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ABSTRACT

Universal expositions of the later nineteenth century were opportunities for the host country to reinforce its sense of nationalism and to showcase its technological progress or, read differently, the progress of man. This thesis examines nationhood as defined in terms of masculinity at the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition, which demonstrated French technological, colonial, and artistic superiority over all other nations. This superiority was trumpeted not just through architecture and colonial exhibits, but also through criticism of other countries' artwork, particularly painting and sculpture from the United States. Also discussed is the reaction of American artists to the criticism received in 1889 by producing art at the 1900 Paris Universal Exposition that resonated with masculinity, thereby projecting an enhanced national identity in fine art.
INTRODUCTION

Universal expositions necessarily promoted the national identity of the host country as well as the countries that participated in them. France's nationalism overshadowed that of every country represented at the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition and so permeated the display that one critic noted that both the French character of the general grounds and the quantity of French exhibits gave the impression that "[the Exposition] was not so much universal as national." The goal of the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition was to demonstrate French technological, colonial, and artistic superiority over all other nations; it did so, largely, by defining nationhood in terms of masculinity. As host of the 1889 Exposition, the French were utterly confident in their national superiority. France proved its technological innovativeness and prowess at the Exposition through the architecture of the Eiffel Tower and the Palais des Machines, which served as both the real and ideological symbols for the Exposition itself. These iron structures relied heavily upon the engineering bravado and tremendous scale made possible by the primacy of metal, thereby equating French technological superiority and, by extension, national strength with masculinity and manliness.

Furthermore, French colonial exhibits at the 1889 Exposition confirmed the nation's imperial prowess by demonstrating the extensiveness of its colonies and protectorates. Informed by prevailing assumptions about race and gender, the arrangement of the colonial displays accentuated dissimilarities between France and its colonies while corroborating France's inherent superiority. France obviously strengthened its national identity, understood as white and male, through its colonial
exhibits, which underscored the technological inferiority, racial difference, and feminized gender markers of the colonized peoples.

In addition, France capitalized upon its superior status by assuming the role of the international standard bearer of cosmopolitan art with the underlying assumption of superiority in the fine arts. The undeniable similarities between American and French art at the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition prompted many French (and American) commentators to disparage American art and its evident lack of national distinction. The link between nationalism and masculinity was by no means limited to the French. In contrast with the predominance of decorative figure paintings of women at the 1889 Exposition, and in response to criticism of American painting as slavishly dependent upon the Parisian model, American artists increasingly produced images of men that resonated with current assumptions about masculinity, effectively redefining American art's national identity at the 1900 Paris Universal Exposition.

The work of Annette Blaugrund, H. Barbara Weinberg, and Diane P. Fischer proved most useful to my research. An exhibition and publication celebrating the centennial of the 1889 Universal Exposition, *Paris 1889: American Artists at the Universal Exposition*, 1989, features insightful essays by Albert Boime, D. Dodge Thompson, H. Barbara Weinberg, Richard Guy Wilson, and editor Annette Blaugrund. These scholars address social, political, economic, and cultural contexts in which American artists participated in the Exposition. Moreover, *Paris 1889* is a superb source for reproductions of American paintings displayed at the 1889 Exposition and includes an informative reproduction of the official catalogue of the United States section of the

Diane P. Fischer's essay "Constructing the ‘American School’ of 1900” in Paris 1900: the “American School” at the Universal Exposition, 1999, which Fischer also edited, is an invaluable source that directed my research toward considering contrasts between American art exhibited at the 1889 and 1900 Expositions. Fischer notes that contemporary French criticism of American art at the 1889 Paris Exposition provoked American critical responses that resulted in an attempt to establish a national “American” school at the following Paris Exposition. This observation prompted my examination of images of men displayed by American artists in 1889 and 1900, respectively, and how these works related to American notions of manliness.

Prior to the American response in 1900, France had utilized an architectural style that embodied technological strength and modern industrial progress at the Exposition of 1889 that was understood at the time to be masculine. By contrast, the comparatively primitive colonial exhibits were understood to be feminine in their overall lack of technological innovation. Finally, French art maintained its superior status at the 1889
Exposition and served as a model for expatriate American art, which was widely condemned as lacking in national character because it had so thoroughly assimilated French academic standards. This prompted later American artists to respond with images imbued with manliness and masculine themes that strengthened American national identity at the 1900 Exposition.
Notes


3 Diane P. Fischer, “Constructing the American School of 1900” in *Paris 1900: The “American School” at the Universal Exposition* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1999), 1.
CHAPTER 1

French Architecture and Manliness

at the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition

The Paris Universal Exposition of 1889 was scheduled only eleven years after the previous Paris exposition in order to coincide with the one hundredth anniversary of the 1789 French Revolution. A renewed opportunity for the Third Republic to equate itself with the inspirational events of 1789, it was conceived, in large part, as a demonstration of the French government's sponsorship of modern industrial progress and stability.\(^1\) It is well known that the host country always demonstrates its technological prowess at universal expositions through the structures erected on the exposition grounds and the exhibits within. Two decidedly masculine structures epitomized the technological strength of France at the 1889 Exposition. The Eiffel Tower, as the gateway to the Exposition, loomed at one end of the exposition grounds on the Champ-de-Mars while the Palais des Machines was located at the other. Other buildings along the Champ-de-Mars included the Palais des Beaux-Arts, the Palais des Arts Libéraux, and the Palais des Industries Diverses, but the visible reliance of the Eiffel Tower and the Palais des Machines upon advanced technology for their impressive scale distinguished them the rest. A contemporary guidebook to the Exposition emphasized the great scale and innovation of the Palais des Machines by allotting an entire day to tour this "industrial wonder" and described both it and the Eiffel Tower as "gigantic" and "without precedent."\(^2\) The immense scale and engineering accomplishments of the Eiffel Tower
and the Palais des Machines demonstrated France's technological progress and national strength, which was thereby equated with manliness and masculinity.

Gustave Eiffel received authorization on 26 January 1887 to begin construction of the tower, the design for which had won the design competition of 1886 chaired by Jean Alphand, Director-General of Construction for the 1889 Exposition. Some artists and writers, including Meissonier, Gérôme, Bouguereau, de Maupassant, and others, criticized the Tower's design as too commercial, referring to it as the 'Tower of Babel.' These conservative critics then submitted a signed protest to Exposition authorities, and to Alphand in particular, on 14 February 1887, but to no avail.

The Eiffel Tower, the first monumental iron sculpture and the tallest, standing 300 meters tall, remained standing after the 1889 Exposition. Parts of the Eiffel Tower were prefabricated at iron mills and then assembled by a crew of both skilled and unskilled workers employed by Eiffel during the Tower's construction. The requirement of labor to produce the iron structure emphasized the importance of men and masculine strength to create the world's tallest building, an accomplishment that epitomized progress as vital to the function of universal expositions. Previously, iron construction, including prefabricated parts, had been used predominantly in functional structures such as railroads and bridges, but had remained hidden when used in buildings. The Eiffel Tower, on the other hand, was constructed of open wrought iron latticework, beginning with arches at its base, which functioned as a sort of triumphal arch, and culminating in the verticality of the tower that emphasizes height, reminiscent of the spiritual uplift crucial to Gothic cathedrals. Because Eiffel's design combines decorative arches at the tower's base with the
functional trusses that give the structure its height, the viewer’s eye is unavoidably drawn upward and recognizes both the structure’s iron material and its height; as a contemporary guidebook explains, its “summit is lost in the clouds.”^7 From its position on the Champ-de-Mars, the ever-present Tower was inevitably visible from all vantage points within the exposition grounds. From the top of the Tower one has a panoramic view of Paris, an overall view from above looking out and down.° The structure provided visitors with an awe-inspiring view that reinforced French pride in its technological prowess and superiority that had made the construction of the Eiffel Tower possible.

Moreover, in terms of its basic design, the form of the tower expressed itself as strong and upstanding. Contemporary critic Louis Gonse described the Tower in the Gazette des Beaux-Arts as “bracing itself on its feet like a man who spreads his legs to resist the pressure of the wind.”°° A caricature of Gustave Eiffel featured in Punch, 1889, supports the notion that the structural form of the Tower resembles a man, specifically the man who created it. Eiffel has become his tower; his legs have replaced the arches while an extremely long, giraffe-like neck supports his head. Similarly, a contemporary guidebook emphasized the stability of the structure, stating, “The day in which the wind would pull down the Tower, all monuments of Paris would be destroyed before it. That day has not yet come.”\textsuperscript{10}

Neither clearly an art object nor a clearly utilitarian one, the Tower’s lack of an obvious function was questioned at its inception.\textsuperscript{11} Gustave Eiffel himself proposed functional uses, such as astronomy, meteorology, and physics experiments for the Tower—in addition to that of tourist attraction—after the Exposition ended. Eiffel
included these potential uses on the tower design published in the *Génie Civil*, 1884, that placed public ascension at the end of the list. But as art historian Paul Greenhalgh has pointed out, tourism is the Tower's main function today. Eiffel's potential uses for the Tower would have complied with the goal of universal expositions to showcase scientific discoveries and increase tourism to the host country. The implication that the iron structure should be functional in some manner, beyond the merely aesthetic or demonstration of its engineering feasibility, attests to the notion that technology had to have a purpose.

The technology of ironwork on a large scale made the construction of the Tower possible. Yet there were some conservatives who criticized what they perceived as a lack of aesthetic appeal. Conservatives preferred the appearance of buildings with stone exteriors, while progressives accepted the industrial appearance of iron buildings as innovative. For example, Charles Garnier, the architect of the Paris Opéra, 1861-74, also designed the *Histoire de l'Habitation Humaine* on the 1889 Exposition grounds. Garnier valued iron for industrial buildings, including railway stations, rather than so-called artistic construction. Contemporary critic Joris-Karl Huysmans disparaged the Eiffel Tower for its unfinished appearance stating that it "resembles a factory chimney under construction, a carcass that waits to be filled with stone or bricks"; he both recognized and belittled the Tower's industrial nature. Furthermore, Huysmans explains "This appearance of scaffolding, this interrupted air, assigned to a building which is now complete, reveals an absolute lack of artistic sense." Huysmans thought the Eiffel Tower was ugly and referred to it as an "empty obelisk" on a "hollow
In the opinion of conservatives, the Eiffel Tower lacked artistic appeal precisely because of its industrial appearance.

Despite this criticism in the minds of many, the Eiffel Tower symbolized technological prowess and progress at the time of the 1889 Exposition. The tower project was conceived largely in relationship to comparable monuments in other countries (Table 1). For example, a contemporary guidebook and an image in the Génie Civil indicate the height of the Eiffel Tower in relationship to other great monuments. The Tower was over twice the height of St. Peter's in Rome and the Great Pyramid of Egypt. It topped America's own, albeit masonry, obelisk, the 169-meter Washington Monument (begun 1848, completed 1884), eliciting a potential nationalist and masculine competition for the tallest structure between France and the United States. This competition may have been driven in part by the United States and France's status as industrial nations in 1889, ranked third and fourth, respectively. The Tower, at 300 meters tall, remained the tallest man-made structure until 1930 when the 319.4-meter Chrysler Building in New York City was completed. Shortly thereafter, the 1931 Empire State Building, another American skyscraper, stood at 381 meters and surpassed the height of its neighbor. The Eiffel Tower extended far above structures that came before it and enabled France to expand further into the sky, one of the few unstaked territories predating space exploration available to it at this time. The completed structure also shored up the technological image of France as a nation. As art historian Albert Boime explains, the depression after the 1882 crash of the Union Générale bank caused French concern for their economic position in relationship to England and the United States. According to
Boime, French fear of American economic power fueled insistence upon France’s industrial superiority at the Exposition, reinforced by the presence of the Eiffel Tower. Otis Brothers & Co., an American company that became the Otis Elevator Company in 1898, designed the elevators that ascended the Tower’s curved piers; the Otis elevators were installed at the north leg from the ground to the second platform and the south leg from the first to second platform. French companies, Roux, Combaluzier, and Lepape, as well as Edoux, provided the elevators for the east and west legs, and the distance from the second to third platform, respectively. As David P. Billington, professor of civil engineering, has explained, the structure of the Eiffel Tower is accessible to the public for the most part due to its complementary relationship to machines, its elevators. Although the intention behind the Tower may have been to outdo other countries and demonstrate France’s technological innovativeness, it was nevertheless reliant upon American elevator technology to complete it. There are masculine implications of the use of American technology to ascend the height of what became a French national symbol; one could view this as a case of France claiming another nation’s technology for its own.

The link between the notion of manliness and the construction of Eiffel’s Tower is also noticeable in contemporary caricatures. For example, in a cartoon published in Le Central, Gustave Eiffel is depicted accompanied by his tower and a pyramid. Text inscribed on the pyramid reads, “By the magnitude of the work the greatness of man is measured.” The small size of the pyramid likely refers to the pyramids of Egypt that are half the height of the Tower. This image clearly ties manhood and masculinity to the
Tower's size and height, an accomplishment ascribed to Eiffel who rises slightly above the height of the Tower that is almost dwarfed in comparison to his impressive proportions. On the cover of *Les Hommes d’Aujourd’hui*, 1889, Eiffel leapfrogs over the Tower while the seemingly astonished moon behind him looks on as Eiffel and his Tower reach further into the heavens. Both of these images reinforce the Tower as a technological feat by which a man is measured.

*Technological progress at the Palais des Machines*

The 1889 Paris Exposition also featured the Palais des Machines, a structure designed by architect Charles-Louis-Ferdinand Dutert, that combined engineering and artistic decoration that both epitomized and showcased France's technological progress. Academically-trained Dutert won the Prix de Rome in 1869 while studying at the École des Beaux-Arts, and his design for the Palais des Machines was honored with a commemorative medal at the 1889 Exposition. The receipt of a commemorative medal suggests that conservatives received the Palais des Machines better than they had the Eiffel Tower.

Dutert's Palais des Machines trumped Joseph Paxton's Crystal Palace built for the 1851 Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations, London, by 15 meters in height (Table 2). The main building of the Crystal Palace was 563 meters long, 124 meters wide, and 33 meters in height at its central transept. The Palais des Machines, which housed industrial machines, was built primarily of wrought iron and covered 80,000 square meters. Its central nave spanned 420 meters in length, 115 meters in
width, and 48 meters in height, not including the two lateral galleries at 15 meters each in width.

The 110 meters spanned by the main gallery in the Palais des Machines contributed to the visual impression of a huge iron structure towering high above the largest machines displayed within it.\textsuperscript{27} Though French industry occupied three-quarters of the gallery's space, companies from other countries, such as Belgium, England, Switzerland, and the United States, exhibited machines in the remaining space.\textsuperscript{28} The overall size of the exhibition space itself reinforced France's superiority despite the display of innovative technology from outside its borders. The Palais des Machines also functioned as a machine, offering a panoramic view of its interior from huge electrically powered \textit{ponts roulants} or moving bridges that transported visitors the distance of the building without the need to walk it.\textsuperscript{29} Originally used to move the heavy machinery for the exhibit, this technology proved useful as a tourist attraction during the exhibition itself as it enabled visitors to experience technology firsthand.

The arched trusses of the Palais des Machines had three prominent hinges that counteracted any flux in the metal due to changes in temperature without compromising the framing or foundations.\textsuperscript{30} Furthermore, it enabled the trusses to span a greater distance; bridge technology had employed three-hinged arched trusses as early as 1867 to span distances from 42 to 56 meters.\textsuperscript{31} The use of bridge technology strengthened the link between industrial progress and the Palais des Machines. The visible three-hinged assembly reinforced the notion that this building was constructed of metal with functional components. The nave was divided in half by a central bay, which had nine bays on
either side of it. One set of bays terminated at the avenue de la Bourdonnais and the other ended at the avenue de Suffren. These bays were assigned to two different contractors, the Fives-Lille Company and Cail et Cie., respectively. No strangers to this type of construction, the companies had worked on viaducts according to plans by Eiffel in 1867. Both companies used independent construction methods and finished the work in approximately six months. The Fives-Lille Company used four pre-assembled sections for each truss. The components were positioned on the base hinge first, supported by scaffolding, while the remaining sections were positioned and workers joined the top hinge with minimal riveting on-site. Cail et Cie relied on a scaffolding that held a complete arch that was riveted in place on the scaffolding itself. Both companies utilized pre-assembled components to some degree in the construction of the bays.

The collaboration between an architect and engineer produced the Palais des Machines. Victor Contamin, the building’s engineer and a professor at the École des Arts et Manufactures, combined science and art, according to a contemporary critic, by using a few points of support “at the base of the girders and where these latter meet each other in the center of the roof” that “are connected by longitudinal girders” and a minimum of materials to provide the “necessary strength and artistic effect.” This emphasizes the recognition of the significant role engineering played in the production of the building and its appearance. Contamin’s role was acknowledged in a contemporary caricature that made the cover of an 1888-89 issue of Le Central as well. The cartoon depicts Contamin astride a huge truss on which “110 meters” is inscribed in reference to the 110 meters spanned by the trusses in the main gallery. Contemporary critics also remarked upon the
scale of the structure. For example, Gonse described the Palais des Machines in masculine vocabulary, stating that “an army of 30,000 men would be able to sleep there easily; the summit of the great trusses stands two and a half meters taller than the platform of the Arc de Triomphe de l'Étoile.” The Palais des Machines could house not only a large number of men, but military men at that, associated with strength and virility. The association of the Palais des Machines with the military can include the notion of victory since the height of the Palais exceeds even the Arc de Triomphe.

A masculine element is also evident in the surface decorations of the Palais des Machines, which combined iron and plaster decoration in a mix of engineered metal and decorative detail. Plaster molding in the Palais des Machines was often interwoven with elements of mechanization or engineering such as gears, wrenches, or compasses with floral and vegetal motifs and was applied to the interior ceiling and the Grand Vestibule. The inclusion of such decorative molding reveals Dutert’s academic training at the École des Beaux-Arts in that the steel and iron structure does not stand as an example of engineering alone, but is embellished.

The Dutert-designed Grand Vestibule functioned as the main entrance to the Palais des Machines. A large bronze fountain by Frédéric-Auguste Bartholdi and a wrought iron staircase complemented the decoration in the Grand Vestibule. Bartholdi’s large-scale fountain depicted a bare-breasted woman on a wheeled seashell-like cart pulled by four horses with almost webbed hooves, rather than a machine. Spiraling vines in wrought iron composed the railing of the staircase. The emphasis on the feminine detail of curvilinear line counterbalanced the stark maleness and industrial appearance of
the riveted staircase to which the railing was attached. Clear and colored glass featuring the coats of arms of cities such as Lyon, London, Tokyo and so on, in addition to plasterwork, decorated the Palais des Machines, making it more than simply a utilitarian structure. The interior decoration appealed to Huysmans who, in contrast to his criticism of the Eiffel Tower, wrote more favorably of the Palais des Machines. Huysmans praised the building’s “glass sky” and the pleasing effects of colored light streaming through the glass windows, but criticized the machines on display as “too banal.” Despite the prevalence of applied decoration, the visible framework and the machines operating within the structure emphasized its function as an exhibition space for industry and technology.

The plaster sculptural groups flanking the avenue de la Boudonnais entrance to the Palais des Machines, in addition to the building itself, emphasized technological advancement as well. Placed on either side of the “Palais des Machines” inscription on the building’s entrance were two nude sculptural groups at ten meters in height. A contemporary critic describes these sculptures:

The first [Electricity], by M. [Louis-Ernest] Barrias, represents electricity, and is composed of two female figures. One of these by a finger touch, sends an electric flash through the globe, whilst the other, resting in a recumbent position on a cloud, stretches forth her hand to her companion; they symbolize the opposite currents [ac/dc]. The second group [Steam], by M. [Henri-Michel] Chapu, shows a female figure personifying steam, and a workman clasping her in his arms.
In *Electricity*, Barrias uses the female form to symbolize the concept of electricity rather than demonstrating how electricity actually works. The sculpture alludes to the technology represented at the Exposition, while visitors could view actual demonstrations of the technological implementations of electricity inside the Palais des Machines provided by the *ponts roulants* and other displays. As a new force in Western civilization, real electricity itself had a significant presence in the 1889 Exposition, which was able to expand its hours of operation due to the availability of electric light. The Eiffel Tower was equipped with electric lights as were the exposition buildings, including the Palais des Machines that relied entirely upon electric light. As historian David E. Nye argues, the “light, heat, and power” that electricity creates “provided a visible correlative for the ideology of progress,” thereby reinforcing the technological progress exhibited by the Exposition. Dutert’s utilization of electric lights behind the colored leaded glass in the dome of the Grand Vestibule synthesized the technology of electricity with glass art. When utilized at the 1889 Paris Exposition, electricity simultaneously functioned as a spectacle for display with spotlights atop the Eiffel Tower and numerous lit fountains, as well as a useful element, lighting dark interiors of buildings.

In *Steam*, a female figure epitomizes steam that is subdued and controlled by a male figure who grasps a chain attached to a metal band around the woman’s waist; the power of steam has been literally harnessed by man. The male figure, complete with workman’s apron and tools at his feet, simultaneously represents laborers and mankind. The masculine nature of work controls the feminine personification of steam and openly equates technological progress with masculinity.
The trend toward steel is notable even in the Palais des Machines since steel was originally preferred for its design, but was replaced by iron, which was a more cost-effective choice in 1889. In this sense the Eiffel Tower and Palais des Machines marked the end of a building tradition in iron, as cultural critic Richard Guy Wilson has argued. Significantly, the construction of the Eiffel Tower and Palais des Machines promoted the continued practice of utilizing prefabricated components that began with Paxton’s Crystal Palace. Both the Eiffel Tower and the Palais des Machines were incorporated into the grounds of the next Paris Universal Exposition in 1900, although was less enduring than the Tower, the Palais des Machines was demolished in 1909.

Ever since 1889, the Eiffel Tower has been recognized as the universal emblem of Paris and a national symbol of France. As the gateway to the 1889 Paris Exposition, the Eiffel Tower demonstrated engineering accomplishment and modern industrial progress that relied heavily upon its dominating height, the use of elevator technology, and electric lighting to impress the viewer. The Palais des Machines combined decoration with the immense scale of the structure’s iron framework that housed machines of industry. The huge scale and primacy of metal in the construction of the Eiffel Tower and the Palais des Machines paralleled the country’s technological progress demonstrated by the 1889 Exposition and thus resonated with notions of masculinity, maleness, and confident cultural superiority.
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CHAPTER 2

Constructing Masculinity:
French Nationalism and the 1889 Colonial Exhibits

At the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition, France projected national identity that was defined in terms of white masculinity, reinforced by constructions of difference, and supported by colonial expansion. The French colonial exhibits confirmed the nation’s superior strength and imperial prowess by demonstrating the extensiveness of its possessions. In fact, the presence of the French colonies at the Universal Exposition had a defining impact on the exhibition as a whole, comprising nearly twenty percent of the French exhibitors. Informed by prevailing assumptions about race and gender, the colonial exhibitions were designed to corroborate France’s inherent superiority over its colonial holdings. In 1889, the French colonies and protectorates included Algeria, Annam-Tonkin, Cambodia, Cochin China, Gabon, Guadeloupe, Guiana, French India, Martinique, Mayotte and Comoro, Nossi-Bé, New Caledonia, Obock, Réunion, St. Pierre and Miquelon, Senegal, Tahiti, and Tunisia, most of which were represented at the Exposition. In response to the French colonial display, one contemporary observed that “a pompous muster of the French colonies” represented on the Esplanade des Invalides was “calculated to rouse the pride of the French and the jealousy of rival countries,” thus affirming French national supremacy. By underscoring the technological inferiority, the racial differences, and the feminized gender markers of its colonized peoples, France naturally strengthened its white male national identity.
The grounds of the Exposition were organized into four sections: the Champ-de-Mars, Trocadero, Quai d'Orsay, and Esplanade des Invalides. Fine and liberal arts, industry, and the History of Human Habitation occupied the exhibition space of the Champ-de-Mars, which was anchored at either end by the Eiffel Tower and the Palais des Machines. Northwest of the Eiffel Tower, across the Seine, the Trocadero housed horticulture and ethnographic exhibits, and a retrospective exhibition of French objets d'art. Agricultural exhibits and products dominated the exhibition space of the Quai d'Orsay, which ran along the Seine to the northeast of the Champ-de-Mars. Finally, the Esplanade des Invalides, bordered by the Quai d'Orsay, the Rue de Constantine, the Rue Grenelle, and the Rue Fabert, was located to the northeast of, and furthest from, the Exposition's main axis, the Champ-de-Mars. Non-colonial exhibits on the Rue Fabert side of the Esplanade des Invalides included the Palace of the Ministry of War, the Pavilion of the Ministry of Posts and Telegraphs, exhibitions of hygienic working-class housing, public assistance, and social economy, as well as restaurants and other displays. The exhibits of the French colonies extended over 25,000 meters and dominated the Rue de Constantine half of the Esplanade des Invalides, which was divided in two by a central avenue.4

The geographical layout of the grounds was informed by ideological assumptions, which was typical of universal expositions.5 As historian Debora L. Silverman has asserted, the comprehensive whole of the Esplanade reaffirmed French republican government’s control over the working class and colonized peoples.6 The placement of the Ministry of War across from the Palais central des Colonies on the Esplanade further
reinforced the sharp contrast between France and its colonies. The Palace of the Ministry of War shored up the image of French military acumen that far surpassed that of its primitive colonies. Also, the location of public assistance and social economy exhibits in close proximity to the colonial displays suggested that the benefits French government had extended to its working class could similarly improve life in the colonies, thereby justifying French colonial intervention.

The colonial exhibits assembled for the Exposition of 1889 presented the French colonies to the rest of the world. French architects constructed many of the colonial buildings and imposed a Western European perception of colonial architecture. The colonial buildings were designed to emphasize their dissimilarity to French architecture and its technological competence, thus architecturally reiterating France's dominance over its colonies and protectorates. The vividly colored colonial buildings were built primarily of wood and stone and thus utilized more primitive materials in contrast to the iron structures, such as the Palais des Machines, which confirmed the technologically superior engineering capability of the French. The building itself and the French industrial exhibits that filled three-quarters of its interior reaffirmed France's technological competence and masculine status, especially in contrast to the colonial buildings on the Esplanade.

French architects designed three of the largest colonial palaces, the Palais central des Colonies, the Tunisian palace, and the Algerian palace on the Esplanade des Invalides. The Palais central des Colonies was designed by architect Stephen Sauvestre and formed the centerpiece of the French colonial exhibits. Constructed with visible
wood framing rather than iron or steel, atop a masonry foundation of stone courses and brick joints, the wood-framed Palais des Colonies stood in marked contrast to the massive iron Palais des Machines. Vibrant color, such as green and red, epitomizing less sophisticated colonial taste, was used liberally in the interior and exterior of the Palais des Colonies. Through the display of products from some of France’s smaller colonies such as Cayenne, French India, French West Indies, Mayotte, Nossi-Bé, Obock, Senegal, and Tahiti, the Palais des Colonies demonstrated the potential economic profitability of business in the colonies. The exhibition building also housed geographical maps and examples of students’ work from the colonial schools, which had of course imposed French education upon the colonized. Functioning as a gateway to the colonial exhibits, the Palais des Colonies typified the Exposition’s colonial architecture that utilized inferior building materials, such as wood, and housed colonial goods that reiterated French authority over and possession of its colonies and their products.

Located to the northeast of the Palais des Colonies, the exhibit of Tunisia, which had become a French colony in 1882, consisted of a palace, a pavilion of forests, a bazaar, a small model of an Arabian children’s school, a pavilion for products of Djérid, boutiques, restaurants, and a café-concert with music and Tunisian dancers. Henri Saladin, the palace’s architect, had published studies on Tunisian architecture that he had collected firsthand during archaeological missions. Saladin copied elements from specific Tunisian buildings and incorporated them into his design of the Tunisian palace. He modeled the principle façade and its black and white arcade after the great mosque of Sidi-Okba in Kairouan, the minaret after the Sidi-ben-Arouz, and borrowed ornamental
motifs from Souk-el-Bey and Bardo. As such, Saladin integrated elements into a palace that exemplified French expectations of generic Islamic architecture.

The exhibit for Algeria, counted among France’s colonies since 1830, stood just northeast of the Tunisian palace. French architects Albert Ballu and Emile Marquette designed the elaborate Algerian palace that incorporated studies that Ballu had completed for the Commission of Historic Monuments. The mosque of Sidi-Abd-er-Rhaman inspired the 22-meter minaret of the palace while the Great Mosque of the Fisheries served as a source for the mihrab. French, rather than Algerian, architects assumed the role of creating the colony’s palace that, as architectural historian Zeynep Çelik has noted, was nevertheless deemed an Islamic rather than French structure. This assumption is supported by a contemporary account of the Algerian palace in the Gazette des Beaux-Arts in which critic Louis Gonse praised Ballu’s successful blending of personal inventiveness and ideas drawn from architectural models to create a fine example of Arabian style; the French interpretation stood as an authentic image of Algeria. The exhibit also featured numerous tents, a house of Djurdjura, an artesian well, a Moorish café, and several kiosks in addition to the palace proper.

The colonies and protectorates of Cochin China, Cambodia, Annam, and Tonkin fell under the umbrella of French Indo China and had individual colonial exhibits on the Esplanade rather than a single pavilion. The volume of Indo Chinese exhibits played up the extensive range and diversity of France’s holdings. Contemporary critic Eugène Melchoir de Vogue described the appeal of the Indo Chinese exhibits under the glow of electric light that heightened the enigmatic nature of “kiosks guarded by monsters,
pagodas with grotesque figures, and turned-up Chinese roofs" that propelled the visitor into another world. The colonial exhibits brought the unknown, both architecture and people, to the Exposition visitor. Contemporary French accounts described the colonial pavilions of Annam, Tonkin, and Cambodia in particular as profoundly original in both their architecture and the variety of products exhibited. The originality of these pavilions may be attributed to their architects who were based in the colonies. The non-French designs of the pavilions and ornamentation executed by indigenous artists conceivably encouraged descriptions, like those by de Vogue, of the Indo Chinese pavilions as otherworldly curiosities with mysterious origins.

Alfred Foulhoux, chief architect of civil construction from Saigon, drew up the plans and directed the construction of the Palace of Cochin China. Like the Palais des Colonies, the Palace of Cochin China consisted of a wood building constructed on a stone foundation. The palace itself had wood columns, a multiple tiered roof, and a green and red exterior covered with ornamentation. Foulhoux brought nineteen Annamite artists from Indo China to Paris who completed the painting and sculpture of the Cochin China and Tonkin palaces. The Cambodian pavilion was positioned next to the Cochin China exhibit; Albert-Maurice Fabre, architect of civil construction in Pnom Penh, was responsible for the Pagoda of Angkor that he "rendered after one of the Buddhist monuments from Cambodia." The convex column of the pagoda's extensively decorated forty-meter pyramid was painted red and gold.

The Palace of Annam-Tonkin, to the immediate northeast of the Palais des Colonies, featured separate Annam and Tonkin exhibition rooms. Parallel to each other
and connected by two galleries, the exhibition rooms formed a square courtyard that featured a small temple housing a large statue of a Buddha on a masonry altar. The architecture of the Palace of Annam-Tonkin was built following plans drawn up by Henri Vildieu, an assistant architect of civil buildings in Saigon. The spectacle of unfamiliar religious objects placed within the exhibit further differentiated French culture from that of the colonies and protectorates.

*The people of the French colonies and protectorates*

France imported indigenous people to construct villages that represented typical housing, products, and peoples from the French colonies and protectorates, in contrast to the largely European-authored colonial pavilions. Contemporaries stressed the diverse races represented in the colonial exhibits, from a king from the African coast to Annamite soldiers. Organizers placed most of the colonial villages, including Tonkinese, Canaque, Pahouin (Gabon), Tahitian, and Senegalese villages, to the south of the Palais des Colonies. A Belgian-sponsored Congolese village and an unofficial Dutch installation of a Kampong-Javanese village shared the Esplanade with the French exhibits and reiterated the fact that the colonial exhibition was a French endeavor. Writing about the 1889 colonial exhibits in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, critic C. de Varigny asserted:

> These days, colonization no longer implicates the idea of substituting a superior race for an inferior race, of the brutal suppression of the second to benefit the first, but of supremacy, intellectual and moral, military and naval, industrial and commercial of one over the other.
French military preeminence associated with masculine strength justified colonization. Emphasis on the inferiority of the colonized people in terms of intelligence, morality, military ability, and industrialization rationalized French colonization as beneficial to the colonized peoples. The descriptions of the colonized peoples and the numerous contemporary images of them confirmed the intense interest in the colonized people themselves. As anthropologist Burton Benedict has asserted, the physiological characteristics of these peoples, including ethnicity and behavioral customs, made them curiosities for display. The colonized had darker skin pigmentation, different clothing and social practices, and spoke different languages. Race, as well as gender, accentuated perceived differences between the French and the inhabitants of their colonies and protectorates. Furthermore, displaying indigenous people was another means for France to emasculate the colonized and demonstrate its superiority and control over them.

In the Tonkinese village under the direction of M. Viterbo, an entrepreneur in Hanoi, fifty-three indigenous workers from Tonkin built and occupied bamboo huts. Many of the peoples on display were artisans and their work functioned as examples of ethnic tradition. The French admired Tonkinese artistry displayed at the Exposition, such as embroidery, but considered Tonkinese “an inferior race in some regards” compared to Europeans. According to one guidebook, the Tonkinese had flat noses, thick, badly shaped eyebrows, and continued to have a young, childlike appearance throughout their lifespan. The Annamites were characterized as short and physically weaker than the French, with skin the color of cinnamon. de Vogue equated the Annamites’ disposition with that of overgrown children, transfixed and amused by their
own reflection in shiny new objects. Likened to children, Annamite men were consequently denied their manhood as well. Other commentary could have described apes rather than humans, explaining “[t]heir chest is enormous, their hands dry and broad, their feet flat and their toes open, so well that with their flat feet they hold the stirrup, the rudder, pick up the smallest objects.” The Annamites’ physical characteristics, and hence racial difference, distinguished them from the French while reinforcing assumptions of French superiority. A contemporary account of an Annamite’s response to the ponts roulants or moving bridges traveling the length of the Palais des Machines explained:

The bird’s-eye view thus obtained proved so startling to an Annamite the other day that he turned suddenly pale, or pale yellow, on glancing down at the iron monsters which to his untutored and superstitious gaze seemed to be harboring destructive designs upon the passing crowds. . .

This account describes physiological difference, specifically yellow skin pigmentation, suggests a lack of education in understanding the western technology housed in the Palais des Machines, and perpetuates stereotypes of colonial peoples as superstitious, thereby supporting the assumption that the colonized are simple, primitive peoples who confirm the superiority of the colonizer.

Ten indigenous men and women representing New Caledonia, the Loyalty Islands, and the New Hebrides Islands populated the Canaque village, located to the northeast of the Tonkinese village. Although most inhabitants of the Exposition village were dressed conservatively, their typical dress consisted of no more than a leaf or simple
piece of fabric called a manou for men and a tapa or fiber and leaf belt for women. Accounts of the physical characteristics of Canaque men delineated a people with “lamp-black skin,” frizzy hair, thick beards, large, flattened noses, pronounced chins, large chests, and well proportioned bodies. Displayed as curiosities due to their race and appearance, Canaque women were generally described as ugly and repulsive with pierced earlobes and shaved heads; one guidebook stressed that even the Canaque men deemed these women inferior to them. The French found Canaque women peculiar, unattractive, and inferior, assertions apparently corroborated by the opinions of the Canaque men.

As Benedict has noted, people on display often possessed curious behavioral traits that drew audiences to these particular exhibits. The practice of cannibalism among the Canaques seemed even more interesting to Exposition visitors than the Canaque women’s physical appearance, the unsympathetic description of which was likely influenced by knowledge of the people’s cannibalistic behavior. Uncivilized behavior was equated with ugliness. A contemporary guidebook claimed the Canaques reduced family size by cannibalizing unwanted and deformed children. Intervention by the French administration had not eradicated the practice entirely and vices apparently abounded among the Canaques whose children supposedly learned to smoke tobacco pipes before learning to walk. Sensationalized accounts of suspicious or deviant cultural practices undoubtedly increased guidebook sales and admissions. At the same time, these accounts reinforced stereotypes of the people exhibited in the so-called authentic villages at the Exposition. Behavior considered abnormal by western standards reinforced the ‘othered’
status of the people practicing such behavior. Contemporary critic Emile Monod described one of the indigenous women from the Loyalty Islands as an attractive and accomplished person who could read and write as well as speak both French and English.⁴⁹ She functioned as a trophy of conquest, an individual educated in the culture of her colonizer.⁵⁰ Distanced from cannibalistic behavior, this woman served as evidence of the Canaques’ intellectual potential when fostered by the civilizing influence of the French.⁵¹ The rumored inability of some Canaques to cease this immoral behavior warranted colonization and reiterated French national and moral supremacy.

The Pahouin (Gabon) village featured bamboo huts inhabited by the Pahouins, an intelligent people as well as “the handsomest race of the Gabonais” according to one contemporary account.⁵² The men were said to be “very handsome men, tall and well proportioned” with bronzed skin.⁵³ A contrary description in another contemporary publication labeled the Pahouins savages who filed their teeth down to points, fueling accusations of cannibalism among the people.⁵⁴ Again, rumors of aberrant behavior became newsworthy due to widespread public interest. The indigenous people of Gabon typically wore loincloths no wider than 20 centimeters; however, the women had begun favoring European petticoats and silk hats.⁵⁵ This demonstrated the beneficial impact of French colonization and western standards of dress on women who incorporated it into their traditional attire of bare breasts and glass bead collars.⁵⁶ Some Gabonese men also adopted European dress including top hats, coats with tails, watch chains, and umbrellas, which demonstrated French influence upon the colonized.⁵⁷
A contemporary guidebook explained that the copper-skinned Tahitians were amiable, "vigorous and handsome athletes" who were unfortunately idle dreamers. The perceived exoticness of the colony is stressed when Tahiti is referred to as New Cythera and the Tahitian women as "seducing sirens" who live for pleasure. The Tahitian men on display wore a pareu or long wraparound skirt paired with a European shirt, the pairing of which continued to assert a more feminine image of colonized men who traditionally wore skirts. The clothing of some more modestly dressed colonized peoples lacked distinct gender markers noticeable in European standards of dress. For example, Kabyle men and women of Algeria both wore loose fitting, ankle-length, dress-like clothing. Kabyle people are raced nonwhite and may be gendered feminine or neutral, based on their similar attire.

The Senegalese village featured fortifications, huts, a mosque, and the Tower of Saldé, which was a model of a small fort built at Saldé in defense against the French. Contemporary accounts of the Senegalese exhibit touted the people who inhabited it as "much more authentic than those whom they exhibit regularly at the Jardin of Acclimation." As trophies of conquest, the inhabitants engaged in mundane domestic tasks compared with the machines, technology, and commerce of white French men. However, the physical appearance of the Senegalese also proved interesting to the visitors. According to de Vogüe, the races imported from the area between Senegal and the Congo were fine specimens of athletic people with intelligent and pleasant facial features. A guidebook supported this claim and characterized the Senegalese in general as "neat and elegant" with "truly admirable" body proportions and "jet-black" skin.
contemporary publication under the direction of the special commissioner of the colonial exhibition regarded the Wolofs as the most beautiful people with the blackest skin in all of Africa who epitomized the true Senegalese race. The Senegalese village included people of different races who had been nevertheless lumped together as examples of a general racial type to fairgoers.

Organized difference

The plan of the Exposition grounds intentionally juxtaposed colonial and western exhibits, which reinforced French national identity through constructions of difference. In addition to the colonial exhibits on the Esplanade des Invalides, organizers integrated 'othered' space, including the History of Human Habitation and the Rue du Caire, into the entire grounds. Exposition visitors interacted with 'othered' people throughout the grounds rather than simply viewing them on display. Indigenous people imported from the colonies attended and ran the restaurants and boutiques on the Esplanade. Nonwhite peoples also provided transportation to Exposition visitors.

Architect Charles Garnier, assisted by A. Amman, designed the structures in the History of Human Habitation exhibit. Positioned just north of the Eiffel Tower on the Champ-de-Mars, Garnier's exhibit displayed forty-four types of dwellings from prehistoric and historical times, as well as contemporary nonwestern houses, that were intended to function as exact historical reconstructions. The exhibit had three main sections of habitations: prehistoric, primitive, and isolated civilizations. Garnier argued that the dwellings of the isolated civilizations in particular did not contribute to human progress in the development of habitations. According to Garnier, the races of isolated
civilizations included the so-called yellow race or Chinese and Japanese races, the black race, and indigenous peoples of America. Notably, exhibits of colonized Asian and African peoples were also located on the Esplanade and visitors may have equated them with the Garnier’s dwellings on the Champ-de-Mars as examples of structures and peoples far removed from western, specifically French, civilization.

The Rue du Caire, presented by organizers as an exact reproduction of an ancient street in Cairo, was located the Avenue de Suffren just northwest of the Palais des Machines. This Egyptian exhibit, under the direction of commissioner general M. Delort de Gléon with architect M. Gillet, spanned over 3,000 meters. As cultural critic Timothy Mitchell has explained, the street “remained only a Parisian copy of the Oriental original.” Like the colonial palaces on the Esplanade, the Rue du Caire demonstrated the French interpretation of the culture it represented. Its position interspersed a display of the ‘other’ among the French and industrialized countries’ exhibits on the Champ-de-Mars and was physically nearest the Siam, Japanese, and Chinese pavilions and exhibits. The street, inhabited by more than 200 Egyptians, featured Egyptian and Moroccan cafés, boutiques, houses, a minaret, Moroccan and Tunisian tents, and stables for donkeys imported from Egypt. Nonwhite women provided entertainment as dancers and embodiments of the exotic ‘other,’ who performed the danse du ventre or belly dance for Exposition visitors in the cafés on the Rue du Caire.

The integration of exhibits featuring ‘othered’ space throughout the Exposition grounds created juxtapositions of civilized, racially white areas versus uncivilized, nonwhite spaces. For example, the Palais des Machines dominated the end of the
Champ-de-Mars nearest the Esplanade des Invalides so that fairgoers leaving the Palais des Machines for the Esplanade would inevitably recognize the contrast between French technological progress and the more technologically simplified colonial exhibits. Production from the French colonies often emphasized raw, especially agricultural, products rather than technological ones. The French West Indies produced sugar and rum, Guadeloupe provided sugarcane, and New Caledonia provided minerals to be mined such as nickel. The Pahouin village exhibited ginger and pepper among its products. Cayenne produced abundant agricultural products including sugar cane, cotton, cocoa, spices, coffee, mahogany, and quinine tonic wine. The variety of agricultural products displayed in the colonial palaces and villages stressed the economic benefits of French acquisition and utilization of resources from its colonies and protectorates. The location of the colonial exhibits in relationship to the Palais des Machines further emphasized disparity between France's primitive colonies and its own civilized technology, progress, and subsequent masculine status.

Assumptions about racial and technological inferiority of France's colonies inform such ostensibly mundane aspects of the Exposition as transportation. Such so-called primitive modes of transportation, *pousse-pousse* or rickshaw and donkey rides, were powered by nonwhite, often barefoot, men or animals in contrast with the miniature trains of the Decauville railroad, which traversed the perimeter of the fairgrounds and provided more technologically advanced transportation around the grounds via iron tracks. Moreover, passengers could view the colonized peoples on display in the villages while traveling on the railroad.
Essentialism of race and gender

Placing ‘othered’ peoples among the civilized Western exhibits throughout the Exposition grounds further emphasized difference between the colonized and France. The colonial exhibits as a whole displayed the inhabitants of each colonial village as a cohesive, representative example of the indigenous people from their respective colonies. Regardless of the attempt to demonstrate the diversity and extent of France’s colonial endeavors through numerous pavilions and villages, the occupants of the French colonial exhibits were viewed collectively as nonwhite peoples. The essentialist notion of race represented by the colonial exhibits denies racial differences among the colonized themselves, creates a homogenized notion of race, and does not acknowledge gender.75 However, race is gendered and gender is raced. As George Lipsitz, professor of ethnic studies has explained, whiteness functions as “the unmarked category against which difference is constructed;” people who are nonwhite are labeled ‘other’ than white.76 Part of the strategy to ‘other’ those from the colonies was to feminize and thus disempower them. Men who wore clothing interpreted as skirts or dresses by Europeans became feminine since they were attired more similarly to women than to European standards of masculine dress. Colonized men who had acquired European clothing remained marked as ‘other’ by their race. An educated woman from the colonies, like the woman described by Monod, could not, despite her purported intelligence, escape the social restrictions of her gender. The colonial exhibits are raced nonwhite and gendered feminine or gendered neutral while the French national exhibits are raced white and gendered male.
The corroboration of manly nationhood

The colonial exhibits at the Paris Exposition of 1889 validated French nationhood as white and male. The nonwhite space of the exhibits of the French colonies, History of Human Habitation, and Rue du Caire are interconnected as they emphasized the white male civilization of French national exhibits through their perceived and artificially constructed difference. The exposed wood framing of the Palais des Colonies emphasized the use of technologically inferior, hence more primitive, materials in the construction of the colonial buildings despite the French origin of many of their designs. To advance to a civilized state, the colonized would need to assimilate the French national identity. Yet, this goal remained impossible to achieve fully. The colonized peoples were categorized as primitive, nonwhite, and gender neutral or feminine, thereby ensuring French superiority. Moreover, the feminine or neutral gender status of the colonized peoples reaffirmed France's own masculine standing. The not yet civilized people displayed in the colonial villages reinforced the perception that France's national exhibition buildings epitomized technological superiority and civilized white male French national identity.
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CHAPTER 3
American Nationalism and Manhood
at the 1889 and 1900 Paris Universal Expositions

French national superiority was manifest throughout the exhibits of the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition, even in those not organized by the French. For instance, in the United States section of the fine arts exhibit, paintings by American artists emulated French art and reinforced French artistic supremacy. In response to remarks by French and American critics that disparaged the lack of national identity in American painting at the 1889 Exposition, American artists took stock of their national identity for the 1900 Paris Universal Exposition, largely in masculine terms, and produced numerous images of men. As Benedict Anderson, professor of international studies, has asserted, "the 'nation' proved an invention on which it was impossible to secure a patent." Much as the conception of nationalism changes over time and place, manhood is a social construction that changes depending upon the social and historical context in which it is situated. According to historian Kristin L. Hoganson, "in the late nineteenth century, men from across the political spectrum generally agreed that democratic government rested on the manly character and fraternal spirit of male citizens and political leaders." This emphasis on manliness strengthens the argument that nationalism is gendered and that manhood is strongly tied to national identity. Hoganson has asserted that race and class, as well as sex, largely determined who could participate in United States electoral politics and served as a stipulation upon the fraternal character of politics. Nationalism
seems to construct masculinist stories; precisely because of this, art exhibited at the Paris Universal Expositions has the potential to resonate with both nationalism and manhood.

At the 1889 Exposition, resident American and expatriate works were exhibited in separate galleries within the United States section and the selection process of works for the respective displays differed as well. The juries, one in New York and one in Paris, selected the works by American artists to be exhibited at the 1889 Paris Exposition. The United States intended to strengthen its cultural reputation through the American fine arts section, which included 336 paintings by 189 painters. Rush Christopher Hawkins was appointed Commissioner of Fine Arts and created the 1889 jury for the American works, which was composed of artists rather than collectors and dealers as it had been in the past. Most likely due to shipping expenses, American artists based in the United States sent up to three paintings each compared with twice as many from American artists living in Paris. Paris-based American painters had works shipped from the United States for judging in Paris rather than New York, with few exceptions. Resident American artists arranged for their work to be picked up in New York, Brooklyn, or Jersey City, or shipped directly to the New York storeroom where judging took place.

American expatriate artists working in Paris comprised the jury for the works submitted by American artists living abroad. Members of the Paris committee also installed their own work in the best positions in the American galleries. Many artists on the jury, including John Singer Sargent and Gari Melchers, had previously received awards at the Paris Salon. In the American section of the 1889 Exposition, Sargent exhibited six paintings, all portraits of women, and Melchers exhibited four scenes of
Dutch life. Both artists received grand prizes and Sargent was also named a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor.\textsuperscript{14}

Most likely due to limited space within the American galleries, artists' works were not always grouped together and were sometimes placed on different walls or in different rooms.\textsuperscript{15} Curator Annette Blaugrund has emphasized that photographs for Hawkins's report to Congress favored images of European-influenced paintings in the permanent record of the American section and included three walls of the expatriate gallery and only one of the resident gallery.\textsuperscript{16} In The Century, a popular American quarterly, contemporary art critic Mariana Griswold van Rensselaer stated "only the American painters living abroad were well represented" at the 1889 Exposition and confirmed the impression that the expatriate paintings dominated the American section.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, van Rensselaer argued that American portraiture continued to improve while "genre painting only needs to be more national in subject-matter to show its strength and individuality better," demonstrating the potential elevation of American art and the significance of virile national identity.\textsuperscript{18}

Images of men by American artists had the potential to reinforce notions of manliness and nationalism despite wide criticism that American art imitated art by the French. The American section at the 1889 Paris Exposition included portraits of male artists among the paintings exhibited. By looking at male portraits produced by French-trained artists representing the United States, one can examine how American artists chose to portray fellow artists and whether American artists imposed assumed masculine qualities upon their male subjects. James Carroll Beckwith, Kenyon Cox, Robert Bolling
Brandegee, Robert William Vonnob, and Thomas Eakins, all of whom had studied in France, exhibited portraits of white male artists in 1889.

The first artist under consideration is James Carroll Beckwith who trained in Chicago and New York, then studied in Paris at the atelier of Carolus-Duran in 1873, and the École des Beaux-Arts at the atelier of Bonnat from 1875 until he returned to New York in 1878. In 1889 he exhibited three paintings, including *A Lady of California* (unlocated), *Portrait of William Walton*, 1886, and *Portrait of a Child*, and received a bronze medal. Portrait of William Walton depicted a painter, translator, and art critic. Sarah Burns, professor of fine arts, has described the emergent corporate look of maturing postbellum artists that emphasized their being practical career people with businesslike attitudes necessary for success in modern America. The corporate appearance of well-groomed artists often emphasized respectability and civility through business attire, including suit jackets, starched white shirts, ties, and pocket watches, all of which confirmed the male artists' superior and financially secure status. In his portrait, William Walton wears a starched white shirt and suit, with watch chain visible. According to Burns, the cigarette in Walton's hand functions as a bohemian accessory that does not negate his respectability but is an appropriate prop in the artist's portrait.

Also a French-trained artist, Kenyon Cox studied art in Cincinnati, Pennsylvania, and Paris. He trained with Carolus-Duran, under Cabanel at the École des Beaux-Arts, with Gérôme, as well as under Bouguereau, Lefebvre, and Boulanger at the Académie Julian before returning to the United States. Cox won a bronze medal for painting and another for drawing at the 1889 Exposition. Portrait of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, 1887,
destroyed 1904, replica by Cox 1908, was among the works he exhibited, which also included *Painting and Poetry*, 1887, *Jacob Wrestling the Angel*, c.1888, and a landscape titled *Flying Shadows*, 1883. Saint-Gaudens, a sculptor, is depicted at work on a relief of the American artist William Merritt Chase.²⁶ Though working without a suit jacket, Saint-Gaudens wears a white shirt with a high collar, his tie is visible from the back; he holds a piece of clay as an accessory rather than a cigarette.

Robert Bolling Brandegee had also studied in Paris and was enrolled in the École des Beaux-Arts. He received a bronze medal for his only entry in 1889, *Portrait of Montague Flagg*, 1887, which pictured an American artist with whom Brandegee worked.²⁷ The artist’s white collar is barely visible and he lacks the artistic props included in Beckwith’s *Portrait of William Walton* and Cox’s *Portrait of Augustus Saint-Gaudens*. However, he still has the same overall well-groomed appearance of the men in Beckwith’s and Cox’s portraits.

Robert William Vonnoh graduated from the Massachusetts Normal Art School in 1879 and trained under Boulanger and Lefebvre at the Académie Julian from 1881 to 1883 before returning to Boston.²⁸ *Studio Comrade*, 1888, an academic portrait of an art student by Vonnoh, received a bronze medal at the 1889 Exposition, his other entry, *Reverie*, is unlocated.²⁹ He wears a white dress shirt with a flimsy collar and floppy tie, and lacks the facial hair of the men in Beckwith, Cox, and Brandegee’s portraits shown at the same exposition. His loosely tucked, almost blousy shirt coupled with his clean-shaven face give him a more effete appearance than the male artists in the previously
mentioned portraits. A similar portrait by Vonnoh had already met success on American soil with a gold medal at the Massachusetts Mechanics Association Exhibition in 1884.30

Vonnoh's *Studio Comrade* may have suggested a neurasthenic to American viewers. Physically, neurasthenics were described as having delicate skin, nicely chiseled features and other effete traits; neurasthenia was quite common by the 1880s in the United States.31 George Beard, who wrote *American Nervousness* in 1881, asserted that "overcivilization" caused neurasthenia, an illness that primarily affected white, upper and middle class Americans. Neurasthenia is racial coding—a term that appears non-racial yet still describes a racial issue—for a white disease.32 It was understood to affect a particular population and was caused by increased demands upon civilized people that could deplete one's limited supply of nerve force.33 Those who developed neurasthenia, both men and women, did so because of the demands of modern civilization. Professional artists, like those described by Burns, could be at risk. Mentally overworked professional and business men could not build masculine bodies because of a lack of nerve energy and over-educated and intellectually stimulated women could not devote enough energy to motherhood.34 The cure for neurasthenia was highly gendered; men were to take part in outdoor exercise and activities while women were prescribed bed rest and pampering.35 Images that depicted effete types may have resonated with American viewers and current assumptions about the physical appearance of neurasthenics.

Thomas Eakins, who had studied under Gérôme before Cox did and under Bonnat before Beckwith did, also submitted a portrait of an artist to the 1889 Paris Exposition. He exhibited two paintings, *Portrait, Professor George H. Barber*, 1886, and *The
Veteran (Portrait of George Reynolds), 1885, and one watercolor, The Dancing Lesson, 1878, at the Exposition of 1889. The Veteran is a portrait of Eakins’s student and colleague. For the 1889 Exposition, Eakins changed the name of the formerly titled Portrait to The Veteran (Portrait of George Reynolds) so that the audience would identify it as a portrait of a veteran, regardless of their awareness of Reynolds’ veteran status. As art historian Martin A. Berger has asserted, viewers in Philadelphia, where the painting was first exhibited in 1885, would have recognized the portrait as that of Reynolds, a veteran. Hoganson stressed that manly character was vital in late nineteenth-century America for both political leadership and full citizenship, which included military service. Veterans used their manhood for the good of the nation; Eakins emphasized the importance of Reynolds the veteran, rather than Reynolds the artist, in his choice of title and manner of representation. Reynolds lacks the white dress shirt common to the portraits by Beckwith, Cox, Brandegee, and Vonnoh. The male artists in the aforementioned portraits engage either their work or the viewer, while Reynolds looks off to the side in The Veteran.

Though Eakins was also French-trained, the man depicted in The Veteran is quite different from the men in the portraits by Beckwith, Cox, Brandegee, and Vonnoh, all of whom received award recognition of varying degrees at the 1889 Exposition. This suggests that the French judges more favorably received traditional or academic depictions of white male artists than Eakins’s scruffy male artist depicted as a veteran. These portraits recall the more corporate appearance of the financially secure, self-sufficient male artist in America, while still resonating with European influences, but do
not necessarily project American national ideas of manly ruggedness as presented in the portrait by Eakins.

The similarities between artwork by American painters and works by the French were strikingly evident at the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition. Critics acknowledged "[t]he trademark of the Paris studio" left upon paintings by American artists.  

Contemporary critic W. C. Brownell wrote about French criticism at the Exposition in a popular journal in 1890. He explained that the French reproached American artists for lacking originality due to the emulation of techniques acquired through French instruction. Brownell also explained that critics neglected to acknowledge that the cosmopolitan status of French art invited such imitation, the successful execution of which demonstrated "that Americans have learned how to paint." American painters assimilated Beaux-Arts standards from French academies and private ateliers to compete among French artists in international venues, such as the 1889 Universal Exposition, and increase the likelihood of acquiring patronage should their work receive awards. At the 1889 Exposition, French-influenced and French-trained American artists received many medals for their work, second only to France, and the French government purchased some of the works as well. These American artists were caught in a double bind: both rewarded and criticized for their knowledge of French technical standards and assimilation of French styles at the 1889 Paris Exposition. Contemporary critic Theodore Child asserted that works by American residents of the United States received little recognition and were regarded as works of minor importance. According to Child, there was no impression of a national American art at this time; American art too closely
resembled French art and academic standards. The French largely diminished the importance of the Americans as a national group by emphasizing American painting's indebtedness to and imitativeness of French painting. In response to this criticism, American artists attempted to create art with a more national character for the 1900 Exposition.

At the 1900 Exposition, there were again two national juries situated in New York and Paris. In an attempt to ensure the domination of works with national character, at least seventy percent of the American paintings were to be created by resident artists; expatriate artists were largely limited to two submissions, though some exhibited three. Furthermore, paintings by resident and expatriate artists were exhibited together in 1900 to create the appearance of a unified American section.

The increased move away from French influence by the 1900 Paris Exposition indicates the desire to create an American national identity in painting. American landscape painting that recalled the Barbizon School was recognized for its tonalism, as well as a lack of high finish or obliteration of form, both of which had characterized French painting. Nationalism manifested itself in paintings of the American landscape that were described in masculine terms that also resonated with changes in American paintings of men. American landscape painting and the masculine vocabulary used to describe it show the significance of manliness in America's national identity. For example, contemporary critic Charles H. Caffin argued that foreign critics recognized the straightforward treatment and "note of unmistakable force and independence" of Winslow Homer's virile paintings that may be representative of American art. The only
American artist who exhibited four paintings at the 1900 Exposition, Homer received a gold medal for his work. His accepted entries included *Maine Coast*, 1895, an example of a virile seascape with its pointed rocks and crashing waves, and *The Lookout—"All's Well"*, 1896. Curator Gail Stavitsky asserted that critics interested in promoting an "American School" used terms such as "'big,' 'virile,' and 'real' in their possession of manly vigor, strength, austerity, sobriety, rawness, and uncompromising integrity" when describing Homer's seascapes. This highly gendered manner of describing American paintings emphasizes the importance of masculine terms to define American national identity at this time. Masculine terms can be further applied to descriptions of images of men in which manliness is equated with nationalism.

At the 1900 Exposition, the emergence of more manly images of strong, virile, healthy, vigorous men accompanied the emphasis on fitness and movement to counteract the effects of neurasthenia. The changing idea of American masculinity fits with America's attempt to project a national identity at the 1900 Exposition that did not duplicate French influence as it had in 1889. Art historian Diane P. Fischer has noted that until around 1900, images of women outnumbered masculine themes. However, images of men that celebrated vitality and virility, rather than effete European portraits more typical of expatriates, conveyed the notion of American supremacy. The increase in images of men corresponds with the rise in importance of American nationalism at the 1900 Exposition and the potential to imbue images of men with American national identity.
American expatriate artists continued to receive medals in 1900. Still, resident American painters captured most of the silver and bronze medals as well as two-thirds of the prizes awarded to Americans.\textsuperscript{54} James McNeill Whistler, an American expatriate, won a grand prize at the 1900 Paris Exposition for his self-portrait, \textit{Brown and Gold}, c.1895-1900. Though Whistler had exhibited with the British at the 1889 Exposition, in 1900 the United States claimed both Whistler and his grand prize.\textsuperscript{55} Rather than depicting an American ideal of manly character, Whistler had created a flamboyant public persona that was immediately recognizable and reinforced by his self-portrait.

Eakins won an honorable mention at the 1900 Paris Exposition, where he exhibited two paintings, \textit{Salutat}, 1898, a boxing image first exhibited in 1899 at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts in Philadelphia, and \textit{The Cello Player}, 1896, which features a man with a full beard concentrating on his instrument, his white cuffs visible as they peek out of his suit jacket. The boxing subject matter of \textit{Salutat} links it to notions of masculinity that reinforce American national identity. Emphasis on physical fitness and sports grew in the 1880s and 1890s and continued to be important in the United States.\textsuperscript{56} As historian Gail Bederman observed, the ideal male body in popular imagery shifted from one that was lean and wiry in the 1860s to one that was more substantial and muscular by the 1890s.\textsuperscript{57} In the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century United States, boxing was a popular, and often illegal, sport. The boxing venue in Eakins's \textit{Salutat} is a white male American arena where the victor necessarily established his masculine superiority over his (unpictured) opponent. Art historian Michael Hatt stresses that boxing became more important as a ritual of manliness than
one of class;\textsuperscript{58} here, power lies primarily in the victor’s physical strength, prowess, and stamina. His defined musculature and toned body reinforce the boxer’s strength and virility as well as his power over his body and that of his opponent.\textsuperscript{59} The physical ideal itself creates a masculine American identity that can be imbued with different meanings dependent upon class, but still lies within the male body.\textsuperscript{60} Whereas the American subject matter of a contemporary American congressional act referred to by Eastman Johnson’s 1889 bronze medal winner, exhibited as \textit{Two Men}, 1881, was evident only in its original title, \textit{The Funding Bill}, the subject matter of Eakins’s \textit{Salutat} is identifiable as a boxing image and resonates with a masculine American national identity.\textsuperscript{61}

America’s westward advancement of the frontier away from the Atlantic coast can be viewed as a movement away from the influence of Europe, despite the declaration that the U.S. Census closed the frontier in 1890.\textsuperscript{62} Yet, at the same time, westward expansion was a form of colonialism, pushing indigenous peoples off their land as the United States expanded its borders. George Lipsitz has asserted that “possessive investment in whiteness” is demonstrated by “the colonial and early-national legal systems [that] authorized attacks on Native Americans and encouraged appropriation of their lands” as settlers established themselves in North America.\textsuperscript{63} According to cultural critic Amy Kaplan, one problem with postcolonial studies is that “United States continental expansion is often treated as an entirely separate phenomenon from European colonialism of the nineteenth century, rather than as an interrelated form of imperial expansion.”\textsuperscript{64} Despite the interconnection between French and American colonialism, in \textit{My Bunkie}, 1899, by Charles Schreyvogel, the frontier is manifested in the visual
language of a painting that is therefore distinctly “American.” *My Bunkie* was awarded a bronze medal at the 1900 Paris Exposition, one suspects, for its American subject matter. This is a painting of masculine camaraderie in the implied attack by Native Americans. Three armed men on horseback bolt across an empty frontier while the man at the center of the canvas pulls a fourth man onto the back of his horse. To the right, one man points his rifle at the viewer as the frontiersman to the far right points his rifle upward and his horse squarely faces the viewer. In contrast to Schreyvogel’s painting, an 1889 Paris Exposition bronze medal winner and western-themed painting, *Danger*, 1888, by Henry F. Farny, featured a Native American on horseback with a rifle in his lap. He is a still, solitary figure in a landscape from which frontiersmen have been excluded. Interestingly, at the 1900 Exposition, living Native Americans were not displayed as they had been in 1889 when included in Buffalo Bill’s Wild West. The absence of Native Americans in *My Bunkie* reinforces the success of virile white frontiersmen whose masculine strength enabled them to overcome their powerful Native American opponents. A popular quarterly noted that American genre painting in 1889 lacked national subject matter; perhaps *My Bunkie*, shown in 1900, fulfilled this lack and equated manliness with national identity.

The portraits of male artists by Beckwith, Cox, Brandegee, and Vonnah at the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition, confirmed the American image of the male artist more than American ideals of manliness. The 1900 Paris Exposition marked a shift toward masculine themes and terms that described American painting, especially genre scenes, and shored up its national character. Both French and American critics had disparaged
American art as imitative in 1889; American artists responded to this criticism and created a national identity in landscape painting and produced American subject matter for the 1900 Exposition. Through images of virile men in paintings such as Eakins's *Salutat* and Schreyvogel's *My Bunkie*, the United States projected a national image of manly strength and vigor within the international sphere of the Paris Universal Exposition.
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CONCLUSION

The institution of the universal exposition provides an environment in which different countries vie for national superiority through exhibits that demonstrate strength and virility on an international platform. The host country maintains an advantageous position, ideologically mapping the exposition grounds in a manner that reinforces a superior national identity. Nationhood, like manhood, is a social construction that changes depending upon the social and historical context in which it is situated. Universal exposition displays that emphasize manliness strengthen the argument that nationalism is gendered and that manhood is strongly tied to national identity. Nationalism seems to construct masculinist stories; precisely because of this, displays at universal expositions have the potential to resonate with both nationalism and manhood.

This thesis has addressed nationalism and masculinity in a historical context, which elicits questions regarding the presence of similar themes after 1900, and whether manhood and national identity have contemporary relevance in current institutions of power. Present-day Olympic Games parallel universal expositions as a context in which the significance of masculinity may be further explored in a blatantly nationalistic competition. Nations compete for the privilege of hosting the Games. Poorer, non-industrial countries have little chance of hosting the Olympics, which demand a technologically competent site. The location under consideration must provide sufficient modern transportation and accommodations for large numbers of visitors, as well as the facilities necessary for the competitive events or, at a minimum, the economic resources to construct such facilities. The Olympic Games provide an opportunity for the host
country to project an image of national strength to visitors. The physical strength and ability of national athletic representatives, the wherewithal to participate in numerous diverse athletic events, and the successful accumulation of gold medals measure national superiority. This raises questions concerning the role of female athletes in the Olympic Games and whether these women refute the supposition that strength and virility are distinctly masculine qualities or if, instead, they are effectively gendered male in order to equate masculine strength with nationalism. The 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City, Utah, have the potential to shore up the national image of the United States as one of strength and resilience despite the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon on the eleventh of September 2001, which threatened national security and tarnished assumptions of American supremacy and immunity from attacks within its borders. Further research in the context of the Olympic Games may prove fruitful in the examination of changes within institutions and the relationship between nationalism and masculinity.

Universal expositions provide an effective framework in which to consider the role masculinity has played in shaping national identity. The themes of nationalism and masculinity also surface in institutions outside of the universal exposition. However, by examining the link between nationalism in the context of universal expositions, one may recognize how manliness has been implemented in the past to project an image of superior national character and the relevance of these themes at the present.
### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONUMENT</th>
<th>HEIGHT (in meters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notre-Dame de Paris</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantheon</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Invalids</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's, Rome</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral of Vienna</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral of Strasburg</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Pyramid of Egypt</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral of Rouen</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral of Cologne</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Monument</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiffel Tower</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>HEIGHT (in meters)</th>
<th>LENGTH (in meters)</th>
<th>WIDTH (in meters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Palais des Machines</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crystal Palace</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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