

The Great Exhibition and Historical Memory

Jeffrey Auerbach

John Calcott Horsley's *Portrait Group of Queen Victoria and Her Children* (c.1865) (fig. 1) shows Queen Victoria standing pensively, her hands resting on the shoulders of her eldest son, the future King Edward VII. Slightly removed from his siblings, and in the centre of the canvas, the Prince of Wales holds the architectural drawings of his father's *magnum opus*, the Crystal Palace, which appears in the background amidst the trees. It is ethereal, like the mythical Arabian Nights' fairy palace to which it was so often compared, a tangible yet unarticulated symbol of British nationhood. The empty chair at Queen Victoria's right is a pointed reminder of Albert's death just a few years earlier; she has become the grieving widow, responsible for a large brood of children. Just as in life when Victoria and Albert symbolized middle-class domesticity, now even without her Prince, Victoria still reigns over family and nation. Juxtaposing the Crystal Palace, the royal family, and basic middle-class values, Horsley's painting is a potent symbol of British national identity in the mid-nineteenth century.

But what exactly does Horsley's Crystal Palace signify? Memory, Pierre Nora has written, 'is life, borne by living societies founded in its name'. It is 'a perpetually actual phenomenon ... in permanent evolution.' History, by contrast, 'is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer'. It is 'a representation of the past', and as such 'calls for analysis and criticism'.¹ The gulf between memory and history, however, may not be as large as Nora claims. Memory, as a number of scholars have recently suggested, is continuously updated,² and the Great Exhibition is no exception. How people have remembered the exhibition has changed as Victorian values have gone in and out of fashion. Historians' interpretations of the meaning and significance of the Great Exhibition have similarly been refracted through a Victorian lens: whiggish historians seeing it as a shining example of mid-Victorian peace, progress, and prosperity; Marxists as



Fig. 1. John Calcott Horsley, A Portrait Group of Queen Victoria and Her Children (c.1861). Forbes Magazine Collection, New York. © All rights reserved.

The Great Exhibition and Historical Memory

an egregious symbol of industrialization and the formation of rigid social classes; postmodernists as an imperial and commodity spectacle. The argument offered here is that for more than a century the Great Exhibition has symbolized Victorianism, serving as a projection screen for attitudes towards the Victorians. Repeatedly the Great Exhibition has symbolized Victorianism. But what was the Victorianism it symbolized?

* * *

From the International Exhibition of 1862 through the end of the nineteenth century, the Great Exhibition of 1851 was viewed positively, as a success for Britain and a symbol of peace.³ Edmund Yates, art critic for *Temple Bar*, comparing the 'Brompton Boilers' (the large iron-domed brick building designed by Isambard Kingdom Brunel for the 1862 exhibition) with Paxton's iron-and-glass predecessor, wrote of the Crystal Palace that 'its place in the memory is like a fairy vision'.⁴ Not that this should be surprising, given Prince Albert's untimely death a year earlier, along with the uncanny resemblance of Brunel's building to the unpopular and aborted plan for the 1851 exhibition. Nevertheless, memories of the Great Exhibition remained nostalgic through the nineteenth century. Charles Knight, the author, editor, publisher, and educator, looked back on the exhibition in the mid-1860s 'with pleasurable feelings that never before or since have been called up, in an equal degree, by any public display of national power and wealth'. He described the Crystal Palace with affection as a tribute to free trade and fiscal reform, 'a palace of untaxed glass'. The exhibition as a whole was 'a true symbol of what *had been accomplished* and what *was to be accomplished* by wise legislation'.⁵ And in 1872 Jane Budge wrote that 1851 was 'the brightest year of all Victoria's reign, when ... [t]he world was at peace; and England, prosperous at home and honoured abroad, saw men of almost every nation gather in friendly rivalry to her shores'.⁶

The exhibition was also widely regarded as a success for Britain. Both Lord Granville, who had been Vice President of the Royal Commission for 1851, and Benjamin Disraeli, who was rumoured to have taken a bribe at a secret meeting at the crystal fountain, agreed that the exhibition had stimulated invention, refined taste, and produced positive results, although Disraeli tempered his enthusiasm by characterising the Great Exhibition as a 'great lesson,' in which 'England learned many things of which before she was ignorant, and unlearned some things which perhaps she had practised too long'.⁷ Some forty years later, George Douglas Campbell also remembered the exhibition as 'a splendid success',⁸ and in 1913, when the *Times* provided a brief history

of the Crystal Palace as part of a fund-raising appeal for its preservation, the paper suggested that 'an almost Elizabethan halo' surrounded the Great Exhibition and the mid-Victorian years. There was, in the *Times*' words, 'a spirit of passionate devotion to the young Queen and her Prince Consort, which touched the whole enterprise of the Fair of the Nations with a colour of romance'. The exhibition was an 'enormous success'.⁹

Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, the Great Exhibition was also almost uniformly associated with peace. Looking back, Edmund Yates wrote that in 1851 he had believed that 'in commerce was at last found the true link to bind together all the races of man in common brotherhood'. Now, following the Crimean War, the Indian Mutiny, the American Civil War, and the Wars of Italian Unification, that seemed to be 'a former age'.¹⁰ In the 1870s, what journalist and poet Charles Mackay remembered about the exhibition was that the year 1851 had been 'memorable in the peaceful history of the world'.¹¹ And as late as 1906, George Douglas Campbell recalled that the supporters of the exhibition 'seemed to think that it would inaugurate in the world an age of universal peace' and that 'Swords were to be beaten into plough-shares'.¹² During the nineteenth century, then, the Great Exhibition consistently stood for peace in people's memories, despite disillusionment that it had not brought it about.

But as the values that were associated with Victoria's name began to recede further into the past, attitudes towards the exhibition began to shift. Robert Edward Francillon, for example, wrote the following on the eve of the First World War about a holiday his family had taken when he was ten:

About that time occurred an experience that ought to be, but is not, among the principal of my memories – a visit to the Great Exhibition of 1851. I was by no means too young or too ignorant, certainly anything but too apathetic, to take an intelligent and enduring interest in what I saw, and [it] was the talk and wonder of the world in a way with which not even the most ambitious of its subsequent imitations can remotely compare. But it remains in my mind a mere formless blur of colour, heat, and crowd, with a delightful iced drink for its solitary detail. We took it on our way to Littlehampton for the summer holidays; and far more distinct than all the fondly supposed triumph of peace and industry (though in fact the harbinger of over sixty years of almost incessant war) remains the feudal keep of Arundel, with its guardian owls.¹³

What is so interesting about Francillon's recollection is his sense that he 'ought' to have remembered the exhibition more clearly and fondly than he did, which suggests not only its iconic status, but his sense that

there was a collective memory of the exhibition that he did not share. Like many before him, he was sceptical of the internationalist rhetoric that had surrounded the exhibition, but unlike those discussed above, there was little that was special or even memorable about his exhibition experience.

Francillon's recollections, written when he was in his seventies looking back some sixty years, effectively constitute the last personal memory of the Great Exhibition. But as scholars have pointed out, the line between history and memory is a fine one, and memory – individual or collective – quickly faded into nostalgia, which would itself be superseded first by disgust, and then by irrelevance.¹⁴ When King George V opened the Wembley British Empire Exhibition of 1924, he reminded those present of the Great Exhibition of 1851, and 'the brilliant hopes of international peace and friendship with which it was inaugurated'. His language testifies to the enduring legacy of 1851: He spoke of the Wembley Exhibition as a 'picture', a means by which 'to take stock of the resources, actual and potential, of the Empire', just as Albert had spoken of the Great Exhibition as 'a true test and a living picture ...'.¹⁵ The King also asserted that the Wembley Exhibition represented to the world 'a graphic illustration of that spirit of free and tolerant cooperation which has inspired peoples of different races, creeds, institutions, and ways of thought, to unite in a single commonwealth and to contribute their varying national gifts to one great end.' Here too there are obvious references to 1851. But 1924 was not 1851, and the King knew this. Britain, he said somewhat wistfully, was no longer 'quite so ambitious' as it had been.¹⁶

The last nostalgic glance back at 1851 came with the fire that destroyed the Sydenham Crystal Palace, the enlarged version of the building that had stood in Hyde Park for the exhibition. Late in the evening of 30 November 1936 a fire broke out in one of the offices of the Crystal Palace. Within an hour the building had become an inferno, and by morning there was nothing left but molten glass, twisted iron, and a pile of ash and rubble. As the *London News Chronicle* put it, under a front page headline which read, 'Is it a Portent?':

The Crystal Palace was built in 1851 'for the promotion of universal happiness and brotherhood,' to summon all nations 'to the peaceful field of a noble competition' where all might strive who could do most to embellish, improve, and elevate their common humanity. Last night the Palace was in ruins.¹⁷

The paper reported that very same day that German troops had landed in Spain. Winston Churchill, never one to miss the momentousness of

an event, commented, upon surveying the ruins, 'This is the end of an age'.¹⁸ For many, the demise of the Crystal Palace was indeed the final break with the Victorians.

Already by the time the re-built Crystal Palace burned down, however, nostalgia was being replaced by disillusionment, and not just with 1851, but with the entire Victorian Age. Violet R. Markham, in a book about Paxton and the Duke of Devonshire, wrote in 1935, 'The Great Exhibition of 1851: I am very conscious that to write its name is to invite a yawn'. According to Markham, the exhibition conjured up in people's minds 'a confused impression of Albert the Good, a giant glass house, some antiquated machinery and a litter of Victorian furniture and works of art'.¹⁹ The culmination of reappraisals of the significance and majesty of the Great Exhibition came with Christopher Hobhouse's *1851 and the Crystal Palace*, published in 1937, in which he wrote:

As for the importance of the Great Exhibition, it had none. It did not bring international peace; it did not improve taste. Imperceptibly it may have promoted free trade: a few manufacturers may have learned a few lessons from their foreign rivals. The Russell Government and the Prince both gleaned a little popularity from it. But first and foremost it was just a glorious show ...²⁰

The date of Hobhouse's book is important, immediately following the destruction of the Crystal Palace, and barely a generation after the appearance of Lytton Strachey's witty and debunking *Eminent Victorians*. The Victorians were no longer in vogue, and the Great Exhibition, from beginning to end the epitome of the Victorian age, suffered along with its creators.

At no time was the legacy of the exhibition more ambiguous – or perhaps more forgotten – than at the Festival of Britain in 1951. When the government announced its plans for a Festival of Britain, its stated intention was 'to mark the centenary of the Great Exhibition of 1851 by a national display illustrating the British contribution to civilization in the arts, science and technology, and industrial design'.²¹ The links between the Festival of Britain and the Great Exhibition, however, were tenuous from the outset, and grew even more so as the festival plans progressed. It has even been suggested that for its organizers the Great Exhibition was 'a red herring' and little more than 'a pretext'. *The Times*' article announcing the proposed international exhibition for 1951 did not even mention its Hyde Park antecedent, and plans for the South Bank site were well advanced before anyone noticed that there were no references to 1851 or the Crystal Palace. Only at the last minute did the organizers commission a scale model of the Crystal Palace, the

only tangible reminder that the Festival of Britain actually marked the centennial of the Great Exhibition, so far from memory had the exhibition receded.²²

Rather than marking the centennial of the first world's fair, the festival ended up more as a celebration of the achievements of the Labour Government and a demonstration of Britain's recovery from the Second World War than as a commemoration of the Great Exhibition.²³ The Great Exhibition was irrelevant to the Labour Party because the values the exhibition had come to represent, especially free trade and a minimalist government, were anathema to Labour policies. The Labour organizers cannot have ignored the exhibition by accident; they ignored it because it did not serve their purposes. Just as the organizers of 1851 had used the Great Exhibition to promote liberal values, so did the organizers of 1951 use the Festival of Britain to foster Labour values.

Nonetheless, just as his father had at the Wembley Empire Exhibition, King George VI repeatedly invoked the Great Exhibition in his opening address. He called its creators 'far-sighted men who looked forward to a world in which the advances of art and science would uplift civilization in enduring peace and prosperity', and asserted that the Festival of Britain, as with its predecessor, had been planned 'as a visible sign of national achievement and confidence'. He did, however, note 'the contrast between the calm security of the Victorian age and the hard experience' of his own. The peace that the Great Exhibition had promised had not endured, and much of the wealth that was associated with it had 'dissipated in fire and slaughter', although the King remained optimistic that the festival would be 'a symbol of Britain's abiding courage and vitality'. *The Times* added in its leader that there was nothing wrong with the Victorian ideal, and that at least in one sense the prophets of 1851 had been vindicated: 'Man's power over his material surroundings has increased to even greater proportions than they foresaw'.²⁴ Although the Labour Government forgot the 1851 exhibition, the King, the *Times*, and many observers remembered.

Not until the Thatcherite eighties, when Victorian values came back into vogue, did the Great Exhibition again become an object of affection in the popular imagination.²⁵ In 1991, for example, the *Times* described the Crystal Palace as 'a showcase of all that was great about Britain at the height of the Industrial Revolution'.²⁶ And in the debates surrounding the construction of the Millennium Dome, the Great Exhibition was repeatedly heralded for having shown Britain to be 'the most ingenious and inventive of nations, a mighty engine of trade and prosperity, the hub of the greatest of empires, respected across the world'.²⁷ Nostalgia, however, is selective: Just as the *Guardian* was celebrating the

exhibition for having demonstrated 'the resolution, ingenuity and skill which had made us [sic] one of the world's great empires', it claimed that in 1851, as opposed to 1951 and 2001, 'the politicians kept out of things'.²⁸ Nothing, of course, could have been further from the truth.

For 150 years, therefore, the Great Exhibition has functioned as a litmus test for attitudes towards the Victorians. During the nineteenth century, memories were nostalgic, as those who noted the exhibition in their memoirs did so with fondness, seeing 1851 as a time when the possibilities for Britain, both at home and abroad, seemed limitless. By the First World War the glow of the Great Exhibition had begun to fade. It was still regarded as an important event, but there was an increasing sense that it was not as significant as its organizers, or those who attended, had claimed it was. In 1924, it continued to be a reference point for the King, who, while acknowledging that times had changed, nevertheless invoked the exhibition as a means of representing the ideals towards which Britain should continue to strive, especially the ideal of cooperation. Even as late as 1936, the Great Exhibition was still a significant marker, important enough for Christopher Hobhouse to proclaim its irrelevance. But once the Crystal Palace burned down, and with the massive assault on the Victorian belief in liberalism wrought by communism and fascism, the Great Exhibition lost its relevance. Only when Victorian values came back into fashion in the 1980s would the exhibition be rehabilitated.

* * *

Professional historians too, charged with 'reconstructing' as opposed to 'remembering' the past, have made the Great Exhibition the pre-eminent symbol of the Victorian Age, portraying it as a monumental and monolithic event with a set of self-evident meanings. According to traditional accounts, it symbolized, in G.M. Trevelyan's words, 'peace, progress, and prosperity'.²⁹ For Walter Arnstein it stood for mid-Victorian material progress, self-satisfaction, economic efficiency, the gospel of free trade, universal peace, 'and the glories of the British constitution'.³⁰ And for T.W. Heyck it represented 'the prosperity, the faith in progress, and the social reconciliation of mid-Victorian Britain'.³¹ It has also been, for many historians, the high point of what W.L. Burn called 'the age of equipoise,' a period of domestic accord when British society was in balance.³² G.M. Young proclaimed it a 'pageant of domestic peace'.³³

Scholars ranging widely across the political spectrum have also almost uniformly characterized the exhibition as the product of middle-class cultural ascendancy in mid-Victorian Britain. Thomas Richards

asserted unequivocally that 'The Great Exhibition advanced a particularly middle-class vision' of society, while Asa Briggs claimed that at the time of the exhibition, 'Middle-class ideals set the standard for the nation'.³⁴ Similarly, Gertrude Himmelfarb interpreted its motto – 'The workers, of all types, stand forth as the really great men' – as 'not the slogan of "two nations", but of a single nation sharing a single ethos and exulting in the monumental product of that ethos'.³⁵

As for the exhibition itself, historians have generally viewed its creation as inevitable and its lessons unambiguous. According to one historian, Prince Albert's proposal at the annual meeting of the Society of Arts in 1849 'rang like a trumpet blast through the land'; 'great' was 'the energy and enthusiasm of all concerned'; Joseph Paxton, the architect of the Crystal Palace, was the archetypal self-made man 'born of poor parents'; 'the exhibits were beyond calculation'; the weather for the opening was 'perfect'; and 'It was a triumph for England'.³⁶

In point of fact, none of these was true. Albert was reluctant to become involved in the planning process, and his announcement was not only tentative, but fell, if not on deaf ears, at least on only a few. Many Britons responded with apathy if not outright opposition, even after the exhibition opened. Paxton was not born of poor parents, nor was he without patronage and connections. The exhibits were a hodge-podge at best and severely criticized in many quarters. The morning of the opening was cloudy and raining, although the sun did appear just before the opening ceremony began. Finally, while Britain performed well at the exhibition, premonitions of its decline appeared almost as often as proclamations of victory.

The Great Exhibition of 1851 has become one of the most misinterpreted events in modern British history. This is due, first of all, to the event's protean nature. The exhibition was such a popular success because its organizers promoted it in multifarious ways, continually shifting the focus of their appeal to fit their audience, and because millions of Britons were able to see in it what they wanted. In Bradford the organizers publicised the exhibition as a means of demonstrating manufacturing greatness; in Leeds, as an opportunity to refute perceptions of backwardness. In Bath the exhibition was to boost tourism, in Liverpool commerce, and in Wales the sale of raw materials. In free trade areas, such as Kensington, a centre of retailing within the greater London metropolis, the organizers railed against 'excise regulations'. And yet in Marylebone, Richard Cobden reassured his audience that the exhibition was not, as the Peelite *Morning Chronicle* christened it, 'the inaugural festival of free trade'. He promised those in attendance that he would not be involved in any scheme which might bring into

London a vast influx of goods from around the world which would be sold at the expense of London shopkeepers.³⁷ The organizers' great achievement was turning what was at heart a liberal, Peelite, free-trade enterprise that was largely English into a non-partisan national event. Far from being a monolithic event with a set of self-evident meanings, the Great Exhibition was a protean event with numerous possible meanings, many of which have been lost and ignored.

Second, historians have consistently tried to fit the Great Exhibition into a governing paradigm, or analytic framework. The Whig interpretation of British history, with its emphasis on progress, the Marxist interpretation of history, with its focus on the role of industrialization in the creation of social classes, and the postcolonial/postmodernist interpretation of history, with its attention to modernity and reliance on Gramscian notions of hegemony, have all seen the exhibition as a critical cultural moment, simplifying its complexities and distorting its meaning in the process. In 1959 Asa Briggs wrote that the Great Exhibition had 'proclaimed ... the triumphant facts of industrial progress', and represented confidence based on economic strength and social balance.³⁸ Anthony Wood, a year later, held up the exhibition as a symbol of free trade, constitutional reform, international peace, a growing Empire, thrift, hard work, and 'high moral endeavour'.³⁹ Conversely, Eric Hobsbawm denigrated it as 'the moment when the middle class dripped with excess capital, to be wildly invested in railways and spent on the bulging, opulent household furnishings displayed at the Great Exhibition of 1851, and on the palatial municipal constructions which prepared to rise in the smoky northern cities'.⁴⁰ Likewise, Paul Greenhalgh's *Ephemeral Vistas* (1988) argued that the exhibition was not simply a cultural event aimed at educating and enlightening, but a purveyor of coded messages about the alleged racial superiority of European civilization. It was a legitimising structure, 'saturated with Liberal ideology,' that served the interests of the ascendant middle class, 'a giant counter-revolutionary measure', 'an immense show of strength designed to intimidate potential insurrectionists'.⁴¹ Two years later, in *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England*, Thomas Richards claimed that the exhibition was 'an extraordinary collective bluff', the genesis of advertising and a commodity culture.⁴²

What these historians share in their analyses of the exhibition is a reliance on official and published sources. The narrative that emerges from the *Reports* of the commissioners, the *Official Descriptive and Illustrated Catalogue* of the exhibition, the mainstream press such as the *Times* and the *Illustrated London News*, and highbrow periodicals such as *Blackwood's*, the *Edinburgh Review*, and the *Westminster Review*, is of the

exhibition as an inevitable event, sprung from the mind of Prince Albert, embraced by the broadest spectrum of the British public, and symbolic of the middle-class ideals of peace, progress, and prosperity. But there is another narrative of the Great Exhibition, which is based on the unpublished records of the 1851 commission, the exhibits themselves, the more peripheral but not necessarily less important newspapers such as *John Bull*, the *Britannia*, and the *Mechanics' Magazine*, the provincial press, and popular penny publications. This is the story of reluctant manufacturers, nationalistic and jingoistic rivalries, petty political disputes, and, in many areas of Britain, outright antipathy towards the exhibition. These sources show that rather than heralding Britain's industrial successes, the exhibition was organized to rectify broader economic deficiencies; that in the end the exhibits were as much a harbinger of Britain's failures as a celebration of its prowess; that underneath all the nostrums of social harmony there were deep social divisions; and that despite the rhetoric about pacifist internationalism the exhibition was dominated by strident nationalism and even racism.

* * *

While the Great Exhibition has come to symbolize Britain's supremacy in industrial production in the mid-nineteenth century, inside the Crystal Palace handicrafts stood side-by-side with mass-produced, machine-made goods. Mechanization, to paraphrase Siegfried Giedion, had not yet taken command.⁴³ Moreover, the event was organized not to demonstrate Britain's successes, but to locate and rectify deficiencies throughout the production process. Although Britain was clearly the world's leading economic and industrial power, the foundations of that strength were not uniformly strong, and this was especially so with respect to the technical education of workers and industrial design. In 1824, Henry Brougham wrote an influential article in the *Edinburgh Review* on scientific education in which he argued that British artisans were the least-trained, and middle-class manufacturers the worst-educated, in Europe.⁴⁴ The creation of mechanics' institutes and schools of design attempted to rectify these problems, but without success, and there is no question that Prince Albert, Henry Cole, and the other organizers saw the exhibition as a means of improving industrial design and artisanal skills.⁴⁵

British economic growth in the 1840s was also being hampered by a still-nascent consumer economy.⁴⁶ While commercialisation had increased markedly during the eighteenth century, there were still enormous problems of distribution. According to several British manu-

facturers at the time of the Royal Society of Arts' 1847 exhibition, one of the greatest hindrances facing them in their quest for profits was that their products were not reaching consumers, and consumers did not want the products that were available.⁴⁷ There were only 3,036 miles of railway track in 1846, less than half the amount that existed only five years later at the time of the exhibition.⁴⁸ An exhibition would provide manufacturers with a forum in which they could display their wares, and provided consumers with an opportunity to discover, examine, and compare a diversity of products.

More broadly, there was a marked if not a chasmic divide between the London world of commerce and finance and the northern provincial world of industry.⁴⁹ One of the areas in which the organizers were most successful was in bridging the gap between these two worlds. They did so by detailing how everyone could contribute to the exhibition, whether as producer, distributor, retailer, shipper, or financier. Meetings held throughout the British Isles drew on a diversity of local talent; symbolic actions such as publishing subscribers' lists in newspapers provided honour and prestige; and a sophisticated publicity campaign, in conjunction with a carefully cultivated relationship with the press, put forward the exhibition in the most positive light.⁵⁰

The Royal Commission itself represented an amalgamation of interests, including the peerage (Granville, Buccleuch, Ellesmere, Rosse), the political establishment (Lord John Russell, Lord Stanley, Robert Peel, and William Gladstone), manufacturers (Richard Cobden, Thomas Bazley, President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, and John Gott, a Leeds wool magnate), financiers (Samuel Jones Lloyd, a prominent and wealthy banker, and Thomas Baring, Chairman of Lloyd's and head of the merchant firm of Baring Brothers), commerce (Archibald Galloway, Chairman of the East India Company, and Henry Labouchere, President of the Board of Trade), agriculture (Philip Pusey), and science (William Cubitt, President of the Institute of Civil Engineers, and Charles Lyell, President of the Geological Society). The commission forged connections not only between these men and their diverse backgrounds, but, by extension, the worlds they represented.

Nor were fears for Britain's economic future unfounded. While part of the lore of the exhibition is that it was a smashing victory for Britain, prescient observers at the time were already discerning the beginnings of British economic decline. As Karl Marx wrote with unusual clarity in October 1851, 'The English admit that the Americans carried off the prize in everything'.⁵¹ Britain consistently ranked below its continental competitors in the design and ornamentation of manufactures, especially the French in silver and silks, and the Germans in wood-

carving.⁵² And, while Britain won sixteen of thirty-one council medals awarded for scientific instruments, with France, its nearest rival, taking home nine, there was little ground for complacency. Three of Britain's medals were for photography, and four for the electric telegraph. Of the nine other medals, three went to inventors unconnected with industry, and four went to one-of-a-kind oddities. The most successful of the British scientific instruments were the microscopes, which won two medals. In contrast, seven of the nine French medals were for instruments with clear commercial applications. In astronomy, navigation, chemistry, and meteorology the jury which awarded prizes was consistently underwhelmed by the British offerings. The results of the competition in this all-important class suggested that the lead in developing scientific instruments was slipping away from Britain.⁵³

Lyon Playfair recognized all of this, and issued a strong warning about Britain's competitiveness: 'Do not let us nourish our national vanity by fondly congratulating ourselves that, as we were successful, we had little to fear'. He admonished:

It is a grave matter of reflection, whether the exhibition did not show very clearly and distinctly that the rate of industrial advance of many European nations, even of those who were obviously in our rear, was greater than our own; and if it were so, as I believe it to have been, it does not require much acumen to perceive that in a long race the fastest-sailing ships will win, even though they are for a time behind ... The Roman empire fell rapidly, because, nourishing its national vanity, it refused the lessons of defeat and construed them into victory.⁵⁴

In machinery and manufacturing Britain was still clearly in the lead – although McCormick's reaper from America posed an enormous threat – but in those areas that have been characterized as belonging to 'the second industrial revolution' – particularly electrical and chemical science and the standardization of machine-making – the leading products were French or American.

As for the social significance of the exhibition, whereas the organizers and many observers portrayed the exhibition as a tribute to social order and class integration, a careful analysis of attendance patterns discloses deep, underlying divisions. John Tallis, author of one of the many popular guides to the Great Exhibition, described how industrialists and factory workers scrutinized the latest machinery, women examined the cloths and handicrafts, and fashionable society virtually ignored the exhibits altogether, preferring instead to remain in the transept of the Crystal Palace 'to see and be seen'.⁵⁵ His comments, which were echoed by many contemporaries, encapsulate the way in which the Great Exhibition and the Crystal Palace served both to integrate and to

segregate Victorian society along social, regional, occupational, and gender lines. The organizers of the Great Exhibition sought to bring together all sectors of British society under one roof. Yet, at the same time, the arrangement of exhibits, admission prices, patterns of attendance, and latent fears of the working classes reflected and reinforced hierarchies and divisions within Victorian society.

Historians have amply documented not only the fears among the middle and upper classes towards workers during the nineteenth century, but also the divided, class-based nature of British society.⁵⁶ And yet the Great Exhibition has always stood as an oasis of calm in the midst of what is generally described as stormy class conflict.⁵⁷ However, the class-based character of the exhibition itself should not be underestimated: the organizers tried to ban the public from the opening of the exhibition in order to protect the Queen (a decision that was later rescinded); admission prices were elaborately structured so as to segregate the classes, and Lord Palmerston was not alone in refusing to attend the exhibition on so-called shilling days; and, the organizers were deeply concerned about the conduct of workers in London during the exhibition, and whether there would be a repeat of the Chartist activities of 1848.⁵⁸ Alexander Redgrave, who was in charge of arranging accommodation for workers in London, wrote 'that such arrangements should in themselves conduce to the maintenance of good order and regularity *without the appearance of any ostensible precautions*', a comment which reveals the duplicitous, condescending manner in which the organizers dealt with the working classes.⁵⁹ It should be emphasized that this class-based discourse was not present solely in the middle and upper classes: the radical working-class press derided the exhibition as a 'monster bubble' and a 'gigantic humbug', and dismissed the exhibits as 'plunder, wrought from the people of all lands, by their conquerors, the men of blood, privilege, and capital'.⁶⁰

Even within the Crystal Palace, which to many symbolized the harmony of the classes and the masses, there were underlying tensions and antipathies. *Punch*, ever the astute social observer, captured the duality of integration and segregation in 'The Pound and the Shilling: "Whoever Thought of Meeting You Here?"' (fig. 2).⁶¹ It depicts the Duke of Wellington and some well-dressed ladies, face-to-face with a working man in a stocking cap and his children, whose clothes are tattered and patched, suggesting at the same time both the clarity of class and the integrative nature of the Crystal Palace. And yet, even as the *Times* exclaimed how 'well dressed, orderly, and sedate' the workers were, earnestly engaged in examining all that interested them, Gideon Mantell, a crotchety old surgeon and geologist, complained about



*Fig. 2. John Leech, *The Pound and the Shilling* (Punch, 14 June 1851).*

'Vulgar, ignorant, country people'.⁶² Most offensive for the upper classes was the sight of working-class women nursing their babies in the nave of the Crystal Palace and sitting on the edge of Osler's Crystal Fountain to eat their sack lunches, both affronts to middle-class notions of propriety and respectability.⁶³ The Great Exhibition demonstrated a high degree of social cohesiveness, but class tensions and divisions persisted.

There was also a dichotomy between the language used by the organizers and by many commentators which characterized the exhibition as a festival of peace and an opportunity to foster international harmony and trade, and the stridently nationalistic, jingoistic, and xenophobic cartoons and publications that turned the exhibition into a competition not only of products, but of values. 'The Happy Family in Hyde Park' (fig. 3), a John Tenniel cartoon that appeared in *Punch* two months after the exhibition opened, seems to represent the amity and togetherness of the human community. Prince Albert is standing outside the Crystal Palace, bringing to the attention of some well-dressed ladies and gentlemen the fact that representatives from all nations have congregated inside, where they are happily dancing, talking, and celebrating their collective participation in the great peace congress being held in Hyde Park. As was so often the case, *Punch* had captured the public mood, highlighting the internationalist, peaceful orientation of the exhibition.⁶⁴

But when was *Punch* ever not poking fun at someone or something? A closer reading of this illustration reveals its irony, suggesting the opposite of what it appears and mocking the very theme it seems to be espousing. And lest the reader miss this point, the 'Punch' character, in the lower left-hand corner, is smiling wryly, even knowingly, as if to remind the reader not to miss the deeper meaning of the image. To look closely at Tenniel's drawing is to notice that those in the foreground are Europeans, while those in the background, separated behind the glass windows of the Crystal Palace, are exotic foreigners: a Chinese, an American Indian, a Turk wearing a turban, and a bushy-haired Russian. They are alien 'others', on display as in a museum case, engaged in a bizarre and perhaps primitive dance. The British and Europeans, looking in, are separated from, and literally defined by, those they are looking at. They are civilized; the 'others' are wild, almost Bacchanalian. Rather than suggesting the happy union of peoples of all nations, that all people are one, Tenniel's caricature ridicules the strange rituals of foreigners, revealing an undercurrent of nationalism, even racism.

Prince Albert had established the internationalist tone of the exhi-



THE HAPPY FAMILY IN HYDE PARK.

Fig. 3. John Tenniel, The Happy Family in Hyde Park (Punch, 19 July 1851).

bition when at a meeting at the Mansion House in London in March 1850, he spoke of 'peace, love, and ready assistance, not only between individuals but between the nations of the earth'.⁶⁵ And throughout the spring and summer of 1851, there were speeches about the Great Exhibition ushering in an era of peace, or at least reducing the likelihood of war, by constructing new arenas in which nations could compete with each other, and by encouraging commercial, linguistic, and scientific ties among nations. For many writers, the nations of the world were like one happy family.⁶⁶

Yet these very same writers also asserted and reaffirmed those elements that they considered central to British national identity, and that differentiated Britain from other nations. *The World's Fair; or, Children's Prize Gift Book*, celebrated the English for their 'industry and perseverance'. In contrast, Indians were poor and simple; Turks were 'a fine and handsome race of people, and very grave and sensible, except when they are angry, when they grow raging and furious'; and Italians were beggars and bandits, and not particularly industrious, even though their country had fertile soil and a good climate.⁶⁷ And the nationalistic newspaper *Britannia* discussed in its analysis of the German contributions the powder-barrels and muskets, swords and bayonets, and artillery, which constituted 'Germany's preparations for the great peace exhibition'. That is, the Germans were militaristic; the British peace-loving.⁶⁸ In general, northern Europeans were held in the highest regard, followed by southern Europeans and Mediterraneans, with Russians, Asians, Africans, and native Americans bringing up the rear. Racial and ethnic groups that were perceived as exotic or different, and nations that were not westernised or industrialized, were considered lowest in the hierarchy.

The undercurrent of nationalism went beyond immutable national characteristics to include the very idea of what it meant to be 'civilized.' Thomas Onwhyn's *Mr. and Mrs. Brown's Visit to London to see the Great Exhibition of All Nations. How they were astonished at its wonders, inconvenienced by the crowds, and frightened out of their wits, by the Foreigners*, was merciless in its contempt for 'exotic' foreigners. Among those that the Browns encounter during their trip to London are bedouin, 'dark gentlemen in their bed-clothes', who carry spears, and most deprecating of all, a group from the so-called 'Cannibal Islands', who are sitting at an outdoor restaurant in Hyde Park beneath a sign that reads 'Soup a la Hottentot'. They have dark skin, bare feet, and monkey-like faces; one holds a knife, and is threatening to eat the Browns' child. They are depicted as animalistic, cannibalistic savages, the exact opposite of how the British liked to see themselves.

Edward Said has detailed how 'the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience'. He has argued 'that European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self'.⁶⁹ Although by 'Orient' Said was referring to the Middle East, he could, at least in this instance, have just as accurately been describing European attitudes towards Asia or the South Pacific. What we see in these caricatures is the process of Britons defining themselves against, and in comparison to, other nations and peoples. 'There is no more effective way of bonding together the disparate sections of restless peoples', Eric Hobsbawm has written, 'than to unite them against outsiders'.⁷⁰ This is not to imply that at the time of the Great Exhibition a sense of what it meant to be British superseded or expunged other ties or identities. Local, class, and party divisions remained strong. What the nationalist sentiments expressed around the occasion of the exhibition suggest is that even if only for a brief period, many Britons were able to subsume their allegiances to class, region, factory, or community, and rally around the flag hoisted above the Crystal Palace. At the time of the Great Exhibition, a substantial number of British men and women had a sense of what they shared with each other, and perhaps more importantly, what differentiated them from the people of other nations.

* * *

The Great Exhibition has, for more than a century, stood as the leading symbol of the mid-Victorian era, symbolizing peace (in international affairs), progress (socially, politically, technologically), and prosperity (in economics). Surely it is time to question these nostrums, because upon close examination it appears that the mid-century years, with the Revolutions of 1848, Russia's repression of Hungary, Napoleon's rise to power in France, and the Crimean War, were hardly peaceful. Nor, with the persistence of radicalism after 1848 and increasingly strident class relations, were they socially harmonious. Nor, with the aristocracy still controlling Parliament and with the modest extent of reform in 1832, were they especially democratic. Nor, despite a gradually increasing standard of living, were they uniformly prosperous. In short, the Victorian era is not what it used to be.

Similarly, the Great Exhibition can no longer stand for the peace, progress, and prosperity that did not exist. Rather, it should be regarded as symbolizing those qualities that *were* characteristic of the mid-Victorian years: fierce nationalistic competition and xenophobia in international affairs; the persistence of aristocratic power; the increas-

ing division of British society into classes; the beginnings of British economic decline; and, the entrenchment of racial attitudes that would characterize the expanding British empire. It is still the leading symbol of the mid-Victorian years, but only if its meanings are seen not as whiggish and self-evident, but protean in nature and fiercely contested.

The Great Exhibition has been remembered and interpreted in so many different ways because, from its inception, it has contained so many different meanings. What is important about the exhibition is what people have seen in it, what they have projected onto it, how they have interpreted it. This process of imparting meaning to the exhibition began at the very first organizational meeting in 1849, if not before, and continued not only throughout its duration, but even after it closed. From beginning to end, Britons have projected onto the Great Exhibition their hopes and fears, values and beliefs. That the exhibition put Britain on display there is little doubt. What is, and always will be, open to question is just which visions and versions of Britain it exhibited.

(California State University, Northridge)

Endnotes

1. Pierre Nora, 'Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Memoire*', *Representations* 26 (1989): 8-9. See also Patrick H. Hutton, *History as an Art on Memory* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1993).
2. See especially David Thelan, 'Memory and American History', *The Journal of American History* 75:4 (1989): 1117-29.
3. The analysis offered here makes a distinction between memories of the Great Exhibition and the Hyde Park Crystal Palace, and reactions to the Sydenham Crystal Palace, such as those offered by Fyodor Dostoevsky in *Notes from Underground* (1864) and George Gissing in *The Nether World* (1888), which were discussed in Jeffrey A. Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 206-8.
4. Edmund Yates, 'The International Exhibition', *Temple Bar* 5 (May 1862): 205.
5. Charles Knight, *Passages of a Working Life During Half a Century* (London: Bradbury and Evans, 1864-5), III:122.
6. [Jane Budge], *Great Events in England's History* (London: John Marshall, 1872), 222.
7. *The Times*, 6 June 1861, 29 April 1862. The allegations about Disraeli's meeting with Mrs Brydges Willyams are discussed in Robert Blake, *Disraeli* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1967), 414-15.
8. George Douglas Campbell [8th Duke of Argyll], *Autobiography and Memoirs*, ed. Dowager Duchess of Argyll (London: John Murray, 1906), I:337-8.
9. *The Times*, 30 June 1913.
10. Yates, 'The International Exhibition': 121-31. Similarly, an anonymous reviewer of the 1862 exhibition wrote rather sarcastically that the array of armaments on display in South Kensington was much more likely to guarantee peace – through deterrence, as it were – than was 'the affectation of good will and charity which we displayed rather too ostentatiously in 1851'. See 'The World's May Meeting', *Bentley's Miscellany* 51 (1862): 609.

The Great Exhibition and Historical Memory

11. Charles Mackay, *Forty Years' Recollections of Life, Literature, and Public Affairs from 1830 to 1870* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1877), II:165.
12. Campbell, *Autobiography and Memoirs*, I:337-8.
13. R.E. Francillon, *Mid-Victorian Memories* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914), 49-50.
14. Thelan, 'Memory and American History'.
15. *The Times*, 22 March 1850.
16. *Ibid.*, 23-4 April 1924.
17. *London News Chronicle*, 1 December 1936.
18. Quoted in Michael Musgrave, *The Musical Life of the Crystal Palace* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 3.
19. Violet R. Markham, *Paxton and the Bachelor Duke* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), 183. Her account was nonetheless largely positive. She was also Paxton's granddaughter, and had a lot invested in his reputation.
20. Christopher Hobhouse, *1851 and the Crystal Palace* (London: John Murray, 1937), 149-50.
21. *The Times*, 6 December 1947.
22. *Ibid.*, 4 April 1946; Mary Banham and Bevis Hillier, eds., *A Tonic to the Nation: The Festival of Britain, 1951* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1976), 7, 12.
23. Banham and Hillier, *A Tonic to the Nation*, 8.
24. *The Times*, 4 May 1951.
25. The revival of so-called Victorian values in the 1980s has been amply documented. See Charles Dellheim, *The Disenchanted Isle: Mrs. Thatcher's Capitalist Revolution* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995), 108-9, 196; Eric J. Evans, *Thatcher and Thatcherism* (London: Routledge, 1997), 3, 121-3; Gordon Marsden, ed., *Victorian Values* (London: Longman, 1990), 1-11.
26. Rupert Steiner, 'Leisure-age Crystal Palace gets a Tudor pub and bowling alley', *The Times*, 7 August 1991.
27. *The Guardian*, 29 January 2000.
28. *Ibid.*, 7 September 2000.
29. G.M. Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century and After (1792-1919)*, 2nd edn (London: Longmans, 1937), p. 295. This is true even for those historians who disparaged the Victorians, such as Yvonne Ffrench, *The Great Exhibition, 1851* (London: Harvill Press, 1951) and Nikolaus Pevsner, *High Victorian Design: A Study of the Exhibits of 1851* (London: The Architectural Press, 1951), one of the last anti-Victorian accounts.
30. Walter L. Arnstein, *Britain Yesterday and Today*, 5th edn (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1988), 71-3.
31. T.W. Heyck, *The Peoples of the British Isles*, vol. II (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1992), 349.
32. W.L. Burn, *The Age of Equipose* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1965).
33. G.M. Young, *Victorian England: Portrait of an Age*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 69.
34. Thomas Richards, *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 4-5; Asa Briggs, *Victorian People*, rev. edn (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), 20. See also Eric Hobsbawm, *Industry and Empire* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969), 92; Martin J. Wiener, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 28; Utz Haltern, *Die Londoner Weltausstellung von 1851* (Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1971).

35. Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The Idea of Poverty: England in the Early Industrial Age* (New York: Random House, 1983), 364-5. The motto is from Briggs, *Victorian People*, 41.
36. J.E. Preston Murdock, *The Romance and History of the Crystal Palace* (London: L. Upcott Gill, 1911), pp. 1-12.
37. Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition of 1851*, 54-88.
38. Asa Briggs, *The Making of Modern England, 1783-1867; The Age of Improvement* (New York: Harper & Row, 1959), 398, 402.
39. Anthony Wood, *Nineteenth Century Britain* (London: Longmans, 1960), 176.
40. Hobsbawm, *Industry and Empire*, 92.
41. Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), esp. 27-9, 52-4, 226.
42. Richards, *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England*, 1-72.
43. Siegfried Giedion, *Mechanization Takes Command* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948). Historians such as David Landes, *The Unbound Prometheus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), have almost uniformly failed to recognize the purpose and focus of the exhibition because they have largely used 'industry' in its twentieth- rather than its mid-nineteenth century meaning of sustained effort, hard work, or diligence. For useful correctives, see Raphael Samuel, 'Workshop of the World: Steam Power and Hand Technology in Mid-Victorian Britain', *History Workshop* 3 (1977): 6-72; Adrian Forty, *Objects of Desire: Design and Society Since 1750* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986), 43; Maxine Berg, *The Age of Manufactures 1700-1820*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1994); Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, rev. edn (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 165-8.
44. Henry Brougham [William Davis, pseud.], 'Hints to Philanthropists; or a Collective View of Practical Means of Improving the Condition of the Poor and Labouring Classes of Society', *Edinburgh Review* 41 (October 1824): 96-122.
45. See, among many, Michael Argles, *South Kensington to Robbins* (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1964); R.J. Montgomery, *Examinations* (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1965), esp. 76; Quentin Bell, *The Schools of Design* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963); Mabel Tylecote, *The Mechanics' Institutes of Lancashire and Yorkshire Before 1851* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957).
46. On the absence of a 'mass market' for consumer goods or even a 'humble consumer society' in the late-18th and early-19th centuries, *pace* Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J.H. Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), see Lorna Weatherill, *Consumer Behavior and Material Culture in Britain, 1660-1760* (London: Routledge, 1988), 193, and Carole Shammas, 'Changes in English and Anglo-American Consumption from 1550 to 1800', in John Brewer and Roy Porter, eds., *Consumption and the World of Goods* (London: Routledge, 1993), 177-205, who claims that only 25 percent of the adult population regularly used such items as tobacco, sugar products, and caffeine drinks (179). Insofar as there was growth in the market for consumer goods in the late-eighteenth century, it was enjoyed largely by the upper classes; to a great extent businessmen, shopkeepers, and the middle classes only benefited a generation or two later, in the 1830s, and it was not until the second half of the nineteenth century that middle-class homes would take on the cluttered appearance now so commonly associated with the Victorians. See Neil McKendrick, 'Josiah Wedgwood and the Commercialization of the Potteries' in McKendrick, Brewer and Plumb, 100; Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 375-6;

The Great Exhibition and Historical Memory

- Asa Briggs, *Victorian Things* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), esp. 213-59.
47. John Scott Russell, 'Statement of Proceedings Preliminary to the Exhibition of Industry of All Nations, 1851', 8 February 1850, *Collection of Printed Documents and Forms used in carrying on the business of the Exhibition of 1851*, National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, I:5.
48. B.R. Mitchell, *British Historical Statistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 541.
49. P.J. Cain and A.G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion 1688-1914* (London: Longman, 1993).
50. Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition*, 54-88.
51. Karl Marx to Friedrich Engels, 13 October 1851, in *Karl Marx on America and the Civil War*, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), 37.
52. *The Times*, 29 July 1851; Ralph Nicholson Wornum, 'The Exhibition as Lesson in Taste', *The Art Journal Illustrated Catalogue* (London: George Virtue, 1851), vii***-viii***; John Tallis, *Tallis' History and Description of the Crystal Palace, and the Exhibition of the World's Industry in 1851* (London: John Tallis & Co. [1852]), II:259; 'Philoponus', *The Great Exhibition of 1851; or, the World in its Workshops* (London: Edward Churton, 1850), 35-42, 47-57, 89-91, 133; James Ward, *The World in its Workshops*, 2nd edn (London: William S. Orr & Co., 1851), 21, 28-9; Archibald Alison, *Some Account of My Life and Writings* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1883), 28-9. The notable exception to this assessment came from [W.B. Adams], 'Industrial Exhibition', *Westminster Review* (July 1851): 391.
53. J.A. Bennett, *Science at the Great Exhibition* (Cambridge: Whipple Museum of the History of Science, 1983).
54. Quoted in Tallis, *Tallis' History* II:195.
55. Tallis, I:101; the now familiar phrase 'To see and be seen' appears in *The Times*, 24 May 1851.
56. The literature on this point is voluminous, but see, among many, Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), 56; Young, 30-7; Norman Gash, *Aristocracy and People* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), 214-18; Gareth Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working Class History 1832-1982* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Margot C. Finn, *After Chartism: Class and Nation in English Radical Politics 1848-1874* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
57. Burn, *The Age of Equipoise*; Young, *Victorian England*, 69.
58. On Palmerston's decision to attend the exhibition only on Saturdays when the price of admission was high and the number of working-class visitors was low, see the Palmerston (Broadland) papers, Southampton University Library, D/12. On the arrangement of admission prices, it should be pointed out that the one shilling sum (at a time when the skilled workers labouring to build the Crystal Palace were paid 28s per week) effectively divided British society into those who were 'respectable' and those who were not, rather than into rigid Marxian classes. It also needs to be emphasized that the commissioners had little idea of just who they were including and excluding, and that the admission fee was not the result of precise social analysis, but a guess based on a number of assumptions about the make-up of society. See Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition*, 128-58.
59. Minutes of the Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851, Imperial College of Science, Technology, and Medicine, 12 May 1851.
60. *Reynolds's Newspaper*, 8 June, 11 August, 12 October 1851; G. Julian Harney, *The Friend*

Jeffrey Auerbach

- of the People*, 22 (10 May 1851): 152.
61. *Punch*, 14 June 1851.
62. *The Times*, 29 May 1851; Gideon Mantell, *The Journal of Gideon Mantell*, ed. E. Cecil Curwen (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), 273.
63. Mantell, *Journal*; *Punch*, 5 July 1851.
64. *Punch*, 19 July 1851.
65. *The Times*, 22 March 1850.
66. See, among many, Tallis, *Tallis' History*, I:103, 110; *The Royal Exchange and the Palace of the People*, 162-3; *The World's Fair; or, Children's Prize Gift Book* (London: Thomas Dean & Son [1851]), 3; *A Guide to the Great Exhibition; containing a description of every principal object of interest* (London: George Routledge & Co., 1851), 1, 11-13; *Economist* 9 (26 July 1851): 813; Ward, 5-7.
67. *The World's Fair; or, Children's Prize Gift Book*, 71, 76.
68. *Britannia*, 2 November 1851.
69. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Random House, 1978), 1-3.
70. Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 91.