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ABSTRACT

Celebrating Milestones:
An Examination of the Centennials of the American and French Revolutions and their
International Expositions
A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts
by Jeffrey A. Clarke

This thesis is a comparative examination of the centennial celebrations of the American and French Revolutions. It studies the International Expositions held in these countries in 1876 and 1889 respectively. This thesis attempts to answer the question of what purpose did these expositions have in their respective countries, and how successful each exposition was in meeting these purposes. In general it is argued that the American centennial exposition failed because its purpose changed to become more extreme and exclusionary. The French centennial exposition succeeded because its purpose changed to become more moderate and inclusive. The research for this thesis was done in the City Archives of Philadelphia and using various published primary sources.
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INTRODUCTION

This paper is an examination of two events, the centennials of the American and French Revolutions. These two events provide the nexus of several different phenomena of the nineteenth century. The first is the rise of centenary commemorations, and the second is the explosion of World Fairs. We have writ large on the page of history as well, nationalist and economic movements, political spectacle and healing, industry, technology, imperialism, and categorization to say nothing of the artistic, musical and literary trends of the time. All these come together at the Centennial International Exhibition of 1876 in Philadelphia, and the Exposition Universelle de 1889 in Paris.

The questions therefore are as follows, what purpose did these events serve in their respective countries, and did they succeed in that purpose? The answer to these questions and the goal of this work is that the centennial expositions of 1876 and 1889 are political manifestations that attempt to bring together a widely divided citizenry rife with political and ideological differences. The apparent unification of the United States and France around certain rallying symbols in the later quarter of the nineteenth century was largely due to political motives and the centennial expositions were the most visible method of promulgating unity. As Faith Pizor says, “exhibitions are more than anything else a powerful means for propaganda.”¹ For the United States in 1876 and France in 1889 this is not just a propaganda of the superiority of the nation, it is also propaganda of

the superiority of a political view, and an ideological view. In short the purpose of the centennial celebrations was political and societal unity; the centennial expositions were the tools/symbols used to achieve this unity; the success of the unity can be seen in the enduring nature of these tools/symbols.

The remainder of this introduction will deal briefly with the rise of centenary commemorations and a brief history of International Expositions. The next two chapters discuss in detail the American and French expositions respectively. Each starts with a brief sketch of the problems that faced each nation, and then discusses various political maneuverings required to hold these spectacles for the ages.

Celebrations of Birth

How does one celebrate a birthday? For many people it has become nothing more than an excuse to go out for a nice meal at a fancy restaurant with their spouses. When we are children, birthdays are momentous occasions, the chance to gain more presents and have all of one’s friends over, to get sick eating ice cream and cake. However, in general we tend to celebrate only milestone birthdays, from the civic standpoint when one can drive, drink, be conscripted, and vote, from the personal standpoint, the round numbers of thirty, forty etc. It is in latter life that we start finding the retrospective birthdays, those milestones where family and friends gather to celebrate and reexamine our life.

How does a country celebrate a birthday? For many countries this question is often followed with that of, when is the country’s birthday? For the United States one can see that the answer is similar. The various civic celebrations and fireworks displays are the equivalent of the nice meal at the fancy restaurant, a reason to feel happy, but not
a reason for over the top celebrations and massive introspection. Yet for countries too there are those birthdays that are introspective, that are milestones. The most obvious of these are the centennials, the celebration of another one hundred years of existence.

In today’s world, a decade removed from the world wide celebrations surrounding the millennium, there is a keen sense of the importance of celebrations of milestone events. Yet, this is in many ways a new phenomenon or at least one of the modern world. The celebration of centennials expanded exponentially in the second half of the nineteenth century. While the majority of these were to recognize literary or musical figures a few could be considered National birthday celebrations.

But the rise of this ‘Cult of the Centenary’ as Roland Quinault describes it, was not just simply a celebration of historic figures; indeed each of these celebrations is in some small way part of the rise of nationalist feelings within the countries, “many centenary commemorations had an obviously national flavor…. some centenary commemorations were actively supported by governments as a way of asserting national pride.” But beyond the nationalism, almost inherent in the celebrations of important historical events and figures the ‘Cult of the Centenary’ was motivated in part by economic concerns. As an example when the Crystal Palace was rebuilt in 1854 it was the sight of long standing triennial Handel Festivals, starting in 1857, for the economic benefit they provided to the company which had rebuilt the massive edifice.

3 Ibid., 306-312.
4 Ibid., 306-307. This of course requires an acceptance of the English State starting with Alfred the Great.
5 Ibid., 321.
6 Ibid., 307.
So a centenary becomes not just a marker of time, but a rallying point for nationalist and economic drives of the country at the time and as such a reflection of the country. By the canonization of figures from a national past centenaries provide new symbols for the glory of the nation. There is a correlation between the rise of nationalism and the rise of assigning history and meaning to various symbols. Just as the later nineteenth century saw an explosion in the centenary celebration so it saw large growth in the study of symbols and their associated meanings. The beginnings of psychoanalysis, and especially dream interpretation are a prime example of the categorizing and creation of meaning for symbols.

Centenaries by their focus on events and human figures and the commemorations that arose among them were uniquely placed to be a birth place for new national symbolism. Quinault mentions in his study of centenaries countless times where busts are used as the primary symbols, “a colossal bust of Goethe,” “a gigantic bust of the poet [Robert Burns],” “the colossal bust of Schiller.”7 We also have the first creation of Shakespeare libraries and national Shakespeare theatre’s in the United States and Britain to commemorate his three hundredth birthday, the maintenance of Naval superiority to honor Drake. There was a shift in the later nineteenth century away from melodrama and poetry as markers for a centenary and towards “scholarly lectures, historical exhibitions and sometimes by statues in ‘correct’ period costume.”8

Centenary commemorations, be they nationalistic or economically oriented, are a government statement. Government support, whether overt or not, means that these commemorations were establishing new modern views of an active citizenry. It may be

---

7 Ibid., 307-308.
8 Ibid. 321.
difficult to get all citizens to vote, but by nationalizing a local figure political control is further extended over the citizens. Much as the Catholic Church might do with raising local saints to positions of high importance, so the government might raise a local poet to national prominence. Therefore part of the purpose of a centennial was the bolstering of national unity through the creation of new symbols of national significance.

For the Education of the Public

The Bureau International des Expositions was originally created in 1928 to act as a governing body for the multitude of Expositions being held around the world.\(^9\) The B.I.E.’s categorization and organization of the vast numbers of International Expositions is in some ways simply the continuation of the nineteenth century idea of labeling and categorizing the entire world in an attempt to understand it. This idea is one that is central to the Expositions of the nineteenth century with their elaborately devised systems of categorization and the strictly delineated lines between industry and art. There have been over 300 International Expositions since the first modern one was held in London in 1851.

In general the first International Exposition\(^10\) was that held in 1851 at the ‘Crystal Palace.’ The brain child of Prince Albert, consort of Queen Victoria, the Crystal Palace was an unmitigated success, and in many ways provided the spur and ground work for every single exposition that followed. Officially titled “The Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations” the 1851 International Exhibition drew over 6 million visitors and garnered a profit of £186,437. To house the fair a single building was

---


\(^10\) There are three main descriptors of these events, either the more American ‘fairs’ the French ‘exposition,’ or the British ‘exhibition.’ Throughout this work I shall be adopting the B.I.E.’s terminology of International Exposition.
constructed looking in some ways like a giant green house. The ‘Crystal Palace’ was large enough to accommodate a record of 93,224 people at once and housed close to 14,000 exhibitors.

Despite the generally acknowledged primacy of the London 1851 International Exposition, most sources trace these expositions back farther. J.S. Ingram traces these events back to biblical times, referencing the Book of Esther, and makes a lengthy argument regarding the internationality of Ahasuerus’s display. While not reaching quite that far back to antiquity the general consensus is that the precursors of the International Expositions were the medieval trade fairs, “great fairs were held at major crossroads of trade and were a mixture of commerce, entertainment, and theatre.”

It is in France, however, a distinctive tradition of what might be seen as National Expositions appeared. Conceived originally to occur in 1797 by the Marquis d’Avèze as a way of promoting his industrial products the first exhibition did not take place until 1798 due to “bills of the Directory, ordering all the nobility to withdraw within twenty four hours to, at least thirty leagues from Paris.” However, after the success of the first they became a tradition, with expositions held in 1801, 1802, 1806, 1819, 1823, 1827, 1834, 1839, 1844 and 1849. These national affairs proliferated throughout Europe in the first

---

12 Ibid., 7. Oct 7 1851. I will also note that there were a total of six restrooms in the Crystal Palace.
13 Ibid.
15 Findling, Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, xv.
16 Ingram, The Centennial Exposition, 24-25.
half of the nineteenth century, but it was not until London in 1851 that the international aspect was truly embraced.

After London in 1851 there were a number of less successful International Expositions, including the first in the United States, the failed New York attempt to reproduce the Crystal Palace. Several were held in Dublin, and Paris hosted an International Exposition in 1855 which displayed the dichotomy in Anglo-Frankish relations at the time. 1855 in Paris had to balance the international military alliance in the Crimean War and the traditional rivalry between France and England in economic, colonial and cultural areas.\textsuperscript{18} However, in terms of formatting and spurring the drive towards greater numbers of International Expositions for the 25 years between 1851 and 1876, there are two that should be mentioned in greater detail.

The first of these is the International Exposition that took place in Paris 1867. Officially the \textit{Exposition Universelle}, the 1867 French exposition would introduce two enduring aspects. The first enduring aspect was the eruption of international exposition activities beyond the main exhibition hall. Holding everything from diverse restaurants to the various minor structures, “the innovations of the park would be copied in virtually every subsequent world’s fair.”\textsuperscript{19} The second, although not explicit was that of a centralizing theme for the International Exposition, for 1867 it was “the bounty of nature could be transformed in universal harmony for the human race.”\textsuperscript{20} Tied closely to the idea of theme is the idea of how one categorizes and organizes an International Exposition.

\textsuperscript{19} Arthur Chandler, "Paris 1867," \textit{Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions}.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid. 33
Once a country determined to hold an International Exposition one of the key factors is how to classify the thousands and thousands of products that will be displayed. In some ways this classification of the exhibits is what separates International Expositions from international yard sales. In general there are two problems to be solved in the categorizing and layout of an International Exposition, The first is what sort of general groupings should be made (e.g. all steam engines should go together) and the second in their national identity (all products of Prussia should be displayed with other products from Prussia). Bruno Giberti in his book dealing with the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia discusses the difficulties that various nations had in the classification and arrangement of exhibits.\textsuperscript{21} According to Giberti, the panel of Judges for London in 1851 had to adapt Prince Albert’s simple four categories – raw materials, machines, manufactured goods, manufactured arts – into eventually thirty classes of exhibits with the bulk of the exhibits falling under Albert’s machines and manufactured goods categories.\textsuperscript{22} In addition exhibits were only displayed by nationality, so if a person wanted to see the difference in carriages between England and the United States, they would need to walk from the British display of carriages in the extreme western end of the Crystal Palace to the extreme eastern end where the exhibits of the United States were grouped, and then hunt within the United States area to find carriages. 1855 did little to ameliorate this confusion and indeed the adding of fine arts\textsuperscript{23} as a critical aspect of International Expositions further confused the issue.

\textsuperscript{21} Giberti, Desiging the Centennial, 1-32.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 5.
\textsuperscript{23} The 1851 London exposition had only allowed sculpture to be presented because it bridged the gap between art and manufacture.
In this context it becomes apparent that the system devised for the 1867 International Exposition was in some ways a radical departure. Organized into ten departments and further broken down within the departments into ninety-five classes based on “a hierarchy of human needs.” To solve the problem of how to display the exhibits, the International Exposition of 1867 adopted for the first time the dual system of placing objects in both national and class groupings. With an elliptical shape, nations were assigned wedges of the space while the class groupings formed rings. Thus for our visitor interested in carriages they would simply find the ring dealing with manufactured goods, and wander that ring knowing that all countries examples of carriages would be on this ring.

The second International Exposition of importance in those 25 years is that of Vienna in 1873. Officially the Weltausstellung 1873 Wien the International Exposition did not follow the 1867 Paris example and organized items only according to geography. However two other aspects of the 1873 Vienna International Exposition that are most memorable: its abandonment of a single building style and the absolute financial disaster that it represented both for Vienna and the Austrian government.

The organization of items by geography only can be mitigated somewhat by the separation into multiple buildings. The intrepid carriage aficionado who had visited each of the other fairs in his comparisons of carriages would know that so long as he was in the Palace of Industry he would be able to find the carriages; however, within the said building pinpoint accuracy was impossible. The 1873 International Exposition basically

24 Giberti, *Designing the Centennial*, 11.
26 Ibid., 50-54.
took the idea of Albert’s four classes and created separate buildings for each, and this idea would be carried on in the following International Expositions.

Equally important was the absolute economic failure of the International Exposition. While London in 1851 had earned an outstanding profit, the International Expositions since had failed to provide much return; most ended in debt, but could claim to be triumphs by attracting more visitors than previous fairs or by imparting a sense of national superiority. Vienna’s International Expositions specifically designed to herald the glory of a rebuilt and revitalized Austria\textsuperscript{27} was the first International Exposition that could be considered a flop. Paris in 1867 had drawn nearly eight hundred thousand more visitors than did London in 1862; Vienna drew roughly two hundred thousand more visitors than Paris, but it was not the unmitigated triumph the organizers had hoped to see. In economic terms, “the loss amounted to 15 million gulden.”\textsuperscript{28} Contributing to this sense of unmet expectations were outside events, including the Vienna stock market crash shortly after the fair opened, and a major cholera outbreak.

One centralizing purpose of each of these International Expositions and indeed of all International Expositions is that of education. Part I, Article 1 of the 1928 Protocol that established the B.I.E. and under which it is governed to this day states “An exhibition is a display which, whatever its title, has as its principal purpose the education of the public.”\textsuperscript{29} A citizenry that attended an International Exposition was becoming an educated citizenry in not only geography, (the organization of the Vienna in 1873 was within buildings geographical based on the Mercator projection) but also in the triumph

\textsuperscript{27} Giberti, Desiging the Centennial, 13.
\textsuperscript{28} Leila G. Sirk, “Vienna 1873,” Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, 53.
of technology and modernity over more backward exhibitors and favorable comparisons
to the giants of the world. Education during the early International Expositions was not
simply the education of people in terms of the goods and services available but was also
the education of a citizenry in the superiority of the host nation.

By 1876 and 1889 a long standing tradition of centennial commemorations as
well as International Expositions had arisen. Both were traced by authors of the time to
back to the Greeks and Romans, which for the modern republics founded in imitation of
those ancient republics would have added significance. It should also be clear that the
goals and purposes of International Expositions and centenary commemorations were
fluid and ever shifting and often contained a layer of subtext beneath the stated goals and
purposes.

Most examinations of International Expositions of the nineteenth century are
mainly concerned with narrative descriptors of the process of creating the International
Expositions and the sights to be observed there. Historical interest in International
Expositions can be roughly divided into three categories, the art on display, the
architecture of the buildings, and nationalist support. That International Expositions with
their Fine Arts component, judging and extensive written reports would be a bonanza for
art historians is obvious. Likewise for the historian of architectural change and national
architectural styles International Expositions are a major focus of work. Indeed it is
nearly impossible to discuss any specific International Exposition without describing the

30 Ingram, The Centennial Exposition, 22-23.
buildings and the engineering feats needed to create them, whether it be the interchangeable parts of the Crystal Palace, the giant dome of the main building in Vienna or the Eiffel Tower, architecture has a central place in historical scholarship of the expositions. 32

The Centennial International Exhibition of 1876 is in some ways a forgotten event in American Historiography. During the past twenty years, while there has been some republishing of primary source material from 1876 it appears that only two books have been written dealing with the centennial exhibition, Julie Brown’s Health and Medicine on Display: International Expositions in the United States, 1876-1904, 33 and Bruno Giberti’s Designing the Centennial: A history of the 1876 International Exhibition in Philadelphia. 34 Giberti approached the Centennial International Exhibition originally as an architectural history, and while aspects of his book are still very much focused on architecture, his main focus is on the order and organization of the Centennial International Exhibition. Articles on the Centennial International Exhibition are scarce as well, with four prominent ones being, Faith Pizor’s “Preperations for the Centennial Exhibition of 1876,” Thomas Winpenny’s “The Phoenix Tower and the Struggling Centennial Exhibition of 1876: A tale of what might have been,” Jeffrey Howe’s “A 'Monster Edifice': Ambivalence, Appropriation, and the Forging of Cultural Identity at the Centennial Exhibition,” and Mary Frances Cordato’s “Toward a New Century: Women and the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition, 1876” all of which are published in

32 Miriam Levin, When the Eiffel Tower Was New: French Visions of Progress at the Centennial of the Revolution (South Hadley, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989); The Paris Universal Exhibition Album, 1889 (London: W. Stiassny and E. Rasetti, 1889); Giberti, Designing the Centennial; Post, 1876: A Centennial Exhibition; Gross and Snyder, Philadelphia's 1876 Centennial Exhibition.
34 Giberti, Designing the Centennial.
For this paper I have relied heavily on Giberti’s account, the articles listed above and the Smithsonian’s volume edited by Robert Post *1876: A Centennial Exhibition* to provide some analysis of the events of the exhibition.

Thankfully regardless of the dearth of modern sources on the Centennial International Exhibition there are a host of sources from the 1870’s. Visitor guides and souvenir publications abound. J.S. Ingram’s is one of the most detailed and most frequently referenced, and attempts to place the Centennial International Exhibition in its place historically. In addition to these contemporary accounts of the Centennial Internation Exhibition, the City Archives of Philadelphia house the reports and documents of the Centennial Commission. The main reports of the Centennial Commission were published and are available in both hard copies and online through Google Books. My research for this paper draws largely from the Centennial Commission’s state correspondence archived in Philadelphia and the published reports of the Centennial Commission which have a wealth of information.

English language sources on the *Exposition Universelle* in 1889 are even more scarce, with most concerned either with art or with the Eiffel Tower. 1889 also struggles under the problem of not being a unique event in Parisian history, with more

---


36 Post, *1876: A Centennial Exhibition*.

37 Ingram, *The Centennial Exposition*.


39 Levin, *When the Eiffel Tower Was New*. 
written about 1900 or the collection of *Expositions Universelle* from 1855 through 1937. By far the best source of information relating to 1889 specifically is Brenda Nelms’s *The Third Republic and the Centennial of 1789*.\(^{40}\) Nelms’s work does an excellent job tracing the celebrations and representations of 1889 and interweaving the *Exposition Universelle* into the story. In addition to Nelms’s book which forms the core of my discussion on the *Exposition Universelle*, the published reports of the United States Commissioners, as well as Edward Jeffery’s report for the City of Chicago were strong supporting documents.

Today Fairmount Park in Philadelphia is a fairly traditional city park, outstanding in some ways because of its size, but in many ways what one expects to find in an urban wooded space. However, Fairmount park is one of the best places to take children in Philadelphia; not only can one wander the grounds of the Philadelphia Zoo, there is also the Please Touch Museum, housed in an ornate building whose façade seems ill at ease with its interior. This is simply because the Please Touch Museum is housed in the last of the large buildings still standing from the 1876 Centennial Exhibition, Memorial Hall.

In general the structures of International Expositions are impermanent, designed to house these events for roughly 6 months and then be torn down. Yet the Crystal Palace was rebuilt elsewhere after being disassembled; two of the five main buildings from 1876 survived into the 1950’s, with Memorial Hall standing to this day, and the Eiffel Tower, symbol of Paris to the modern mind, is the lasting relic from 1889. Memorial Hall was different from the first; during the Centennial it was the main building housing the Art exhibits from around the world, and for years afterwards served as the Philadelphia Museum of Art, it was always meant to be a permanent structure, and the building of it was largely the responsibility of the city of Philadelphia.
What strikes the mind on viewing the massive edifice that is Memorial Hall today is a sense of just how large the other main buildings must have been. Memorial Hall was the second smallest of the five main buildings and stood next to what was the largest building in the world at the time, the Main Exhibition Hall. Close to three hundred acres were covered by the Centennial Exposition and the cost was well over five and half million dollars. The questions then become why and what? Why did the country feel the need to celebrate its industrial might and prominence with such a display? What was the purpose of Centennial International Exhibition? The answers of course lie in the political needs of the time, and 1876 was a unique year: the Centennial Birthday of the United States, coming just over a decade since the end of the Civil War, and the year of presidential elections. The purpose for the Centennial International Exhibition was to unify the country.

Wounds Old and New

In a country as unified as the United States is today it may seem strange that there were serious and deep divisions at any point in its history. However, the reality is that the United States has more often been divided than united. Certainly when it comes down to political parties the animosity has been evident. While the second half of the nineteenth century may be romantically viewed as the time when the United States began its movement towards world power both economically and spatially with the taming of the west it was a politically and culturally divisive time.

41 Alfred Heller “Philadelphia 1876” Findling, Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, 55-60; Ingram, The Centennial Exposition, 49
42 A factor that is very evident today with the bipartisan nature of politics in the last 10 years.
By the time of the Centennial Exposition eleven years had passed since the ending of the Civil War. Lee had been dead for 6 years and Meade buried for 4, the generation that had fought in the war was now either in the process of raising families as opposed to razing buildings, or in the case of general officers, settling into semi-retirement, which for many included political aspirations. Yet the Civil War was still the most obvious of the wounds marring the American Landscape. After six hundred thousand war dead and vast areas of territory ravished, the attempts at reconstruction were still keenly felt, especially politically in 1876.43

One of the chief political issues that was – with the help of politically aligned newspapers – dividing the country and public opinion during President Ulysses S. Grant’s second term (1872-1876) was that of rampant graft and abuse of power. In a chapter recounting the scandals as covered by the New York Sun Frank O’Brien identifies the eight primary scandals of Grant’s second term, each to do with some sort peculation or graft.44 The three most egregious (at least to O’Brien’s eyes) were the Crédit Mobilier Scandal, the Whiskey Ring and the Post-Trader Scandal.45 Crédit Mobilier involved the selling of votes for favors to the Union Pacific Railroad,46 the Whiskey Ring would engulf Grant’s private secretary in its scheme of cheating government tax,47 and the Post-Trader Scandal forced the resignation of the Secretary of

http://books.google.com/books?id=tGiOpdUTnBsC.
War. Each of these scandals was a blow not just to Grant but also to Republican Party unity as would become apparent in the 1874 and 1876 elections.

Paul Haworth, in his book on the 1876 election, argues that Republican Party in 1876 was in danger because of hubris. For Haworth the power that the party held in the years immediately after the Civil War had blinded it to the need to practice politics. For Haworth it was the beginning and height of the spoils system. Roy Morris Jr. views the Republican failings through the glass of the Democratic Party, that of extreme mismanagement for the purpose of political and economic gain. His description of 1876 reworks Clausewitz’s famous dictum as “more than any other election in American history, the election of 1876 was war by other means.”

The battlegrounds of that war were very closely linked to those which had run with blood over a decade before. By 1876 both parties ran on platforms calling for some form of reform, the Republicans stating that they would “hold all public officers to a rigid responsibility, and engage that the prosecution and punishment of all who betray official trusts shall be speedy, thorough, and unsparing,” while the Democrats opened their platform with “We, the delegates of the Democratic party of the United States, in National Convention assembled, do hereby declare the administration of the Federal Government to be in great need of immediate reform.” Veterans of the Union army feared the loss of benefits should Democrats enjoy success, and Black veterans were

---

51 Ibid., 4.
especially concerned that the amendments that gave them freedom and the right to vote would be extinguished.\textsuperscript{54}

While not explicitly political, one of the other major problems that the United States was attempting to recover from in 1876 was that of the financial panic of 1873. Started by the collapse of several smaller firms and then the collapse of Jay Cooke & Company,\textsuperscript{55} the panic of 1873 is the longest official recession recognized by the National Bureau of Economic Research, lasting 65 months.\textsuperscript{56} The 1873 panic was the forbear of what is commonly known as the Long Depression, and was seen by some as the result of the movement away from specie and towards paper money.\textsuperscript{57}

A Vision of Unity

Crossing Belmont avenue, through the military drawn up on both sides with presented arms, the procession entered Machinery Hall, where all was stillness prior to their coming, and surrounded the great Corliss engine…. The President having taken hold of the valve-lever of one engine and the Emperor of that of the other, both gave the turn simultaneously; steam was on; the great walking-beams began to ascend and descend; the engine was in motion; eight miles of shafting and hundreds of machines of all descriptions were in operation, and the International Exhibit of 1876 was at that instant thrown open to the world.\textsuperscript{58}

Thus started what was at the time the greatest International Exposition the world had yet seen. As previously mentioned, the 1876 Centennial International Exposition was the largest, most expensive and most well attended International Exposition to that point.

\textsuperscript{54} Morris, \textit{Fraud of the Century}.
\textsuperscript{57} “Retrospect of 1879” \textit{The financial review} (W.B. Dana Co., 1880), http://books.google.com/books?id=zS4rAAAAYAAJ http://books.google.com/books?id=zS4rAAAAYAAJ.
\textsuperscript{58} Ingram, \textit{The Centennial Exposition}, 96-97.
Two hundred fifty small buildings and pavilions, five main buildings, two hundred eighty-five acres, thirty seven different governments attending, fifty cents admission to the grounds, 1,785,067 people walked through the gates for free, 8,004,325 paid to access the Centennial Exhibition.  

Yet for all its eventual apparent success the Centennial was nearly stillborn. In 1866 John L. Campbell wrote letters to the mayor of Philadelphia and one of the Senators from his home state of Indiana suggesting the idea of an International Exposition to celebrate the centennial of the United States. Thus overtly the purpose of the Centennial International Exhibition was the celebration of the American Centennial and that veneer would remain the official reason for celebration. Over time however other purposes would be added to the main one.

According to Campbell, a professor of mathematics and astronomy, he developed the idea and concept of an International Exposition celebrating the centennial in 1864 when he was giving a lecture at the Smithsonian during the tercentenary celebrations of Galileo’s birth. Campbell would have been remembered as the originator of the idea regardless, but he would eventually be nominated as one of the Centennial Commissioners for Indiana, and served as secretary to the Commission. However, despite the initial favorable reception of the concept by those receiving letters, it was not until 1871 that the plans for the Centennial would truly begin to move forward.

---


60 Pizor, “Preparations for the Centennial Exhibition of 1876,” 214; Findling, *Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions*, 55; De Witt Clinton Goodrich and Charles Richard Tuttle, *An illustrated history of the state of Indiana* (R. S. Peale & co., 1875), 639-640


62 United States Centennial Commission et al., *International exhibition, 1876. [Reports]* (Govt. print. off., 1880) 6; Smith and Commission, *International Exhibition, Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, 1876*, 3
Opposition appeared at once. The New York Times stated “that we do not consider it an appropriate method of celebrating such an event or of expressing its full significance.”63 Several other cities had been proposed as alternate sites for the International Exposition and there was serious concern over the celebration of the centennial of the signing of Declaration of Independence by the crowned heads of Europe,64 a concern that would for the French in 1889 become one of the defining debates about their own centennial.

May 3rd 1871 saw the passage of the “Act Creating the United States Centennial Commission,” which was the governing body for the Centennial Exposition, for the purpose of “celebrating the One Hundredth Anniversary of American Independence.”65 From this point on debate regarding the location of the Centennial Exposition was stifled.

One Commissioner and one alternate were to be appointed by the President of the United States at the suggestion of the Governors of the respective States. Shortly after it convened it became apparent to all involved that meetings of the full Centennial Commission would be too unwieldy to effectively steer to fruition the Centennial International Exhibition.66 To deal with this difficulty an executive committee was formed and this eventually led to the appointment of a Director-General.

The main difficulty facing the original members of the Centennial Commission was a lack of funding. International Expositions are not usually cheap to produce. It was not until June 2 of the following year that Congress passed “An Act relative to the Centennial International Exhibition,” which would allow the creation of the Centennial Commission Finance Board, and the right to sell up ten million dollars worth of stock to

---

64 Pizor, “Preparations for the Centennial Exhibition of 1876,” 215.
65 Commission et al., International exhibition, 1876. [Reports], 101.
66 Pizor, “Preparations for the Centennial Exhibition of 1876,” 219.
finance the Centennial International Exhibition.\(^67\) Despite this act or perhaps because of it financing would remain an issue for the Centennial.

The act creating giving the Centennial Commission the ability to finance the Centennial is one of the more controversial in the history of the 1876 Centennial International Exhibit. Prior to the passage of the bill there had been support for a direct grant from the United States Treasury as being the only way to ensure that “every taxpayer would contribute his share according to the value of his estate or business.”\(^68\) The act was not a direct grant; instead it gave the Centennial Commission the ability to issue stock at ten dollars a share to a maximum of ten million dollars. While it did provide the means for raising the majority of the money for the International Exposition it did so in such a way as to distance the federal Government from any responsibility for the undertaking, thus creating some confusion both domestically and internationally as to whether the exposition would occur and whether the United States government would support it. Section 9 of the 1872 document makes this very clear, “but nothing in this act shall be so construed as to create any liability of the United States, direct or indirect, for any debt or obligation incurred.”\(^69\) So at the same time as Congress gave the Centennial Commission the power to raise funds it also undercut the Centennial Commission and made the job of marketing the stock that much more difficult. Indeed the Georgia Weekly Telegraph, among others in its brief article about the passage of the act makes specific


mention of the amount of the subscriptions and the above mentioned Section 9.70 Pizor argues that the country viewed the whole enterprise as doomed to failure, “many people felt that the endeavor was a gamble at best; millions of others failed to take the celebration seriously.”

While the amount of stock available for each state was based upon population, the actual subscription for the stock was not. New Jersey sold roughly half of the 23,499 shares it was allocated, Delaware likewise subscribed for roughly half of its allotted 3,242 shares. However, these nearby neighbors of Pennsylvania were among the exceptions. Of the $2,357,750 raised through the subscription of stock roughly $1,500,000 was from Pennsylvania and specifically from Philadelphia. In his statistical breakdown for the subscriptions, Ingram, while providing an aggregate total, only mentions four states separately for the selling of one thousand shares of stock. In trying to determine why this subscription was in general not successful it helps to look at two aspects, first the general belief that the Centennial Exhibition was doomed to failure and second the Panic of 1873. After its creation in June of 1872, it took the Board of Finance until November to open the subscriptions in the various states. For New York granted the largest quota of shares owing to the size of its population the effect of the Panic of 1873 on subscriptions cannot be brushed aside as a few banking failures. Of the two firms

---

71 Pizor, “Preparations for the Centennial Exhibition of 1876,” 220. It should be noted that in truth this feeling and belief was justified, the Centennial Exhibition did indeed fail to make money for its investors. 72 Ingram, The Centennial Exposition, 48-49.
73 Ibid., 49.
74 Pizor, “Preparations for the Centennial Exhibition of 1876,” 223.
selected for the distribution of stock in New York, one was Jay Cooke & Company which was the first and most devastating of the collapses in 1873.\textsuperscript{76}

The differences between subscriptions for the Centennial Exhibition highlighted one of the chief problems facing the organizers, the disunity of the United States. The Centennial International Exhibition was suggested and funded primarily in the states that had stayed loyal to the Union during the Civil War, and for the former Confederate States there was certainly reason to believe that they were being partially excluded. The official title of the Centennial International Exhibition was the “International Exhibition of the Arts, Manufactures, and Products of the Soil and Mine,”\textsuperscript{77} suggesting an industrial bias that would favor those states whose industry had not been destroyed by the war. If part of the goal of the exhibition was to “show the progress of society since 1776,”\textsuperscript{78} the South, still home to a relatively unchanging manner of agricultural life, would be at a severe disadvantage. The sectionalism would manifest itself at the Centennial International Exhibition in a wide variety of ways, one of the most striking being the building of State sponsored ‘pavilions.’

Each state was given the opportunity to provide the funds for a ‘State Building’ to provide for the comfort and care of their citizens while at the exhibition. However, no one can seem to agree how many state buildings were actually constructed. J.S. Ingram lists seventeen states building sixteen buildings,\textsuperscript{79} which is contradicted by the map in the back of his book showing twenty-five states. Linda Gross and Theresa Snyder claim

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{77} Smith and Commission, \textit{International Exhibition, Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, 1876}.
\textsuperscript{79} Kansas and Colorado had a shared building. Ingram, \textit{The Centennial Exposition}, 116.
twenty-five buildings, yet the map they display prominently shows locations for only 16. Giberti too weighs in with the number twenty-four, which his map seems to support. The Smithsonian’s work commemorating the centennial of the Centennial Exhibition has images of twenty two buildings and accounts for the discrepancies by talking about staggered completion dates of the various buildings. Going with the visual record of the Smithsonian we can presume that roughly twenty-five states were represented in twenty three buildings, with Kansas and Colorado as well as California and Nevada sharing buildings. Of these, after removing Colorado and Nevada from the mixture of states, we find that of the remaining twenty three states, four are former members of the Confederate States of America, three are ‘border’ states, and the remaining sixteen were Union. Certainly this suggests support for the Centennial Exhibition was stronger in the Union than in the former Confederacy. This lack of unity is shown as well in the location of these buildings on the grounds of the Centennial. The plan had originally been for the State buildings to line the aptly named ‘State’s Drive’ however, only Tennessee is properly located there, Mississippi, Virginia, and Arkansas were scattered elsewhere in the grounds, almost ostracizing those states as if they were still in rebellion. Nor is this simply a matter of these states being the last to erect buildings, Mississippi’s building was the first of the state pavilions to be constructed.

The sectionalism and the healing of the wounds of the Civil War were recurring themes for the Centennial Commissioners. The President of the United States Centennial
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80 Gross and Snyder, *Philadelphia’s 1876 Centennial Exhibition*, 109. Gross and Snyder’s map is produced on page 26 and is a reproduction of the most common printed map of the Centennial Exhibition that I came across in my research.
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Commission, General Joseph R. Hawley, never stopped stressing the idea of the
Centennial International Exhibition as a balm to heal those wounds. In a letter to the State
governments in 1873, Hawley says “unity and concord among our own people…stand
foremost among the sentiments that inspired the project.” The act establishing the
commission itself said “the exhibition should be a national celebration, in which the
whole people of the whole country should participate.” This is a prime example of the
beginning of the shift in the nature of the Centennial, from national celebration to
national unity. Despite the firm belief of the Commissioners the cries and the pleas for
the government and populace to see the Centennial International Exhibition as a unifying
occasion were largely ignored, until the political climate changed after 1874.

Politics and Celebrations

Of the thirty seven State Governors in 1871, the year that the Centennial
Commission was created, twenty five were Republicans, and twelve were Democrats.
In the Forty First Congress, the House of Representatives was made up of one hundred
seventy-one Republicans and sixty-seven Democrats, the Senate of sixty-two
Republicans and twelve Democrats. Figures 1, 2, and 3 show the change in these
numbers over the next six years. What becomes clear is that the apparent unassailable

85 “Letter To The Officers Of The General Government, And Of The Governments Of The Several States" Commission et al., International exhibition, 1876. [Reports], 41 Appendix B.
87 All figures for Governors are taken from the respective state web pages.
89 United States Senate, “Party Division in the Senate 1789-Present” United States Senate, http://www.senate.gov/pagelayout/history/one_item_and_teasers/partydiv.htm. All Senate statistical data has been retrieved from the Senate’s website.
Republican Majority after the Civil War was by the time of the 1872 elections suffering a steady erosion of political power. What the numbers do not show as well are the divisions within the Republican Party.

**Figure 1**
State Governors By Political Party 1870 -1876

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Democratic Governors</th>
<th>Republican Governors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Figure 2
Party Division in the House of Representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>41st Congress (1869-1871)</th>
<th>42nd Congress (1871-1873)</th>
<th>43rd Congress (1873-1875)</th>
<th>44th Congress (1875-1877)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Political Parties</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Republican Representatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat Representatives</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Representatives</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Figure 3
Party Division in the U.S. Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>41st Congress (1869-1871)</th>
<th>42nd Congress (1871-1873)</th>
<th>43rd Congress (1873-1875)</th>
<th>44th Congress (1875-1877)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Republican Senators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat Senators</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Senators</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the end of the Civil War the Republican Party was faced with “amalgamating the diverse elements that during the war had rallied under the party’s banner.” While Andrew Johnson served out Abraham Lincoln’s term as president there grew to be great discord between the Republican Party and the President. In 1868 the country had been very much in favor of General Grant becoming president. The New York Times commented shortly after Grant was elected in 1868 that “the Republican Strength in the Administration, as a whole, will plainly be far greater after the 4th of March 1869, than ever during the past three years.” Yet to the consternation of those party political figures that had rallied to the idea of Grant as president, things soured swiftly, his nominations for his cabinet, announced after great secrecy, received this commentary from the New York Times, “the eminently respectable character of the men is everywhere conceded, but their fitness for their peculiar positions is the subject of criticism on every hand.” Opposition to Grant and his methods would begin to splinter the party.

As indicated by an examination of Figures 2 & 3 an off-shoot of the Republican Party appeared called the Liberal Republicans. The Liberal Republicans grew from the frustrations felt by various members of the Republican Party regarding Grant’s Presidency. Although never a threat to supplant the Republicans, the Liberal Republicans certainly were able to wield enough weight to influence both parties. They

---

94 Ross, *The Liberal Republican movement*, 1-16.
can be seen as the precursors of the major reform efforts\textsuperscript{95} that were to color the 1876 presidential platforms of both Democrats and Republicans.

It becomes apparent that the mainstream Republican Party from 1870 to 1876 was awakening to the difficulties in maintaining its power. The arrogance of the party during Grant’s first term was rocked by the 1872 Presidential election and the apparent union between the Liberal Republicans and Democrats that nominated Horace Greeley as their joint presidential nominee.\textsuperscript{96} The perceived threat was short lived, however, as Grant’s victory was in some ways even more impressive than his 1868 victory.\textsuperscript{97} The election of 1874 was, in some ways, the real wake up call for the Republican Party. Although the party extended its control over the House of Representatives, Democrats and Liberal-Republicans made large gains in the Senate, and in terms of governor’s mansions the country was about evenly split. For the Republican Party to remain in power it would need to find a way to define itself to the voting public. That the party was unsure of how to accomplish this change and preserve its power is evident in the similarity of the 1876 Presidential platform to those of 1872, and 1868 elections.\textsuperscript{98}

It is time to attempt to interweave two timelines, that of the Centennial Commission and the International Exhibition with that of the Republican Party. During the first years of the 1870’s while the Republican power based seemed incontestable, the
Centennial Commission moved forward with plans for the Centennial. According the Centennial Commission’s report, the first three sessions of the Commission were mainly concerned with administrative affairs, such as “to accept the privilege of free transportation over the Pennsylvania Railroad and its branches when traveling on the business of the Commission.”99 The Commission’s other major concerns in these early years was the raising of funds and the publicizing of the Centennial International Exhibition. It proposed, “that an Address to the People of the United States should be issued, informing them of the characteristics of the Exhibition.”100 Before the fourth session of the Centennial Commission in May 1873 the 43rd Congress was seated following the election of 1872. The gains of the Liberal Republicans and Democrats in the Senate would have served as a wake-up call and spur to action for the Centennial Commissioners. In 1873 we find the Centennial Commission suddenly a hive of activity according to the fourth and fifth session reports. Behind its progress are two other factors, the Commission’s having funds from the sale of some stock and through the tireless efforts of the Women’s Centennial Committee, and the final streamlining of executive power for the Commission.

The Commission had been intended to make all choices and decisions jointly, but the obstacles of time and space would prevent this. As service on the Commission was usually unpaid, and as Philadelphia was not centrally located the majority felt it necessary to meet only once a year. The election of a President and the formation of the Executive Committee was the Commission’s solution to the everyday needs of the centennial. Former Connecticut Governor Joseph Hawley was elected as President of the Centennial

99 Commission et al., International exhibition, 1876. [Reports], 6.
100 Ibid.
Commission\textsuperscript{101} and an Executive Committee was formed to drive the business and needs of the Centennial International Exhibition forward. The Executive Committee was originally made up of seven members but by the time of Exhibition it had grown to thirteen, only Daniel Morrell and John Lynch served on the Executive Committee from its inception.\textsuperscript{102} By 1873 the Executive Commission further streamlined the process and created the position of Director-General of the Centennial International Exhibition. Alfred T. Goshorn, who had been in charge of the industrial exhibitions in Cincinnati in 1871 and 1872 was elected as Director-General.\textsuperscript{103}

Three of the four men\textsuperscript{104} mentioned above, Joseph Hawley, Daniel Morrell, and Alfred Goshorn, deserve some further examination, as it was these men and their ties to the Republican Party who made the Centennial International Exhibition a tool for the Republican Party to bring some unity back to the country. It is these men who truly changed the purpose of the Centennial International Exhibition from a national celebration to a national unifying event. Because of their political ties the unity they brought to the Centennial International Exhibition was not simply the unity of North and South (one that meshes very nicely with a celebration of the American Revolution) but rather the unity of the Republican party as a symbol for the ideals of the Revolution.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[101] Smith and Commission, \textit{International Exhibition, Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, 1876.} 3; Ingram, \textit{The Centennial Exposition.} 734
\item[102] Commission et al., \textit{International exhibition, 1876. [Reports]} 4; Smith and Commission, \textit{International Exhibition, Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, 1876.} 4
\item[103] Commission et al., \textit{International exhibition, 1876. [Reports]} 7; Ingram, \textit{The Centennial Exposition}, 737; Smith and Commission, \textit{International Exhibition, Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, 1876.} 3
\item[104] Information on individual Commissioners is very difficult to come by, it is possible that John Lynch, Commissioner from Louisiana is John Roy Lynch, former slave and to be U.S. Representative of Mississippi, and if so he is very much a stalwart of the Republican Party, however, I have not been able to find any definitive information one way or another. If he was indeed a Commissioner, John Roy Lynch’s biographers have failed to mention it.
\end{footnotes}
Goshorn was in some ways the least political; he was from Cincinnati, Ohio and
had served in various capacities on the city council. He served in the Union Army and
would remain a major figure in Cincinnati politics until his death. From all accounts he
worked well with both Hawley and Morrell on the Executive Committee and he was, due
to organization of Cincinnati exhibitions, the most qualified person to hold the post of
Director-General. Both Hawley and Morrell were major players in Republican Politics.
Daniel Morrell, of Pennsylvania, was one of the U.S. Representatives that had introduced
the original act creating the Centennial Commission. He served in the Fortieth and Forty-
First Congresses and was chair of the Committee on Manufactures; for the Centennial
Commission he would Chair the Executive Committee. Combining his position as
Chair with his proximity to Philadelphia allowed him steer the Committee in matters that
were beneficial to his party. His actions as Chair were strongly supported by Joseph
Hawley.

Hawley was the great proponent for Centennial International Exhibition as an
instrument of national unity, stressing constantly the healing of the wounds of the Civil
War. He had served in the War for the Union eventually becoming a Major General of
Volunteers, and he would continue after the war as a major figure in the Grand Army
of the Republic. But beyond his military ties to such prominent political leaders as

105 I scoured sources to find some indication as to any party affiliation during his years in politics, but was
unable to find any.
106 Rossiter Johnson and John Howard Brown, The twentieth century biographical dictionary of notable
Americans ... Volume IV (The Biographical Society, 1904).
107 Ingram, The Centennial Exposition, 739. "Morrell, Daniel Johnson (1821-1885)" Biographical
Directory of the United States Congress.
108 Ibid., 734.
John Logan, he was one of the premier figures in the Republican Party, having helped establish the Party in Connecticut.\textsuperscript{110} The military ties of Goshorn and Hawley cannot be downplayed, for the veterans of the Union army, especially those who would join the Grand Army of the Republic, the Civil War was the completion of the Founding Fathers’ dream for the United States. For the members of the G.A.R. like Hawley, the Union was preserved through \textit{Republican} perseverance.

However, it is Hawley’s connections to the Republican Conventions in 1868, 1872 and 1876 that make him the bridge from the Republican political crisis to the Centennial International Exhibition’s healing message. In 1868 Hawley was President of the Republican National Convention and so was in a position to see the Republican Party in all of its post-war might. In 1872 Hawley was on the committee of resolutions for that convention, and considering the vitriolic nature of the time would be able to see just how problematic the split had become. In 1876 he was Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions at the convention, and as such can be seen as responsible for the slight changes in the party platform towards reform and accommodation.\textsuperscript{111} Hawley’s dedication to the Centennial as a means of healing the country, and in a way of healing the Republican Party, fare evident in his move to Philadelphia in 1875-6 on the business of the Centennial International Exhibition. Hawley’s vision of the exhibition as a unifying and healing event gathered popular support to the point that eventually in 1876 the Federal government put forward general funds for the Centennial to ensure its success.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{110} Johnson and Brown, \textit{The twentieth century biographical dictionary of notable Americans ... Volume V}
\textsuperscript{111} Johnson and Brown, \textit{The twentieth century biographical dictionary of notable Americans ... Volume V}
\textsuperscript{112} Giberti, \textit{Desiging the Centennial}. 
The link between the control of the Commission and to a lesser extent direct control of the Centennial International Exhibition is thus firmly established, as is the idea of the multilayered purpose of the Centennial International Exhibition. Several events during the run of the Exhibition itself attest to the political nature that the event had acquired. Logically the events surrounding July 4, 1876 would be those most expected to be focused on healing and reunification, yet on July 3 the Grand Army of the Republic toured the exhibition and proceeded to hold parades throughout Philadelphia. The G.A.R., while mainly idealized as a veterans association, was very much involved in the politics of the Republican Party. Its initial membership and certainly its leadership read like a who’s who of Republicans, John Logan, John Hartranft, Ambrose Burnside, and Rutherford B. Hayes were all members. Thus the idea of unity from the American Revolution was unity preserved by the Union army and for the G.A.R. at least the Republican Party. Ingram in his description of the Centennial International Exhibition makes mention of several of the special ‘Days’ that would be held, and singles out the G.A.R.’s parade on July 3 for special praise.\textsuperscript{113} The scheduling of the G.A.R.’s march suggests that the purpose of the Centennial International Exhibition had shifted from simply the celebration of the American Revolution and the Declaration of Independence, to the celebration of the Declaration of Independence as a unifying force for the country as a whole, to the celebration of the preservation of the Union as the unifying feature.

Indeed in some ways the Centennial International Exhibition itself would ‘wave the bloody shirt’ in several areas; while the US Government Building did avoid the display of captured battle flags from the south, there were great display’s of the ordinance

\textsuperscript{113} Ingram, \textit{The Centennial Exposition}, 652-654.
Thus in the Centennial International Exhibition we have the fusion of propagandas. In the display of items such as the Corliss Steam Engine and “Little Wonder” sewing machine\textsuperscript{115} we have the propaganda for America’s manufacturing might, prompting President Hawley in his final report to quote the London Times, “the American invents as the Greek sculpted and the Italian painted ; it is genius.”\textsuperscript{116} In the reading of the Declaration of Independence on July 4\textsuperscript{117} and the American System used by the juries\textsuperscript{118} there is the propaganda of nationalism: the Centennial is in a way saying, ‘American democratic non-monarchial government, where all are equal, produced this document and this fair and these items.’ Finally, the location of the buildings and the various displays of former Union military might serve as political propaganda, the reminder that the manufacturing might and nationalism would not have been possible without the Republican Party. With all these messages available to the average fair-goer the final question is ‘did the Centennial International Exhibition succeed in its purposes?’

\textsuperscript{114} Ingram, \textit{The Centennial Exposition}.

\textsuperscript{115} Ingram, \textit{The Centennial Exposition}, 157; Post, \textit{1876: A Centennial Exhibition}; Giberti, \textit{Desiging the Centennial}.

\textsuperscript{116} Commission et al., \textit{International exhibition, 1876. [Reports]}, 15.

\textsuperscript{117} Appendix B Ibid., 87.

\textsuperscript{118} Giberti, \textit{Designing the Centennial}. Giberti discusses the American System of the judging at length including discussions of the European outrage and the problems that the organizers of Chicago 1893 had in using the system.
CHAPTER TWO

‘INDUSTRIAL BY ACCIDENT, REVOLUTIONARY BY ESSENCE’\textsuperscript{119}

THE 1889 PARIS \textit{EXPOSITION UNIVERSELLE}

For France the idea of International Exposition was not a new one. As previously mentioned, France had in many ways started the trend of national expositions that would eventually lead to the idea of International Expositions. The 1889 Paris \textit{Exposition Universelle} was undoubtedly one of the more successful International Expositions of the nineteenth century. It would provide, albeit not intentionally or without controversy, for the city of Paris what its most iconic iron structure, the Eiffel Tower. The \textit{Exposition Universelle} was brilliant with electricity: while in 1876 Machinery Hall was operated by the giant Corliss Steam engine in 1889 \textit{la Galerie des Machines} (the Gallery of Machines) was powered by electricity. The \textit{Exposition Universelle} of 1889 was the second International Exposition that Paris and France had held since the Franco-Prussian War; as such there was less pressure on the \textit{Exposition Universelle} to justify a Republic over a Monarchy. That is not to say that France in 1889 was a fully unified and happy state. Indeed time does not always heal wounds, especially political or ideological ones.

\begin{quote}
Wounds Old and New
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{119} Steven Kale, “Catholic Responses to the Centenary of the French Revolution,” \textit{Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History} 23 (1996): 231. Kale is quoting Father Maurice Maignen’s letter to his friend Paul Vrignault which objected to Count Albert de Mun’s efforts to use the \textit{Exposition Universelle} as a platform to fight the revolution.
France in 1889 was roughly nineteen years removed from the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune, the events of which were just as destructive of national unity as the American Civil War. The end of the Commune is not Prussia crushing Paris; instead the end of the Commune is the French regular army controlled by Thiers from Versailles crushing Paris.\footnote{William Pembroke Fetridge, \textit{The rise and fall of the Paris commune in 1871} (Harper & brothers, 1871). “Google Books Link,” http://books.google.com/books?id=EtUnAAAAYAAJ.} The Paris Commune is simply another shot in the long battle between the French left and right, at the same time it is also a shot in the struggle within the left between radical and moderate elements. The seeds of the Commune had been planted in 1789 and the time period generally referred to as the French Revolution. The Revolution, whatever else it did, provided guiding light for both the left and right in French politics for the rest of the century. Generally, the left of the political spectrum became associated with the idea of Republican government, divided between Radicals and Opportunists, and the right associated with the idea of Monarchical rule, divided between Bourbon, Orleans and Bonapartists.\footnote{Nelms, \textit{The Centennial of 1789}, 3.}

In the nineteenth century France could be said to have had seven distinct governments, with war and revolution providing the transition point for four of them. The change from the First Empire to the Restored Bourbon monarchy was through war; Louis-Philippe gained his throne through the revolutions of 1830, he lost it through the proclamation of the Second Republic in 1848; finally the end of the Second Empire was through the Franco-Prussian War and Thiers’s proclamation of the Third Republic in 1870. This transitory nature is enhanced if one considers that in the twenty-five years from 1848 through to 1873, France went from vaguely constitutional monarchy to
Republic, to Empire, to Republic, with every expectation that a monarchy was just around the corner. It is possible to see France for the nineteenth century as simply a two party government under the winner claims all theory that instead of elections tended to use violence for the transition from one party to the other. Therefore in 1889, while the Third Republic had been in control for longer than the First and Second Republic’s combined, it is understandable as to why there was still expectation and fear, on the part of the right and left respectively, of a change to monarchial government. Unity is just as much a need of France in the late nineteenth century as it was for the United States at the same time.

The Third Republic is in many ways a misnomer. It wasn’t until 1875 that France gained a constitution for the Third Republic, having been ruled previously through a provisional government. Adolphe Thiers, a moderate Republican of long standing, led the Provisional government. Pierre de Coubertin, himself a Republican, would say of Thiers’s government that

> He always found before him the coalition of monarchists and radicals, anxious above all things, not to allow themselves to be appeased, and to maintain opinion in a state of uncertainty, of uneasiness favorable to the hopes of their parties.122

The constitution of 1875 provided for a President, two chamber legislature, and Council of Ministers. Seen at the time as only a stopgap measure, “a constitution whose provisional character was proclaimed by the very persons by the very persons who had drawn it up has surpassed…all the ‘definitive’ constitutions to which it succeeded.”123

Marshal Patrice MacMahon, a strong supporter of the Comte de Chambord, was elected

---

123 Ibid., 61.
President. After a political crisis on May 16 1877 MacMahon and the royalists suffered several electoral defeats and he resigned shortly after the *Exposition Universelle* of 1878.

The political situation and instability of the French Government permeated all aspects of life, from education to religion to industry to colonialism. Religion has been in some ways the touchiest of situations. During the nineteenth century the Catholic faith became a battleground of ideological political ideas masquerading in religious clothing. The Catholic Church had spent most of the early part of the nineteenth century recovering from the damage done by its dissolution during the Revolution, and as such regarded all republics with a skeptical glance. Catholicism became identified as the staunch opponent of the Revolution and republicanism in general. To the right it was the bastion of correct morals and justification for rule. To the left it was the last remnant of an outdated and reactionary system that sought to keep people in ignorance. De Coubertin would say in his 1894 book, “it was the logic of things that a conflict should break out between the Third Republic and the Roman Catholic Church…because the long and passionate struggle directed by the Roman Catholics of France against republican institutions must, necessarily, lead to reprisals.”

Tension between the Catholic Church and the Third Republican government was most evident in the realm of education. The passage of laws requiring “all state-supported primary schools must have lay personnel,” as well as several other restrictions, such as the 1881 requirement that religious women could no longer teach with just a lettre...
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As one of the primary purposes of an International Exposition is to educate it is logical that the *Exposition Universelle* was a target of the Church vs. State mentality of the time. For the Opportunist government then the one purpose of an International Exposition in 1889 as a centennial would be to educate the populace of France regarding the superiority of a state free from the privilege system of the old regime.

**The Universal Exposition of 1889 and Ideology**

In a short time we approach the first platform, and from it we command the vast extent of the Exhibition Buildings. Down below we perceive a swarm of insects; they are the visitors who cover the grounds. Here and there are large dark patches bordered with green; they are the gardens and parks with their green grass plots. In the middle of the Champ-de-Mars some enormous glass roofs glitter in the sunlight; they are the galleries of the different exhibitions, of the sections of the Fine Arts, and of the Liberal Arts. Nearer and just at the foot of the Tower, the grand fountains of the park look like two bowls of water on which a dozen swans make a white and almost imperceptible spot.  

The French have always had a talent for spectacle it seems. The *Exposition Universelle* of 1889 was in some ways simply the latest in a long line of International Expositions. As previously mentioned the modern idea of a celebration of industry was first developed by the Marquis d’Avèze. Paris had held three great International Expositions at roughly eleven year intervals leading up 1889. Unlike the American Centennial International Exhibition in 1876, funding was not a major issue for the *Exposition Universelle*. Once the French government had decided to hold an International Exposition, the government had little problem in granting funds. Instead the major controversy was over the date, scope and type of exposition to be held. The debate in
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France was more openly about what would be the purpose of the International Exposition.

The key issue for the *Exposition Universelle* in the years before 1889 was whether or not there should be one at all, and the key issue in that debate was whether or not the French Revolution should be commemorated by such an event. Whether the purpose of the *Exposition Universelle* of 1889 was to celebrate the Revolution or not is still under debate by historians to this day. Most accounts of 1889 discuss the official French government decree that the *Exposition Universelle* was not to celebrate the Revolution, and yet most remain skeptical. Joy Hall in her short descriptor of the *Exposition Universelle* says “the government sought to disassociate the centennial of the Revolution from the exposition. The artifice did not work.” 128 Edward T. Jeffery in his report to the Mayor of Chicago, then was making plans for his own International Exposition, does not even suggest the separation, stating that “the inception of the present Exposition was about five years ago, when the Government deemed it advisable to prepare for the commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the French Republic in 1789.” 129 Brenda Nelms in her excellent book *The Third Republic and the Centennial of 1789* puts its best in her opening chapter,

All these varied activities, whether educational or entertaining or inspirational in form and content, were ostensibly dedicated to the same end: the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the French Revolution. For Frenchmen and foreigners, 1889 was the Year of the Exposition, the Year of the Centennial. 130

Steven Kale’s article “Catholic Responses to the Centenary of the French Revolution” takes for granted that the *Exposition Universelle* and the Centenary were linked.\(^{131}\) To modern eyes then the purpose of the *Exposition Universelle* was to celebrate the Revolution.

The problem facing the French Government was if the purpose of the *Exposition Universelle* was to celebrate the Revolution, i.e. be held in 1889, then they would probably be snubbed by the other Great Powers of Europe, which spoke against the idea of an *international* exposition, with the joint purpose of celebrating Revolution. Yet, for the French Government to deny 1789 and cut it off completely – i.e. hold the *Exposition Universelle* in another year – would entail the denial of the Republic and the Government’s basis of authority. To solve this issue the French Government asked its ambassadors to inquire of their hosts as to whether they would respond favorably to an invitation to an International Exposition in Paris in 1889. Nelms quotes the instructions provided by Louis de Freycinet to the ambassadors in 1886, “we do not intend to make of our proposed exposition an international political manifestation, much less a work of republican propaganda.”\(^{132}\) The responses to these informal inquiries were universally negative, yet not so negative as to be hostile or for the French government to suppose that the crowned heads of Europe would prevent their private citizens from attending.\(^{133}\) Thus armed and with the backing of the majority of Frenchmen, the Government went ahead with plans for an International Exposition in 1889. The centenary of the French Revolution would be celebrated at the same time as the *Exposition Universelle*, but the

\(^{131}\) Kale, “Catholic Responses to the Centenary.”


\(^{133}\) Ibid., 28-30.
Exposition Universelle would be shorn of its purpose of overtly celebrating the revolution.

From the beginning the Exposition Universelle was a government project, originally designed and envisioned by the Government appointed Proust Commission in 1884-1885. It was during this time that the Commission wrestled with the ideas of whether celebration of the Revolution should be an overt part of the Exposition Universelle. Nelms identifies “two proposals for the erection and inclusion in the exposition of a special, permanent pavilion in honor of the French Revolution….a ‘Pavillon-Musée de 1789’ serve as the focal point of the exposition.”¹³⁴ That these ideas did not make the final report of the Proust Commission is indicative that for the government the purpose of the Exposition Universelle was not celebrate the revolution but rather the “assessing a century of progress,”¹³⁵ or more specifically to remind the world of the power and glory of France.

Once the financial basis was approved (17 million francs from the Government, 8 million francs from the City of Paris, and 18 million by the ‘Guarantee Association’) the control of the International Exposition was transferred to the Minister of Commerce and Industry. For the formative years of the Exposition, this post was held by Édouard Lockroy, an extreme Radical. It was under Lockroy’s direction that the plans for the Exposition Universelle were first officially drawn up, and it was Lockroy who oversaw the various categories for goods, and the official invitations delivered to the governments of the world. During Lockroy’s leadership is also when, while officially maintaining their

¹³⁴ Ibid., 21.
¹³⁵ Ibid., 23.
separation, the *Exposition Universelle* and the various commemorations of 1789 planned in and around Paris began to run together.\footnote{Lockroy’s visit to model of Bastille created just outside the grounds for the fair would severally blur the sharp line the government claimed to have drawn.}

As expected when the official invitations were sent, the governments of monarchial Europe declined. However, just as the Centennial Commission in the United States had in preparation for 1876 established separate Centennial Boards within each state, so now for the *Exposition Universelle* “special committees were formed in nearly every country to coordinate exhibits from private parties both with and without government support.”\footnote{Hall, "Paris 1889," *Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions*, 110.} This lack of governmental support meant that for the *Exposition Universelle* to be successful Paris would have “to provide the exposition of 1889 with some unique, spectacular attraction which would lure exhibitors and visitors.”\footnote{Nelms, *The Centennial of 1789*, 36.} The unique, spectacular attraction would of course be the Eiffel Tower. Selected from over one hundred designs,\footnote{Every source seems to feel the need to mention two of these and I am not one to buck tradition, the two other designs that drew the most attention were one for a giant Pyramid decorated with friezes of the Revolution, and one for 300 meter tall Guillotine to reflect the ‘true’ nature of the Revolution.} the tower would be the tallest structure in the world, nearly double the height of the previous record holder, the Washington Monument. Whether viewed as an eyesore or “as a paradigm of a liberal democratic society,”\footnote{Levin, *When the Eiffel Tower Was New*, 23.} the Eiffel Tower had its intended effect: almost every nation was represented either officially or unofficially.

What becomes clear from this is that regardless of its supposed pristine non-ideological and a-political nature, the line between *Exposition Universelle* being a celebration of industry and French Glory and being a celebration of the Revolution of...
1789 was blurred. To the passing Frenchman on the Rue Saint-Dominique, the purpose of the *Exposition Universelle* was both France’s world power status and the celebration of the Revolution.

Politics and the end of Boulanger

If the main stumbling blocks for the *Exposition Universelle* were time and purpose, and if those were dealt with relatively early on in the progress towards 1889, what then was the political purpose of the *Exposition Universelle*? The answer lies in the use that the Republic made of the “principles of ’89” and in the *Exposition Universelle* to combat the perceived threat of usurpation by Georges Boulanger. The purpose of the *Exposition Universelle* was to educate people as the benefits of life under the Third Republic compared to under a dictatorship of Boulanger.

In 1887 after the arrest of an obscure French Police commissary by a German official the rhetoric was apparently so great that it “well might lead to war.” The larger effect was to launch into public consciousness General Georges Boulanger as the personification of ‘revanchism.’ Boulanger was fifty years of age when he leapt onto the political scene, and through some manner not fully understood became the darling of both monarchists and extreme radicals. The political crisis caused by his rise would split the left and proceed to paralyze French politics for 1888.
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Just as in the United States losses in political power caused the Republican Party to try and use the Centennial International Exhibition as a rallying point, so too did the losses in political power by the Opportunists in France lead to their use of the *Exposition Universelle* and the other celebrations for 1789 as a rallying point to unify the supporters of the republic. To do this the Opportunists abandoned the radical elements of the revolution and stressed the “themes of the official centenary were conciliation, apoliticism, and moderation….the Revolution was commemorated not as work in progress but as a fait accompli, the Republic being its ultimate and inevitable result.”

The purpose for celebrations of the Revolution was not then the celebration of revolutionary spirit but rather the historical significance of the events.

The principal loss of power for the Opportunists was in 1885 when there was a fundamental shift in the politics of France. Instead of a strong but divided anti-republic right, which allowed the relatively unified Opportunist pro-republicans to rule, there was a strong but divided pro-republic left that basically split the country into three factions, the Radical left, the Opportunist left and the anti-republic right, as Nelms says, “the remainder of the decade was marked by struggles for power between Opportunists and Radicals.”

Nelms claims that from the events of centennial year two themes surface repeatedly, “the demonstration of France’s status as a great power and the promotion of domestic peace and unity.” The latter echoes the central purpose of the Centennial International Exhibition well over a decade earlier of unity and healing. For Nelms the moderation of the celebrations is the major emphasis, but this presumes on Nelms’s part.
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the acceptance of these celebrations by the Opportunist government. She does acknowledge both the Catholic Counter-Centennial movement and the attempts by Boulangists to turn the celebrations to their advantage, but seems to dismiss them both out of hand. Kale agrees with her; for him the problem lies with the primary counter centennial Catholic activity being an attempt to use the Revolution to justify social change in 1889.148 As he describes it, “the event which best exemplified Catholic attempts to appropriate the revolutionary narrative was the counter-centenary staged … in June 1889…. depicting the meeting of the Estates General as the founding event of a corporatist Christian social order.”149 Thus, in hindsight, the Opportunists had no need to be worried about Catholic protest of the centennial commemorations.

This does not however mean that the Opportunists were not worried. Certainly the Opportunists and the French Third Republic were able to demonize the Boulangist ‘other’ to unify their supporters in 1889, with the general’s exile and subsequent trial. They were able to exploit this at the polls, and thus preserve their own political power. Anti-clericalism, already one of the major elements of Third Republic identity, was able over time to identify the religiously devout as the ‘other,’ and most Catholics, even the devout viewed the counter-centenary as having dangerous Jacobean overtones.150

Once again we see in the *Exposition Universelle* the fusion of propagandas identified in the Centennial International Exhibition and the changing nature of the purpose of the event. The purpose of the *Exposition Universelle* was originally to be the celebration of Revolution. Then because of perceived international political necessity the Revolution was removed as the purpose of the *Exposition Universelle*, instead the world
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power status of France and the stability and moderation of the Republic became the prime purposes of the *Exposition Universelle*. Finally the purpose evolved to the idea of educating France on: its unity within the Republic (the form of government that divides least), its status as a world power, and the benefits of moderation ( Opportunists) compared to extremism (Boulangists). Did the *Exposition Universelle* truly succeed in these purposes?
CONCLUSION

EVALUATING AND LINKING THE REVOLUTIONARY CELEBRATIONS

One of the more noted of the various buildings at the Centennial International
Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1876 was a round building with a large arm holding a giant
torch thrust through the roof. By far the most visited of the industrial exhibits in 1889
were the nine thousand square feet devoted to the inventions and products of an
American. The United States and France have been linked since Louis XVI promised
support to the fledging American republic in 1778. The parallels between the two nations
and especially their two revolutions are everywhere. The American Revolution started in
part because of heavy taxes imposed to pay for war against France, the French started in
part because of the financial burden of supporting the American Colonies during the
Revolution. Thomas Paine’s pen would fire imagination and speculation for both
revolutions. Washington would become as much as symbol for the Parisians in
Revolution as he was for the United States, the marquis de Lafayette’s service in the
American Revolution burned so strong that one hundred and forty years later he was still
being invoked as the symbol of friendship between the two countries, ‘Lafayette, we are
here!’ The Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen owes as much to the
Declaration of Independence as that document owes to Rousseau. The American and
French Revolutions are forever linked, the American and French centennial celebrations
are also linked although in far more subtle ways.
The building housing the arm described above was erected to secure funds for the creation and donation of the Statue of Liberty, what would become in many ways the beacon of the American democratic ideal was presented to the United States as gift from France. The American whose inventions were so beloved was Thomas Edison and his work with electric lights contributed to the Eiffel Tower being lit up in spectacular fashion during the *Exposition Universelle*. Their dual connection of revolutions and republics linked the two countries closely; while the French may have coveted American natural resources and vibrancy, the United States coveted French taste and fashion. Both nations in celebration of their Revolutions’ centennials hosted International Expositions to show the world how they had progressed and adapted. For both nations the purpose of those International Expositions was to heal, unify and provide political stability to countries torn asunder by political strife and civil war. Both International Expositions were considered wildly successful by the host countries. The question is, were the International Expositions successful?

**Evaluation**

The *Exposition Universelle*, and the Centennial International Exhibition set attendance records at the time,\(^{151}\) in terms of absolute visitors the International Expositions were successful. In other distinctions they were not, or certainly not as successful as their promoters claimed them to be. However, of the two the more successful the answer was the *Exposition Universelle* of 1889 in Paris. The Centennial
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International Exhibition’s purpose started as unity, and then became more extreme and exclusionary as that purpose was refined and changed; the *Exposition Universelle*’s purpose started more extreme and became moderate.

The *Exposition Universelle* managed to a large extent to produce the unity and healing that its organizers claimed it would.\(^{152}\) The Opportunists and their redefining of the Revolution as a historical event and the general moderation of their party would be a contributing factor to the Third Republics ability to survive the crises of Panama Canal scandal and the Dreyfus Affair. The political purpose of the *Exposition Universelle* was therefore a large success. Internationally, the purpose of the *Exposition Universelle* to reemphasize the world power status of France was also fairly successful. Various exhibits of the “African and Franco-Indian natives at their characteristic occupations,”\(^{153}\) helped to remind the world that France was indeed a great power. In examining educational purpose the *Exposition Universelle* can be said to be extremely successful as well, thirty-two million people came and saw and absorbed the greatness of France, the greatness of the moderate Republic, and the historical greatness of the revolution.

The Centennial International Exhibition was less successful over all. The shift in purpose from national unity through to Union oriented unity failed in its attempt to heal wounds or strengthen the Republican Party. As previously mentioned the nature of the International Exposition led to the focus on the industrial exhibits, yet for the South the key that they wished to show were agricultural products. Mississippi spent $1500.00 on Centennial Premiums, basically rewards for items to send to the Exhibition, $725.00 of

\(^{152}\) Nelms, *The Centennial of 1789*.

that amount was spent on premiums for cotton and cotton products. The 1876 Presidential election would prove to be one of the most controversial ever, Rutherford B. Hayes, being described as Rutherfraud Hayes. The vitriolic of the following years did not speak to a country united behind the Republican Party, nor did the election of 1876 and its creation of the ‘Solid South’ create an atmosphere of unity. A prime example of this lack of unity can be found in the general history of International Expositions, of the nine expositions held on American soil before 1900, five of them were held in Southern cities and most had particularly southern themes, “International Cotton Exposition,” “Southern Exposition,” and of course “The World’s Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition.” The World’s Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition was in some ways a deliberate answer to the Centennial International Exhibition, organized to celebrate the centennial of cotton in the New World its funding and focus were on the South. Unity was not achieved.

According to Marc Bloch one of the purposes of comparative history is to “bring out the ‘originality’ of the different societies” being compared. It is in that aspect that the Centennial International Exhibition and the Exposition Universelle can be most profitably examined. The first major difference is that of Government interaction. From the first thoughts regarding an International Exposition in 1889 the French Government was heavily involved in the planning and celebrating of the Exposition Universelle. The United States government, while it sent invitations to foreign governments and authorized
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the creation of the Centennial Commission, for the most part stayed removed from the Centennial International Exhibition. This difference is highlighted when one examines the different amounts of money forwarded by the respective governments. As shown in Figure 4\(^{160}\) the largest difference is indeed in public subscription of stock for the companies. Had the United States Centennial Commission not suffered both the financial Panic of 1873 and the particular wording of the act creating the Board of finance it is conceivable that those numbers may have evened out. The other major difference is in the amount spent by the national governments of France and the United States. In some ways government support for a project can be seen in how much money the government is willing to spend on the project, if that is the case then support for the Centennial International Exhibition is sorely lacking.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure4.png}
\caption{Government, Local, and Private Expenditure}
\end{figure}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
                      & Philadelphia 1876 & Paris 1889 \\
\hline
Private Investors    & 2.5               & 1.6          \\
State/City Government& 1.5               & 3.4          \\
National Government  &                    &              \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\(^{160}\) Data for the chart presented here is taken from Ingram’s *The Centennial Exhibition* for Philadelphia, and from Jeffery, *Paris Universal Exposition 1889*. for Paris. Jeffery converted the French amounts to U.S. dollars to at an exchange rate of 5 francs to 1 dollar.
The year of Centennial International Exhibition was also the year that Ferdinand de Lesseps began serious work on his dream of a Panamanian canal, founding *La Société internationale du Canal interocéanique* in Paris. The year of the *Exposition Universelle* the company went bankrupt and work was halted. When the United States took over the canal project in 1904 it would end up spending $352 million dollars to complete the canal.\(^{161}\) The French tried great engineering projects mainly through private enterprise but ensured that the International Expositions were heavily publicly funded. The Americans made sure that great engineering projects were government projects but mainly left the funding of International Expositions to private individuals. To argue that one is correct and the other not is to pass value judgments on societies. The Eiffel Tower stands still as proud standard of the great French Expositions of the nineteenth centuries, and the Panama Canal still ferries shipping between the oceans, an everlasting monument to American engineering ability.
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