



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/109168/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Noe, J (2016) "Everybody is Centennializing:" White Southerners and the 1876 Centennial. *American Nineteenth Century History*, 17 (3). pp. 325-343. ISSN: 1466-4658

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14664658.2016.1270025>

---

© 2016 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *American Nineteenth Century History* on 23rd December 2016, available online:  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/14664658.2016.1270025>

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# **“Everybody is Centennializing:” White Southerners and the 1876 Centennial**

**Jack Noe**

**The University of Leeds**

**10 Winker Green Lodge**

**Eyres Mill Side**

**Leeds LS12 3DH**

**[hisjn@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:hisjn@leeds.ac.uk)**

**telephone (44) 07816886860**

## ABSTRACT

The one hundredth anniversary of American independence was celebrated with a huge world's fair or 'International Exhibition' in Philadelphia, commonly referred to as 'The Centennial,' a central theme of which was post-bellum reconciliation.

This article argues that the Centennial served as a catalyst for reflection about sectional distinctiveness. It examines the highly politicized discourse around the commemoration, the ways in which white Southerners' self- definition was bound up in perceived differences from their Northern counterparts and the extent to which exaggerated or re-affirmed Southernness in reaction to the Centennial detracted from post-war affirmations of renewed American nationalism.

## KEYWORDS

Centennial

1876

The South

Identity

Nationalism

Sectionalism

## **“Everybody is Centennializing:” White Southerners and the 1876 Centennial**

“A Yankee never eats anything that he can sell, and a Southern man never sells anything that he can eat.”<sup>1</sup> This aphorism, appearing in a small town Mississippi newspaper, captured both the way white Southerners saw themselves in the Centennial year of 1876, and how their self-definition was bound up with perceived differences from their Northern counterparts. A useful lens for examining those differences is provided by the International Exhibition or as it was more commonly referred to “the Centennial,” a grand world’s fair held at Philadelphia’s Fairmount Park from May 10 to November 10, 1876. The fair attracted more than ten million visitors in the six months it was open, some one in five Americans. It introduced Americans to both popcorn (sold as “popcorn balls”) and the ice cream soda; and Alexander Graham Bell was on hand to provide curious crowds with demonstrations of his new invention, the telephone.<sup>2</sup> One contemporary chronicler noted that “No account, however close, however graphic, can give a just conception of the variety and interest of things to be seen. The whole season would not exhaust them...yet if you have but a single day to spend, it is well to go. You can never spend a day with richer return.”<sup>3</sup> And the *Chicago Tribune* urged readers, “Come at all events, if you have to live six months on bread and water to make up for the expense.”<sup>4</sup>

Historian John Hepp has recently contributed a useful article on the celebrations of 1876 in which he points out the “numerous opportunities” they hold out for scholarship.<sup>5</sup> This article engages one of those opportunities through an analysis of the ways in which the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia served as a catalyst for white Southern reflection about sectional distinctiveness, and how discussion of the commemoration was used to different ends in political and public discourse.

There has been valuable work in recent years on the post-Civil War South. Historians such as Anne Sarah Rubin and Richard Zuckzek have demonstrated that white guerrilla-style terrorism, a defiant and resistant white public mood and the fact of Federal military control of the South make it plausible to argue that a state of quasi-war, as well as a strong sense of Confederate identity, persisted throughout the period of Reconstruction.<sup>6</sup> David Blight has argued that sectional reunion was achieved at the expense of African Americans, with the war's emancipatory aspects largely overlooked while Caroline Janney has presented, arguably, a more nuanced case that stresses the gaps between political 'reunion' and genuine 'reconciliation.'<sup>7</sup> The little that has been written on the Centennial Exhibition, however, has been largely concerned with the fair itself and its design rather than with how Americans actually experienced the event and inscribed it with meaning. Mitch Kachun and Philip Foner have proven admirable exceptions to this in their explorations of African American engagement with the Exhibition. Kachun's work is centered around black attempts to create a usable past by utilizing the Centennial as a space in which to articulate an American identity, while Foner's contribution is essentially a dispiriting account of black exclusion and white (Northern) indifference and/or hostility.<sup>8</sup> Robert Rydell, in a general study of late nineteenth/early twentieth century world's fairs, stressed the Exhibition's use as a vehicle for equating progress with both white hegemony and the existing (Northern) social and economic order. Lyn Spilman's work, meanwhile, has framed the Centennial as a locus of national memory and shared identity. Spilman touches on the issue of Southern Centennial resistance, pointing out attempts by Centennial promoters to counter that by appealing to shared Revolutionary heritage.<sup>9</sup> And the late W. Burlie Brown, writing in the midst of 1970s Bicentennial hoopla, showcased some interesting and colorful source material in a localized study of white Louisiana's engagement with the Centennial, but seriously underestimated the reach and influence of the Exhibition when he characterized it as **'miniscule' in comparison**

with that of the Bicentennial.<sup>10</sup> This article will demonstrate the ubiquity of this national anniversary in mid-1870s white Southern culture, as well as the ways in which the commemoration amplified ideas of regional distinctiveness and served as a rhetorical proxy for the political and social divisions of the era.

National conversation around the Centennial commenced in earnest in the early 1870s, following the formation of a National Centennial Commission, comprised of two commissioners from each state, charged with raising money for and organizing the fair. Congress had authorised the committee to oversee “an exhibition of American and foreign arts, products and manufactures” but provided no capital for the endeavour. A central theme of the celebration, coming only a decade after Appomattox and in the midst of Reconstruction, was patriotism and reunion. The *United States Centennial Almanac* (1874) expressed the aim of making the Centennial “a work of pride, of patriotism, and reconciliation.”<sup>11</sup> And in the words of one of Wisconsin’s Centennial commissioners, “I am convinced that this Centennial Celebration will do more to reunite all the elements of this nation into one grand whole than any event which has occurred in this century.”<sup>12</sup>

It was envisioned that each state, as well as many foreign countries, would have dedicated exhibition space at Fairmount Park, but the years leading up to the Centennial saw fierce controversy within the not quite Reconstructed white South over the question of participation in the commemoration. For example, when the Alabama legislature debated appropriating funds to represent the state at Philadelphia, opponents fulminated against the thought of their state being represented at what was referred to as “this Yankee humbug.”<sup>13</sup> Alabama was not unique here; in the end, the strength of opposition to Centennial involvement meant that, of the former Confederate states, only Arkansas and Mississippi had an official, state-funded presence at the Exhibition.

A recurring theme in Southern anti-Centennial rhetoric was that the Exhibition was nothing more than a Northern money-making scam; one typical snipe complained that “the press of the South has not done its duty in exposing that huge fraud and Yankee Swindle...”<sup>14</sup> This served to highlight a second aim of the Centennial, albeit one less freely acknowledged by its organizers than that of commemoration and reunion: profit. The Gilded Age of unbridled capitalism was getting underway, and Philadelphia’s leaders anticipated a lucrative windfall from the millions of visitors to Fairmount Park. *Scribner’s Monthly* magazine summarized the extent to which the Centennial was seen as a catalyst for recovery after the economic downturn of 1873:

All good Americans are looking forward to the passage of the year 1876 with great interest...there is a belief we have seen the worst. Of a certain kind of business there will be more done than ever before. The passenger traffic on the railroads will be immense. All the West is coming East...the Southern states will be similarly moved...all lines of travel converging upon New York and Philadelphia will be crowded...There will be a tremendous shaking up of the people, a great going to and fro in the land a lively circulation of money and a stimulation of trade.<sup>15</sup>

The layering and interlocking of motivation behind the Centennial Exhibition was underscored in a letter from Connecticut Commissioner William Phipps Blake to Exhibition Director-General Alfred Goshorn. Blake advised cautioning investors in the Exhibition that they might not receive a full return on their stock and that: “We must fall back upon patriotism and other such incentives...”<sup>16</sup> Linda Gross and Theresa Snyder, in their 2005 photographic history of the Centennial described Centennial patriotism as a “mechanism” to convey American innovation and technology to the world.<sup>17</sup> Philadelphians certainly hoped to reap financial rewards from the Exhibition but there is no reason to believe that pecuniary and patriotic motivations were mutually exclusive. But although, as Lyn Spillman has pointed out, the “most enthusiastic organizers” of the Centennial were “Pennsylvania manufacturers and merchants,” it was much more than a commercial enterprise, or “Yankee swindle.”<sup>18</sup> The Exhibition was a celebration of American nationhood *and* progress. Its significance and its

power to confirm and/or challenge American identities are ratified by its sheer reach: the Centennial hosted a staggering 20% of the American population and virtually every literate person amongst the remaining 80% would have been exposed to discussion and descriptions of the fair.

The Centennial was inescapable in 1876. Newspapers across the South regularly listed the names of local citizens who had “Gone to the Centennial” and prominently displayed advertisements from railroad companies offering special excursion fares to and from Philadelphia. In Pulaski, Tennessee, the local newspaper published a letter signed by dozens of local citizens requesting that Captain C. P. Jones, recently returned from Philadelphia, deliver a lecture on “The World’s Great Show” for Pulaski residents unable to see it for themselves. Jones’ acceptance was also published, along with the caveat that he was incapable of “convey[ing] any adequate conception of the Great Show at Philadelphia.”<sup>19</sup>

In Columbia, Tennessee, the *Herald and Mail* reported that:

Reverend Stoddert, who...gives interest to every subject upon which he speaks, is expected to lecture...on the Centennial. Having devoted sometime (sic) to the examination of all subjects of interest at this grand Exposition of the world’s curiosities, he will be able with his great powers of delineation he will be able to present a panoramic view of the whole scene which will be more perfect and far better than nine tenths of the visitors will ever see amid the hurly-burly and wild rush of the excited crowds.<sup>20</sup>

So in the view of this Tennessee editor, there was no need for anyone to actually travel to Philadelphia when they could instead rely upon the delineative powers of a local minister to experience what was more an exhibition of curiosities than a commemoration. Elsewhere in the same edition, the paper noted that “several of our handsomest and most prominent young bachelors are making their arrangements to start to the Centennial. While we believe it is money badly laid out, yet it is theirs. They can very conveniently spare it and if they choose to use it in this way, no one has a right to object.”<sup>21</sup> The newspaper seemed more sympathetic to “Bob Frierson,” who, it observed, was going to “stay at home, smoke Centennial cigars, and wait for the next hundred years to roll around.”<sup>22</sup>

This was typical of the surfeit of often labored humor focused on the ubiquity of Centennial talk; a Georgia newspaper editor joked that “Mrs Cowart...only thirty years old and already the mother of thirteen children recently gave birth to triplets. That’s clever, name ‘em all ‘Centennial.’”<sup>23</sup> The *Richmond Enquirer* noted that “the advocates of phonetic spelling have neglected to avail themselves of every public writer’s weariness over the words ‘Centennial Exhibition’ as a plea with which to get their theories into favour. Every newspaper writer...would look with favour upon a proposition to write ‘Cen10yl’ or ‘10c.yl.’ or ANY other abbreviation of the word, which must be used so many times in every newspaper.”<sup>24</sup> The *Dallas Herald* defined a ‘Declaration of Independence’ as “refusing to take your mother-in-law to the Centennial Exhibition.”<sup>25</sup> And *The Hinds County Gazette*, in Mississippi, observed caustically that:

Many Southern people believe that they cannot be saved in the next world unless they look upon the wonders of the Great Centennial that it will be to them what the brazen serpent was to the Israelites, that they have only to look and believe to be saved.<sup>26</sup>

Such cynicism notwithstanding, many Southerners who visited the Centennial sent back breathless accounts of its wonders. A Virginia woman, writing to a relative, explained that “When I first got there I felt bewildered and my eyes hurt me from looking so much. I hardly know where to begin to tell you of what I saw.” She continued that she felt that those who avoided the Exhibition would feel ‘very blank’ in twenty years’ time.<sup>27</sup> The *Atlanta Constitution*, meanwhile, informed its readers that the Centennial was an opportunity that no man “who can command the necessary time and money should neglect. Two weeks are needed, although one busy week is better than none at all.” The *Richmond Enquirer*’s report was typical:

A more magnificent scheme was never gotten up in any city in these modern times...To describe all or even a part of what is to be seen there in even slight detail would take days, weeks, even months. There is such a variety of every conceivable product, from all parts of the world, that the mind becomes confused in attempting to attempt to enumerate them. It is almost futile to attempt even a formal description of what’s to be seen... All I have to say is come, see and be satisfied. If you’ve got the money, alright, come. If not, borrow it, it will pay you to go

into debt and pay fifty per cent interest, rather than not see the Arabian Nights of modern times. If worst comes to worst, buy a walking excursion ticket and start up the railroad track. At any rate, come, for you may live a hundred years and still never see anything like it.<sup>28</sup>

The Arabian Nights theme was reiterated by a young North Carolina lawyer, John Henderson, who wrote to his mother that, “In going through the different buildings one is utterly bewildered by the displays. It reminds me more of the Arabian Nights than anything else...People think of nothing else here except the Centennial. Nobody talks politics. You read about that in the papers.”<sup>29</sup>

Henderson’s claim that “nobody talks politics”, though, could not have been more misleading, for while the Centennial Exhibition itself bedazzled, and made some forget politics, the Centennial in abstract, the idea of the Exhibition and what it represented, was all politics. Indeed, people’s reactions to it seemed to exist independently of the actual Exhibition.

A contentious subject throughout the years of its planning, the Exhibition continued to serve as a lightning rod for partisan discourse after it opened its gates to the public on May 10, 1876. In contrast to the *Richmond Enquirer’s* awestruck descriptions of Centennial wonder, reporter Harry Moss, writing in the New Orleans *Daily Picayune* was eager to downplay the success of the exhibition: “Never since the world began has any city so overcropped herself as Philadelphia has in her Centennial expectations.” Moss painted a picture of empty hotel rooms and desperate vendors, describing “oceans and oceans of lager which has never been tapped, regiment after regiment of white-aproned waiters who have never served a customer, battalions upon battalions of snappish hotel clerks with scarcely anybody to snap at.”<sup>30</sup> Ten days after the fair opened, *The Mobile Register* gloated at “over-grasping” Philadelphia’s “disastrous financial failure.”<sup>31</sup> These descriptions are at odds with most other accounts, but taken with the jaundiced views expressed in Bourbon-leaning papers like the *Hinds County Gazette*, seem to illustrate the ways in which the Centennial served a purpose beyond amusement and beyond commemoration of an anniversary. The Exhibition sparked strong feelings and its relevance

and meaning were evident in the efforts of those inclined to tear it down and dismiss its importance. Discussing Mississippi's state-funded Centennial exhibition building, *the Hinds County Gazette* pointed up the state's economic dependence on Northern manufacturing when it sneered that the "close-fisted Yankees no doubt shake with laughter as they pass by the house erected at the expense of the exhausted Treasury of impoverished Mississippi out of 68 varieties of wood gathered from forests that did not supply the handles for the axes that provided the 68 varieties..."<sup>32</sup> In contrast, the *Clarion* of Jackson, relatively pro-Centennial, saw the matter differently: "Our rustic cottage at Fairmount Park, displaying the great variety of timber grown in Mississippi is attracting very general attention....several large contractors and builders have been around, looking at and admiring our fine specimens of yellow pine, etc. ...a great many ladies who have visited the building have carried off pieces of the bark as curiosities."<sup>33</sup>

Historian Lynn Spillman has addressed what she calls "center-periphery" relations in the context of the Centennial, and her identification of "Eastern manufacturing and commercial elites" as 1876 America's cultural center, would necessarily relegate the white South to the periphery.<sup>34</sup> This is borne out through a look at press coverage of the Exhibition, with a sense of apartness, of distinct sectional and political (the two were largely conflated) identity being evident in much white Southern discussion of and reaction to the Centennial.

The Republican *Knoxville Chronicle*, commenting on disappointing attendance during the Centennial's first few weeks, predicted that while the exhibition would end up losing money, the fair would succeed on an aesthetic and artistic level. The Democratic *News*, of Bristol, Virginia, seized on this assumption of 'failure' to proclaim that "The fact that it is being made a sectional parade for flaunting the bloody plumes of the late war and the laurel wreaths of northern heroes will cause it, not only to lose much patronage it would otherwise have had, but cease to be regarded as a national affair."<sup>35</sup> The *News* concluded with a sentiment that encapsulated the delicacy of white Southern sensibilities in any matter concerning the Civil

War: “There ought not to be anything there which revives the unpleasant memories of the late bloody struggle inside the nation.”<sup>36</sup> The difference in attitude between these Republican and Democratic Southern newspapers towards the Centennial is just one indicator of how deep the partisan and sectional split was in 1876, and of how discourse around the Centennial reflected these divisions. John Henderson had commented to his wife (before they knew they would be attending the Exhibition) about a relative who harboured ill feeling towards the commemoration:

Yr uncle Tom Ruffin has conceived a violent hatred of the Centennial and all connected with it or who patronize it or who speak of patronizing it. I told him you and I would fail to patronize (it) for no other reason than because we were too poor to do so and that I wished exceedingly that that obstacle could be removed. That statement however did not make him view the subject any more leniently. If anything, he now looks upon us with much less favour than ever, on account of our weakness for the Centennial.<sup>37</sup>

Tom Ruffin’s reaction is typical of the strong reactions the Centennial could elicit. While the precise source of Ruffin’s animus is unknown, it is likely safe to assume it was grounded in sectional resentment, like much of the anti-Centennial rhetoric that had echoed through Southern legislative halls and across editorial pages in the years and months of build-up to the Centennial.

For those white Southerners who did travel to Philadelphia, the Centennial Exhibition appears to have engendered not feelings of national unity, but profound regional difference and, it must be admitted, a good deal of self-conscious Southernism. One woman described how, as she and a companion travelled to Philadelphia for the Centennial:

An Irishman was in the seat behind us...[he] was a highly educated man, he got to talking to a gentleman next to him who was quite deaf, in the course of his remarks it came out that the Irishman was a Southern sympathizer and the deaf man was a Republican. He quite horrified the Rep[ublican] by saying if the thing was to be done over again he would come over and help the South, and paid the Southern people compliment-for which Bettie turned around and thanked him.<sup>38</sup>

“Bettie” was typical of the Southern visitor to Philadelphia, who seldom seemed to lose consciousness of their difference and their status as outsiders or “foreigners.” The same

correspondent, in describing some objects on display at the Exhibition that she “suppose(d)...came over on the May flower (sic),” declared herself unimpressed: “not that I admire it on that account, for I wish she had sunk in mid ocean.”<sup>39</sup> This violent reaction to the seventeenth century voyage that resulted in the settlement of New England serves to emphasise a Southern sense of apartness, harking back to the old belief that New Englanders descended from Puritan Roundheads and Southerners from the Cavaliers.

Puritan relics were not the only items on view at the Exhibition that aroused strong regional feelings. Particular sensitivity was also shown to any artistic representation of slavery or emancipation. The *Petersburg Post* of Virginia described one Southerner’s reaction to a painting on display entitled “Emancipation” which depicted Abraham Lincoln using a sledgehammer to break the chains on a “heavily shackled” black man while hovering angels smiled their approval: “The gentleman who saw this disgusting picture at once turned on his heels and left the Centennial grounds and a few hours after was on the train speeding homewards. He now advises every Southerner to keep away from the Centennial, or if they care to be insulted, to go by all means.” Another Virginia paper, in recounting this anecdote, dismissed the Centennial as a “bigoted sectarian show for the humiliation of the conquered South.”<sup>40</sup>

A reporter for the *Richmond Enquirer* took offense from another work: “One very objectionable thing I did see. It was a bronze in the United States department, wherein a negro is represented struggling with a mammoth bloodhound who has him by the throat. A brazen slander on the Southern people.”<sup>41</sup> Commenting on what was probably same bronze, a correspondent for The *New Orleans Times-Picayune* conveyed their disgust at “the malicious insolence of the idiots who are running the Centennial.”<sup>42</sup> Describing a piece of “abolitionist scarecrow,” ‘Cousin Nourma’ continued that, “Placed thus conspicuously by some malicious

and spiteful persons, with no other design but to flaunt an insult in the eyes of Southern visitors...the thing is a frightful caricature of the subject it represents.”<sup>43</sup>

Unwilling to either recognize any motive beyond a desire to insult Southerners, ‘Nourma’ concluded that the piece “frightens children, shocks ladies, alarms girls and is sneered on by men. So the artist has found his reward in failure.”<sup>44</sup> A correspondent for a Galveston paper concurred, describing for readers “a brassy looking bronze figure, representing the negro set free, which the Yankees think very fine but which looks like a dancing dervish to me.”<sup>45</sup>

Unsurprisingly, the Civil War itself was another sore spot for Southern visitors to the Exhibition. The largest of over 1300 paintings in the American Gallery at Fairmount Park was Philadelphia artist Peter Rothermel’s *Battle of Gettysburg*. At 16 by 32 feet, it was, according to the *New York Tribune*, the “central showpiece at the Centennial.”<sup>46</sup> Besides commemorating a decisive Confederate defeat, arguably the turning point of the war, the picture, according to historian Susanna Gold, “celebrates Northern efforts by depicting the beginnings of the Southern demise” and contrasts brave, triumphant Union forces with “fearful, helpless and ungainly Confederates.”<sup>47</sup> Rothermel’s piece was only the most notable of several works of art depicting the war that were on display, a fact that prompted one Texan to comment that “I do not much admire the American paintings(at the Centennial) and there is one- the largest in all the collections- that should never have been hung.”<sup>48</sup> This Texan remarked on the *Battle of Gettysburg*’s prominent position and, noting the large crowds that gathered around it discussing the war, quoted a fellow Southerner as predicting “that picture will make trouble yet, you had better take it down.” This observer was particularly galled because the painting’s presence seemed to fly in the face of the Centennial’s goal of selective commemoration: “I believe it was understood there was to be no reminders of the ‘late unpleasantness.’”<sup>49</sup> The *Mobile Register* used Rothermel’s work and the prominent position it was given to demonstrate the “glaring... (lack of) common decency and taste” in what it dismissively referred to as “this

love-feast of the centuries.”<sup>50</sup> In Bristol, Virginia, the local newspaper’s correspondent referred to the “thousands” of works of art on display at the Exhibition but only commented on Rothermel’s, pronouncing it a “daub” noteworthy only for its gargantuan size and the “bloody memories it revives.”<sup>51</sup> The *Richmond Enquirer’s* correspondent, adopting a milder tone, reassured his readers that:

There is little to be found that will offend Southern sentiment. I do not think the mammoth picture of the battle of Gettysburg is so very objectionable as it has been made out to be, except that it has a strong tendency to revive the memories which had better be left buried.<sup>52</sup>

Here we see touchiness on the part of the Southerner, a wary concern with how the South was represented on this national and international stage. In another example of Southern sensitivity, an Augusta cotton broker wrote to Georgia Centennial commissioner George Hillyer enclosing a newspaper clipping which purported that a portrait of Robert E. Lee had been refused a place in the American gallery by Centennial officials and was being kept “in a dark corner among the works of Norway.”<sup>53</sup> Hillyer relayed the report of this offense to Southern sensibilities to the national commission, testily requesting them to locate the reporter responsible, ascertain the facts, and allow him to publish the truth, as he was “heartily sick of these scurrilous squibs” and wished to reassure his constituents “how little cause there is for persons who sided with the Confederacy... to feel that anything has been done, or would be done...to wound their feelings.”<sup>54</sup> John Sartain, who was in charge of art exhibitions at the Centennial, responded to Hillyer’s query by explaining that the painting was indeed on display and “well-placed” in the American Gallery. Sartain admitted that it was not in the “centre” but went on to point out that it had been received after the deadline for inclusion and, in his words, had “only been accepted because it was from the South and was a portrait of Gen. Lee.” He conceded that “pictures from Norway and Sweden have overflowed into this gallery but it is an American room nonetheless and a sign in large gilt letters makes it known as such.”<sup>55</sup>

Interestingly, Susanna Gold has pointed out that Sartain took pains to ensure that Rothermel's *Battle of Gettysburg*, in contrast to the Lee painting, *was* center-stage in the gallery, quoting the curator as proposing that "Rothermel's great picture form the centre of the wall in the American portion of the great...hall."<sup>56</sup> Here, the American gallery serves as a microcosm of the sectional divides and tensions besetting 1876 America. White Southerners took offense at a work of art seen as representing *them* apparently being relegated to a less desirable, non-American position in the Gallery. John Sartain, in correcting that misapprehension, made the point that only special consideration of and sensitivity to Southern feeling allowed the tardily-received portrait to be on display at all. The same John Sartain had, however, ensured that a painting bound to provoke Southern ire and resentment was given pride of place in an exhibition explicitly designed to heal the wounds of Civil War.

Running in tandem with the Centennial theme of reunion was an attempt to accommodate Southern distinctiveness and identity within American nationalism. One attempt to woo the former Confederacy took the form of a guidebook especially for Southern visitors to the fair, apparently the only one of myriad Centennial guidebooks that was produced for a specific segment of the American population. This little book, which had been written by North Carolinian Democrat Theodore Bryant Kingsbury, exhorted its readers:

By all means, whether or not your state has contributed money and material, let all go who can afford to do so, for it is *our* Centennial as well as the Centennial of the Northern people. We are a part of the Union. This country is *our* country...it is now more than eleven years since the last Confederate gun was fired...Let the dead past bury the dead. Let all bitter memories be forgotten.<sup>57</sup>

(The book went on to offer some helpful advice to its Southern readers: "In travelling, keep off the platform of cars, and do not put your arms or head out of the window [of a moving train]...")<sup>58</sup> This promotional effort for the Centennial offered a microcosm of the paradigm that would define American/Southern relations for the next half-century, with Southern distinctiveness being affirmed rather than challenged. An example of this, touted in the guide

for Southern visitors, was the “Restaurant of the South” which illustrated “Southern plantation scenes” and featured entertainment by what was described as an “Old Plantation Ducky Band” who would “sing their quaint melodies and strum the banjo before visitors from every clime...” The *Guide* offered its view of how this would represent the South to the rest of the world: “... imagine the phlegmatic German...with his frau and kinder, gazing with astonishment at the... essence of ole Virginny...”<sup>59</sup> Meanwhile, writer James Dabney McCabe’s widely distributed guide to the Exhibition assured its readers that the Southern Restaurant’s proprietor hailed from Atlanta, Georgia and that “the waiters were all colored men.”<sup>60</sup> As historian Christopher Hayashida-Knight has observed, “At no point in these Centennial promotions are Southerners asked to “give up” their sectional prejudices for the sake of reunion; on the contrary, their political and cultural biases are stroked and celebrated.”<sup>61</sup> In describing “[American] nationalism’s deliberate acquiescence to Southern sectionalism,” Hayashida-Knight has ably demonstrated the lengths that Centennial organisers and backers went to in order to accommodate Southern sentiment at the Exhibition.<sup>62</sup>

There was though, some strong Northern and Republican reaction to Southern sensitivity. Furthermore, as will be demonstrated, much Northern press coverage of the Centennial was not conducive to inculcating reunion or unity. In an article headlined “Absurd Manifestations of Tenderness for the Feelings of Unconverted Rebels” the Republican *Chicago Inter-Ocean* recounted a *contretemps* over black employment at the Exhibition. The newspaper, noting the controversy over Rothermel’s *Gettysburg*, commented that “the commission has been assailed because they let the canvas have a space in the art gallery. It tended to revive the animosities of the war, they said, and therefore it ought to be kept out. So steadily has this prating of reconciliation been kept up, that one might have believed that the Southerners are really converted, that they had given up the doctrine of states’ rights...that they were only too willing to accord to the colored men all the rights and privileges to which they are entitled. But

it seems this is all a mistake...” The *Inter-Ocean* related that a Centennial Commissioner from Iowa proposed a resolution that the Commission authorise the employment of black men on the Centennial police and guard forces. As the newspaper put it, “nearly every one of the Southern members was on his feet, canes and umbrellas were flourished...these howlers for reconciliation demanded that the offensive resolution be withdrawn...” The motion passed, but barely. The Chicago paper published the vote tally- the majority of the Southern commissioners voted against the resolution, including, interestingly, John Lynch, Louisiana’s black commissioner. *The Inter-Ocean* summed up the Centennial management’s priorities in pandering to a sulking South at the expense of black Americans: “The fear of offending some over-scrupulous visitors from a section of the country that contributes almost nothing to the Exhibition is a sentiment that will meet no favour with the great multitude of the North... simply the resurrection of that morbid sentiment which has so long disgraced our civilization.”<sup>63</sup>

The *Inter-Ocean* reported that as of May 27 no African Americans had been hired and that Director General Alfred Goshorn would

probably decline to do so, on the ground that the positions are already filled...it is time to stop talking about reconciliation. The Southerners do not want it and will not have it if it involves any concessions. This is to be a great Centennial year of jubilee but according to the Confederate notion, white men only are allowed...the black men are to be left to peek through the knot-holes. That the colored people feel the slight...is apparent. Your correspondent, among the hundreds of thousands of visitors he has noticed...has not seen a dozen negroes of any age or sex.<sup>64</sup>

The (white) *Atlanta Constitution* also posed a question about black involvement with the Centennial:

The radical party in its malignity and insanity, has made the Negro an equal citizen and sharer in the blessings of this republic...if (the centennial) is to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of liberty in this country why should the beneficiaries of its most recent expansion be ignored? If the exposition is the memorial of human emancipation from...subjugation...why are (African Americans) put aside as unworthy of a place in the festival?<sup>65</sup>

The *Constitution’s* argument was not, on the surface, dissimilar to heated complaints about black exclusion in Philadelphia that appeared in the columns of African American papers like

the Alexandria, Virginia *People's Advocate* as well as the *Inter-Ocean* and other Republican journals. But the *Constitution* had a different, and particularly Southern, point to make: "The matter is of no particular concern to us. It is only a queer exhibition of the hypocrisy and duplicity of those who projected this grand farce."<sup>66</sup> The *Constitution* here conflated the Centennial organisers with the Radical Republicans and saw a double standard between the civil rights extended to African Americans during Reconstruction and the role allowed black people in the planning and running of the Centennial Exhibition. (Philip Foner has pointed out that there is no evidence of any black employment in the construction of the Centennial grounds at time when the black jobless rate in Philadelphia approached 70%.<sup>67</sup>)

One method of boosting attendance at the Centennial was to hold 'State Days,' encouraging residents from specific states to attend the Exhibition on a given date, designated to salute that state. 'Pennsylvania Day' set a daily attendance record of 275,000 while 'Ohio Day' drew 125,000 visitors.<sup>68</sup> The *Cincinnati Daily Times'* account described both the 'immense crowds' and, with the speech, introduced by Centennial Commission President Joseph Hawley, of that state's governor and Republican presidential nominee Rutherford Hayes, the utilisation of the Exhibition as a political space. At the speech's conclusion cheers were given for "the next President of the United States."<sup>69</sup>

There were no days set aside for specific Southern states, although several Southern governors made speeches in Philadelphia. On September 12, for example, Texas Governor Richard Hubbard delivered a platitude-laden speech that was ostensibly about sectional reunion, but which sounded more like an advertisement for the benefits of settling and or investing in the Lone Star State. The *Galveston Daily News* described it as "a description of the resources and capabilities of the state" and commented that the "eloquent orator was greeted by a large crowd...including more than a hundred Texans."<sup>70</sup>

There were plans for a day to celebrate Virginia, but the state's Democratic governor, James L. Kemper, issued a well-publicised explanation for his refusal to sanction or participate in "Virginia Day." Kemper, grounding his statement in Virginia's dire financial situation, stated that the commonwealth had already "declined to incur the cost of taking part in the Centennial because her poverty, not her will, forbade the diversion of any portion of her revenues to that object."<sup>71</sup> Exhorting ordinary Virginians to greater financial responsibility, the governor further explained that he "would not, if I could, attract to Philadelphia those who, in view of their necessities at home, ought not to go at all."<sup>72</sup> Kemper embedded within this homily on frugality an acknowledgement that while Virginia was of course only interested in reconciliation, others were using the Exhibition as a vehicle for expressing sectional and unreconciliatory sentiment: "With regretful composure, without abating her known spirit of conciliation, she beholds the untimely sectional animosities and reproaches which, provoked by no act of hers, tend to mar the noblest design of the Centennial celebration."<sup>73</sup> Kemper's refusal garnered some criticism in the Northern press. A New Hampshire newspaper, paying scant heed to the governor's claims of financial concern, zeroed in instead on Kemper's remarks on "sectional animosities," terming them "very unpatriotic." The newspaper then quoted, disapprovingly, *The Richmond Dispatch's* claim that the Centennial may have been "a fine exhibition of art and artifice, but as a celebration of things that live not in the American heart an abomination."<sup>74</sup>

In response, then, to what the *Cincinnati Daily Gazette* called "the refusal of Gov. Kemper to appoint a day for that state at the Centennial" the nineteenth of October was designated as 'Southern Day' in joint honour of Virginia, Delaware and Maryland.<sup>75</sup> With a turnout of 170,000, second only to Pennsylvania Day, the highlight of the day was a jousting tournament. It featured fifteen 'knights,' representing each of the original thirteen states plus two bonus gallants, one personifying "the Union" and the other "the Centennial." The knights

were garbed inconsistently- some in tinsel and velvet, others in sashes, plumed hats or sombreros and brightly hued scarves. The actual sport, “so popular in the South” according to one newspaper, involved attempting to collect two-inch rings (suspended from three 15 foot high arches) on a spear or lance while galloping at full tilt.<sup>76</sup> Most of the ‘knights’ were ‘gentlemen of the South, experienced in the art [of jousting]’ whose skills, according to the *New York Times*, caused the thousands of spectators to “gape in wonderment.”<sup>77</sup> Delaware’s ‘knight’ emerged victorious, and in post-tournament festivities that evening had the honour of crowning a “beautiful brunette from Rockingham County, Va” as “The Queen of Love and Beauty.”<sup>78</sup> Following this coronation, “a band of plantation darkies rendered a song in true Southern style in salutation to the Queen, after which the audience paid their respects to Her Majesty.”<sup>79</sup> While those in Southern newspapers tended to adopt a matter of fact tone, accounts of “Southern Day” at the Centennial in Northern journals seemed to emphasise the *distinctiveness* and the exoticness of the South, with its velvet-clad cavaliers and serenading “darkies.” A mocking tone further underscores the sense of regional alienation discernible in Southern accounts of the Exhibition. The *New York Herald* commented on the “different shades of peculiar Southern dialect” that could be heard at the Exhibition and, in a less than gracious dig at the almost desperate importance many Southerners attached to the concept of honour, remarked facetiously that “a brick thrown in the air would be sure to fall on the head of a ‘Kernel’ or a Major...who had lost “all but...honnah, in the late wah, sah!”<sup>80</sup> The *New York Graphic*, perhaps working on the assumption that Southern visitors would be gaunt, starving and incapable of appreciating the Yankee ingenuity on show, stated that “Reconstructed rebeldom was out in force. The contrast between the representative visitors of the two sections was plain enough, but the Southern visitors appeared well and were profoundly interested in what they saw.”<sup>81</sup> At this point the *Graphic*’s tone became even more patronizing: “The Exhibition probably made a deeper impression on them than on those of the North who are

familiar with mechanical inventions and products and works of art. It showed these Southern visitors what the real deficiencies of their section are and the lines on which their activities must move to win wealth and material success.”<sup>82</sup> The New York paper concluded with lines that simultaneously pointed up the reconciliatory and nation-building aims of the Exhibition and the wide chasm that still existed between the sections noting that the Exhibition:

must have taught them that the contentions of politics and the antagonisms of races are directly in the way of industrial prosperity and material power. Really, could all Southerners spend a week in the Exhibition it would do more to extinguish their old war passions, and give them a new conception of their true interests and duties and make them thoroughly loyal and united in their efforts to promote order and industry and education and art...<sup>83</sup>

This idea that the white South had something to learn from the Centennial and the North was acknowledged, with a strong sense of sectional alienation, by “Traveler,” a correspondent for a Macon, Georgia paper, who provided this impression of the Exhibition:

The most striking feature of this whole Centennial business is the...’get up and git’ you see about everything and everybody...There is no ‘Sleepy Hollow,’ ‘wait for the wagon’ or ‘hang ‘round the corner’ schedule run here...Move! Go! You catch it from the peanut and popcorn sellers on the sidewalk. You hear and see it and feel it in the jostling, wrestling crowd...you begin to shudder at your own insignificance and involuntarily feel a desire to ‘get up and git.’ And you do get, and everybody around you gets...the only question is, how much of it can you stand...? Everybody is centennializing....

This Southerner’s account of the hustle and bustle, the commerciality, the “get up and git” of the North highlights the lack of these attributes in the “sleepy-headed” South and gives us a sense of the kind of economically revitalized region proponents of the “New South” hoped to achieve through their programme of industrialization and boosterism. “Traveler”’s report shows the Centennial as a vehicle for confirming identity, through the sense of cultural alienation the reporter describes and the realization that, to paraphrase, “we are not like that.” “Traveler” concluded: What a pity it is that some of this energetic ‘matter’ can’t be taken from these live Doodles and punched into the arms and feet and legs of our sleepy-headed men and boys of the South...”<sup>84</sup>

The same article also ratifies the close connection between sectional and party loyalty. ‘Traveler’ described the headquarters of Philadelphia’s Union League (a Republican men’s club) as being festooned with gas jets forming the words virtue, liberty and independence. He also quoted a bystander who remarked, after the wind had blown out the first two words “How emblematic of the Republican Party! There’s ‘virtue’ gone, and ‘liberty’ gone, and but d----d little of ‘Independence’ left.”<sup>85</sup> The Fayetteville, Tennessee *Observer*’s report on the Centennial’s opening highlighted President Grant’s reference to his “countrymen” by placing it in inverted commas, seemingly indicating that they did not fall into that grouping.<sup>86</sup> Across the state in Cleveland, the *Weekly Herald* quoted another Tennessean as saying that he “couldn’t turn around” for the Radicals in Philadelphia, giving the impression that the city was an uncomfortably foreign place.<sup>87</sup> The Centennial correspondent of the same paper felt the need to describe in detail a Democratic Party rally he attended at Bristol, Virginia en route to Philadelphia. He struck up an acquaintance with a South Carolinian visiting the fair, and in the alien landscape of the North, they “swore by Old Father George [Washington] that we would stick to each other like brothers until separated by fate.”<sup>88</sup>

A Centennial correspondent for a small town Georgia newspaper included in his Centennial reportage an account of a Republican rally, or what he described as “an amusing entertainment” that he witnessed in that election year of 1876. The purpose of the meeting was to ratify and endorse the nomination of the Republican ticket of Hayes and Wheeler, but “not once was the name of R. B. Hayes...mentioned...poor Hayes was left out in the dark.”<sup>89</sup> The reporter listed a series of speakers who castigated the “Southern Rebs” to the approbation of the Philadelphia audience, quoting one who declared that “Southerners were the most ignorant set of people on the globe, that they had no schools or colleges and that there wasn’t a Southern man, who when the war broke out was six years old, who could now read and write.” Describing his reaction to this diatribe, the correspondent continued, “This struck me like a

thunderbolt. I scratched my head to feel if it was really on my body. I pulled out pencil and paper to try if I had forgotten how to write...I only restrained myself from openly calling [the speaker] a prevaricator by the thought that he was a Republican and therefore not to be blamed for falsehoods.”<sup>90</sup> And a reporter from Bristol, Virginia, drew a connection between the Gatling gun on display in Machinery Hall and the Federal forces at that time still in control of the state of Louisiana. In the midst of descriptions of “silk fibres” and “rustic Terra Cotta vases” he editorialized that the gun “brought up memories of the death of civil liberties in Louisiana at the hands of men trained to war and unwisely placed in charge of such unspeakable heritages as Magna Carta and Habeas Corpus.”<sup>91</sup> Analogous to wartime claims that the Confederacy was the true embodiment of the Founding Fathers’ ideals, a remark like this extended the sense of Southern proprietorship of liberty even further back as well as incorporating a dig at Federal suspension of *habeus corpus* during war and Reconstruction.

These digressions in generally positive accounts of the Centennial Exhibition serve to emphasize the overlapping sectional and political divisions in the Centennial year as well as the strength of these partisan sentiments. Feelings were running so high that one Southern visitor observed that “there is more excitement than there has been since 1861, and really it looks more like war than it did then.”<sup>92</sup> In fact, resumption of war was not an unheard of idea in a year that saw not only the Centennial Exhibition but also one of the most bitterly partisan, and ultimately fraudulent Presidential elections in US history. Ulysses Grant, his administration besmirched by scandal after scandal, was approaching the end of his second term in office. When Grant’s most likely successor for the Republican nomination, James Blaine, became embroiled in scandals of his own, the Republicans went for a compromise candidate, the personally honest but colourless Rutherford B. Hayes.<sup>93</sup> The Democrats nominated New York Governor Samuel Tilden. There was a dearth of real difference between the two parties’ platforms, with both agreed on the desirability of withdrawing federal troops

from the South and the need for civil service reform. Still, the campaign was rancorous, and in some ways seemed to embody a proxy continuation of the War. This was the same year in which the Centennial Exhibition was meant to provide a setting for “bind(ing) more closely together every part of our great Republic...”<sup>94</sup> Yet as one Republican, stumping for Hayes, declaimed:

Every man that endeavoured to tear the old flag from the heavens that it enriches was a Democrat. Every man that tried to destroy this nation was a Democrat...the man that assassinated Abraham Lincoln was a Democrat...Soldiers, every scar you have on your heroic bodies was given you by a Democrat!<sup>95</sup>

This type of rhetoric, known as “waving the bloody shirt” ensured that the war was never far removed from public discourse. In October 1876, just before the presidential election, *The Christian Recorder*, an African American paper based in Philadelphia, warned that:

We stand today face to face with a crisis involving the life of the nation. We confront in the contest an enemy bolder, a more adroit, and a far better matured than in 1860. Then, as now, there was a “solid South.” But now murder, violence, and fraud are more persistent and studied.<sup>96</sup>

Here the *Recorder* acknowledged a white South made more militant, more cohesive and more determined to define citizenship on its own terms by the events of war and Reconstruction. The piece conflated the two sides in the Civil War with the two main political parties and warned that if the choice between Republican Hayes and Democrat Tilden fell to the electoral votes of South Carolina or Mississippi, “scoured to the Democratic juggernaut by violence and fraud” that resumption of war could be necessary:

Only this, Americans: war or abject, cowardly craven submission to a more wicked and diabolical plot than that of 1860-61...the only patriotic...way out is to elect Hayes... by a majority so crushing that the embodiment of all the crimes in the Decalogue will not dare question the result. “Up guards, and at them!”<sup>97</sup>

The *Daily Gazette*, of Cincinnati, described the Centennial Exhibition as a Northern venture and went on to link Southern attitudes to the Centennial to a possible recurrence of

civil war: “Several of the Southern states have always regarded the Centennial with disfavour...[they have never] concealed their dissatisfaction with an exhibition which has so signally demonstrated the superiority of the North in most of the essential elements of civilization.” The *Gazette* then castigated “untaught and unteachable Southern Bourbons” and in reference to the 1876 elections warned that “the evidence is indisputable that the same spirit of disorder and rebellion that brought on the Civil War now animates the Democrats’ rank and file and that they are better armed than ever.”<sup>98</sup>

The *Mobile Register* also used the Centennial to make political points. Musing upon the changes seen since 1776, the *Register* reflected that, “For, in precisely the same ratio as today is ahead of that day in steamboats and telegraphs and Gatling guns, it is also ahead in demagoguery, demoralization and Blaineism, and in this latter is the ugliest and worst of the progress we have made.” (Senator James Blaine had spoken in Congress against extending amnesty to Jefferson Davis, and was widely accused in the South of ‘waving the bloody shirt.’) The *Register* complained that Blaine had “stifled much of the fraternal gush, without which the Centennial Exposition is only a Mechanic’s Institute.” Striking a note of injured righteousness, the paper claimed that the South had been prepared to “gush as spontaneously as any Brotherly Lover” until Blaine’s words in Congress “fiendish(ly) rend(ed) open nearly healed scars.”<sup>99</sup> Months later, the *Register* counselled Alabamians to avoid “Centenniadelphia,” and played down both the appeal and the success of the Centennial, remarking that “the Centennial rush from the South has dwindled into almost nothingness...our people are too poor to go northward this year...especially when they reflect that it will be one of universal extortion and cheating, with the mighty Yankee Nation ‘on the make’ as one man.”<sup>100</sup> Here the *Register* employed the trope, often encountered in Centennial- related discourse, that the Exhibition was a money-making scam devised by a people more commercial, and more avaricious than were

Southerners. This consistent theme of those Southerners arguing against Centennial engagement during 1873-1875 remained popular after the fair had opened.

While many white Southerners did travel to “Centennialadelphia” (with almost every account enthusiastic) the overall proportion of Southern visitors, both as percentages of fair attendees and of the overall Southern population, must have been relatively low. (Mississippi’s state building on the Centennial grounds recorded 3,800 visitors from the Magnolia State over the course of the Exhibition, out of a total population of 830,000.)<sup>101</sup> The Centennial’s importance in a discussion of the 1870s white South lies less in the actuality of the Exhibition than in its power to serve almost any rhetorical purpose, and in the way it was simultaneously derided as a failure, a cynical Yankee ploy, held up as a missed opportunity for Southern and local advancement, or extolled as the most marvellous, breath-taking human endeavour of all time. It also served as a looking-glass in which Americans North and South saw reflected back a nation that was far from reunified.

---

<sup>1</sup> “The Differences” in *The Holly Springs South* (Holly Springs, Mississippi, March 30, 1876.)

<sup>2</sup> Linda P. Gross and Theresa R. Snyder, *Philadelphia’s 1876 Centennial Exhibition* (Charleston, South Carolina: Arcadia, 2005) 8.

<sup>3</sup> William Dean Howells, “A Sennight at the Centennial” in Lally Weymouth, *America in 1876* (New York: Random House, 1976) 43.

<sup>4</sup> Weymouth, 47.

<sup>5</sup> John Hepp, “Centennial Celebrations” in Edward O. Frantz, ed., *A Companion to the Reconstruction Presidents* (Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley and Sons, 2014.) 534.

---

<sup>6</sup> Anne Sarah Rubin, *Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy 1861-1868* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), Richard Zuczek, *State of Rebellion: Reconstruction in South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2009)

<sup>7</sup> David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), Caroline Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.)

<sup>8</sup> Mitch Kachun, "Before the Eyes Before the Eyes of All Nations: African-American Identity and Historical Memory at the Centennial Exposition of 1876," *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* Vol. 65, No. 3, (Summer 1998), 300-323, Philip S. Foner, "Black Participation in the Centennial of 1876," *Phylon*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (1978), 283-296.

<sup>9</sup> Lyn Spillman, *Nation and Commemoration: Creating National Identities in the United States and Australia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 71.

<sup>10</sup> W. Burlie Brown, "Louisiana and the Nation's One-Hundredth Birthday," *The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association*, 18, 3, p. 271.

<sup>11</sup> *United States Centennial Almanac* (Philadelphia: King and Baird, 1874), 31.

<sup>12</sup> *Journal of the Proceedings of the United States Centennial Commission at Philadelphia, 1872* (Philadelphia: Markley & Sons, 1872) 153.

<sup>13</sup> "Alabama Legislature, Centennial Exposition" in *The Montgomery Advertiser*, March 17, 1875.

<sup>14</sup> The 'Centennial' Humbug" in *Hinds County Gazette* (Raymond, Mississippi, 24 May 1876).

<sup>15</sup> "Topics of the Times" in *Scribner's Monthly* (January 1876) 432.

---

<sup>16</sup> Robert Rydell, *All the World's A Fair* Robert Rydell, *All the World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987) 18. The Exhibition was largely funded by the sale of shares; each state was assigned a quota in sold shares, based on population. By the end of 1875, Pennsylvanians had purchased nearly three times their quota, acquiring almost \$3 million in Centennial stock.

<sup>17</sup> Gross and Snyder, 7.

<sup>18</sup> Spillman, 80.

<sup>19</sup> "Lecture by Capt. Chas. P. Jones" in *The Pulaski Citizen*, November 9, 1876, p. 3.

<sup>20</sup> "Rev. Stoddert" in *The Herald and Mail* (Columbia, Tennessee) August 18, 1876, p. 3.

<sup>21</sup> "Ho! For the Centennial" in *The Herald and Mail* (Columbia, Tennessee) August 18, 1876, p. 3.

<sup>22</sup> "Around Town" in *The Herald and Mail* (Columbia, Tennessee) August 18, 1876, p. 3.

<sup>23</sup> Steve Gurr, "Americus and the Centennial Year in the Sumter Republican" in *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, 60, 3, (1976), 243.

<sup>24</sup> "Centennial Notes" in *The Richmond Enquirer*, May 13, 1876.

<sup>25</sup> "Local Brevities" in *The Dallas Daily Herald*, June 18, 1876, p. 4.

<sup>26</sup> "The 'Centennial' Humbug" in *Hinds County Gazette* (Raymond, Mississippi)N May 24, 1876, p. 1.

<sup>27</sup> Eliza Adams Robinson to Alice Marshall, September 17, 1876, Williams Family Papers, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.

---

<sup>28</sup> “Centennial Notes: A Richmond Man’s Observations at the Great Exhibition” in *The Richmond Enquirer* June 4, 1876, p. 1

<sup>29</sup> John S Henderson to ‘Mother’, September 15, 1876, John S Henderson Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.  
(Afterward SHC)

<sup>30</sup> Harry Moss, “Harry Moss at the Centennial” in *The Daily Picayune* (New Orleans), June 25, 1876, p. 11.

<sup>31</sup> “Centennial Failure” in *The Mobile Register*, May 21, 1876, p. 4.

<sup>32</sup> *Hinds County Gazette*, (Raymond, Mississippi) May 24, 1876, p.1.

<sup>33</sup> “Centennial Notes” in *The Weekly Clarion* (Jackson, Mississippi) May 3, 1876, p.1.

<sup>34</sup> Spillman, 138-140.

<sup>35</sup> “The Insult to the South” in *The Bristol News*, May 23, 1876, p. 1.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> John S. Henderson to Elizabeth Henderson, July 2, 1876, John S. Henderson Papers, SHC

<sup>38</sup> Unknown to “Dear Aunt,” December 2, 1876, Larkin Newby Papers, SHC.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> “The Insult to the South” in *The Bristol News*, May 23, 1876, p. 1.

<sup>41</sup> “Centennial Notes: A Richmond Man’s Observations at the Great Exhibition” in *The Richmond Enquirer*, June 4, 1876, p.1.

<sup>42</sup> ‘Cousin Nourma,’ “Jottings by the Way” in the *New Orleans Times-Picayune*, August 13, 1876, p.4.

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> “Centennial Chat” in *The Galveston News*, June 6, 1876, p. 4.

<sup>46</sup> Susanna Gold, “Fighting It Over Again: The Battle of Gettysburg at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in *Civil War History*, 54,3 (2008), 281.

<sup>47</sup> Gold, 282-284.

<sup>48</sup> “Centennial Chat: Observations on the Exhibition by a Galvestonian” in *The Galveston News*, June 6, 1876, p. 4.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> “Centennial Failure” in *The Mobile Register*, May 21, 1876, p. 4.

<sup>51</sup> “Centennial Correspondence Number 9” in *The Bristol (Virginia & Tennessee) News*, January 30, 1877 p. 1.

<sup>52</sup> “Centennial Notes: A Richmond Man’s Observations at the Great Exhibition” in *The Richmond Enquirer* June 4, 1876, p. 1.

<sup>53</sup> Daniel A. Rowland to George Hillyer, July 21, 1876. United States Centennial Commission Papers, Philadelphia City Archives. Afterward USCCP. Undated clipping enclosed with this letter.

<sup>54</sup> George Hillyer to Alfred Goshorn, August 4, 1876, USCCP.

<sup>55</sup> John Sartain to Alfred Goshorn, August 8, 1876, USCCP.

<sup>56</sup> Gold, “Fighting It Over Again,” 285.

<sup>57</sup> Theodore Bryant Kingsbury, *The International Exhibition Guide for the Southern States: The Only Guide-book Specially Suited to the Southern Visitor* (Raleigh, North Carolina, 1876), 5.

<sup>58</sup> Kingsbury, 5, 40.

---

<sup>59</sup> Robert Rydell, *All the World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987) 28.

<sup>60</sup> James McCabe, *The Illustrated History of the Centennial Exhibition* (Philadelphia: The National Publishing Company, 1876) 695.

<sup>61</sup> Christopher Hayashida-Knight, "Philadelphia Plays Dixie: Accommodating the South at the 1876 Centennial." unpublished ms.

<sup>62</sup> Hayashida-Knight p. 4.

<sup>63</sup> "Colored Men and the Centennial" in the *Chicago Inter-Ocean* May 25, 1876, p.4.

<sup>64</sup> "Absurd Manifestations of Tenderness for the Feelings of Unconverted Rebels" in *The Chicago Inter-Ocean*. May 27, 1876, p. 9.

<sup>65</sup> "No Nigger Need Apply" in *The Atlanta Weekly Constitution*, May 23, 1876.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid

<sup>67</sup> Foner, 288.

<sup>68</sup> McCabe, 800, 828

<sup>69</sup> "Ohio Day" in *The Cincinnati Daily Times*, 26 October 26, 1876, p.1.

<sup>70</sup> "Our Empire State" in *The Galveston Daily News*, September 12, 1876, p. 1.

<sup>71</sup> "Gov. Kemper's Letter on the Centennial" in *The Alexandria Gazette*, (Alexandria, Virginia) October 10, 1876, p. 2.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Untitled, in *The New Hampshire Sentinel*, (Keene, New Hampshire), October 19, 1876, p. 2.

<sup>75</sup> "Solid South: Shot-Gun Policy in South Carolina: Rabid Rebels on the Stump" in *The Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, October 14, 1876, p. 5.

---

<sup>76</sup> “Southern Day at the Centennial” in *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper* (New York)

November 4, 1876, p. 7.

<sup>77</sup> “The Centennial Southern Day: The Solid South at Philadelphia” in *The New York Times*,

October 20, 1876, p.1.

<sup>78</sup> “The Exhibition: Virginia, Maryland and Delaware at the Great Show” in *The New York*

*Herald*, October 20, 1876, p. 10.

<sup>79</sup> “The Centennial Southern Day: The Solid South at Philadelphia” in *The New York Times*,

October 20, 1876, p.1.

<sup>80</sup> “The Exhibition: Virginia, Maryland and Delaware at the Great Show” in *The New York*

*Herald*, October 20, 1876, p. 10.

<sup>81</sup> “Centennial Successes” in *The New York Graphic*, October 20, 1876, p. 2.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid

<sup>84</sup> “The Centennial: A Practical View by a Practical Man” in *The Georgia Weekly Telegraph and Georgia Journal and Messenger* (Macon, Georgia) November 7, 1876, p.1.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid

<sup>86</sup> *Fayetteville Observer*, May 18, 1876, p. 2.

<sup>87</sup> “Local” in *The Weekly Herald* (Cleveland, Tennessee) 6 October 1876, p. 3.

<sup>88</sup> “Our Centennial Letter” in *The Weekly Herald* (Cleveland, Tennessee) October 13, 1876, p. 1.

<sup>89</sup> “Letter From Philadelphia” in *The Sumter Weekly Republican* (Americus, Georgia)

October 6, 1876, p. 2.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>91</sup> “Centennial Correspondence Number 6” in *The Bristol News* (Bristol Virginia/Tennessee) December 5, 1876, p. 1.

<sup>92</sup> Unknown to “Dear Aunt,” December 2, 1876. Larkin Newby Papers, SHC.

<sup>93</sup> Paul F. Boller, Jr., *Presidential Campaigns* (New York, 1985) pp. 133-137. Tilden won the popular vote and was 1 electoral vote shy of victory. The electoral votes of South Carolina, Florida and Louisiana were in dispute and each state submitted multiple sets of returns. The outcome was decided by an Electoral Commission set up by Congress; Hayes was proclaimed the winner 2 days before Inauguration Day 1877. In the “Compromise of 1877,” Democrats had acquiesced in Hayes taking all the electoral votes of the disputed states, in return for the withdrawal of all Federal troops from the South. This was the end of Reconstruction.

<sup>94</sup> “Our Greatest Day” in *The National Republican* (Washington, D.C.) May 11, 1876, p.1.

<sup>95</sup> Keith Polakoff, *The Politics of Inertia: The Election of 1876 and the End of Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge, 1974) pp. 145-146.

<sup>96</sup> “The Country’s Danger” in *The Christian Recorder*, October 26, 1876.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> “Solid South: Shot-Gun Policy in South Carolina: Rabid Rebels on the Stump” in *The Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, October 14, 1876, p. 5.

<sup>99</sup> “Sow and Reap” in *The Mobile Register*, January 23, 1876, p.4.

<sup>100</sup> “Summering at Home” in *The Mobile Register*, May 14, 1876, p. 5.

<sup>97</sup> *Annual Reports of the Departments and Benevolent Institutions of the State of Mississippi for the Year Ending 1877* (Jackson: Power and Barksdale, 1878.) 12.

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boller, Paul F. Jr., *Presidential Campaigns* (New York, 1985)
- Gross, Linda P. and Theresa R. Snyder, *Philadelphia's 1876 Centennial Exhibition* (Charleston, South Carolina: Arcadia, 2005)
- Hepp, John, "Centennial Celebrations" in Edward O. Frantz, ed., *A Companion to the Reconstruction Presidents* (Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley and Sons, 2014.)
- Kingsbury, Theodore Bryant, *The International Exhibition Guide for the Southern States: The Only Guide-Book Specially Suited to the Southern Visitor* (Philadelphia, 1876)
- McCabe, James Dabney, *The Illustrated History of the Centennial Exhibition*" (Philadelphia: The National Publishing Company, 1876)
- Polakoff, Keith, *The Politics of Inertia: The Election of 1876 and the End of Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge, 1974)
- Rydell, Robert *All the World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987)
- Spillman, Lyn, *Nation and Commemoration: Creating National Identities in the United States and Australia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)