

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

The Indian Role in the 1876 Centennial Celebration

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4p75530d>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 1(4)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Trennert, Robert A.

**Publication Date**

1976-09-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

## THE INDIAN ROLE IN THE 1876 CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Robert A. Trennert

The American nation found itself wrapped up in a major contradiction in 1876. Celebrating its own one-hundredth year of independence from Britain, the country was ruthlessly extinguishing the independence of the Native American people. Despite the Sioux victory over General Custer that summer, 1876 proved to be no year of celebration for the Indian. The end of his freedom was at hand. Yet, ironically, while wars still continued on the plains, the United States government decided to include the American Indian in its exposition. The role the Indian played in the Centennial is illustrative of the contemporary public image of Indian America and of the utter incapacity of the nation to see more than curiosity value in native culture. It also may serve to suggest that history should not be repeated one hundred years later.

The Centennial celebration held in Philadelphia between May and November 1876 was very much an organizational product of Congress and the federal government.<sup>1</sup> Each department of the federal bureaucracy participated, and this meant that those agencies dealing with the Native American were expected to have an exhibit. No one appears to have questioned the logic of having an Indian exhibit or the irony of having Indians participate in celebrating American independence. Thus the only question facing the government, as it first came to grips with the exhibition, concerned what should be included in the display and, indirectly, how the Indians of the United States should be portrayed. Would it be appropriate to invite large groups of Indians to come to Philadelphia as a living demonstration of their customs and culture, or would it be better to present a static display of Indian arts, crafts, and ethnology? The story of the Indian exhibition at Philadelphia is that of a few individuals attempting, within the limits of their biased views of the American Indian, to present an effective display of Indian life. Unfortunately, the results proved less than satisfactory.

Spencer F. Baird, the aggressive assistant secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, dominated the Indian exhibit. He held general responsibility for collecting the materials, constructing the display, and running the exhibition. Baird coordinated his activities with the Office of Indian Affairs, which, along with the Smithsonian and the United States Centennial Commission, shared responsibility for the affair. When Baird began planning in 1874 he had two things in mind. One was to use the occasion to compile a major collection of ethnological and archaeological material, which by law would become property of the Smithsonian at the close of the exhibit. He also wanted to devote part of the exhibit to the contemporary Indian in order to make the affair as complete as possible and offer a better understanding between the two cultures. He hoped to accomplish this by using the opportunity to collect items being discarded as the tribes came under the government's program of acculturation and by bringing in an "exhibition of living representatives of the principal Indian tribes."<sup>2</sup>

Baird organized the ethnological expeditions first. Under the direction of famous western explorer John Wesley Powell, anthropologists fanned out over the western portions of the country during 1875. Looking for "areas of ethnology least known," they moved into Alaska, Puget Sound, northern California, and the lands of the Shoshoni, Paiute, Moqui, and Navajo tribes.<sup>3</sup> All of the expeditions sent back tons of collected material of Indian manufacture. James G. Swan's trip to Alaska and British Columbia proved the most prolific, as he purchased an extensive collection of rare manufactured goods from the Haida and Makah at a fraction of their value. These goods included a giant canoe, several smaller canoes, gold and silver jewelry, snowshoes, dog sleds, and many totem poles and other ceremonial items.<sup>4</sup>

Despite the extensive expeditions, Baird realized that large areas of the country were not covered by the major collections. To close this gap, he decided to use existing government facilities among the tribes to obtain additional materials. These collections were to concentrate on the present life of the Indian, but older items would be welcome, so that they could show how much "progress" had been made.<sup>5</sup> This decision gave the Indian Office and the various tribes an opportunity to contribute directly to the exhibition.

The Indian bureau, permeated with the philosophy of destroying native culture, had absolutely no idea what artifacts were available at the

This is a revision of an article that first appeared in *Prologue: The Journal of the National Archives*, Summer 1974.

Indian agencies. It, therefore, commissioned Otis T. Mason, of Columbia University, to prepare a guide to collecting material for the exhibition. The thirty-two-page pamphlet, entitled *Ethnological Directions Relative to the Indian Tribes of the United States*, listed items of interest to the government. These included specimens of material then or formerly in use, including weapons, utensils, dwellings, dress, photographs, and written descriptions of tribal life or customs.<sup>6</sup> The Indian Office sent two copies of the pamphlet to every Indian agent in April 1875, along with the circular from the commissioner, instructing the agent to check such articles as he could procure, note the probable cost, and return the pamphlet. If the Office wanted the items, it would grant authority for purchase.<sup>7</sup> Basically, this procedure authorized agents to begin an unscientific search for all remaining valuable crafts in the possession of those tribes not then actively resisting American expansion.

The use of Indian agents to collect ethnological material proved disastrous. The Indian Office was not overly enthusiastic about the project and provided little encouragement, often ignoring letters of inquiry or clarification from confused agents.<sup>8</sup> The real difficulties, however, came with the agents. Clearly, there was antipathy toward preserving any kind of Indian culture and many found excuses to do nothing. One agent decided that his tribe had nothing of value and gave his pamphlets away. Several others said that the Indian people did not have the proper attitude about participating in the Centennial, would not donate their valuable goods, and were asking exorbitant prices for even the smallest items and for worthless material. A few looked upon the request as a curiosity hunt, checked off any trinket that they might readily buy, and returned the list.<sup>9</sup>

Even agents who were seriously interested in making a collection encountered difficulties. The government's acculturation policy had already significantly influenced most tribes. The comment of James W. Fairchild, at the Siletz Agency, Oregon, was fairly typical: "These Indians have been so long among the whites, that they have adopted their customs, utensils, etc., and but few of their old articles of clothing, utensils for cooking, etc., are still in use, or can be procured."<sup>10</sup> The tribes that were still using native materials presented a different problem. A few were willing to donate their crafts to the exhibit, even to the extent of offering items manufactured "by a few of their old people [who] know how," but such collections were

necessarily limited to a few miscellaneous items. Many other tribes were not interested in making donations to the national celebration but would agree only to sell their work. The agents' responses to such replies varied greatly. Many considered the prices too high and would not recommend purchase. An agent at the Cimarron Agency in New Mexico lectured the Utes there on civic responsibility when they asked for money in return for items, telling them that they were indebted to the nation for their rations and goods. James M. Haworth, on the other hand, suggested purchasing articles from the Kiowa and Comanche because "my people are quite poor and need the help of the money the articles would bring them." Any kind of collecting was risky. Concerning a special agent who proposed collecting in the Denver area, Powell noted that many of the items were either acquired from traders or manufactured by the Indians for tourists and, thus, devoid of ethnological value.<sup>11</sup>

None of the agents' collections excited Baird. In fact, he quickly became disillusioned with their work. After inspecting the first packages, he wrote Indian Commissioner John Q. Smith that it would be wise to stop wasting money: "Their collections are not likely to add very materially to the present richness of the ethnological exposition of the Bureau, and what would be paid to them from the allowance can perhaps be better expended otherwise." Smith agreed and, a few days later, ordered all agents to "incur no further expenses than is required to prepare and forward such articles as you have in hand."<sup>12</sup>

In making these collections, most of the activity was directed toward making static displays. As the opening of the exposition moved closer, however, increasing attention focused on direct Indian participation. Some Indian interest definitely existed, but, in most cases, it seemed to be inspired more by white ideas than by any Indian desire to celebrate the anniversary of the nation. For instance, a number of tribal leaders expressed interest in being present at the Centennial. Perhaps the most noteworthy proposal came from Spotted Tail's band of Sioux. Spotted Tail, who was trying to keep his young men from leaving their reservations to join Crazy Horse and Sitting Bull on the plains, suggested that he be allowed to represent the American Indian at Philadelphia. This idea was probably encouraged by the local Indian agent, Edward A. Howard, who suggested that 100 families be transported to the exhibition with "their Lodges,

Costumes, Camp Equipage, and 50 Ponies, in order to Establish a Regular Indian Camp so as to enable the White people to see what so few have yet been able to see, the Native Indian in his original style." Howard had another reason for suggesting a trip east, however; it would tend to impress the potentially hostile members of the tribe with the power of the government.<sup>13</sup> John Clum at the San Carlos Agency in Arizona saw the same advantages. He wrote that the Apaches were anxious to attend the Centennial and predicted that they would "form an additional interesting feature at the great exposition." Moreover, the trip would allow the Apache to realize the extent and power of the American nation.<sup>14</sup>

The Five Civilized Tribes in Indian Territory were also interested in attending. Since the inhabitants of Indian Territory failed to classify as a part of the nation automatically invited to participate, they wanted a special invitation. George A. Crawford, a Kansas politician, sponsored the proposal and announced that the Grand Council of the Five Nations had created an "International Fair Association" under the direction of Major John A. Foreman, a white. But the Grand Council refused to finance the exhibit, and, therefore, Crawford asked the government for an appropriation. He hoped that the Indians could use this money to construct a building of their own similar to other state pavilions at the exposition, suggesting that one be constructed in the form of a "Great Wigwam" where the Indians could illustrate the "progress of the Indian from barbarism to civilization." Eventually, the Centennial Commission extended an invitation to the "General Council of the Civilized Nations of the Indian Territory" but provided no funds, rendering their attendance impossible.<sup>15</sup>

Baird and Powell reacted enthusiastically to the idea of bringing Indians to Philadelphia. Although such an event would attract most people from sheer curiosity, the Smithsonian scientists hoped that Indian visitors would improve the understanding between the two races and demonstrate to Americans the richness of native culture. In this way the general population could see the exotic Navajo demonstrate their ability at weaving blankets and belts; the Pueblo might produce their famous pottery; and the Blackfeet could demonstrate their skills at dressing buffalo skins. It promised to be an outstanding and informative attraction.<sup>16</sup>

Indian participation would be expensive. So expensive, that it would require an additional

appropriation from Congress to cover the cost of transporting, lodging, and supervising them. In the fall of 1875 the Indian Office officially requested \$100,000 for Centennial objects. An unspecified part of this fund was designated for bringing 30 or 40 Indian families to the exhibition. Despite its participation, the Indian Office was not enthusiastic about the project. The Indian commissioner was reluctant to demonstrate a native culture that the government considered valueless, and it was agreed that Baird would take charge of the whole affair.<sup>17</sup>

Although unable to take official action prior to congressional approval, Baird immediately launched into plans for Indian participation. He needed to decide which tribes would be represented, where they would live while at the exposition, and how much transportation and subsistence for them would cost. In consultation with Powell, Swan, and Smith, Baird agreed to exclude the partly civilized tribes living in the more settled areas of the country. One reason for this decision was that "their mixture with whites and negroes and their adoption of their manners and customs renders them less interesting as objects of ethnological display."<sup>18</sup> Thus, only the most curious, unusual, or primitive tribes were desired. The final list of tribes to be invited numbered 18, all of which had been subdued or at least felt threatened by the government. Many were small tribes from the Pacific Coast, such as the Hoopaw, Yocut, and Comanche. In addition, Spotted Tail's Sioux, Mandan, Shoshoni, Ute, Paiute, Comanche, Modoc, Navajo, and Moqui (Hopi) would be represented. In approving this selection, Powell stated, "I think you obtain from this list a number of tribes representing as great diversity [of] habitation, habits, customs, language, etc., as could be obtained from that number."<sup>19</sup>

Tribal representatives had to be selected with extreme care. Powell and Baird realized that the behavior of the tribes would reflect upon them and the government. Therefore, they decided that Indian families must comply with a 13-point checklist, a decision that effectively compromised their desire to present true native culture. The individuals selected had to be more white than Indian. Each family head had to be influential in his tribe, speak English, have a pleasant disposition, be the "cleanest and finest looking," and have a wife "well skilled in household arts," a clean child, a dog, and a pony. They should bring with them samples of housing, utensils, and "implements of superstition and religion."<sup>20</sup> Thus, despite all the talk,

the directors of the exhibition could not bring themselves to permit [unassimilated] Indians to attend. Only those that fit into the government's image of a "good Indian" would be invited.

The Indian Office began to investigate the cost of Indian participation. Based on 120 tribal representatives and 20 attendants remaining in Philadelphia for seven months, the estimate came to \$115,000. This figure included transportation, subsistence at the rate of \$1.00 a day per individual, and miscellaneous costs.<sup>21</sup> The families were to reside on a reservation of some 5 acres on the exposition grounds in Fairmont Park. Here, according to Indian Commissioner Smith, "each group will erect, for their own accommodations, a representative dwelling wigwam, hut, 'wick-up' or 'tipi' . . . with sufficient room for carrying on the several industries which are found among the tribes they represent." In anticipation of a favorable decision on funding, Indian agents received instructions to proceed with the selection of families.<sup>22</sup> Thus, by early 1876 all arrangement seemed to be in order. Only congressional approval for Indian participation was needed.

Baird took an active part in attempting to persuade Congress to appropriate the money. Others supported the proposal, including John Eaton and Colonel Stephen C. Lyford, of the Centennial Commission, and congressional representative Martin Maginnis, of Montana. In January 1876, Baird, Eaton, and Lyford met to discuss how to get congressional approval for the \$115,000. With the opening of the exposition just a few months away and the time for organizing the Indians short, quick action was imperative.<sup>23</sup> The group decided to use its personal influence with Congress and to enlist the aid of President Grant. Baird went before the House Committee on Indian Affairs to plead for funds. Two major reasons—neither involving native contributions to the nation—were advanced for the committee's consideration: "First to show the American people and then visitors from abroad the general character of the American Indian; and secondly, to impress the Indians themselves, through their representatives on the occasion in question with the powers and resources of the U. S. and of civilization generally." Grant delivered a message to Congress on March 27, asking for the additional appropriation.<sup>24</sup>

Despite these efforts, Congress did not supply the money, and plans for Indian participation had to be cancelled. The reasons for this action are apparent. Many members of the Indian Affairs Committee were apathetic about Baird's

planned exhibition, and a question about the constitutionality of subsidizing any part of the exposition had arisen, effectively preventing the committee from acting until it was too late.<sup>25</sup>

Throughout the attempt to bring the Indians to Philadelphia, the Indian Office did little to aid Baird. Before final congressional action, the Indian commissioner discouraged all Indian requests for visits to the Centennial. While many applications were legitimate expressions of tribal interest, some were purely speculative curiosities. One proposal came from C. C. A. McDonald of San Francisco, who had organized seven Indians into a military drill team for the purpose of "demonstrating to our Government and others that even the 'despised Indian' can be successfully taught the 'Science of Arms.'" Another man wanted to bring a band of Indian musicians.<sup>26</sup> All such requests were denied with the same reply: "No Indians will be permitted to leave their reservations to go to the Centennial without authority from Congress." After Congress rejected the appropriation, and it became evident that there would be no official representation, several entrepreneurs asked permission to bring groups of Indians at their own expense and to exhibit them. This permission the Indian Office had the foresight to refuse. Smith knew that if the exhibition was not under direct government control, it would develop into a "side show," with the tribesmen exploited for profit.<sup>27</sup>

The loss of Indian participation deprived the exhibition of its most attractive aspect and of any real chance to acquaint the public with living Indian culture, restricted as the opportunity might have been. Yet Baird had lost none of his enthusiasm, and the main fruits of his other efforts would still be on display. The Indian exhibition was housed in the southwestern corner of the United States Government Building.<sup>28</sup> The building was a rather dismal affair, and photographs of the Indian display show a paradigm of Victorian taste, with specimens and curios crowded into every nook and cranny and even suspended from the roof beams.

The stated theme of the display was "to reconstruct the past history of the different races of man," by providing "an opportunity of studying those tribes of Indians which have come least under the influence of civilized man."<sup>29</sup> This assertion rings with the then controversial thoughts of Herbert Spencer on social Darwinism and the survival of the fittest. Indeed, the entire organization of the exhibition worked to show the public a culture that was being

displaced by progress. As much as they admired Indian societies, Baird and the other Smithsonian scientists saw them as anachronisms, and their work unavoidably reflected this view. Prior to the opening of the Centennial Baird stated, "So far as the ethnological display is concerned, it is quite reasonable to infer that, by the expiration of a second hundred-year period of the life of the American Republic, the Indian will have entirely ceased to present any distinctive characters, and will be merged into the general population."<sup>30</sup> Despite the scientists' desire to present a favorable image of Indian societies, most of the emphasis centered on curiosity value. William Dean Howells, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*, reflected this trend in his reaction to the exhibition. "The red man," he wrote, "as he appears in effigy and in photograph in this collection, is a hideous demon, whose malign traits can hardly inspire any emotion softer than abhorrence."<sup>31</sup> Unfortunately, most visitors would have agreed with Howells.

There were several parts to the exhibition. As a visitor entered the hall he was confronted with rows of cases and tables that could only excite a scientist. The hand-hewn walnut cases, purchased especially for the exhibition, contained piles of unidentified Indian artifacts.<sup>32</sup> Newspaper and guidebook descriptions of these collections show that they were endless, antiseptic, and confusedly arranged. The description in *Frank Leslie's Historical Register of the United States Centennial Exposition* is typical:

The collection of Indian curiosities is large and comprehends a very curious and instructive exhibit . . . pottery, bead and wampum work, carvings, costumes, domestic utensils, and household implements of a very curious and uncommon collection, illustrating games in vogue among the different tribes of Indians, among which are found various gaming sticks, dice and packs of quaintly colored cards. . . . Indian masks, pipes, tobacco-pouches, the collection of these last being large and most interesting, in every variety of stone as to the pipes, ornamented with carvings, in many cases quite artistic and representing a high degree of art idea.<sup>33</sup>

Indian weapons were easily the most common artifacts displayed. The collection included such items as a Moqui throwing stick, a wooden Haida ax, and a Sioux bow made of the spliced horns of a mountain sheep. Yet even these items did little to thrill the visitor, as Edward H. Knight noted. Specimens of "savage" weapons "were in most cases treated as mere casual objects thrown in as curiosities, and in many cases so little esteemed by the parties in charge that they were huddled away under tables."<sup>34</sup>

Because no Indians participated in the exhibit, manikins were used to display Indian costumes and dress. "There were . . . exhibited numerous life-size figures to show every variety of Indian costume and personal decoration," stated the *Smithsonian Annual Report* of 1876.<sup>35</sup> Although the manikins looked remarkably like cigar-store Indians, they elicited considerable interest and managed to direct attention away from their purpose of displaying Indian crafts. In fact, they presented a grotesque stereotype of the Native American. The figure of Tall Bull of the Cheyenne caught the eye of many. This warrior had been killed at the battle of Summit Springs in 1869. His war dress, taken from his body and "composed of tough hide, ornamented with bull's horns, sleigh bells, colored beads and animal claws," had a morbid attraction. The costume of a male Paiute, collected by Powell in Utah, also drew much interest, and one reporter described every detail to his readers. Probably the most grizzly figure was that of an Indian religious man, which some took to be the Sioux leader Red Cloud. Most descriptions of this figure, "attired in all the tinsel and finery of a sageman," with a raised tomahawk in one hand and a string of scalps around his middle, revealed the horror most visitors must have felt. A "repulsive looking" character stated one paper, while another described him as being "ready to pounce on some unsuspecting victim."<sup>36</sup> Such figures were not likely to inspire in the observer any understanding of Indian culture and life. More likely, the manikins convinced many that the Indian deserved extermination.

Swan's collection of material from the Pacific Northwest dominated much of the display. Its monumental size and the display of the totem poles, seen for the first time in the East, caused quite a stir. One post from Cape Flattery, 45 feet tall and decorated with the forms of humans, frogs, beavers, and bears, looked down over the entire exhibition. The carved symbols stimulated considerable speculation about their meaning. One source explained that the poles were not of religious significance but were records of genealogy. This hypothesis came from the idea that since Indians were known to take animal names, it would not be surprising for family members to be represented by their animal appellations. In this way, the pedigree of the carver was recorded in cedar and the family name perpetuated. Baird said that the posts illustrated "the habits of the highly ingenious Northwestern Indians" and listed them among the most important specimens

collected by Swan.<sup>37</sup> The big canoe also found a prominent place in the exhibition. Its size required placement in the center aisle where, wrote Baird, "it attracted great attention."<sup>38</sup>

A fine display of photographs of Indians compensated somewhat for the lack of Indian participation. Two of the most famous frontier photographers of the day, W. H. Jackson and Jack Hillers, contributed the bulk of the pictures. Hillers, who frequently worked with Powell, took over the display. On large illuminated boards were two dozen pictures taken in the Hopi villages of northern Arizona and a group of Indian portraits taken among the Paiute.<sup>39</sup> The sophisticated composition of the photographic work conveyed a romantic and noble image that apparently escaped critics of the exhibition. William Dean Howells, a man who should have been able to recognize the romantic, saw nothing in the photographs to inspire the imagination.<sup>40</sup>

Despite the absence of official representation, some Native Americans did attend the Centennial. Nevertheless, they did little to improve the image of the Indian. The government was willing to allow small tribal groups to attend, provided they went "as visitors only, in charge of competent and proper persons, [and] will not discredit themselves or the Indian service, and will return without expense to government." Under these restrictions a delegation of 24 Menominee and Chippewa attended the dedication of the Memorial Fountain on the Fourth of July. A Seneca "Coronet Band of Musicians" was also permitted to come to Philadelphia.<sup>41</sup> John Clum managed to bring a group of Apaches. The recently retired San Carlos agent decided to bring a 22-person delegation east during the Centennial to show that the tribesmen were not as fearsome as the public imagined. To raise funds, however, Clum organized his companions into actors and wrote a play depicting Indian life in Arizona, resulting in a terrible little production, presented in several cities, that concentrated on Apache methods of warfare. The entourage arrived in Philadelphia in September and toured the exhibition. Although it is not recorded whether they put on a play, Clum's Apache players would have complemented the primitivist theme of the whole exhibit.<sup>42</sup>

Public response to the entire Indian exhibition appears to have been mixed. Although the United State Government Building was very popular, and thousands of visitors passed through its displays, probably few increased their understanding of Native Americans.<sup>43</sup> For all the concern of Baird and others, the Indians

still looked like curios, dead yet strangely romantic. The displays themselves were partly to blame, for the presentation was created by scientists who, for all their ability, were accustomed to dealing with inanimate specimens. The Indians were depicted as if they were no longer living. Newspaper accounts abounded with phrases such as "other remains of the aboriginal races of this continent," "a large collection of relics," and "whose remains are found in the Western and Southern States."<sup>44</sup> Thus, in many respects, the ethnological exhibition failed to offer a complete portrait of the American Indian. Nevertheless, the presence of living Indians probably would have done little to attain more authenticity. Because of their attitudes, the Smithsonian and Indian Office officials—no matter how sympathetic to the Indians—probably would have maintained the same tenor in the exposition even had Indian people participated. It is not difficult to visualize tribal participants being displayed as mutants or missing links in the same way that their crafts and cultures were treated as specimens and relics.

The real failure of the Centennial Indian exhibition came in the inability of Anglo-American society to see any lasting value in Indian culture. In effect, the approach to creating the display incorporated most of the white cultural prejudices against the Indian. The identity of the Native American was not allowed to surface; he was treated as a museum piece, and his advice and opinion was never solicited. Thus, it should not be surprising if such past experiences have led some Indian groups to oppose Indian participation in the 1976 Bicentennial celebration.

## NOTES

1. The Centennial Commission, in charge of planning the fair, was made up of representatives of all branches of government. Those planning the Indian display, in addition of Spencer F. Baird of the Smithsonian, were John Eaton of the Interior Department and Colonel Stephen G. Lyford of the War Department.
2. Interior Department circular, Jan. 15, 1875, Indian Office Circular, April 3, 1875, Philadelphia Centennial, Papers and Correspondence, Incoming and Outgoing, 1875-1883, Record Unit 70, Smithsonian Institution Archives (hereafter cited as RU 70, SIA); *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of Smithsonian Institution . . . for the year of 1875* (Washington, D.C., 1876), p. 69.
3. Material concerning these expeditions is found in Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives (hereafter cited as RG 75, NA); presidential message, Mar. 27, 1876, House

- Ex. Doc. 148, pp. 20-21; *Smithsonian Annual Report*, 1875, p. 68.
4. Information on Swan's expedition is found in Correspondence between James G. Swan and S. F. Baird, RU 70, SIA; Guy Allison, "Forgotten Great Man of Washington History, James G. Swan," in *Longview* (Wash.) *Daily News*, Swan Collection, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution.
  5. Baird to H. N. Clum, Aug. 30, 1875, Letters Received, RG 75, NA.
  6. Otis T. Mason, *Ethnological Directions Relative to the Indian Tribes of the United States* (Washington, D.C., 1875), in Letters Received, RG 75, NA, and RU 70, SIA.
  7. Indian Office circular, Apr. 3, 1875, RU 70, SIA.
  8. S. S. Dyar, Klamath Agency, to E. P. Smith, Nov. 16, 1875, Letters Received, RG 75, NA.
  9. J. C. Bridgeman, Green Bay Agency, to E. P. Smith, Dec. 10, 1875; Henry W. Bingham, Cheyenne River Agency, to E. P. Smith, Nov. 29, 1875; Isaac T. Gibson, Osage Agency, to E. P. Smith, Sept. 31, 1875; Paul Beckwith, Devil's Lake Agency, to E. P. Smith, Dec. 5, 1875; Eugene C. Charouse, Tulalip Agency, to E. P. Smith, June 9, 1875. *Ibid.*
  10. James W. Fairchild to E. P. Smith, July 10, 1875; J. C. Bridgeman to E. P. Smith, Dec. 10, 1875; William H. Fanton, Fort Belknap Agency, to E. P. Smith, Sept. 1, 1875. *Ibid.*
  11. Dyar to E. P. Smith, July 27, 1875, Alex Irvine to E. P. Smith, June 1, 1875, James M. Haworth to E. P. Smith, Aug. 24, 1875, Powell to Baird, Oct. 29, 1875. *Ibid.*
  12. Baird to J. Q. Smith, Mar. 29, 1876, J. Q. Smith to J. O. Miles, Cheyenne and Arapaho Agency, Apr. 4, 1876. *Ibid.*
  13. E. A. Howard to E. P. Smith, Oct. 9, 1875. *Ibid.*
  14. John Clum to E. P. Smith, Nov. 11, 1875. *Ibid.*
  15. George A. Crawford to Secretary of the Interior, Aug. 27, 1875, Acting Secretary of the Interior to E. P. Smith, Aug. 5, 1875. *Ibid.*
  16. *Smithsonian Annual Report*, 1875, p. 69; Baird to Lyford, Mar. 23, 1876, House Ex. Doc. 148, pp. 32-36.
  17. J. Q. Smith to Secretary of the Interior, Feb. 10, 1876, J. Q. Smith to R. H. Milroy, Mar. 6, 1876, Letters sent, RG 75, NA.
  18. J. Q. Smith to Baird, Mar. 9, 1876; Letters Received. *Ibid.*
  19. There are several lists of tribes to be invited. See Powell to Baird, Mar. 4, 1876, RU 70, SIA; J. Q. Smith to Baird, Mar. 9, 1876, Letters Received, RG 75, NA; Baird to Lyford, Mar. 23, 1876, House Ex. Doc. 148, pp. 32-36.
  20. Anonymous memo [Baird's?], n.d., in Powell to Baird, Mar. 4, 1876, RU 70, SIA.
  21. J. Q. Smith to Baird, Mar. 9, 1876, Letters Received, RG 75, NA.
  22. J. Q. Smith to Secretary of the Interior, Feb. 10, 1876, Letters Sent, *ibid.*; J. Q. Smith to Baird, Jan. 24, 1876, Letters Received, *ibid.*; W. P. Blake to Baird, Jan. 21, 1876, RU 70, SIA; Baird to Lyford, Mar. 23, 1876, House Ex. Doc. 148, pp. 32-36.
  23. Eaton to Baird, Jan. 26, 1876, RU 70, SIA; Baird to J. Q. Smith, Jan. 24, 1876, Letters Received, RG 75, NA.
  24. S. A. Galpin to Martin Maginnis, May 6, 1876, Letters Sent, RG 75, NA; Indian Office circular, Feb. 3, 1876, *ibid.*; presidential message, Mar. 27, 1876, and Baird to Lyford, Mar. 23, 1876, House Ex. Doc. 148, pp. 32-36.
  25. *Congressional Record*, 44 Cong., 1 Sess., 1876, pp. 959-971, 996-1002, 1024-1037, 4493, 4755. In late May Maginnis introduced a resolution (House Resolution 118) to permit Indians to visit the Centennial, but it died in committee. *Ibid.*, p. 3366.
  26. McDonald to Goshorn, Dec. 4, 1875, John Beeson to J. Q. Smith, Feb. 12, 1876, Letters Received, RG 75, NA.
  27. J. Q. Smith to Secretary of the Interior, Apr. 29, 1876, Letters Sent. *Ibid.*
  28. H. Craig Miner, "The United States Government Building at the Centennial Exhibition, 1874-1877," *Prologue* 4 (1972): 203-218; Baird to Lyford, Mar. 23, 1876, House Ex. Doc. 148, pp. 32-36; *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, May 23, 1876.
  29. *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution . . . for the Year 1876* (Washington, D.C., 1877), pp. 10, 34.
  30. Baird to Lyford, Mar. 23, 1876, House Ex. Doc. 148, pp. 32-36.
  31. William Dean Howells, "A Sennight of the Centennial," *Atlantic Monthly* 38 (1876): 103.
  32. J. Q. Smith to Baird, Feb. 7, 1876, RU 70, SIA.
  33. Frank H. Norton, ed., *Frank Leslie's Historical Register of the United States Centennial Exposition, 1876* (New York, 1877), p. 103; *Phila. Public Ledger*, May 24, 1876; *Phila. Evening Bulletin*, May 23, 1876.
  34. Edward H. Knight, *A Study of the Savage Weapons at the Centennial Exhibition, Philadelphia, 1876* (Washington, D.C., 1880).
  35. *Smithsonian Annual Report*, 1876, p. 10; Baird to J. Q. Smith, June 12, 1876, Letters Received, RG 75, NA; J. Q. Smith to Baird, Feb. 7, 1876, RU 70, SIA.
  36. *Phila. Public Ledger*, May 24, 1876; Miner, "U. S. Government Building," p. 211.
  37. *Phila. Public Ledger*, June 12, 1876; Norton, ed., *Leslie's Historical Register*, p. 103; *Smithsonian Annual Report*, 1876, p. 39; *Phila. Evening Bulletin*, May 23, 1876.
  38. *Phila. Public Ledger*, June 12, 1876; Baird to J. Q. Smith, June 12, 1876, Letters Received, RG 75, NA.
  39. *Phila. Public Ledger*, May 24, 1876.
  40. Howells, "Sennight of the Centennial," p. 103.
  41. J. Q. Smith to Agent Bridgeman, Kenesha, Wisc., June 13, 1876; Smith to Charles Ewing, June 21, 1876, Smith to Agent P. Sherman, Forrestville, N. Y., Aug. 25, 1876, Letters Received, RG 75, NA.
  42. J. Q. Smith to Baird, Sept. 28, 1876, *ibid.*; John Clum, "Apaches as Thespians in 1876," *New Mexico Historical Review* 6 (1931): 76-99; Ralph and Natasha Friar, *The Only Good Indian: The Hollywood Gospel* (New York, 1972), pp. 57-59.
  43. *New York Times*, May 12, 1876; *Philadelphia Inquirer*, May 16, 1876; *Phila. Evening Bulletin*, May 10, 23, 1876.
  44. *Phila. Public Ledger*, May 10, 25, 1876; *Phila. Evening Bulletin*, May 23, 1876.