subscription taxes. The other committee members agreed and the U.C. Regents approved. This process created the War Memorial Trust Agreement with the members of the original committee, along with U.C. Regents, becoming the War Memorial Trustees. This new legal agreement caused the first set of delays in the project. Attorneys for the Regents required all subscribers to sign new pledge forms that included the information regarding the War Memorial Trust Agreement. This requirement created a loss of momentum for the project as people's attention and money went elsewhere. Kendrick later insisted that this cost the project nearly two years and countless thousands of dollars as not everyone returned the new pledge cards or their donations. Another problem might have been with the expansion of the project from a local memorial, embodying the democratic principles of the veterans who believed they should play a significant part in community decision-making, to a state project with input from University of California regents.[23]

While subscribers' funds slowly trickled in, the Trustees contracted architects to prepare plans for three buildings: an opera house, symphony hall, and art museum. The architects' designs reflected the Trustees' vision of an architecturally pleasing cultural center and not the veterans' desire for a functional meeting space. However, the most pressing problem with the architects' plans was the realization that the proposed site of

---

[23]For more on the conflicting goals between cultural leaders and veterans regarding memorials see John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 13-19; 79-86.

the War Memorial was not sufficient for three buildings. The Trustees then authorized a location reassessment, further delaying the project.[24] In the spring of 1922 Supervisor Ralph McLeran approached the Board of Trustees about property to the west of City Hall that a company had purchased to build a warehouse, a building city leaders through inappropriate adjacent to the Civic Center Comples. Mayor Rolph and the city's Finance Committee suggested that they Trustees buy the two blocks and that when the city had the money they would pay the Trustees back for one of the lots.[25] The Trustees agreed, but the purchasing process took two years.

Meanwhile, it became clear to the Trustees that $2 million would not be enough money for the entire project. Trustees determined that their goal of three separate buildings was no longer feasible and pared down their project to an opera house and veterans' center/art museum. The Board of Supervisors and Mayor Rolph stepped in with support for a proposed $4 million city bond, which voters approved on June 14, 1927.[26] During the fund-raising and property acquisition, the Trustees claimed they continued to be committed to providing veterans with facilities that reflected the importance of their sacrifices. However, the real focus appeared to have shifted to creating a civic center that would promote the cultural progress of the entire community.

The next obstacle to the construction of the War Memorial would pit these two

---

[24]Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 113-114; Charles Kendrick (David Warren Ryder, ed), *Memoirs of Charles Kendrick* (San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co., 1972), 51.

[25]Rolph, *History of the the* [sic] *San Francisco War Memorial*, 19.

[26]Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 113-114; Kendrick, *Memoirs of Charles Kendrick*, 51.

sides against each other as each claimed their vision of the site to be more vital than the other. Even before the bond election, some veterans began to worry that the Trustees did not have their best interests in mind. They believed they were not receiving an equal distribution of funds and space within the War Memorial complex. According to Charles Kendrick, a small group of "professional" veterans believed that the opera house's design would require more funds than the veterans' buildings, thereby reducing the significance of their part of the War Memorial.[27] As a result of their protests, the Board of Supervisors passed a resolution preventing the expenditure of any money unless the veterans were "entirely satisfied as to the plans for their housing." According to Milton Sapiro, a representative of the city's American Legion posts, the veterans' frustration stemmed in part from the lack of progress made by the Trustees to provide veterans a facility for their activities. Sapiro argued that the Trustees had failed to do what Oakland and Los Angeles had managed to do years earlier, the construction of a building with "efficiency and expedition" that honored San Francisco veterans.

This comparison to Los Angeles and Oakland reflects residents' frustration with their city's inability to keep pace with its competitors. For San Franciscans, the lack of a public memorial epitomized their frustration. While Los Angeles and Oakland grew exponentially, San Francisco could not keep up with something as simple as constructive a suitable monument to the sacrifices of the city's enlisted and drafted men. Sapiro pointed to the fact that the veterans had already made progress in erecting a building for their purposes in 1920 when they agreed to join their plans with those of the music and art

---

[27] Kendrick, *Memoirs of Charles Kendrick*, 52.

associations. In trying to aid the city, Sapiro implied, the veterans had sacrificed their opportunity to have the facilities they wanted and the memorial the city's residents demanded.[28]

Trustees who believed the project's impact on the city's cultural refinement insisted that veterans did not need an entire building for their purposes. John Drum argued that when the American Legion first joined the fund-raising in 1920, their representatives said the Legion would only need about 40,000 square feet within one of the new buildings. Six years later, they claimed they needed more than 100,000. Drum insisted that the veterans' organizations refused to work with the Trustees, who had already pared down the size of the opera house and the art museum.[29] The conflict between the two sides would have continued had it not been for the city's elected leaders. Trying to unify the two sides and bring the project to completion, Mayor Rolph and the Board of Supervisors proposed a November 1928 charter amendment that transferred control of the War Memorial from the U.C. Regents to the city.[30] Under the charter amendment, the city's mayor would appoint the eleven members of the War Memorial Board of Trustees. As "mayor of all the people" Rolph could ensure the veterans the democratic voice in decision-making that was vital to their continued support for the project. San Franciscans approved the charter amendment.

Despite the amendment's passage, the Trustees were reluctant to give up

---

[28]Rolph, *History of the the* [sic] *San Francisco War Memorial*, 34-37.

[29]Rolph, *History of the the* [sic] *San Francisco War Memorial*, 21.

[30]Issel and Cherny, *San Francisco, 1865-1932*, 114.

administration of the fund. As a result, veterans began to accuse Trustees, particularly William Crocker, of mismanaging the subscription. The veterans believed a "cloud of secrecy" surrounded the funds. This suggested to them that the funds had "been subjected to such mal-administration, inefficient and unbusiness-like use" that Trustees did not want the city to assume responsibility for fear the truth would be revealed.[31] In response, John Drum argued that turning over the conflict to a new group of trustees would not resolve the conflict. Instead, it would delay construction and retard the city's cultural refinement. Drum insisted that without the opera house and the museum, the city was left with moving picture theaters that could be found in "any town of 500 in population." Drum considered the project vital to San Francisco's future development: "This is a cosmopolitan community; it is one of the few cosmopolitan communities of the world. But unless this community puts in those things. . . . you have not that opportunity to give the . . . hundreds of thousands of our own people an opportunity to enjoy those things that make this the greatest city on earth."[32]

By identifying San Francisco as a cosmopolitan city, Drum articulated the new vision of the city and delineated the difference between it and the other West Coast metropolitan centers. The U.S. Census had already noted that San Francisco was no longer at the heart of its own metropolitan district: it would have to share that designation with Oakland. Meanwhile, Los Angeles, San Diego, Seattle and Portland were independent metropolitan centers, consuming a growing number of suburbs. Those

---

[31] J. C. Claridge to William Crocker, 7 January 1930, Charles Kendrick Papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[32] Rolph, *History of the the* [sic] *San Francisco War Memorial*, 25.

suburbs allowed residents to scatter, creating segregated cultural enclaves. San Francisco, from its development in the 1850s, had been a city geographically confined. Residents were, therefore, unable to create neighborhoods exclusively based on class or ethnic identity. Drum was noting the possible role of San Francisco in the mid-twentieth century Far West – a cosmopolitan city where diversity was accepted and cultural refinement admired.

The actual construction of the War Memorial complex began January 2, 1931 and on Armistice Day that year veterans lay the cornerstones of both buildings.[33] Due to the depression, the city replaced the eight-hour work day with two separate five-hour a day construction crews, which also sped up the completion of the buildings. On October 15, 1932 the San Francisco Opera Company, which had performed its first nine seasons in the Civic Auditorium, inaugurated the War Memorial Opera House with *Tosca*. Five hundred people stood in the auditorium during the performance as all 3,285 seats were occupied. Another four thousand deposits for seats had to be returned to patrons due to the lack of seats.[34] The Veterans' Building opened the next month on Armistice Day, but the Art Museum would not be ready for another two years due to limited funds. Other elements of the facility were also not completed immediately. Charles Kendrick's papers show that landscaping, the instillation of acoustical tile, and the construction of stage

---

[33] American Legion, War Memorial Commission, *War Memorial of San Francisco* (San Francisco: American Legion War Memorial Commission, 1935), 2.

[34] Lawrence Kinnard, *History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region*, (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1966), 692.

platforms and the orchestra pit were not completed until 1935.[35] After more than ten years of planning what was most important was getting the facilities open. The internal and external adornments could be completed later. By the time the San Francisco Art Association was ready to establish their galleries in 1935, the veterans had taken over most of their building. This left only the fourth floor available for the museum and required patrons to use a small side door on McAllister Street as an entrance.[36]

Though more than a decade in the making, the city had its war memorial and cultural center. The War Memorial Opera House and Veterans' Building represented the desire of San Franciscans to commemorate the sacrifices of their war heroes. At the same time, it reflected the desire of civic leaders to construct edifices that served the greater good by providing entertainment purported to improve the hearts and minds of all residents. With its completion, San Franciscans proved that, despite their differences, they could pull together to promote the cultural advancement of the city. Memorials reflect the culture of their time and San Francisco's Opera House and Veterans' Building was no exception.[37] By approving the 1927 bond issue and 1928 charter amendment, the majority of San Francisco voters showed their support for permanent structures meant to honor the sacrifices of residents who served. They also expressed how important these

---

[35] Box Three, Charles Kendrick Papers, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[36] Kendrick, *Memoirs of Charles Kendrick*, 65.

[37] For more on cultural memory and historical analysis of twentieth-century memorials see Jay Winter, *Remember War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), William Kidd and Brian Murdoch, ed., *Memory and Memorials: The Commemorative Century* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2004), Jeanette Rodriquez and Ted Fortier, *Cultural Memory: Resistance, Faith and Identity* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007), Nicholas J. Saunders, *Matters of Conflict: Material culture, memory and the First World War* (London: Routledge, 2004).

buildings could be to the future progress of San Francisco and its identity as a city that supported public spaces for the practice and appreciation of high culture.

This cultural recognition not only appealed to the middle and upper class, who for decades had considered opera, symphony, and art the tools necessary for social advancement, but to other sectors of the populace. Veterans, in honoring their fallen comrade might have perceived the facilities as less about the future of the city and more about constructing a monument to them and their comrades' sacrifices. However, even they hoped the buildings would encourage veterans from across the country to visit San Francisco and take advantage of the amenities at the Veterans' Building. For politicians, like Rolph and the members of the Board of Supervisors, the buildings helped to complete a dream for the civic center that had begun with the Burnham plan in 1905. In just a few square blocks municipal leaders had organized the planning, funding, and construction of a series of buildings that incorporated the best San Francisco had to offer – democratic access to the seats of municipal power aandthe seats of culture. For the Chamber of Commerce it was another site to advertise the attractiveness of San Francisco to potential commercial investors and future residents. The city's laborers, union members or not, found work constructing the grand edifices and, like the Chamber, hoped it would attract new business ventures to the city. The city's ethnic groups, particularly the Italians and Germans, saw the Opera House as an opportunity to produce music in their native tongue, providing a means of celebrating their culture and impressing on others an appreciation of those nations' offerings to America.

San Francisco residents could no longer boast of having the largest population on

the West Coast, or the greatest number of urban industries, or the headquarters of the Pacific military defenses. Nevertheless, in the "City That Knows How," residents constructed a community where Americans could experience a cultural education in a cosmopolitan atmosphere. Others around the world came to define the city in a similar light. The birthplace of the United Nations in 1945 was not in sunny Los Angeles, on a naval vessel in San Diego Harbor, the Boeing plant in Seattle, or a warehouse in Oakland. Truman and other world leaders signed that international charter on the stage of the War Memorial Opera House in San Francisco.

Bibliography

Manuscript Collections and Archives

Allyne-Burr Family Papers. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Arthur Arlett Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Baeck Family Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

David Prescott Barrows Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

"Base Hospital No. 47, San Francisco Auxiliary." North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Milly Bennett Papers. Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

Bernard R. Bowron. *A History of The California Ink Company Inc.* Volume 1, 1891-1919. carbon typescript, [195-?]. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

California. Historical Survey Commission. *Report of the War History Department of the California Historical Survey Commission*. [Berkeley: 1921]. Hoover Institute Library, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

California Department of Industrial Relations. Division of Immigration and Housing records, 1912-1939. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Estelle Carpenter Papers. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Certified Milk and Baby Hygiene Committee of the Collegiate Alumnae**.** North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Ina Donna Coolbrith Correspondence and Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Charles Caldwell Dobie, Correspondence and Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Enemy Alien Registrations, History Center, San Francisco Public Library.

Milton H. Esberg Papers. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Mark Lewis Gerstle Memories, (Microfilm). The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Graupner Family papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Growing Up in the Cities: Oral History Interviews. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Isaias W. Hellman Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

John Galen Howard Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Sidney Coe Howard Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Hiram Johnson, Sr. Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Charles Kendrick Papers. Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

Frank Kester Papers. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Edward Krehbiel, *Report of The United States Food Administration for California*: typescript, 1919. Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

League of Women Voters Records. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Simon Julius Lubin Correspondence and Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Lillian Mae MacRae Papers. Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

Howard C. Naffziger, M.D. Archives and Special Collections, University of California, San Francisco.

David D. Oliphant Papers Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.

Pamphlet box of materials on California in World War, 1914-1918. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Janet Peck Papers. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Peixotto Family Papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Mary Hutchinson Peixotto Letters and papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

James D. Phelan Papers. San Francisco Public Library Collection.

James Rolph, Jr. Papers. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.

Edith H. Rosenshine, writings. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Records, 1851-1962. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.
San Francisco Civic Auditorium. Portfolio of programs, announcements, etc. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
San Francisco Labor Council Records, 1906-1965. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
San Francisco. Presidio Training Camp Records, 1917. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.
San Francisco Miscellaneous. Coliseum Military Training Drills. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.
San Francisco Miscellaneous. Liberty Loan. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.
San Francisco Miscellaneous. Liberty Loan (Third). North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.
San Francisco Miscellaneous. Japanese In San Francisco, 1910-1919. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.
San Francisco Miscellaneous. Women's Patriotic League of San Francisco. North Baker Research Library, California Historical Society, San Francisco.
San Francisco. Municipal Orchestra Programs, 1917-1918. San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco.
Paul Scharrenberg Correspondence and papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
Jeffrey Schweitzer Papers. The Bancroft Library. University of California, Berkeley.
Edwin Allen Sherman papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
William Sproule Correspondence. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
Swope Family Correspondence, 1917-1918. Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California, San Diego.
William A. Talbot Letters. San Francisco Public Library Collection.
Henry Tevis Correspondence and papers. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
Mrs. J. E. Thane Papers. Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.
United States. Department of Justice. Registration Affidavits of Alien Females and Enemies. History Center, San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco.
Wars. WWI. Alien Registration. San Francisco Public Library Collection.
World War I Scrapbook. Scrapbook 64. San Francisco Public Library Collection.

Contemporary Publications

Adams, Ephraim Douglass. *Why We Are At War With Germany*. San Francisco: Liberty Loan Executive Board, Department of Publicity, 1918.
American Field Service. *The American Field Service Memorial: A Tribute to Those Who Died A Step toward International Peace*. San Francisco: American Field Service, 1923.
American Legion. War Memorial Commission, *War Memorial of San Francisco*. San Francisco: American Legion War Memorial Commission, 1935.
American National Red Cross, San Francisco Chapter. *History of the war activities of the San Francisco Chapter, American National Red Cross and a brief outline of its organization*. San Francisco: [?], 1919.
Ashe, Elizabeth H. *Intimate Letters From France During America's First Year of War*. San Francisco: Philopolis Press, 1918.
Bamford, Mary. *Angel Island: The Ellis Island of the West*. Chicago: The Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1917.
California Civic League, San Francisco Center. *Report 1913-1918*. San Francisco: The Center, 1918.
California National Guard. "Activities of The California National Guard During The World War, 1917-1919." Microfilm. The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
California State Council of Defense. *California in the War: Addresses Delivered at State War Council*.

Sacramento: California State Printing Office: 1918.
California State Council of Defense. *Hand Book on Community Organization*. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1918.
California State Council of Defense, Women's Committee. *Report, Women's Committee of the State Council of Defense of California to Governor William D. Stephens, chairman of the State Council of Defense of California, from June 1, 1917 to January 1, 1919*. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1919.
City Federation of Women's Clubs. *Yearbook, 1916-1918*, vol. 1. San Francisco, 1918.
City Federation of Women's Clubs. *Yearbook, 1918-1920*, vol. 2. San Francisco, 1920.
Colburn, Mrs. Frederick H. *Report of National Service Training School*. San Francisco: Phillips & Van Orden Co, 1916.
Commission on Training Camp Activities. *Camp Music Division of the War Department*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919.
Cross, Ira B. *Collective Bargaining and Trade Agreements in the Brewery, Metal, Teaming and Building Trades of San Francisco, California*. Berkeley: University of California Press (University of California Publications in Economics), 1918.
Davis, John F. *Address in English of Judge John F. Davis at the Celebration of the Fall of the Bastile at the Civic Auditorium San Francisco, on July 14, 1918*. San Francisco: John Henry Nash, 1918.
Douglas, Paul H. "The War Risk Insurance Act." *The Journal of Political Economy* 26 (May 1918): 461-483.
German Relief Bazaar. "Arabian Nights." The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
Johnson, Hiram. *The Diary Letters of Hiram Johnson, 1917-1945*. Edited by Robert E. Burke. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1983.
Koster, Frederick J. *Law and Order and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, An Address*. San Francisco: San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, 1918.
Krehbiel, Edward. *Report of The United States Food Administration for California*. Typescript, 1919. Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Palo Alto.
Lambin, Maria. *Report of the Public Dance Hall Committee of the San Francisco Center of the California Civic League of Women Voters*. San Francisco: San Francisco Center of the California Civic League of Women Voters, 1924.
Letterman General Hospital. *The History of Letterman General Hospital.* San Francisco: Listening Post [1919?].
Liberty Loan General Speakers Committee. Twelfth Federal Reserve District. *Suggestions for Speakers: Fourth Liberty Loan*. San Francisco: Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 1918.
Macomber, Ben. *The Jewel City: Its Planning and Achievement; Its Architecture, Sculpture, Symbolism, and Music; Its Gardens, Palaces, and Exhibits*. San Francisco: John H. Williams, 1915.
Manners, Guy. *The Soul of the Trenches*. San Francisco: Sunset Publishing House, 1918.
McNutt, William Slavens. *The Yanks are Coming!* Boston: The Page Company, 1918.
Native Sons of the Golden West. *War record N.S.G.W* [1919?].
91st Division Publication Committee. *The Story of the 91st Division, San Francisco*. San Francisco: H.S. Crocker Co., 1919.
Odell, Joseph H. *The New Spirit of the New Army: A Message to the "Service Flag" Homes.* New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1918.
Plehn, Carl C. *War Finance In Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States*. San Francisco: Patriotic Liberty Loan Committee of 1000, 1918.
Rolph, James. *History of the* [sic] *San Francisco War Memorial: message to the Board of Supervisors and the people of San Francisco at a special meeting of the Board of Supervisors, February 18, 1930.* San Francisco: Ricoden Printing and Publishing Co., [1930?].
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. *Seventh Annual Statisticasl Report of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce for the Year Ending December 31, 1918*. San Francisco: Publicity Department, 1918.
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. Law and Order Committee. *Law and Order in San Francisco, a*

Beginning. San Francisco: The H. S. Crocker Company, 1916.
San Francisco. Charters. *Proposed charter amendments to be submitted November 5, 1918*. San Francisco: Press of the Phillips & Van Orden Co., 1918.
San Francisco. Citizens' Welcome Home Committee. *The people of San Francisco welcome home the Army Artillery Park, First Army*. [San Francisco: 1919].
San Francisco. Citizens' Welcome Home Committee. *The people of San Francisco welcome home the 18th Engineers*. [San Francisco: 1919].
San Francisco. Citizens' welcome Home Committee. *The people of San Francisco welcome home to the Grizzlies, 144th field artillery*. [San Francisco: 1919].
San Francisco. Citizens' Welcome Home Committee. *The people of San Francisco welcome home to the 62d coast artillery*. [San Francisco: 1919].
San Francisco. Citizens' Welcome Home Committee. *The people of San Francisco welcome home the 347th field artillery*. [San Francisco: 1919].
San Francisco. Citizens' Welcome Home Committee. *The people of San Francicso welcome home the 363d infantry*. [San Francisco: 1919].
San Francisco: Its builders Past and Present. 2 volumes. Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Co., 1913.
Sullivan, Reginald Noel. *Somewhere in France*. San Francisco: Printed for Private Circulation, 1917.
State of California Adjutant General's Office. *Honor Roll: Names of Officers and Enlisted Men From California Who Lost Their Lives While Serving in the Armed Forces During the World War*. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1921.
Star of the sea parish, San Francisco. *Star of the sea church annual . . .Service number, September, 1918* [1918].
Stephens, William D. *California in the War: War Addresses, Proclamations and Patriotic Messages of Governor William D. Stephens*. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1921.
Steward, George, and Henry Wright. *The Practice of Friendship: Studies in Personal Evangelism with Men of the United States Army and Navy in American Training Camps*. New York: Association Press, 1918.
Survey of the Moral and Religious Forces in the Military Camps and Naval Stations in the United States. New York: General War-Time Commission of the Churches, 1918.
Uncle Sam's Fact Book of the World War. New York: C.S. Hammond and Company, 1918.
United States Army. 44th Infantry. *History and station of the 44th, California's infantry regiment*. San Francisco: Presidio, 1920.
United States. Bureau of the Census. *Report on the Social Statistics of Cities*. 2 volumes. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1887.
———. *Thirteenth Census of the United States*. Volumes 1-4. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1913.
———. *Fourteenth Census of the United States taken in the year 1920*. Volumes 1-4. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922.
United States Naval Training Station (San Francisco, Calif.), *San Francisco Naval Training Station*. San Francisco: The Station, [1917?].
War Camp Community Service. *War Camp Community Service, A Retrospect: How a Nation Served its Sons in Army and Navy through Organized Community Hospitality*. New York: War Camp Community Service, 1920.
War Memorial of San Francisco: Souvenir Edition. San Francisco: Pisani Printing & Publishing Company, [1932?].
Young Men's Christian Association, San Francisco Chapter. *Man Power in Wartime*. [San Francisco, 1918?].
Young Women's Christian Association of the U.S.A. "San Francisco Social Service Organizations." San Francisco: The Association, 1919.
Yorke, Peter. *America and Ireland: An Open Letter to Mr. Garret W. McEnerney by Rev. P.C. Yorke, D.D*. San Francisco: Text Book Publishing, Co., 1918.

Newspapers and Periodicals

The Argonaut (Berkeley)
Bethlehem Star (San Francisco)
The Bulletin (San Francisco)
California Christian Advocate (San Francisco)
Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations of San Francisco
The Courier (Berkeley)
The Daily News (San Francisco)
Labor Clarion (San Francisco)
Municipal Record (San Francisco)
The New York Times
Organized Labor (San Francisco)
Overland Monthly (San Francisco)
Pacific Churchman (San Francisco)
Pacific Marine Review (San Francisco)
Sacramento Bee
The San Francisco Call and Post
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Activities
San Francisco Chronicle
San Francisco Examiner
Town Talk: The Pacific Weekly (San Francisco)
Transactions of the Commonwealth Club of California
The Wasp: A Weekly Journal of Illustration and Comment (San Francisco)

Books and Articles

Abbott, Carl. *Portland: Planning, Politics, and Growth in a Twentieth-Century City*. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1983.

Abbot, Willis J. *The United States in the Great War*. New York: Leslie-Judge Co., 1919.

Abrahamson, Mark. *Urban Enclaves: Identity and Place in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Abrams, Ray H. *Preachers Present Arms*. New York: Round Table Press, 1933.

Ambrosini, Linda L. "The San Francisco Civic League and the Redefintion of Women's Role, 1911-1921." Master's thesis, California State University, Hayward, 1980.

Anderson, Robert L. *The Diggs-Caminetti Case, 1913-1917: for Any Other Immoral Purpose*, vol. 1. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellon Press, 1990.

Arrington, Leonard. "The Influenza Epidemic of 1918-19 in Utah." *Utah Historical Quarterly* 58 (Spring 1990): 183-200.

Barnes, Merritt. " 'Fountainhead of Corruption': Peter P. McDonough, Boss of San Francisco Underworld." *California History* 58, no. 2 (Summer 1979): 143-153.

Barnhart, Jacqueline Baker. *The Fair But Frail: Prostitution in San Francisco, 1849-1900*. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1986.

Barth, Gunther. *City People: The Rise of Modern City Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

———. *Instant Cities: Urbanization and the Rise of San Francisco and Denver*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Beans, Rowena. *"Inasmuch . . .": The One Hundred-Year History of the San Francisco Ladies' Protection and Relief Society, 1853-1953*. Edited by Carol Green Wilson. Berkeley: James J. Gillick & Co., 1953.

Bean, Walton. "Ideas of Reform in California." *California History* 51, no. 3 (Fall 1972): 213-226.

Benedict, Burton, ed. *The Anthropology of World's Fairs: San Francisco's Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915*. Berkeley: Scolar Press, 1983.

Benton, Lisa M. *The Presidio: From Army Post to National Park*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998.

Berhow, Mark J. "Historic California Posts: Harbor Defenses of San Francisco," from website of California State Military Department, The California State Military Museum, http://www.militarymuseum.org/HDSF.html.

Besch, Michael D. *A Navy Second to None: The History of the U.S. Naval Training in World War I.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2002.

Blackford, Mansel G. *The Lost Dream: Business and City Planning on the Pacific Coast, 1890-1920.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993.

———. *The Politics of Business in California, 1890-1920.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1977.

Blair, Karen J. *The Clubwoman as Feminist: True Womanhood Redefined, 1868-1914.* New York: Homes & Meier Publishers, 1980.

Bodnar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Boxerman, Alan. "Kahn of California." *California History* 55, no. 4 (winter 1976): 341-351.

Boyer, Paul. *Urban Masses and Moral Order in America, 1820-1920.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Brechin, Gray. *Imperial San Francisco: Urban Power, Earthly Ruin.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Bristow, Nancy Kathleen. "Creating Crusaders: The Commission on Training Camp Activities and the Pursuit of the Progressive Social Vision during World War One." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1989.

———. *Making Men Moral: Social Engineering during the Great War.* New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Breen, W. J. *Uncle Sam at Home: Civilian Mobilization, Wartime Federalism and the Council of National Defense, 1917-1919.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984.

Brook, James, Chris Carlsson, and Nancy Peters. *Reclaiming San Francisco: History, Politics, Culture.* San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1998.

Broussard, Albert S. *Black San Francisco: The Struggle for Racial Equality in the West, 1900-1954.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1993.

Burton, Jean. *Katharine Felton and Her Social Work in San Francisco.* Stanford: James Ladd Delkin, 1947.

Byington Lewis Francis, and Oscar Lewis, eds., *The History of San Francisco.* 3 vols. Chicago: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1931.

Byrkit, James. *Forging the Copper Collar: Arizona's Labor Management War of 1901-1921.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1982.

Cannistraro, Philip V. and Gerald Meyer, ed. *The Lost World of Italian American Radicalism: Politics, Labor, and Culture.* Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2003.

Carroll, F. M. *American Opinion and the Irish Question, 1912-23: A study in opinion and policy.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.

Center of Military History. *Order of Battle of the United States Land Forces in the World War.* Volume 3. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1931-1949.

Chambers II, John Whiteclay. *To Raise and Army: The Draft Comes to Modern America.* New York: Free Press, 1987.

———. *The Tyranny of Change: American in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920.* 2nd ed. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2000.

Chen, Yong. *Chinese San Francisco, 1850-1943: A Trans-Pacific Community.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Cherny, Robert W. "City Commercial, City Beautiful, City Practical." *California History* 73, no. 4 (Winter 94/95): 296-307.

Chrislock, Carl H. *Watchdog of Loyalty: The Minnesota Commission of Public Safety During World War I.* St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1991.

Cinel, Dino. *From Italy to San Francisco: The Immigrant Experience.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982.

Clark, Clifford E., Jr. *Minnesota In a Century of Change: The State and Its People Since 1900*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1989.
Clary, Raymond H. *The Making of Golden Gate Park, 1906-1950*. San Francisco: Don't Call It Frisco Press, 1987.
Cleland, Robert Glass. *From Wilderness to Empire: A History of California*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
———. *March of Industry*. San Francisco: Powell Publishing Co., 1929.
Cowan, Robert G., with Roger M. Baty. *Foibles, Fun, Flukes, Facts of life in World War I, San Francisco, Oakland and France and Los Angeles*. Glendale, Calif: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1985.
Crosby, Alfred. *Epidemic and Peace, 1918*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1976.
Davis, Reda. *California Women: A Guide to their Politics, 1885-1911*. San Francisco: California Scene, [1968?].
Dawley, Alan. *Changing the World: American Progressives in War and Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
Delmatier, Royce D. *The Rumble of California Politics, 1848-1970*. New York: Wiley, 1970.
DeWitt, Howard A. *Images of Ethnic and Radical Violence in California Politics, 1917-1930: A Survey*. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1975.
Diner, Steven. *A Very Different Age: Americans of the Progressive Era*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1998.
Dobie, Charles Caldwell. *San Francisco: A Pageant*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1939.
Drury, Clifford M. *San Francisco YMCA: 100 Years by the Golden Gate, 1853-1953*. Glendale, California: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1963.
Edwards, Vina Howland. *The Story of the San Francisco Presbyterial Society*. Oakland: A. Newman, 1933.
Ellis, Edward. *Echoes of Distant Thunder: Life in the United States, 1914-1918*. New York: Coward, McCann, and Geoghegan, 1975.
Emmons, David. *The Butte Irish: Class and Ethnicity in an American Mining Town, 1875-1925*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.
Englander, Susan. *Class Conflict and Coalition in the California Woman Suffrage Movement, 1907-1912: The San Francisco Wage Earners' Suffrage League*. Lewiston: NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.
Erie, Steven P. *Globalizing Los Angeles: Trade, Infrastructure, and Regional Development*. Standford: Stanford University Press, 2004.
Estavan, Lawrence, ed. *San Francisco Theatre Research* vol. 10: *The Italian Theatre in San Francisco*. San Francisco, WPA Project 10677, OP 665-08-3-167, 1939.
Ethington, Philip J. *The Public City : the Political Construction of Urban Life in San Francisco, 1850-1900*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Evans, Martin and Ken Lunn. *War and Memory in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Berg, 1997.
Fahey, John. *The Inland Empire: Unfolding Years, 1879-1929*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1986.
Fairbanks, Robert B. and Patricia Mooney-Melvin, ed. *Making Sense of the City: Local Government, Civic Culture, and Community Life in Urban America*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2001.
Flamm, Jerry. *Good Life in Hard Times: San Francisco's '20s and '30s*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1978.
Fogelson, Robert M. *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850-1930*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
Frost, Richard H. *The Mooney Case*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.
Gibbs, Christopher C. *The Great Silent Majority: Missouri's Resistance ot World War I*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988.
Giffen, Guy and Helen Giffen. *The Story of Golden Gate Park*. San Francisco: Phillips and Van Orden Co., 1949.
Gillette, Howard, Jr. and Zane L. Miller, eds. *American Urbanism: A Historiographical Review*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.

Goldbeck, Herman G. "The Political Career of James Rolph, Jr.: A Preliminary Study." Master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1936.
Gumina, Deanna Paoli. *The Italians of San Francisco, 1850-1930*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1978.
Gutfeld, Arnon. *Montana's Agony: Years of War and Hysteria, 1917-1921*. Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1979.
Hall, Greg. *Harvest Wobblies: The Industrial Workers of the World and Agricultural Laborers in the American West, 1905-1930*. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Press, 2001.
Haller, Stephen. *The Last Word in Airfields: San Francisco's Crissy Field*. San Francisco: Golden Gate National Parks Association, 2001.
Harries, Meirion and Susie. *The Last Days of Innocence: America at War, 1917-1918*. New York: Random House, 1997.
Heiger, Robert F., and Alan F. Almquist. *The Other Californians: Prejudice and Discrimination under Spain, Mexico, and the United States to 1920*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.
Helton, Helen E., & Norman E. Leach, *Heritage and Hope: A History of the Protestant, Anglican & Orthodox Church Movement in San Francisco on the occasion of the 75th Anniversary Year (1978-1979) of the San Francisco Council of Churches*. San Francisco: SF Council of Churches, 1979.
Hoover, Karl Douglas. "The German-Hindu Conspiracy in California." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1989.
Issel, William, and Robert W. Cherny. *San Francisco, 1865-1932: Politics, Power, and Urban Development.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
James, D. Clayton and Anne Sharp Wells. *America and the Great War, 1914-1920*. Wheeling, Ill.: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1998.
Jensen, Joan M. "Annette Abbott Adams, Politician." *The Pacific Historical Review* 35 (May 1966): 185-201.
Johnson, Judith. "Kansas in the 'Grippe': The Spanish Influenza Epidemic of 1918." *Kansas History* 15 (Spring 1992): 44-55.
Kahn, Judd. *Imperial San Francisco: Politics and Planning in an American City, 1897-1906*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.
Karp, David A., Gregory P. Stone, and William C. Yoels. *Being Urban: A Sociology of City Life*. 2nd ed. New York: Praeger, 1991.
Kazin, Michael. *Barons of Labor: The San Francisco Building Trades and Union Power in the Progressive Era*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987.
Keene, Jennifer D. *Doughboys, the Great War, and the Remaking of America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
Kendrick, Charles. *Memoirs of Charles Kendrick*. Edited by David Warren Ryder. San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co., 1972.
Kennedy, David M. *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
Kidd, William and Brian Murdoch, ed. *Memory and Memorials: The Commemorative Century* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2004.
Kinnard, Lawrence. *History of the Greater San Francisco Bay Region*. 3 vols. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1966.
Knafla, Louis and Susan Binnie, ed. *Law, Society and the State: Essays in Modern Legal History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
Knight, Robert Edward Lee. *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1900-1918*. Berekely: University of California Press, 1960.
Lansing, Jewel. *Portland: People, Politics,and Power, 1851-2001*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2003.
Larsen, Lawrence H. *The Urban West at the End of the Frontier*. Lawrence: Regents Press of Kansas, 1978.

di Leonardo, Micaela. *The Varieties of Ethnic Experience: Kinship, Class, and Gender among California Italian-Americans*. Ithaca: Corenll University Press. 1984.
Levi, Steven C. *Committee of Vigilance: The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Law and Order Committee, 1916-1919: A Case Study in Official Hysteria*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 1983.
Lewis, Emanuel Raymond. *A History of San Francisco Harbor Defense Installations: Forts Baker, Barry, Cronkhite, and Funston*. [California?], 1965.
Lincoln, A. "My Dear Friend and Champion: Letters Between Theodore Roosevelt and Hiram Johnson, 1918." *California History* 48, no. 1 (March 1968): 19-36.
Lotchin, Roger W. *The Bad City in the Good War: San Francisco, Los Angeles, Oakland, and San Diego*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003.
———. "The City and the Sword: San Francisco and the Rise of the Metropolitan-Military Complext, 1919-1941. *The Journal of American History* 65, no. 4 (March 1979): 996-1020.
———. *Fortress California, 1910-1961: From Warfare to Welfare*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
Lott, Arnold S. *A Long Line of Ships: Mare Island's Century of Naval Activity in California*. Annapolis: U.S. Naval Institute, 1954.
MacMahon, Sandra Varney. "Epidemics as Catalysts in the Development of the Public Health Care System: San Francisco, California, 1854-1930." Masters Thesis: San Jose State University, 1991.
Malone, Michael and Richard Etulain. *The American West: A Twentieth-Century History*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.
Marshall, Gordon, ed. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
McGloin, John Bernard, S. J. *San Francisco: The Story of a City*. San Rafael: Presidio Press, 1978.
Meigs, Mark. *Optimism at Armageddon: Voices of American Participants in the First World War*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
Melzer, Richard. "Exiled in the Desert: The Bisbee Deportees' Reception in Mexico, 1917." *New Mexico Historical Review* 67 (July 1992): 269-284.
Monti, Daniel J., Jr. *The American City: A Social and Cultural History*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
Moore, Shirley Ann Wilson. *To Place Our Deeds: The African American Community in Richmond, California, 1910-1963*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
Mowry, George E. *The California Progressives*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1951.
———. *The Urban Nation, 1920-1960*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1965.
Mullendore, William Clinton. *History of the United States Food Administration, 1917-1919*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1941.
Myers, Rex. "An Immigrant Heritage: South Dakota's Foreign Born in the Era of Assimilation." *South Dakota History* 19 (summer 1989): 134-155.
Nash, Gerald. *The American West in the Twentieth Century: A Short History of an Urban Oasis*. 2nd ed. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1977.
National Park Service. *The Presidio of San Francisco, 1776-1976: A Collection of Historical Source Materials*. San Francisco: National Park Service, Western Regional Office, 1976.
Narell, Irena. *Our City: The Jews of San Francisco*. San Diego: Howell North Books, 1981.
Nelson, Gerald B. *Seattle: The Life and Times of an American City*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.
Nolte, Carl and the San Francisco Chronicle Staff, *The San Francisco Century: A City Rises from the Ruins of the 1906 Earthquake and Fire*. San Francisco: San Francisco Chronicle Press, 2005.
Older, Cora. *San Francisco: Magic City*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1961.
O'Leary, Cecilia Elizabeth. *To Die For: The Paradox of American Patriotism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
Palen, J. John. *The Urban World*. 7th ed. New York: Paradigm Publishers, 2004.
Paoli, Deanna M. "La Colonia Italiana Di San Francisco = The Italian Colony of San Francisco, 1850 to 1930." Master's Thesis, University of San Francisco, 1970.

Paterson, Thomas G. "California Progressives and Foreign Policy," *California History* 47, no. 4 (December 1968): 329-342.
Peterson, H. C. and Gilbert C. Fite. *Opponents of War, 1917-1918*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.
Phillips, Catherine Coffin. *Through the Golden Gate: San Francisco, 1769-1937*. San Francisco: Sutton House, 1938.
Plowman, Matthew Erin. "The Anglo-Irish Factors in the Indo-German Conspiracy in San Francisco During WWI, 1913-1921." Ph.D. diss., University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1999.
———. "Irish Republicans and the Indo-German Conspiracy of World War I." *New Hibernia Review* 7 (Autum 2003): 81-105.
Pollock, Christopher. *San Francisco's Golden Gate Park: A Thousand and Seventeen Acres of Stories*. Portland: West Winds Press, 2001.
Powell, Allan. "Our Cradles Were in Germany: Utah's German American Community and World War I." *Utah Historical Quarterly* 58 (Fall 1990): 371-387.
Pourade, Richard. *The Rising Tide*. San Diego: Union-Tribune Publishing Company, 1967.
Putnam, Jackson K. "The Persistence of Progressivism in the 1920's: The Case of California." *The Pacific Historical Review* 35, no. 4 (November 1966): 395-411.
Radin, Paul. *The Italians of San Francisco: Their Adjustment and Acculturation*. Abstract from the SERA Project 2-F2-98 (3-F2-145): Cultural Anthropology, July 1935.
Righter, Robert W. *The Battle Over Hetch Hetchy: America's Most Controversial Dam and the Birth of Modern Environmentalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
Rischin, Moses. "Sunny Jim Rolph: The First 'Mayor of All the People.'" *California History* 53, no. 2 (Summer 1974): 165-172.
Rockafellar, Nancy. "Making the World Safe for the Soldiers of Democracy: Patriotism, Public Health and Venereal Disease Control on the West Coast, 1910-1919." PhD diss., University of Washington, 1990.
Rodriquez, Jeanette and Ted Fortier. *Cultural Memory: Resistance, Faith and Identity*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007.
Rosenbaum, Fred. *Architects of Reform: Congregational and Community Leadership Emanu-El of San Francisco, 1849-1980*. Berkeley: Judah L. Magnes Memorial Museum, 1980.
Ryan, Frederick L. *Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Building Trades*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1936.
Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
Sabraw, Liston F. "Mayor James Rolph, Jr. and the End of the Barbary Coast." Master's thesis, San Francisco State College, 1960.
Sale, Roger. *Seattle: Past to Present*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976.
Saunders, Nicholas J. *Matters of Conflict: Material culture, memory and the First World War*. London: Routledge, 2004.
Scott, Mel. *The San Francisco Bay Area*, 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
Schwartz, Stephen. *Brotherhood of the Sea: A History of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, 1885-1985*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1986.
Selvin, David F. *Sky Full of Storm: A Brief History of California Labor*. San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1975.
Sitton, Tom and William Deverell, ed. *Metropolis in the Making: Los Angeles in the 1920s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
Soennichsen, John. *Miwoks to Missiles: A History of Angel Island*. Tiburon, Calif.: Angel Island Association, 2001.
Sparks, Edith. *Capital Intentions: Female Proprietors in San Francisco, 1850-1920*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
Steinson, Barbara J. *American Women's Activism in World War I*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1982.

Sterba, Christopher M. *Good Americans: Italian and Jewish Immigrants During the First World War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Strobridge, Colonel William F. *Golden Gate to Golden Horn: Camp Fremont, California and the American Expedition to Siberia of 1918*. San Mateo: San Mateo County Historical Association, [1975?].

Taylor, David Wooster. *The Life of James Rolph, Jr.* San Francisco: Committee for Publication of The Life of James Rolph, Jr. [Recroder Printing and Publishing Co.], 1934.

Teaford, Jon C. *The Twentieth-Century American City: Problem, Promise, and Reality*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Thompson, Erwin N. *Defender of the Gate: The Presidio of San Francisco , A History from 1846 to 1995*. Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California: National Park Service, 1997.

Thompson, Erwin N., and Sally B. Woodbridge. *Special History Study: Presidio of San Francisco: An Outline of Its Evolution as a U.S. Army Post, 1847-1990*. Denver: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1992.

United States Bureau of the Census. Population Division. *U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population of the 100 Largest Urban Places in the United States: 1790-1990*. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1998.

United States National Park Service. *The Presidio of San Francisco 1776-1976: A Collection of Historical Source Materials*. San Francisco: National Park Service, Western Regional Office, 1976.

Vaughn, Stephen. *Holding Fast the Innter Lines: Democracy, Nationalism, and the Committee on Public Information*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

Walsh, James P. ed. *The San Francisco Irish: 1850-1976*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: The Irish Literary and Historical Society, 1979.

Watkins, T. H. and R. R. Olmsted. *Mirror of the Dream: An Illustrated History of San Francisco*. San Francisco: Scrimshaw Press, 1976.

Weintraub, Hyman. "The I.W.W. in California, 1905-1931." Master's Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1947.

Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order: 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.

Wilson, William H. *Coming of Age: Urban America, 1915-1945*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1974.

Winter, Jay. *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Wittke, Carl. *The German-Language Press in America*. University of Kentucky Press, 1957.

Wohl, R. Richard and Anselm L. Strauss. "Symbolic Representation and the Urban Milieu." *The American Journal of Sociology* 63, no. 5 (March 1958): 523-532.

Wollenberg, Charles. *Golden Gate Metropolis: Perspectives on Bay Area History*. Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1985.

Works Projects Administration in Northern California. *The Army at the Golden Gate: A Guide to Army Posts in the San Francisco Bay Area*. San Francisco: Sixth Army Library, Library Depot, Presidio of San Francisco, [1941?].

Worthen, James. *Governor James Rolph and the Great Depression in California*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland and Company, 2006.

Wynn, Neil A. *From Progressivism to Prosperity: World War I and American Society*. New York: Homes & Meier, 1986.

Zelinsky, Wilbur. *Nation Into State: the Shifting Symbolic Foundations of American Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Zieger, Robert H. *America's Great War: World War I and the American Experience*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2000.

Zukin, Sharon. *The Cultures of Cities*. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.